

Exploring Tertiary Students' Perceptions of Instructors' Oral Corrective Feedback in EFL Speaking Classes

Tuan Van Vu^{1*}

¹*Faculty of Foreign Legal Languages, Hanoi Law University, Viet Nam*

E-mail: tuanvv@hlu.edu.vn*

*Corresponding author

Article Info	Abstract
Received: 03 May 2026 Reviewed: 10 June 2026 – 15 August 2026 Accepted: 25 August 2026 Published: 30 August 2026	Purpose Oral corrective feedback is an essential component of EFL speaking instruction because it helps learners notice spoken errors, improve accuracy, and develop confidence in oral communication. However, limited mixed-methods research has examined how tertiary students perceive feedback types, timing and frequency, emotional effects, and feedback uptake in EFL speaking classes. Methodology This study investigated tertiary students' perceptions of instructors' oral corrective feedback through a mixed-methods design. Quantitative data were collected from 385 tertiary students using a researcher-made 45-item five-point Likert-scale questionnaire, while qualitative data were obtained from 17 voluntary participants through semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire data were analyzed using SPSS v.27 through descriptive statistics and independent-samples t-tests, whereas interview data were processed with NVivo v.12 and examined through thematic analysis. Results/Findings The findings revealed that students showed generally neutral to agreeable perceptions of oral corrective feedback. They valued feedback that was clear, explanatory, regular, timely, and selective, particularly when it helped them recognize errors, improve vocabulary use, and pay greater attention to speaking accuracy. Supportive and polite feedback was viewed positively because it reduced anxiety and strengthened confidence. Implications The study concludes that oral corrective feedback should be accurate, supportive, context-sensitive, and responsive to learners' emotional needs and speaking development.
Keywords: EFL speaking; feedback uptake; learner perceptions; oral corrective feedback; tertiary students	

1. Introduction

Oral communication is one of the most valued yet challenging abilities for learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). At the tertiary level, students are expected to use English for classroom interaction, academic mobility, professional communication, and participation in globalized workplaces (Ferreiro-Santamaría, 2025). However, speaking development is often complex because learners may struggle with pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary choice, fluency, and confidence, particularly when authentic English exposure is limited. In this context, instructors' oral corrective feedback plays an important role in helping students notice gaps between their spoken output and more accurate target-language forms (Dung & Quy, 2025). Oral corrective feedback refers to instructors' verbal responses to students' spoken errors during classroom interaction, including explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, elicitation, metalinguistic explanation, repetition, and prompts for self-correction

(Ivan & Hakim, 2024; Kleij & Adie, 2020). Nevertheless, students may not perceive these feedback strategies similarly. While some learners prefer direct and immediate correction for its clarity, others value indirect feedback because it protects confidence and maintains communicative flow (Morales, 2024; Rosmayati et al., 2026). Therefore, the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback depends not only on linguistic accuracy but also on how learners interpret, accept, and apply it in later speaking tasks.

Previous studies have shown that oral corrective feedback can support EFL learners' speaking development. Nhac (2021) found that instructors' corrective feedback contributed to learners' oral accuracy, while Tran and Nguyen (2020) emphasized that feedback becomes meaningful when students respond to and use it. Similarly, recent studies reported that students generally perceive oral corrective feedback as useful for improving speaking performance, especially when it is delivered clearly and supportively (Du et al., 2024; Ho et al., 2025; Muslem et al., 2021). However, corrective feedback is also affectively sensitive. Students may experience anxiety, embarrassment, or reduced confidence when correction is public, excessive, or harsh (Hussain et al., 2023; Ruswandi et al., 2025). Moreover, learners' preferences vary according to feedback type. Direct correction may be appreciated for its clarity, whereas indirect feedback may encourage reflection and self-repair (Adhana et al., 2024; Uloh-Bethels & Okonji, 2026). Other studies have also highlighted the value of feedback that helps students understand the nature of their errors rather than simply receive the correct form (Nurjanah et al., 2024; Wardani et al., 2023). Thus, students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback should be examined across interconnected dimensions, including feedback type, timing, emotional response, and perceived usefulness.

Despite these contributions, several gaps remain. First, many studies have focused mainly on instructors' practices or students' general attitudes, while fewer have examined students' perceptions across multiple dimensions. Second, studies relying solely on either quantitative or qualitative data may provide limited insight into both patterns and explanations. Third, although recent Vietnamese and Asian EFL studies have expanded this field, more evidence is needed at the tertiary level, particularly regarding feedback uptake and later speaking performance (Du et al., 2024; Ho et al., 2025; Van, 2023). To address these gaps, the present study investigates tertiary students' perceptions of instructors' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes through a mixed-methods design. The study employs a researcher-made five-point Likert-scale questionnaire based on attitudinal and behavioral criteria (Dörnyei & Dewaele, 2022), together with semi-structured interviews analyzed thematically following Braun and Clarke (2021). Accordingly, the study addresses three research questions:

1. What are tertiary students' perceptions of instructors' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes?
2. What types, timing, and frequency of oral corrective feedback do tertiary students prefer?
3. How do tertiary students respond to and use oral corrective feedback to improve their speaking performance?

By integrating quantitative and qualitative evidence, this study seeks to inform feedback practices that support speaking accuracy while maintaining students' confidence, motivation, and willingness to communicate.

2. Literature review

2.1 Oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes

Oral corrective feedback is a central component of EFL speaking pedagogy because it connects classroom interaction with learners' developing spoken competence. In speaking classes, errors are not merely signs of weakness; rather, they show learners testing their knowledge of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, and discourse. Instructors' responses to these errors can help students notice linguistic gaps and refine their oral production. This is especially important in EFL contexts, where learners often have limited exposure to English outside the classroom and depend heavily on instructional interaction for input, practice, and feedback. Empirical studies suggest that corrective feedback can improve oral accuracy, support learner noticing, and encourage repair when it is clear, purposeful, and comprehensible (Nhac, 2021; Phuong & Huan, 2018; Van, 2023). Thus, feedback should be understood not simply as correction, but as a pedagogical bridge between communication and language development.

Oral corrective feedback may take different forms, including explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. Explicit correction directly identifies the error and provides the correct form, while recasts reformulate the learner's utterance without strongly interrupting communication. Clarification requests invite learners to modify unclear speech, whereas metalinguistic feedback and elicitation encourage reflection and self-correction. Since these strategies differ in explicitness and learner involvement, no single type is universally effective. Previous studies show that learners often value direct correction for its clarity, but they also appreciate indirect feedback because it promotes reflection and self-repair (Adhana et al., 2024; Melly et al., 2024; Nurjanah et al., 2024). Therefore, instructors should select feedback strategies flexibly according to students' proficiency, task type, and classroom expectations (Muslem et al., 2021; Wardani et al., 2023).

However, the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback also depends on social and emotional conditions. Feedback is both a linguistic and interpersonal act because it addresses language errors while being delivered during public classroom performance. Supportive feedback may be interpreted as useful guidance, whereas harsh or poorly timed correction can lead to anxiety, embarrassment, or reduced willingness to communicate. This affective dimension is crucial in speaking classes, where students must expose their developing competence to peers. Research indicates that corrective feedback can influence speaking anxiety and confidence, especially when learners perceive correction as evaluative rather than developmental (Hussain et al., 2023; Ruswandi et al., 2025). Therefore, effective feedback requires sensitivity to tone, classroom climate, and learner readiness (Kleij & Adie, 2020; Kleij, 2021).

Timing and uptake are also essential to oral corrective feedback. Immediate correction may help learners connect feedback with the original error, especially in accuracy-oriented tasks. Nevertheless, it may interrupt fluency during discussions, presentations, or role plays. Delayed correction allows learners to complete their ideas before reflecting on errors, although it may weaken the link between feedback and the original utterance. Beyond timing, feedback becomes meaningful only when learners understand, remember, and apply it. Uptake may occur through immediate repair, modified output, or later use of corrected forms. Studies in Vietnamese and broader EFL contexts show that students value feedback when it helps them identify errors, improve pronunciation, strengthen grammar accuracy, and use vocabulary more appropriately (Du et al., 2024; Ivan & Hakim, 2024; Sirait & Anggraini, 2025). Overall, oral corrective feedback should be viewed as an adaptive and learner-sensitive practice that balances correction with communication, explicitness with encouragement, and linguistic guidance with repeated practice.

2.2 Students' preferences and emotional responses to oral corrective feedback

Students' preferences for oral corrective feedback are central to understanding how feedback functions in EFL speaking classes. Although instructors may correct with the intention of improving accuracy, learners do not always perceive feedback in the same way. Proficiency level, prior learning experiences, classroom culture, and confidence in oral communication shape their preferences. Some students prefer direct correction because it clearly identifies the error and provides an immediate model of the correct form. This type of feedback is often viewed as useful when learners are unsure how to repair their own utterances. By contrast, other students favor indirect feedback, such as clarification requests, elicitation, or metalinguistic prompts, because these strategies encourage reflection and self-correction. Recent studies have shown that EFL learners value both direct and indirect feedback, but their preferences depend on how feedback is delivered and whether it supports meaningful speaking practice (Adhana et al., 2024; Melly et al., 2024; Nurjanah et al., 2024). Therefore, students' preferences should not be interpreted as fixed choices. Rather, they reflect a dynamic relationship between feedback type, task purpose, and learners' perceived ability to respond.

In addition to feedback type, students' preferences are strongly connected to timing and frequency. Immediate correction can be helpful because it allows students to link feedback directly to the error they have just produced. It may be particularly beneficial in pronunciation practice, grammar-focused speaking tasks, or controlled classroom activities. However, frequent immediate correction may interrupt fluency and reduce students' willingness to participate, especially during communicative tasks. Delayed feedback, on the other hand, allows students to complete their ideas before receiving correction, which may protect the flow of interaction and reduce performance pressure. Studies on students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback suggest that learners often prefer teachers to correct serious or repeated errors rather than every minor mistake (Ho et al., 2025; Muslem et al., 2021; Wardani et al., 2023). This indicates that learners do not simply want more feedback; they want feedback that is selective, relevant, and pedagogically meaningful. Consequently, effective feedback requires instructors to make sensitive decisions about when to correct, how much to correct, and which errors deserve immediate attention.

Students' emotional responses are equally important because speaking is a public and psychologically demanding activity. Oral corrective feedback may encourage learners when it is delivered politely, respectfully, and supportively. In such cases, students are more likely to perceive correction as guidance rather than criticism. However, when feedback is harsh, excessive, or given in a face-threatening manner, learners may feel embarrassed, anxious, or less confident. This emotional dimension is particularly significant in EFL classrooms, where students often worry about losing face in front of peers. Hussain et al. (2023) found that corrective feedback and speaking practice are closely related to learners' speaking anxiety, while Ruswandi et al. (2025) reported that oral corrective feedback can influence students' affective responses in speaking classes. Similarly, Kleij and Adie (2020) argued that feedback effectiveness depends on how teachers and students understand feedback within classroom practice. Thus, students' emotional responses should be treated as a core component of feedback research. When correction is clear but supportive, it can strengthen confidence, promote uptake, and sustain participation. Conversely, when feedback neglects learners' emotions, it may limit communication and reduce the pedagogical value of correction.

2.3 Oral corrective feedback uptake and speaking performance

Oral corrective feedback becomes pedagogically meaningful when learners are able to notice, process, and use it in subsequent language production. In this respect, feedback uptake is a crucial concept in EFL speaking research because it reflects students' immediate or delayed responses to instructors' correction. Uptake may appear in several forms, such as self-repair, modified output, repetition of the corrected form, or later application of feedback in similar speaking contexts. Although the presence of uptake does not automatically guarantee long-term acquisition, it indicates that learners have attended to the feedback and attempted to incorporate it into their developing oral competence. Phuong and Huan (2018) emphasized that teacher corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes should be understood in relation to students' uptake, since correction without learner response may have limited instructional value. Similarly, Van (2023) argued that both teachers' and students' perspectives are necessary for understanding how oral feedback contributes to speaking proficiency. Therefore, uptake serves as a bridge between feedback provision and speaking development, linking classroom correction with learners' active participation in language improvement.

The relationship between oral corrective feedback and speaking performance is particularly significant because speaking ability involves multiple linguistic and communicative dimensions. Students may need feedback on pronunciation, grammatical accuracy, vocabulary choice, fluency, and pragmatic appropriateness. When instructors provide clear and comprehensible correction, learners can become more aware of recurring errors and gradually improve the accuracy of their spoken output. Nhac (2021) found that teachers' corrective feedback could enhance learners' oral accuracy in English speaking lessons, suggesting that well-directed feedback may support more precise language use. Recent studies have also shown that students generally perceive oral corrective feedback as beneficial to their speaking development, especially when it helps them identify errors and understand how to improve them (Du et al., 2024; Ho et al., 2025; Sadiq et al., 2022). However, feedback effectiveness depends on the extent to which students can transform correction into learning action. For example, explicit correction may help learners recognize errors quickly, while metalinguistic feedback can deepen their understanding of language rules. Recasts may maintain communication, yet their corrective function may be missed if learners do not notice the reformulation. Thus, the impact of feedback on speaking performance is mediated by clarity, salience, learner readiness, and opportunities for practice.

Nevertheless, feedback uptake should not be viewed only as an individual cognitive response. It is also shaped by classroom interaction, emotional climate, and learners' willingness to speak after being corrected. If students perceive feedback as supportive, they are more likely to accept correction and apply it in later speaking tasks. Conversely, if feedback is experienced as embarrassing or punitive, learners may avoid participation, thereby reducing opportunities for uptake and performance improvement. Studies on students' perceptions suggest that learners value feedback when it is delivered respectfully and when it contributes to confidence rather than anxiety (Hussain et al., 2023; Ruswandi et al., 2025; Wardani et al., 2023). In this sense, speaking performance develops not only through correction but also through sustained engagement with corrected language. Learners need repeated chances to reformulate utterances, practice accurate forms, and receive confirmation that their improvement is recognized. Therefore, instructors should design feedback practices that move beyond isolated correction. They should create follow-up opportunities, encourage self-correction, and integrate feedback into later speaking activities. Such practices can help students convert oral corrective feedback into uptake, and uptake into more accurate, confident, and autonomous speaking performance.

3. Research method

3.1. Research design

This study employed a mixed-methods research design to examine tertiary students' perceptions of instructors' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes. Following Creswell and Creswell (2023), the design integrated quantitative and qualitative data to provide both breadth and depth of understanding. The quantitative phase used a researcher-made five-point Likert-scale questionnaire to measure students' perceptions across five dimensions: general perceptions, feedback-type preferences, timing and frequency, emotional responses, and perceived effectiveness and uptake. The qualitative phase employed semi-structured interviews with selected participants to further explain students' experiences and interpretations. Interview data were analyzed through thematic analysis based on Braun and Clarke (2021). By combining statistical patterns with interview-based insights, the study generated a more comprehensive understanding of how students perceive, respond to, and use oral corrective feedback in speaking classes.

3.2. Research instrument

The study employed two research instruments: a researcher-made questionnaire and a semi-structured interview guide. The questionnaire consisted of 45 five-point Likert-scale items developed to measure students' perceptions of instructors' oral corrective feedback across five dimensions: general perceptions, preferences for feedback types, timing and frequency preferences, emotional responses, and perceived effectiveness and uptake. The scale ranged from 1 = strong disagreement to 5 = strong agreement. Following Dörnyei and Dewaele's (2022) questionnaire framework, the items were designed to capture both attitudinal and behavioral responses. A pilot study was conducted with 35 participants to examine reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values ranging from 0.71 to 0.91, indicating acceptable to excellent internal consistency. In addition, five semi-structured interview questions were used to obtain deeper qualitative insights into students' feedback experiences and perceptions.

3.3. Research participants

The participants were 385 tertiary students enrolled in EFL speaking classes at Hanoi Law University. Since the total population was unknown, a probability sampling approach was adopted to obtain a sufficiently representative sample for quantitative analysis. The sample included 256 male students (66.5%) and 129 female students (33.5%). In terms of academic year, most respondents were sophomores, followed by juniors, first-year students, and seniors. Regarding academic major, 305 students (79.2%) were English majors, while 80 students (20.8%) were non-English majors. In addition, most respondents reported having motivation to learn English. For the qualitative phase, 17 students voluntarily participated in semi-structured interviews. These interview participants were selected to provide deeper explanations of their perceptions, preferences, emotional responses, and uptake of instructors' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes.

Table 1: Demographic respondent's information

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	256	66.5	66.5	66.5
	Female	129	33.5	33.5	100.0
	Total	385	100.0	100.0	
University academic year	Freshman	37	9.6	9.6	9.6
	Sophomore	217	56.4	56.4	66.0
	Junior	115	29.9	29.9	95.8
	Senior	16	4.2	4.2	100.0
	Total	385	100.0	100.0	
Student major	non-English major	80	20.8	20.8	20.8
	English major	305	79.2	79.2	100.0
	Total	385	100.0	100.0	
Self-motivation learning	Little motivation	24	6.2	6.2	6.2
	Motivation	361	93.8	93.8	100.0
	Total	385	100.0	100.0	

3.4. Statistical tools

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 27. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the respondents' demographic profile, while mean and standard deviation were employed to interpret responses to the Likert-scale items. Mean scores were interpreted as follows: 1.00–1.80 = strong disagreement, 1.81–2.60 = disagreement, 2.61–3.40 = neutrality, 3.41–4.20 = agreement, and 4.21–5.00 = strong agreement. An independent-samples t-test was also conducted to compare group differences, with effect size measured using Cohen's *d* to strengthen statistical interpretation. Qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews were processed using NVivo version 12 and analyzed through Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis procedure, including familiarization, initial coding, theme searching, theme reviewing, theme defining and naming, and final qualitative reporting.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Quantitative findings on tertiary students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback

As glimpsed from Table 2, the strongest results appear in students' agreement that oral corrective feedback is useful for tertiary learners ($M = 3.57$), that they prefer teachers to correct their errors rather than ignore them ($M = 3.55$), and that feedback contributes positively to their English learning process ($M = 3.46$). These findings indicate that students do not want teachers to overlook their speaking errors. Rather, they appear to view correction as a necessary source of learning, especially in EFL contexts where classroom interaction may be one of the few opportunities to receive immediate language input. This finding supports Muslem et al. (2021), who reported that EFL students generally perceived oral corrective feedback as beneficial to speaking development. In this sense,

feedback may function as a form of pedagogical reassurance: it signals that the teacher is monitoring students' language growth and helping them move toward more accurate oral production. However, the neutral scores on several items complicate this positive interpretation. Students were only moderately convinced that oral corrective feedback is necessary ($M = 2.97$), helps them understand what to improve ($M = 2.96$), or is a normal part of English learning ($M = 2.91$). These results suggest that students may not always receive feedback in ways that are sufficiently explanatory or actionable. If correction merely points out errors without clarifying why they occur or how they can be improved, students may acknowledge its usefulness but fail to experience it as genuinely supportive. This aligns with Kleij and Adie's (2020) argument that feedback effectiveness depends on shared understanding between teachers and learners. Feedback, therefore, should not be reduced to error identification; it must help learners interpret the error and know what to do next. The neutral results on awareness, accuracy, and motivation also deserve attention. Students moderately agreed that feedback raised their awareness of speaking errors ($M = 3.24$), improved speaking accuracy ($M = 3.15$), and motivated them to speak better ($M = 3.24$). These findings are consistent with Nhac (2021) and Phuong and Huan (2018), who emphasized the role of corrective feedback in oral accuracy and learner uptake. Nevertheless, the modest means suggest that feedback does not automatically lead to improvement. Its effectiveness depends on clarity, timing, tone, and opportunities for students to apply corrections in later speaking activities. In general, Table 2 highlights a key pedagogical implication: students value oral corrective feedback, but they need it to be specific, supportive, and usable. Teachers should therefore provide correction that preserves confidence while guiding learners toward more accurate and meaningful spoken communication.

Table 2: Students' general perceptions of oral corrective feedback

Statement	N	Mean	Std.	
			Deviation	Interpretation
1. I believe teachers' oral corrective feedback is necessary in EFL speaking classes.	385	2.97	.802	neutrality
2. Oral corrective feedback helps me become more aware of my speaking errors.	385	3.24	.742	neutrality
3. I feel that receiving oral corrective feedback is a normal part of learning English.	385	2.91	.837	neutrality
4. Teachers' oral corrective feedback helps me improve my speaking accuracy.	384	3.15	.889	neutrality
5. I prefer teachers to correct my speaking errors rather than ignore them.	385	3.55	.840	agreement
6. Oral corrective feedback helps me understand what I need to improve in speaking.	385	2.96	.939	neutrality
7. I think oral corrective feedback is useful for tertiary students learning English.	385	3.57	.927	agreement
8. Teachers' correction of oral errors motivates me to speak better.	385	3.24	.713	neutrality
9. I feel that oral corrective feedback contributes positively to my English learning process.	385	3.46	.830	agreement
Valid N (listwise)	384			

Table 3 shows that students' preferences for types of oral corrective feedback were selective rather than uniform. Although several items reached the level of agreement, many remained neutral. This suggests that students did not simply prefer one universal feedback type. Instead, they seemed to value feedback that was clear, explanatory, and interactionally supportive. In other words, learners appeared to want correction that helps them understand their errors without making the correction process too abrupt or face-threatening. The highest mean score was found in metalinguistic feedback ($M = 3.56$), indicating that students appreciated teachers' explanations of why an answer was incorrect. This result is pedagogically meaningful because it shows that learners not only want the correct answer; they want to understand the reason behind their errors. Such a preference supports Nurjanah et al. (2024) and Wardani et al. (2023), who emphasized that students value feedback that helps them identify error sources and improve speaking proficiency. Metalinguistic feedback may be especially useful for tertiary EFL learners because it promotes conscious noticing, reflection, and more autonomous correction in later speaking tasks.

Students also agreed with clarification questions ($M = 3.49$) and direct correction ($M = 3.47$). These results suggest that learners valued both interaction-based and direct forms of feedback. Clarification questions may be preferred because they allow students to reconsider and repair their utterances without the teacher immediately taking over. Meanwhile, direct correction may be useful because it reduces confusion and provides immediate linguistic guidance. This finding is consistent with Adhana et al. (2024) and Melly et al. (2024), who found that students may appreciate both direct and indirect feedback depending on the learning situation. Thus, the results indicate that effective oral corrective feedback should not be limited to one method; rather, teachers should adapt feedback to students' needs, task types, and error seriousness.

However, several feedback types were rated neutrally, including indirect hints ($M = 3.32$), recasts ($M = 3.38$), self-correction encouragement ($M = 3.08$), explicit correction ($M = 2.95$), and feedback on grammar or

pronunciation forms ($M = 2.98$). These neutral results reveal an important tension. While students supported direct correction in general, they were less certain about explicit correction when it strongly highlighted their mistakes. This may imply that students want clarity, but not necessarily blunt or potentially embarrassing correction. Similarly, recasts may have received only neutral evaluation because learners may not always recognize them as corrective feedback. This supports Kleij and Adie's (2020) view that feedback is effective only when teachers and learners share an understanding of its purpose. The neutral score for combining different feedback types ($M = 3.30$) is also noteworthy. Although pedagogically a combination of feedback strategies is often recommended, students may not consciously recognize its value. As such, Table 3 suggests that students prefer oral corrective feedback that is understandable, explanatory, and respectful. Teachers should therefore combine directness with guidance, using metalinguistic explanation and clarification questions to promote learner noticing, while avoiding correction that may feel overly harsh or discouraging.

Table 3: Students' preferences for types of oral corrective feedback

Statement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
10. I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors directly.	385	3.47	.944	agreement
11. I prefer my teacher to give indirect hints rather than provide the correct answer immediately.	385	3.32	.868	neutrality
12. I find recasts useful when my teacher reformulates my incorrect sentence correctly.	385	3.38	.769	neutrality
13. I prefer my teacher to ask clarification questions when my speaking is unclear.	385	3.49	.753	agreement
14. I find metalinguistic feedback helpful when my teacher explains why my answer is incorrect.	385	3.56	.769	agreement
15. I prefer my teacher to encourage me to self-correct my speaking errors.	385	3.08	.769	neutrality
16. I find explicit correction useful because it clearly shows my mistakes.	385	2.95	.804	neutrality
17. I prefer feedback that helps me understand the correct grammar or pronunciation form.	385	2.98	.905	neutrality
18. I think a combination of different feedback types is more effective than using only one type.	385	3.30	.987	neutrality
Valid N (listwise)	384			

Table 4 indicates that students' preferences for the timing and frequency of oral corrective feedback were moderately positive but highly conditional. The highest mean score was for receiving feedback regularly in every speaking lesson ($M = 3.57$), suggesting that students did not view correction as an occasional or optional classroom practice. Rather, they seemed to expect oral corrective feedback to be a regular part of EFL speaking instruction. This result supports previous studies showing that students generally value corrective feedback as a useful source of guidance for improving speaking performance. However, students' agreement with immediate correction ($M = 3.43$) should be interpreted carefully. While they appeared to appreciate correction soon after errors occur, their neutral response to the statement that immediate correction helps them remember mistakes better ($M = 3.11$) suggests that immediacy alone does not guarantee learning. In other words, students may prefer immediate feedback because it is clear and timely. However, they may still need explanation, repetition, or follow-up practice for the feedback to become memorable and useful. This aligns with Phuong and Huan (2018), who emphasized that corrective feedback becomes meaningful when it leads to learner uptake, rather than remaining a simple teacher correction.

Another important finding is students' agreement that teachers should correct only serious speaking errors ($M = 3.43$). This result suggests that students may not want every minor mistake to be corrected, especially during communicative speaking tasks. Their neutral responses toward correcting frequent errors rather than every small mistake ($M = 3.11$) and toward excessive correction making speaking difficult ($M = 2.94$) further indicate a tension between accuracy and fluency. Students seem to accept correction, but they may become less comfortable if feedback interrupts communication too often. This finding is consistent with Kleij and Adie (2020), who argued that feedback effectiveness depends on how feedback is understood and situated within classroom practice. The relatively low neutral mean for delayed correction ($M = 2.64$) shows that students were not strongly convinced that delayed feedback helps them speak more fluently without interruption. This may imply that students still rely on teachers' immediate support to recognize errors. Nevertheless, their neutral view on correcting after speaking ($M = 2.97$) also suggests that delayed feedback remains acceptable in some situations. Therefore, teachers should not apply one fixed timing strategy. Instead, they should adjust feedback according to the speaking activity, error type, and learners' emotional readiness, as also suggested by studies (e.g., Hussain et al., 2023; Ruswandi et al., 2025) on feedback anxiety and confidence. Inclusively, Table 4 shows that students prefer feedback that is regular, timely, and selective. They value correction, but they also need space to continue speaking. Pedagogically,

instructors should provide immediate feedback for serious or repeated errors, while using delayed feedback for fluency-based activities to protect students' confidence and communicative flow.

Table 4: Students' preferences for timing and frequency of feedback

Statement	N	Std.		Interpretation
		Mean	Deviation	
19. I prefer my teacher to correct my speaking errors immediately after they occur.	385	3.43	.842	agreement
20. I prefer my teacher to correct my errors after I finish speaking.	385	2.97	.945	neutrality
21. Immediate correction helps me remember my mistakes better.	385	3.11	.909	neutrality
22. Delayed correction helps me speak more fluently without interruption.	385	2.64	.663	neutrality
23. I feel comfortable when my teacher corrects only serious speaking errors.	385	3.43	.969	agreement
24. I prefer my teacher to correct frequent errors rather than every small mistake.	385	3.11	.894	neutrality
25. Too much correction during speaking activities makes it difficult for me to continue speaking.	385	2.94	.849	neutrality
26. I think teachers should adjust the timing of feedback depending on the speaking activity.	385	3.32	.841	neutrality
27. I prefer receiving feedback regularly in every speaking lesson.	385	3.57	.876	agreement
Valid N (listwise)	384			

Table 5 shows that students' emotional responses to teachers' oral corrective feedback were generally positive when feedback was delivered supportively and politely, but more cautious when correction involved public exposure or harshness. The highest mean score was found in Item 30, "Oral corrective feedback makes me less anxious when it is given politely" ($M = 3.66$), followed by Item 28, "I feel confident when my teacher corrects my speaking errors in a supportive way" ($M = 3.61$). These results indicate that students do not necessarily view correction as threatening. Rather, their emotional response depends greatly on the teacher's manner of delivery. When feedback is polite, supportive, and constructive, students may interpret it as guidance rather than criticism. This finding is consistent with Hussain et al. (2023), who emphasized the close relationship between corrective feedback, speaking practice, and learners' speaking anxiety. It also supports Ruswandi et al. (2025), who found that oral corrective feedback can influence students' anxiety in speaking classes. However, the present result adds an important point: feedback itself may not be the main source of anxiety; instead, anxiety may arise from how feedback is framed and delivered. Therefore, teachers' tone, timing, and interpersonal sensitivity are central to whether feedback promotes confidence or discomfort.

The agreement on Item 32 ($M = 3.45$) and Item 36 ($M = 3.48$) further suggests that students value emotionally supportive feedback. They feel encouraged when teachers praise their effort before correction, and supportive feedback helps them overcome fear of making speaking mistakes. This result highlights the pedagogical role of encouragement in EFL speaking classes. Since speaking requires students to perform publicly, correction without emotional support may discourage participation. By contrast, praise combined with correction can reduce face-threatening effects and help students remain engaged. Nevertheless, several items remained neutral. Students were neutral about feeling embarrassed when corrected in front of the whole class ($M = 3.35$), feeling nervous when expecting correction ($M = 2.62$), becoming more willing to speak when feedback is respectful ($M = 3.05$), and losing confidence because of harsh correction ($M = 3.28$). These neutral responses suggest that students' emotional reactions are not uniform. Some may tolerate public correction, while others may feel uncomfortable. This supports Kleij and Adie's (2020) view that feedback effectiveness depends on classroom relationships and shared understandings between teachers and learners. Basically, Table 5 suggests that emotional safety is essential in oral corrective feedback. Students appear more receptive to correction when it is respectful, polite, and accompanied by encouragement. Pedagogically, teachers should avoid harsh or humiliating correction and should frame feedback as part of learning rather than evaluation. In this way, oral corrective feedback can support both speaking accuracy and students' confidence to communicate.

Table 5: Emotional responses to teachers' oral corrective feedback

Statement	N	Std.		Interpretation
		Mean	Deviation	
28. I feel confident when my teacher corrects my speaking errors in a supportive way.	385	3.61	.710	agreement
29. I feel embarrassed when my teacher corrects my errors in front of the whole class.	385	3.35	.699	neutrality
30. Oral corrective feedback makes me less anxious when it is given politely.	385	3.66	.839	agreement
31. I feel nervous when I expect my teacher to correct my speaking mistakes.	385	2.62	.601	neutrality

32. I feel encouraged when my teacher praises my effort before correcting my errors.	385	3.45	.760	agreement
33. I am more willing to speak English when feedback is delivered respectfully.	385	3.05	.872	neutrality
34. Negative or harsh correction reduces my confidence in speaking English.	385	3.28	.717	neutrality
35. I feel comfortable receiving feedback when my classmates also receive similar feedback.	385	3.34	.947	neutrality
36. Teachers' supportive feedback helps me overcome fear of making speaking mistakes.	385	3.48	.941	agreement
Valid N (listwise)	384			

Table 6 suggests that students perceived oral corrective feedback as moderately effective, particularly in helping them become more accurate and use vocabulary more appropriately. However, most items remained within the neutral range, indicating that students did not strongly confirm that feedback automatically led to consistent uptake or overall speaking improvement. This pattern is important because it shows that students may value feedback. However, the movement from receiving correction to actually applying it in later speaking tasks is not always direct or guaranteed. The strongest result was found in Item 42, "Oral corrective feedback helps me use vocabulary more appropriately" ($M = 3.61$), which reached the level of agreement. This indicates that students may find oral corrective feedback especially useful when it provides concrete lexical alternatives or helps them choose more suitable words in context. Compared with grammar or pronunciation, vocabulary feedback may be easier for students to notice and reuse immediately. This finding supports studies by Du et al. (2024), which reported that students generally perceived teachers' oral corrective feedback as beneficial for improving speaking performance. Item 43 also reached agreement, showing that students paid more attention to accuracy after receiving oral corrective feedback ($M = 3.45$). This result suggests that feedback contributes to learners' awareness of spoken errors. In this sense, feedback works as a noticing mechanism, helping students monitor their language more carefully. This aligns with Nhac (2021), who found that corrective feedback could support learners' oral accuracy, and Phuong and Huan (2018), who emphasized the importance of student uptake in EFL speaking classes. However, awareness alone does not necessarily lead to stable improvement. Students may become more conscious of accuracy but still need repeated practice to transform feedback into long-term speaking development.

The neutral results for correcting errors after feedback ($M = 3.33$), avoiding repeated mistakes ($M = 3.22$), remembering corrections clearly ($M = 3.24$), improving pronunciation ($M = 3.37$), grammar accuracy ($M = 3.14$), overall speaking performance ($M = 3.26$), and applying feedback later ($M = 3.38$) show a more cautious picture. These scores imply that students recognized the potential usefulness of feedback, but they may not always be able to retain or apply it effectively. This may occur when feedback is too brief, unclear, or not followed by opportunities for practice. Van (2023) similarly argued that the impact of oral corrective feedback depends on how students understand and use it in the learning process. In general, Table 6 highlights a key pedagogical issue: oral corrective feedback is useful, but uptake requires more than correction itself. Teachers should provide clear explanations, encourage students to repeat corrected forms, and design follow-up speaking tasks where learners can reuse the feedback. In this way, feedback can move beyond momentary correction and become a meaningful resource for sustained speaking improvement.

Table 6: Perceived effectiveness and uptake of oral corrective feedback

Statement	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Interpretation
37. I usually try to correct my speaking errors after receiving feedback from my teacher.	385	3.33	.816	neutrality
38. Teachers' oral corrective feedback helps me avoid repeating the same mistakes.	385	3.22	.974	neutrality
39. I can remember corrections better when my teacher explains them clearly.	385	3.24	.920	neutrality
40. Oral corrective feedback helps improve my pronunciation.	385	3.37	.807	neutrality
41. Oral corrective feedback helps improve my grammar accuracy in speaking.	385	3.14	.914	neutrality
42. Oral corrective feedback helps me use vocabulary more appropriately.	385	3.61	.853	agreement
43. I pay more attention to accuracy after receiving oral corrective feedback.	385	3.45	.903	agreement
44. I believe oral corrective feedback improves my overall speaking performance.	385	3.26	.961	neutrality
45. I apply my teacher's feedback in later speaking activities.	385	3.38	.905	neutrality
Valid N (listwise)	384			

Table 7 shows that gender did not significantly influence four dimensions of students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback. Specifically, no significant differences were found in general perceptions, preferences for feedback types, preferences for timing and frequency, or emotional responses, as all p-values were higher than .05. This suggests that male and female students generally shared similar views about the usefulness, delivery, timing, and emotional impact of teachers' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes. However, a significant gender

difference was found in perceived effectiveness and feedback uptake, $t(383) = 2.637, p = .009$. This result indicates that male and female students may differ in how they internalize, remember, and apply teachers' feedback in later speaking activities. Therefore, while feedback practices can be designed for all students, instructors should provide follow-up tasks, encourage self-correction, and create opportunities for learners to reuse feedback meaningfully in subsequent oral communication.

Table 7: The comparison between genders with factors regarding the oral corrective feedback

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
General perceptions of oral corrective feedback	Equal variances assumed	3.692	.055	.560	382	.576	.16797	.29972
	Equal variances not assumed			.583	281.936	.561	.16797	.28834
Preferences for types of oral corrective feedback	Equal variances assumed	.177	.674	.872	383	.384	.25597	.29355
	Equal variances not assumed			.857	245.542	.392	.25597	.29851
Preferences for timing and frequency of feedback	Equal variances assumed	.298	.586	1.611	383	.108	.49370	.30655
	Equal variances not assumed			1.591	248.671	.113	.49370	.31024
Emotional responses to oral corrective feedback	Equal variances assumed	3.132	.078	1.409	383	.160	.41842	.29689
	Equal variances not assumed			1.366	236.299	.173	.41842	.30634
Perceived effectiveness and feedback uptake	Equal variances assumed	2.110	.147	2.637	383	.009	.85850	.32557
	Equal variances not assumed			2.570	239.906	.011	.85850	.33399

4.2. Qualitative insights into students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback

The semi-structured interview findings generally confirmed the quantitative results, indicating that students held a moderately positive yet careful perception of teachers' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes (*Appendix A*). Most participants stated that feedback was necessary because it helped them recognize errors that they might not notice during spontaneous speaking. They explained that correction made them more aware of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary choice, and sentence structure. This finding was consistent with the questionnaire results, where students agreed that feedback was useful and preferred teachers to correct their mistakes rather than ignore them. Regarding preferred feedback types, students expressed different but complementary views. Some favored direct correction because it provided the correct form immediately and reduced uncertainty. Others preferred clarification questions, metalinguistic explanations, or guided self-correction because these strategies helped them think about the reason for their errors. This reflects the quantitative finding that students appreciated clear and explanatory feedback, especially metalinguistic feedback and clarification questions. In relation to timing and frequency, students generally supported regular feedback in speaking lessons. However, they did not want teachers to interrupt every minor mistake. Many suggested that serious, repeated, or meaning-related errors should be corrected first. Some students preferred immediate correction when accuracy was the focus, while others favored delayed feedback during discussions or presentations to maintain fluency. Emotionally, students reported feeling more confident when feedback was polite, supportive, and accompanied by encouragement. Conversely, public or harsh correction could make them embarrassed or nervous. This supports the quantitative finding that emotional safety influences students' acceptance of feedback. Thus, students believed that oral corrective feedback improved their speaking performance when it was clear, respectful, and followed by opportunities to practice. They particularly mentioned better vocabulary use, increased attention to accuracy, and greater awareness of errors in later speaking activities.

4.3. Comparison and discussion of quantitative and qualitative findings

The quantitative and qualitative findings were broadly consistent in showing that students held a moderately positive but cautious perception of teachers' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes. Quantitatively, students tended to agree that oral corrective feedback was useful and that they preferred teachers to correct their errors rather than ignore them. That feedback contributed positively to their English learning process. Similarly, the interview data showed that students considered feedback necessary because it helped them notice pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and fluency problems that they might not recognize while speaking. This convergence suggests that students did not resist correction; instead, they viewed it as an important part of

learning when it was meaningful and supportive. Regarding feedback types, the quantitative results showed stronger preferences for metalinguistic feedback, clarification questions, and direct correction. The qualitative findings explained this pattern more clearly. Students valued direct correction because it provided the correct form immediately, but they also appreciated explanations and guiding questions because these helped them understand why their utterances were incorrect. Therefore, the qualitative data deepened the quantitative results by showing that students wanted feedback that was not only corrective but also explanatory. This indicates that effective oral corrective feedback should help learners understand the nature of their errors rather than simply receive the correct answer.

The findings on timing and frequency also complemented each other. Quantitatively, students preferred regular feedback and showed agreement with immediate correction and selective correction of serious errors. However, the interview data revealed that this preference was conditional. Students wanted timely correction, but they did not want teachers to interrupt every minor mistake, especially during discussions or presentations. This suggests that students were trying to balance accuracy and fluency. Immediate feedback may be useful for accuracy-focused tasks, while delayed feedback may be more suitable for fluency-based speaking activities. Emotionally, both data sets emphasized the importance of supportive delivery. The quantitative results showed that students felt more confident and less anxious when feedback was polite and supportive. The interviews confirmed that harsh or public correction could make students embarrassed or nervous. Finally, both findings showed that feedback uptake was possible but not automatic. Students reported paying more attention to accuracy and improving vocabulary use, yet they also needed clear explanations and opportunities to practice corrected forms. On the whole, the integrated findings suggest that oral corrective feedback is most effective when it is regular, selective, respectful, and followed by meaningful speaking practice.

5. Conclusions

This study investigated tertiary students' perceptions of instructors' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes through quantitative questionnaire data and qualitative interview responses. Overall, the findings indicate that students held a moderately positive but cautious perception of oral corrective feedback. They generally recognized its usefulness in helping them notice speaking errors, improve language accuracy, and become more aware of their weaknesses in pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. However, their responses also suggest that feedback is not automatically effective simply because it is provided. Its value depends greatly on how clearly, respectfully, and meaningfully it is delivered in classroom interaction. The quantitative findings showed that students tended to value oral corrective feedback, especially when teachers corrected their errors rather than ignored them. Students also showed stronger preferences for feedback types that were clear and explanatory, particularly metalinguistic feedback, clarification questions, and direct correction. This suggests that tertiary EFL students do not merely want to be told that their answers are wrong; rather, they want to understand why an error occurs and how it can be improved. Regarding timing and frequency, students preferred feedback that was regular, timely, and selective. They welcomed correction in speaking lessons but did not necessarily want every minor error to be interrupted. This reflects the need to balance accuracy development with fluency and communicative confidence. The emotional dimension was also a significant finding. Students responded more positively when oral corrective feedback was delivered politely, supportively, and with encouragement. Supportive correction helped them feel more confident and less anxious, while harsh or public correction could potentially cause embarrassment or reduce willingness to speak. This finding confirms that oral corrective feedback is not only a linguistic practice but also an interpersonal classroom act. Therefore, instructors should consider students' emotional readiness and classroom atmosphere when correcting spoken errors.

The qualitative findings further supported the questionnaire results. Interview participants explained that feedback helped them become more aware of their speaking problems and encouraged them to improve. However, they also emphasized that correction should be specific, understandable, and respectful. Students valued direct correction for its clarity, but they also appreciated guided self-correction and explanations because these approaches helped them think more deeply about their language use. In terms of uptake, students reported that oral corrective feedback helped them pay more attention to accuracy and apply corrections in later speaking activities, although this process required follow-up practice. Pedagogically, the study suggests that instructors should provide oral corrective feedback in a balanced and learner-sensitive manner. Feedback should be clear enough to guide improvement, but not so excessive that it interrupts communication or discourages participation. Teachers should prioritize serious, repeated, or meaning-related errors and provide opportunities for students to reuse corrected forms in later speaking tasks. In this way, feedback can move beyond momentary correction and become a meaningful resource for long-term speaking development. Despite its contributions, the study has some limitations. It relied mainly on self-reported perceptions and was conducted with a specific group of tertiary students. Future studies may include classroom observation, teacher interviews, or longitudinal assessment of speaking performance to examine how oral corrective feedback influences actual language development over time.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in this work.

Funding acknowledgment

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of the article.

References

- Adhana, M. R., Farihah, S., Sari, N., Sy Ola, B. F., & Eviyuliwati, I. (2024). Teachers' direct and indirect feedback influence to students' speaking performance: Students' perceptions. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 7(6), 4234–4242. <https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v7i6.6836>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Dewaele, J.-M. (2022). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003331926>
- Du, T. T., Nguyen, T. H., Triet, A. M., Dung, D. T. B., Lanh, L. V., & Huong, N. T. K. (2024). Students' perception of teachers' oral corrective feedback on speaking performance: A case at a university in Vietnam. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 162–172. <https://ejal.info/menuscrypt/index.php/ejal/article/view/904/332>
- Dung, D. T. X., & Quy, H. T. K. (2025). An investigation into EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance from a critical discourse analysis perspective – A case study of Vietnamese language classrooms. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 5(3), 1739–1759. <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i3.968>
- Ferreiro-Santamaría, G. (2025). Perceptions of oral corrective feedback: A comparative study of beginner vs. intermediate EFL undergraduate students. *Runae*, 12, 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.70141/runae.12.1130>
- Ho, V. Q., Nguyen, T. B. T., & Truong, B. L. (2025). English-majored students' perceptions of teachers' oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking lessons in Vietnam. *Journal of Inquiry into Languages and Cultures*, 9(3), 403–422. <https://doi.org/10.63506/jilc.0903.362>
- Hussain, A., Saqlain, U. N., & Khadim, H. (2023). The effectiveness of teachers' corrective feedback (CF) and speaking practice on undergraduate language learners' speaking anxiety (SA). *Pakistan Journal of Educational Research*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.52337/pjer.v6i2.832>
- Ivan, M. N., & Hakim, L. (2024). Teacher's use and students' perception on oral corrective feedback in English morning program (EMO). *Journal of English Language and Education*, 9(5), 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v9i5.546>
- Kleij, D. V. F., & Adie, L. (2020). Towards effective feedback: An investigation of teachers' and students' perceptions of oral feedback in classroom practice. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 27(3), 252–270. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969594x.2020.1748871>
- Kleij, V. D. F. (2021). Teacher and student perceptions of oral classroom feedback practices: A video-stimulated recall study. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 50(2), 353–370. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-021-00478-0>
- Melly, S., Listyani, L., & Sumakul, T. Y. G. (2024). Students' perceptions towards direct and indirect feedback in speaking for social purposes. *Satya Widya*, 40(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.24246/j.sw.2024.v40.i1.p1-18>
- Morales, A. B. (2024). English language teachers' and EFL students' perceptions of oral errors and corrective feedback in a rural institution. *Revista Lengua Y Cultura*, 6(11), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.29057/lc.v6i11.13450>
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' perception toward oral corrective feedback in speaking classes: A case at English Education Department students. *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(4), 244. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.19010>
- Nhac, H. T. (2021). Effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral accuracy in English speaking lessons. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(10), 313–330. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.17>
- 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>
- Phuong, T. T., & Huan, N. B. (2018). Teacher corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake in EFL classes. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 3(3), 110–131. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v0i0.1823>

- Rosmayati, E., Yanti, D. S. S. T., & Miftahulloh, A. G. (2026). Students' perception of direct corrective feedback on English speaking confidence: A qualitative study. *The 6th Bogor English Student and Teacher (BEST) Conference*, 158–167. <https://pkm.uika-bogor.ac.id/index.php/best/article/view/3349/2379>
- Ruswandi, R., Fitrianti Sukma, R., & Rahim, N. F. (2025). The impact of teachers' oral corrective feedback (OCF) to students' anxiety in speaking class. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 12(2), 727–751. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v12i1.3432>
- Sadiq, H., Hameed, F., & Ahmed, H. T. (2022). ESL teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of oral corrective feedback at undergraduate level. *Linguistics and Literature Review*, 8(2), 89–111. <https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.82/05>
- Sirait, P. J. J., & Anggraini, W. H. (2025). Students' and teacher' perceptions on oral corrective feedback toward students' speaking performance. *Education of English as Foreign Language Journal (EDUCAFL)*, 8(2), 16–28. <https://educافل.ub.ac.id/index.php/educافل/article/view/629>
- Tran, N. K., & Nguyen, C. T. (2020). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes: A case at colleges in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 5(2), 18–31. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejfl.v5i2.3322>
- Uloh-Bethels, A. C., & Okonji, N. N. (2026). Enhancing poor students' achievement and interest in oral English: Can direct or indirect corrective feedback strategy be assistive? *UNIZIK Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.65360/unijerps.v21i1.1126>
- Van, L. M. (2023). Teachers' and students' perspectives to the impact of oral corrective feedback on student's speaking proficiency in English speaking classes. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 39(3), 170–185. <https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.4973>
- Wardani, H. K., Nisa, L. E., & Maciag, A. (2023). EFL students' perceptions towards lecturer's corrective feedback in speaking class. *English Education: English Journal for Teaching and Learning*, 11(2), 133–147. <https://doi.org/10.24952/ee.v11i02.10293>

Appendix A. Semi-structured interview question

How do you feel about teachers giving oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes?

What types of oral corrective feedback do you prefer your teacher to use when correcting your speaking errors?

When do you think teachers should correct students' speaking errors: immediately or after the speaking activity?

How do you usually feel when your teacher corrects your speaking errors in class?

In what ways does teachers' oral corrective feedback help you improve your English speaking performance?