



UNDERSTANDING ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN EFL SPEAKING CLASSROOMS: EVIDENCE FROM INDONESIAN VOCATIONAL STUDENTS

by

Satrio Binusa Suryadi

Department of Information Technology, State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia

stbinusa@polinema.ac.id

Atiqah Nurul Asri

Department of Information Technology, State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia

atiqah.na@gmail.com

Farida Ulfa

Department of Information Technology, State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia

faridaulfa@polinema.ac.id

Fitrotul Maulidiyah

Department of Accounting, State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia

fitrotulmaulidiyah@polinema.ac.id

Risa Juliadilla

Psychology Study Program, Gajayana University, Indonesia

risajuliadilla@unigamalang.ac.id

**corresponding author*

(Article History: Received:28-03-2026;Reviewed1:30-04-2026;Reviewed2:02-07-2026: Accepted:08-07-2026;Published:10-07-2026).

Abstract:

Oral corrective feedback linking speaking skills to communicative competence as an outcome of undergraduate students is still underexplored. Therefore, this study investigates oral corrective feedback on speaking skills among vocational college students. This study investigated vocational college students' preferences for oral corrective feedback (OCF) in EFL classes. Using a mixed-methods design, the study involved students in non-English departments at a vocational college. An online questionnaire with Likert-scale scoring was used as Qualitative data to assess preferences for various OCF strategies. In contrast, semi-structured interviews for in-depth exploration are considered quantitative data. Questionnaire data were analysed using descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations), and interview results were thematically analysed. Findings indicated that students generally had positive perceptions of all types of OCF; however, elicitation, explicit correction, and requests for clarification emerged as the most preferred strategies. These forms of feedback were considered effective in improving comprehension of linguistic forms by promoting clarity and active engagement in the correction process. Interview results further revealed that students valued feedback that supported cognitive processing and confidence in speaking. In conclusion, this study highlights the importance of integrating direct and interactive feedback strategies in vocational EFL classrooms to support the development of language and communication skills in the workplace. These studies

How to cite this article:

Suryadi, S.B., Asri,A.N.,Ulfa, F., Maulidiyah ,F., Juliadilla,R.(2026). Understanding oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classrooms: evidence from Indonesian vocational students.*Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 15(2),539-567. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v15i2.16110>

also offer pedagogical implications for language teachers and instructors to foster more adaptive and student-centred feedback practices.

Keywords: *oral corrective feedback, speaking, vocational education*

Abstrak:

Umpan balik korektif lisan yang menghubungkan keterampilan berbicara dengan kompetensi komunikatif sebagai hasil belajar mahasiswa sarjana masih kurang dieksplorasi. Oleh karena itu, penelitian ini menyelidiki umpan balik korektif lisan pada keterampilan berbicara di kalangan mahasiswa perguruan tinggi vokasi. Penelitian ini menyelidiki preferensi mahasiswa perguruan tinggi vokasi terhadap umpan balik korektif lisan (OCF) di kelas EFL. Dengan menggunakan desain metode campuran, penelitian ini melibatkan mahasiswa di jurusan non-Inggris di sebuah perguruan tinggi vokasi. Kuesioner daring dengan penilaian skala Likert digunakan sebagai data kualitatif untuk menilai preferensi terhadap berbagai strategi OCF. Sebaliknya, wawancara semi-terstruktur untuk eksplorasi mendalam dianggap sebagai data kuantitatif. Data kuesioner dianalisis menggunakan statistik deskriptif (rata-rata dan standar deviasi), dan hasil wawancara dianalisis secara tematik. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa mahasiswa umumnya memiliki persepsi positif terhadap semua jenis OCF; namun, elisitasi, koreksi eksplisit, dan permintaan klarifikasi muncul sebagai strategi yang paling disukai. Bentuk-bentuk umpan balik ini dianggap efektif dalam meningkatkan pemahaman bentuk linguistik dengan mendorong kejelasan dan keterlibatan aktif dalam proses koreksi. Hasil wawancara lebih lanjut mengungkapkan bahwa siswa menghargai umpan balik yang mendukung pemrosesan kognitif dan kepercayaan diri dalam berbicara. Kesimpulannya, studi ini menyoroti pentingnya mengintegrasikan strategi umpan balik langsung dan interaktif di kelas EFL kejuruan untuk mendukung pengembangan keterampilan bahasa dan komunikasi di tempat kerja. Studi ini juga menawarkan implikasi pedagogis bagi guru dan instruktur bahasa untuk mendorong praktik umpan balik yang lebih adaptif dan berpusat pada siswa.

Kata Kunci: *umpan balik korektif lisan, kemampuan berbicara, pendidikan vokasi*

INTRODUCTION

Anxiety about using spoken English is a common problem faced by EFL students in the classroom. These phenomena tend to be triggered by factors such as difficulty understanding English linguistic structures (Karatas et al., 2016; Subekti, 2018) or receiving a negative response (Maulida & Khotib, 2025; Yalçın & İnceçay, 2014) when they mispronounce words. One way to overcome anxiety and correct language errors is through corrective feedback. Specifically, suitable oral corrective feedback can motivate students to actively participate in classroom activities.

Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) is a teacher's response to correct students' linguistic errors during spoken or written language production (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Teachers provide prompts when errors occur in the target language and guide students toward more accurate forms. Students' errors are easily identified during the learning activity, allowing

teachers to provide corrective feedback. Six types of corrective feedback have been identified: explicit correction, recast, elicitation, clarification request, repetition, and metalinguistic feedback.

Each type of OCF can be distinguished based on directionality (whether the feedback is teacher-initiated or student-initiated), explicitness (how clearly the correction is provided), and the degree of learner involvement required for improvement. In EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms, where students learn English as an additional language, OCF serves as a pedagogical strategy, particularly when students struggle to maintain language accuracy. Here, accuracy refers to producing language in accordance with standard grammatical or usage norms. Corrective feedback entails responses that prompt learners to self-correct or produce modified output (Rosmayanti et al., 2023; Yuksel et al., 2021).

Various studies have shown that students' perceptions of OCF are influenced by several key factors, such as the usefulness of feedback, timing, learning motivation, and the social context of the classroom. A study by Atma & Widiati (2015) found that students generally have a positive attitude toward OCF because it helps them recognize and correct errors in speaking and increases their awareness of the language acquisition process. A study by Kovač (2025) found that students tend to prefer delayed feedback over immediate feedback, as it does not disrupt fluency and reduces speaking pressure. However, the effectiveness and preference for OCF are dynamic and contextual. Other studies have shown that emotional comfort and the perception of non-judgment are important factors in students' positive feedback reception (Aloud, 2022; Tesnim, 2019), which ultimately supports their self-confidence. Furthermore, OCF serves as an error-detection mechanism that facilitates deeper linguistic processing. Interestingly, Tumini (2025) emphasized that students' preference for the type of OCF (explicit vs. implicit) is highly dependent on the learning environment: students in high-confidence classes are more open to explicit feedback, while those in low-confidence contexts tend to prefer implicit feedback.

Many OCF studies involve high school students (Van Ha et al., 2021; Yakışık, 2021) or university students (Hartono et al., 2022; Muslem et al., 2021; Putri & Yusuf, 2025), but not vocational students. In the context of vocational education, English proficiency plays a strategic role because it is directly related to graduates' readiness to meet professional

demands. Vocational students are required to master not only technical competencies (hard skills) but also soft skills, including oral communication skills in a foreign language (Alzubi et al., 2022). Vocational education, which combines practical and educational learning, provides students with different experiences in responding to corrective feedback in English language learning (Gaffar et al., 2024). The focus of EFL in vocational education is practical in everyday work environments (Suryadi, 2023), including both spoken and written forms. However, previous research has not adequately examined how vocational students—oriented toward practical communication and work-readiness—perceive and respond to oral corrective feedback. This indicates a gap in understanding whether OCF functions similarly in academic and vocational contexts.

Several previous studies have provided the basis for this research. A study by Atma & Widiati (2015) highlighted the role of feedback in supporting learners' active engagement in learning activities. Student preferences for feedback indicate student engagement. Findings from some scholars (Kovač, 2025; Aloud, 2022; Tesnim, 2019) indicate that the timing of feedback is crucial. Timing feedback based on learners' conditions increases learner interest and motivation in English classes. Learner engagement is also based on feedback that is appropriate to the student's needs.

Based on previous research, this study focuses on preferences for the timing of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) delivery, as related to students' learning experiences in the classroom. These findings will then be linked to the implications for English language learning and applying this soft skill in the workplace. Furthermore, this study aims to gain a comprehensive understanding of oral corrective feedback from the perspective of vocational students through a mixed-methods approach. In previous research, several studies used qualitative approaches (descriptive and case studies) to map feedback preferences, determine the timing of corrective feedback students need, and map patterns of student learning experiences.

Specifically, this study aims to quantitatively identify patterns in student preferences for various types of oral corrective feedback and to explore in depth the experiences, perceptions, and reasons underlying these preferences using qualitative data. The data collection process employed a sequential explanatory approach. This distinct methodological

approach aimed to achieve more comprehensive research results and identify unexplored gaps. Furthermore, this study analyzed the target errors deemed important to correct and the sources of feedback provided based on students' learning experiences. This research was conducted in a vocational education setting to gain a clearer picture of how vocational students interpret and respond to oral corrective feedback in EFL learning. Therefore, the research questions are formulated as follows: **What are the patterns of preferences and experiences of vocational students toward oral corrective feedback in EFL learning?**

METHOD

Design

This study employed a mixed-methods, exploratory-sequential design that combined quantitative and qualitative data. The survey design included distributing questionnaires to the research sample to identify students' preferences for various oral corrective feedback strategies. The independent variables were the types of oral corrective feedback: recast, metalinguistics, repetition, explicit correction, elicitation, and clarification request. The dependent variable was students' preferences for the OCF type function tailored to their needs. This study focused on comprehensively mapping not only students' general tendencies through numerical data but also the meaning of their experiences in the context of EFL learning in vocational education (Creswell & Creswell, 2018)

Participant

The study population consisted of first-semester students majoring in Information Technology at the State Polytechnic of Malang. There were 61 students in the population, and only 30 were selected as a sample, consisting of 17 males and 13 females, considering ease of access to respondents and time availability. The sample selection was based on the results of speaking and speaking ability tests before completing the questionnaire and conducting interviews. The results of the tests indicated that the English proficiency of the study sample was quite good. The focus of this study was to explore students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback, including its types, targets, and providers.

Instrument

The instruments used in this study were the Students' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) questionnaire, adapted from Ha & Nguyen (2021), Lyster & Ranta (1997), and Ozturk & Ozturk (2016), as well as semi-structured interviews. The questionnaire was employed to identify students' preferences for different types of oral corrective feedback. The questionnaire contained 17 questions on corrective feedback related to the type of OFC. Respondents filled out the questionnaire with one answer that best reflected their experiences in English courses. The questionnaire scores are on a Likert scale from 1 to 5. To explore students' experiences, perceptions, and the underlying reasons for these preferences gained through interviews.

Prior to data collection, the questionnaire underwent expert validation to ensure content validity, clarity, and suitability for vocational contexts. The validation process involved two experts in English Language Teaching (ELT) with expertise in English pedagogy. Experts evaluated each questionnaire item based on its relevance to the research objectives, conceptual appropriateness, linguistic clarity, and contextual appropriateness for vocational higher education students. Based on their recommendations, several items were revised to improve wording, eliminate ambiguity, and ensure that the statements accurately represented the intended construct of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) preference.

Semi-structured interviews have been conducted to gather in-depth insights into viewpoints on oral corrective feedback. Fifteen students participated in the interview sessions. Each respondent was interviewed for 30-45 minutes and answered 15 questions. This semi-structured nature provided students with space to develop their answers, share factual experiences, and express their personal feelings and meanings regarding the oral corrective feedback they received. Interviews aim to engage the researcher in an interactive process with the students, aiming to gather information about students' perceptions of corrective feedback. All interviews were recorded with the respondents' consent to ensure the accuracy of the data obtained.

The study was carried out by (1) selecting research subjects, (2) identifying potential respondents through a placement test, (3) explaining the questionnaire filling procedure to respondents, (4) distributing the questionnaires to respondents, and (5) tabulating the data.

The primary data consisted of a questionnaire about students' views on oral corrective feedback, and (5) conducting data analysis.

The selected instruments are grounded in strong academic considerations. The taxonomy proposed by Lyster & Ranta (1997) provides a well-established theoretical foundation for categorizing OCF types that are widespread in second-language acquisition research and the EFL context. Building on this framework, Ozturk & Ozturk (2016) and (Ha & Nguyen, 2021) offer empirically validated questionnaire models that capture learners' preferences and responses toward OCF in EFL contexts. These instruments have demonstrated reliability and relevance in examining how learners perceive different feedback strategies in Classroom interaction.

Furthermore, adapting these questionnaires to the context of vocational higher education is particularly important. Vocational students, especially non-English majors, have distinct learning orientations that emphasize practical communication skills and workplace readiness. Therefore, the questionnaire items reflect authentic speaking situations and align with the communicative demands faced by EFL learners in vocational settings. This adaptation ensures that the instrument not only maintains its theoretical validity but also enhances its contextual relevance for the target population.

Data collecting technique

The data collection process began with the distribution of a questionnaire to 61 first-semester Information Technology students. All respondents were students taking the Bahasa Inggris Dasar course. The questionnaire aimed to identify their preferences regarding the type of oral corrective feedback they require in their English language learning. The questionnaire was administered online (Google Forms) for one week (7 days). Before completing the questionnaire, respondents received information about the research objectives and were required to provide answers that were appropriate to their individual circumstances. From the 61 distributed questionnaires, 30 were selected, deemed valid, and met the criteria for analysis.

The data obtained from the questionnaire were quantitative, consisting of ordinal responses on a 5-point Likert scale. It enabled the analysis of trends and correlations between

preferences for oral corrective feedback strategies and the English language skills of non-native English-speaking students.

Data analysis technique

The data analysis technique in this study used descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics were chosen because this study aimed to describe students' preferences and perceptions of oral corrective feedback (OCF), not to test causal relationships between variables. Responses from Google Forms on a 1–5 Likert scale, saved in Excel, and analyzed using SPSS 20.

More specifically, frequency distributions and percentages were used to indicate the number of respondents in each Likert scale (1–5) answer category, allowing identification of dominant patterns in student responses. Meanwhile, the mean value was used to measure the central tendency of each item or indicator, indicating students' level of agreement or preference for a particular type of OCF. A higher mean value indicates stronger agreement, while a lower value indicates a tendency toward disagreement or uncertainty.

Interview transcripts were analyzed thematically using Coalizi analysis. The first stage included immersion, significant statements, and formulated meanings. This entire process ultimately resulted in an exhaustive description of the contextual alignment and students' experiences with the oral corrective feedback they received.

The data were analyzed using a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative analysis. Quantitative data from the questionnaires were analyzed descriptively by calculating percentages to identify patterns in students' preferences for types of oral corrective feedback. Qualitative data from the interviews were analyzed using Colaizzi's phenomenological analysis technique, which involves reading through the data, identifying significant statements, formulating meaning, grouping them into themes, and compiling descriptions to uncover the essence of students' experiences. The results of the quantitative and qualitative analyses were then integrated to provide a more comprehensive understanding of vocational students' perceptions and experiences of oral corrective feedback.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

Quantitative results

The results present the statistical analysis of the students' questionnaire on the oral corrective feedback strategies they received in English learning. The strategies cover: recast, elicitation, clarification request, metalinguistics feedback, explicit correction, and repetition. All the strategies are described within a statistical preview with mean and standard deviation scores.

Table 1. Percentages of OFC strategies

No.	OCF Strategies	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1	Recast (I want my teacher to give me the correct form by reformulating and repeating only the erroneous part of the utterance)	46	1	5	3,530	1,099
2	Elicitation (If I make an error, I want my teacher to say my utterance again and pause before the error)	46	1	5	4,181	0,772
3	Clarification Request (If I make an error, I want my teacher to give me the correct form by reformulating and repeating only the erroneous part of the utterance)	46	1	5	3,728	0,824
4	Metalinguistic Feedback (If I make an error, I want my teacher to give me comments or language rules)	46	1	5	3,269	1,04
5	Explicit Correction (If I make an error, I want my teacher to tell me explicitly that there is an error and give me the correct form.)	46	1	5	3,957	0,715
6	Repetition (If I make an error, I want my teacher to reformulate the erroneous utterance and put it in the form of a confirmation check or a question)	46	1	5	3,134	1,015

There was variation in the level of use or perception of various types of oral corrective feedback. Elicitation received the highest mean score ($M = 4.181$; $SD = 0.772$), indicating that it was the most frequently used strategy by respondents. The relatively low standard deviation also indicated that respondents had fairly consistent perceptions of elicitation as a feedback strategy. Furthermore, explicit correction ($M = 3.957$; $SD = 0.715$) and clarification requests

($M = 3.728$; $SD = 0.824$) also showed high mean scores. These two types of feedback are used frequently and are well received by respondents.

Meanwhile, recast ($M = 3.530$; $SD = 1.099$) was at a moderate level but had a fairly high standard deviation. This indicates considerable variation in respondents' perceptions and experiences with recast. Meanwhile, metalinguistic feedback ($M = 3.269$; $SD = 1.040$) and repetition ($M = 3.134$; $SD = 1.015$) had lower mean scores compared to all other types of corrective feedback. This indicates that these two strategies were less dominantly used by respondents. The relatively high standard deviation also indicates homogeneity in respondents' perceptions.

These quantitative results do not fully explain the differences in usage and perceptions across the types of oral corrective feedback. Therefore, qualitative analysis is needed to provide a deeper understanding of respondents' experiences and perspectives regarding the use of these various types of feedback.

Qualitative Result

Colaizzi's thematic analysis was used to represent interview results to formulate a distribution of themes within preferences for each feedback strategy. This thematic analysis also aimed to map the aspects students focused on when receiving and responding to verbal corrective feedback. The student interview results are described in the ***Table 2. Colaizzi's thematic analysis results*** in the **Appendices**

Thematic analysis using Colaizzi's phenomenological approach revealed that students' experiences with (OCF) oral corrective feedback are multidimensional, covering cognitive, affective, and pedagogical aspects. These findings indicate that students view OCF not only as an instrument for correcting errors but also as a learning support system that shapes their understanding, confidence, and participation in speaking activities. From the interviews, several dominant themes emerged, including opportunities for self-repair, explicit guidance, emotional support, clarification strategies, and emotional response. These themes indicate that students' preferences for OCF are closely related to how feedback facilitates comprehension, engagement, and emotional comfort during language learning.

Cognitive engagement through self-repair.

Qualitative findings indicate students' positive preference for feedback strategies that allow for self-repair, such as elicitation and recast. The strategies encourage higher cognitive engagement because students must use their background knowledge to identify errors and then correct them. This strategy also encourages a more active and meaningful learning process than simply waiting for the correct answer. This approach also influences students' participation in classroom learning activities. They become used to using their knowledge when errors occur.

These findings are also supported by quantitative data, which show that elicitation is the OCF strategy with the highest preference score ($M = 4.18$; $SD = 0.77$). The high mean indicates that students value strategies that provide opportunities for independent thinking and error correction. The relatively low standard deviation demonstrates the consistency of students' perceptions of the strategy's effectiveness in aiding language acquisition.

Emotional support through affective development

The research findings also revealed that OCF not only triggers cognitive aspects but also affective aspects of students. OCF impacts both their anxiety and confidence in learning. Excessive or overly interruptive feedback can trigger anxiety and lower students' confidence when speaking. Conversely, supportive and non-judgmental feedback can increase confidence and active participation in speaking classes.

Interview results showed that students felt more comfortable when corrections were made to boost their confidence. These findings are aligned with quantitative data showing lower scores for metalinguistic feedback strategies ($M = 3.26$; $SD = 1.04$) and recast ($M = 3.53$; $SD = 1.09$). The higher standard deviation scores for these two strategies indicate student perceptions of variety, particularly regarding the clarity and emotional impact of the implicit feedback strategy. Some students felt the strategy was not emotionally supportive enough, leading to confusion and uncertainty during classroom interactions.

Emotional response through affective factors

The research findings also underscore that OCF can trigger speaking anxiety in students. Feedback that is too interruptive during a performance can increase anxiety and

lower their confidence. Overly judgmental feedback that makes it difficult for students to participate in the learning process is a factor in their decision to accept OCF.

Interview results also indicated that students felt helped when OCF was tailored to their understanding and delivered in a supportive manner. This finding correlates with quantitative data showing lower scores on preference for metalinguistic feedback ($M = 3.26$; $SD = 1.04$) and repetition ($M = 3.13$; $SD = 1.01$). The higher standard deviation values for both strategies indicate variation in student perceptions, particularly regarding the emotional impact of metalinguistic feedback and repetition. Some students felt these strategies did not significantly help them understand the English materials and actively engage with them.

Clarity of correction through clarification strategy

Clarity is a key factor in ensuring effective OCF in learning. Students tend to prefer explicit correction because it provides definitive answers and reduces ambiguity in understanding errors. In the context of vocational education, which emphasizes efficiency and practical skills, clarity of information is crucial for students to apply correct language forms in communication. Quantitative results support this finding, with explicit correction achieving a high mean ($M = 3.95$; $SD = 0.71$), making it the most preferred OCF strategy by students. This score indicates that students feel more comfortable when lecturers directly point out errors and provide correct forms. This demonstrates that vocational students need clear, fast, and understandable feedback to support their speaking performance.

Discussion

Themes such as cognitive awareness, cognitive engagement, and reflective thinking indicate that students need oral corrective feedback (OCF) strategies that not only function as correction tools (Azar & Molavi, 2013; Rassaei & Moinsadeh, 2011) but also foster their linguistic awareness (Emilia, 2024; Yousefi, 2015). Strategies such as elicitation and clarification requests are the OCF strategies that most often generate cognitive engagement because they allow students to identify and correct their own errors. A study by Amalia et al. (2009) reported similar results, finding a preference for indirect assistance (getting hints about their mistakes). This strategy allows students to unassisted identify errors (Ha et al., 2021), thereby increasing self-awareness and engagement in learning.

In elicitation, the lecturer does not immediately provide the correct answer, but gives a pause, questions, or prompts to students to reformulate their utterances. This process encourages self-repair and strengthens cognitive engagement because students must re-access previously learned knowledge of grammar, vocabulary, and speech structures. These results are similar to a study by Mulyani et al. (2022), which found elicitation to be the most appropriate strategy for corrective feedback among students. They mentioned elicitation as a trigger for students to develop their awareness to think and fix their errors.

Meanwhile, clarification requests foster reflective thinking because students are asked to recheck their utterances when the lecturer asks for clarification on an inaccurate or unclear part. This strategy strengthens metacognitive awareness as students learn to monitor their own language use during speaking activities (Öztürk, 2016). Furthermore, explicit correction also contributes to cognitive awareness, particularly by helping students directly identify errors and correct language forms. In the context of vocational students who tend to prioritize efficiency and clarity in learning, explicit correction provides linguistic certainty that facilitates rapid comprehension of the target language. Unlike implicit strategies such as recasting or repetition, explicit correction provides clear indications that an utterance contains errors (Aranguiz & Espinoza, 2016), eliminating the need for students to guess where to correct. Therefore, this strategy is widely perceived as facilitating faster and more practical language processing, especially in speaking activities that require spontaneous responses.

The themes of affective factors and emotional support indicate that providing OCF directly impacts students' emotional well-being, particularly their confidence (Mulki et al., 2025), speaking comfort (Rizkiya & Pratolo, 2023), and anxiety when making mistakes. Strategies such as metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests are perceived as more supportive (Mardian & Nafissi, 2022) because the lecturer continues to provide linguistic guidance without directly blaming them. When the lecturer provides guidance such as "pay attention to the tense" or "the subject isn't correct," students feel guided to find their own answers without losing confidence. This strategy creates a more emotionally supportive learning environment for students (Nurfaidah et al., 2024) because they still have the opportunity to think and improve without feeling embarrassed in front of the class.

Conversely, some students indicated that repetition and recast strategies can elicit

varying affective responses. Some students felt that repetition helped them recognize errors naturally and without intimidation (Aziz & Jayaputri, 2023; Halim et al., 2021; Rahman et al., 2024), especially when the lecturer repeated the incorrect part with a specific intonation. This finding indicates that indirect yet directional feedback plays a crucial role in the language learning process. However, others felt confused or anxious because the overly implicit correction made it difficult to pinpoint the exact location of the error. This means that the effectiveness of OCF strategies is determined not only by the type of correction but also by the lecturer's sensitivity to identify students' emotional state and linguistic readiness.

From a pedagogical perspective, the themes of learning prioritization and instructional alignment demonstrate the importance of relevance and selectivity in providing oral corrective feedback. Students do not always expect all errors to be corrected comprehensively (Jafari et al., 2022; Rahmi, 2017) but to prioritize errors that hinder communication or that are related to the focus of the learning material. In this context, explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback strategies are considered effective when used for errors directly related to learning targets (Barnes, 2023; Khodadust, 2024), such as grammar, vocabulary (Permadi et al., 2025), or pronunciation. Meanwhile, clarification requests and elicitation are more effective in maintaining fluent communication while encouraging students to think independently without unduly disrupting the flow of speaking.

Thematic results indicate that each OCF strategy contributes differently to students' cognitive, affective, and pedagogical dimensions. Interactive strategies such as elicitation and clarification requests tend to strengthen cognitive engagement (Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012) and self-reflection (Zhang et al., 2025; Shirkhani & Tajeddin, 2016), while explicit correction provides easy-to-understand linguistic clarity. On the other hand, metalinguistic feedback acts as a scaffolding that maintains a balance between correction and emotional support. Therefore, lecturers need to consider learning objectives, students' emotional states, and the complexity of errors before determining which OCF strategy to use in EFL classes.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

In conclusion, the thematic categorization revealed that students' preference patterns for oral corrective feedback (OCF) were drawn cognitively, affectively, and pedagogically.

The analysis revealed that students naturally preferred feedback techniques that not only correct linguistic errors but also encourage active engagement, self-reflection, and meaningful learning. Feedback strategy such as elicitation, clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback encourages deeper cognitive processing for self-correction and monitoring of their own performance. Students' preference for oral corrective feedback is a positive reaction to their active engagement in the classroom.

At the same time, students' affective dimensions are shaped by how they understand the content of the corrective feedback they receive and the way it is delivered. One type of corrective feedback preference, such as explicit feedback, is considered beneficial due to its clarity and efficiency in helping students immediately recognize and understand errors. These findings also highlight the importance of emotional support in feedback delivery, as supportive and constructive correction increases students' confidence and participation, while excessive or inaccurate correction can increase anxiety.

Furthermore, on the pedagogical side, students valued selective and relevant correction aligned with learning objectives and communicative needs rather than indiscriminate correction of all errors. Overall, the thematic analysis suggests that effective OCF in vocational EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms must balance clarity, cognitive engagement, emotional sensitivity, and pedagogical relevance to support language development and communicative competence.

Limitation

This study has several limitations that should be considered. First, participants were limited to vocational students from one institution. While the findings provide valuable insights into student preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF), they do not fully represent students from other educational contexts, study programs, or institutions with different English language learning environments. Future studies could include participants from multiple vocational institutions or compare non-English majors at vocational and non-vocational institutions to discover the findings.

Second, this study focused on student preferences for various oral corrective feedback and did not address the actual effectiveness of each strategy for improving speaking

performance or addressing speaking anxiety. Student preferences may not always align with teaching strategies that promote specific learning outcomes. Therefore, future research is recommended to investigate the relationship between preferred feedback strategies, speaking performance, and psychological variables through experimental or longitudinal designs.

Third, the thematic categorization into cognitive, affective, and pedagogical dimensions was derived from student perceptions and self-reported responses. While these themes provide a comprehensive understanding of learners' expectations of oral corrective feedback, they do not capture classroom interaction patterns or instructor perspectives. Combining classroom observations, stimulated recall interviews, and instructor perceptions would provide a more holistic understanding of how oral corrective feedback is provided and interpreted during learning.

Finally, this study did not examine learner characteristics that may influence feedback preferences, such as English proficiency, speaking self-efficacy, motivation, personality traits, willingness to communicate, or prior learning experiences. These individual differences may shape how students understand and respond to corrective feedback. Therefore, future studies are recommended to investigate these variables to measure the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback among vocational EFL learners.

Implication

This study highlights vocational students' preferences for oral corrective feedback strategies in EFL classrooms. This investigation of OCF preferences also aims to map strategies that align with students' needs in classroom. Exploring these preferences provides important information for lecturers in selecting appropriate learning activities that emphasize speaking development. Students' positive attitudes toward OCF strategies contribute to the exploration of linguistic knowledge through corrective feedback and facilitate the identification of language errors. Therefore, lecturers should provide oral corrective feedback in a measured and systematic manner as an integral part of speaking instruction. They are encouraged to guide students in noticing their errors and understanding the linguistic concepts underlying them, thereby strengthening students' awareness of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and communicative language use. This study also contributes to a deeper understanding of the role and implications of Oral Corrective Feedback in improving

speaking competence in EFL classrooms. For lecturers, OCF serves as a pedagogical strategy that encourages meaningful interactions and reflective learning. For students, OCF enriches linguistic knowledge through a supportive and accessible learning process.

From a practical perspective, these findings provide alternative references for English lecturers in vocational higher education when selecting and implementing oral corrective feedback strategies. Lecturers should consider students' cognitive readiness, emotional responses, and communicative needs before determining the most appropriate type of feedback. The findings suggest that strategies that encourage self-improvement, such as elicitation and clarification requests, can increase learner engagement and autonomy, while explicit correction remains valuable when immediate clarification is needed. Consequently, this study offers practical recommendations for designing speaking activities that integrate corrective feedback without increasing students' speaking anxiety. These implications are particularly relevant for vocational education, where students are expected to develop communicative competencies that support workplace communication and global employability.

From an empirical perspective, this study extends the existing literature on Oral Corrective Feedback by providing evidence from the Indonesian vocational higher education context. Unlike many previous studies that examine the effectiveness of corrective feedback on linguistic comprehension, this study explores students' preferences and organizes them into cognitive, affective, and pedagogical dimensions. This thematic framework contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of how vocational EFL learners perceive various corrective feedback strategies and the factors that influence their preferences. Therefore, these findings also serve as an empirical foundation for future studies investigating the relationships between oral corrective feedback, speaking anxiety, self-efficacy, willingness to communicate, learner engagement, and speaking performance, ultimately contributing to the development of evidence-based pedagogical practices in vocational education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their gratitude to LP2M (Research and Community Service Unit) at State Polytechnic of Malang for providing financial support for this research.

Suryadi et al. (2026)

The authors also extend their appreciation to all members of the research team for their valuable contributions, collaboration, and commitment throughout the research.

BIO-PROFILE

Satrio Binusa Suryadi is an English lecturer at the Information Technology Department of the State Polytechnic of Malang. His areas of specialization or research interests include ESP, TEFL, Online learning, and Instructional Media. Corresponding email: stbinusa@polinema.ac.id

Farida Ulfa is an English lecturer at the Information Technology Department of the State Polytechnic of Malang. Her areas of specialization or research interests include ESP, Material Development, and Creative Writing. Corresponding email: faridaulfa@polinema.ac.id

Atiqah Nurul Asri is an English lecturer at the Information Technology Department of the State Polytechnic of Malang. Her areas of specialization or research interests include ESP, TEFL, ICT in language teaching, and CALL. Corresponding email: atiqah.na@gmail.com

Fitrotul Maulidiyah is an English lecturer at the Accounting Department of the State Polytechnic of Malang. Her areas of specialization or research interests include Translation, curriculum, and writing. Corresponding email: fitrotulmaulidiyah@polinema.ac.id

Risa Juliadilla is a lecturer at the Faculty of Social Science and Culture, Universitas Gajayana. Her areas of specialization or research interest include Psychology and Educational Psychology. Corresponding email: risajuliadilla@unigamalang.ac.id

REFERENCES

- Aloud, R. E. (2022). Saudi Female EFL Teachers' Cognition and Practices Regarding Online Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 8, 56–69.
- Alzubi, A. A. F., Nazim, M., & Al-Mwzaiji, K. N. A. (2022). Learning through Correction: Oral Corrective Feedback in Online EFL Interactions. *World Journal of English Language*, 12(8), 382–389. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n8p382>
- Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2009). Preferences for the Oral Corrective Feedback Types in Speaking Classroom : Voices From Male and Female University Students. *Proceeding of 3rd International Conference of Arts Language and Culture*, 109–116.
- Aranguiz, M. F., & Espinoza, A. Q. (2016). Oral corrective feedback strategies in EFL. A pilot study in chilean classrooms. *Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada*, 16, 103–132. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19893492
- Atma, Nurul; Widiati, U. (2015). EFL university teachers ' perspectives in written corrective feedback and their actual applications. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Seni*, 43(2), 183–195. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i3.21641>
- Azar, A. S., & Molavi, S. (2013). Iranian EFL Learners' Attitudes toward Correction of Oral Errors. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 4(1), 106–118. <https://doi.org/10.15405/ejsbs.2013.1.13>
- Aziz, M. F., & Jayaputri, H. E. (2023). EFL Learners' Perspective on Corrective Feedback. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, 7(2), 219. <https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v7i2.14806>
- Barnes, A. J. (2023). Online Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Outside of Class Time: (In)effectiveness and Task Engagement. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 37–58. <https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v5n2.911>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Emilia, E. (2024). *Challenges In Integrating English for Specific Purposes into the Indonesian Tefl Curriculum : A. 13*, 817–841. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v13i3.8880>
- Gaffar, M. A., Syaidina, R. A., Farida, D., Winulya, F. P., & Mufti, D. M. (2024). Speak Up! Empowering Vocational EFL Students through Oral Corrective Feedback. *Veles*, 8(3), 26–38. <https://doi.org/10.53103/cjess.v2i5.71>
- Ha, X. Van, & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and Sources of Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms : Are Students ' and Teachers ' Beliefs Aligned ? *Frontiers in Education*, 12, 370–371. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>
- 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), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>

- Halim, T., Wahid, R., & Halim, S. (2021). EFL students' attitudes toward corrective feedback: a study conducted at undergraduate level. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, 1(1), 40–49. <https://doi.org/10.1108/sjls-03-2021-0004>
- Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., Prastiyowati, S., & Gilakjani, A. P. (2022). The Impacts of Teacher ' s Oral Corrective Feedback to Students ' Psychological Domain : A Study on EFL Speech Production. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619>
- Jabbari, A. A., & Fazilatfar, A. M. (2012). The Role of Error Types and Feedback in Iranian EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(1), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p135>
- Jafari, S., Karimi, M. R., & Jafari, S. (2022). *Beliefs and Practices of EFL Instructors in Teaching Pronunciation*. 10(2), 147–166. <https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv11i110812>
- Karatas, H., Alci, B., Bademcioglu, M., & Ergin, A. (2016). An Investigation into University Students Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 232(April), 382–388. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.10.053>
- Khodadust, M. R. (2024). *Politeness and Corrective Feedback: Immediate and Delayed Performance*. 12(2), 137–155. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2024.54354.2395>
- Kovač, M. M. (2025). The importance of corrective feedback in foreign language learning. *Sintagma*, 37, 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.21001/sintagma.2025.37.03>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). corrective feedback and Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2, 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Mardian, F., & Nafissi, Z. (2022). Synchronous Computer-mediated Corrective Feedback and EFL Learners' Grammatical Knowledge Development: A Sociocultural Perspective. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 10(2), 115–136. <https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2022.121186>
- Maulida, A. Z., & Khotib, R. R. (2025). *Aspek yang mempengaruhi kecemasan berbicara bahasa inggris pada mahasiswa baru*. Journal Warta Dharmawangsa, Volume 19 (3) 1181–1188. <https://doi.org/10.46576/wdw.v19i3.6734>
- Mulki, N., Meisuri, & Rahmawati, I. N. (2025). Guided Conversation Technique In Efl Classrooms : Supporting Speaking Skills Development. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 400–421. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v24i2.12049>
- Mulyani, S., Ningsih, N., & Setyaningrum, N. I. (2022). Students' Perceptions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in a Speaking Class. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, 8(1), 174–183. <https://doi.org/10.24252/eternal.v8i1.2022.a12>
- Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., Astilla, I., Heriansyah, H., & Marhaban, S. (2021). Students' Perception Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes: *International Journal of Language Education*, 5(4), 244–259. <https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v5i4.19010>

- Nurfaidah, S., Khairunnisa, U., Syukri, S., & Jamilarin, P. A. P. (2024). Exploring teachers' corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Pre-service teachers' reflections. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 14(2), 523–544. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jeft.v14i2.8863>
- Ozturk, E. O., & Ozturk, G. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Voices from students. *Novitas Royal*, 10(2), 113–133. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1167213.pdf>
- Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 22–37. www.jlls.org
- Permadi, A. S. S., Susanti, E., & Munisah, E. (2025). Indonesian And Philippines English as Foreign Language Students (Efl): Perceptions and Attitudes Toward English Language. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 89–110. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v14i1.11382>
- Putri, Y., & Yusuf, F. N. (2025). Teachers' Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Speaking Through a Screen. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning*, 14(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.21580/vjv14i126825>
- 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>
- Rahmi, S. (2017). Types of Corrective Feedback Used By Four Lecturers on Students' Speaking Performance. *Inovish Journal*, 2(2), 79. <https://doi.org/10.35314/inovish.v2i2.235>
- Rassaei, E., & Moinszadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 97. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p97>
- Rizkiya, A., & Pratolo, B. W. (2023). Students' strategies to overcome English speaking. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 660–679. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v12i2.7417>
- Rosmayanti, V., Ramli, R., & Rafiq, R. (2023). Building beginners' self-confidence in speaking at private high school in Makassar. *EduLite: Journal of English Education, Literature and Culture*, 8(1), 192. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.8.1.192-208>
- Shirkhani, S., & Tajeddin, Z. (2016). L2 Teachers' Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback and Its Linguistic Focus. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 181–206. <https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijal.19.1.181>
- Subekti, A. S. (2018). Investigating the Relationship between Foreign Language Anxiety and Oral Performance of Non-English Major University Students in Indonesia. *Dinamika Ilmu*, 18(1), 15–36. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v18i1.880>
- Suryadi, S. B. (2023). Exploring Speaking Anxiety of Non-English Department Students. *Loquen: English Studies Journal*, 15(2), 87–98. <https://doi.org/10.32678/loquen.v15i2.6768>

- Tesnim, O. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback and Its Impact on Learners' Speaking Skills : Tunisian EFL Students as a Case Study. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 7(3), 138–149. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20190703.15>
- Tumini, N. T. (2025). Investigating Oral Corrective Feedback in Teaching Speaking to Seventh-Grade EFL Students. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(4), 1–10.
- Van Ha, X., Murray, J. C., & Mehdi Riazi, A. (2021). High school efl students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(2), 235–264. <https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.4>
- 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 ? *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 6(1), 103–122.
- Yalçın, Ö., & İnceçay, V. (2014). Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety: The case of Spontaneous Speaking Activities. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2620–2624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.623>
- Yousefi, V. (2015). Corrective feedback preferences among Iranian EFL students. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 4(5), 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsl.2015.1101>
- Yuksel, D., Soruç, A., & Mckinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes Do ~. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 362–382. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijal.12336>
- Zhang, C., Bowen, N. E. J. A., & Thomas, N. (2025). Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake: an analysis of Chinese high-school teachers' practices in a national teaching competition. *Classroom Discourse*, 00(00), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2025.2474233>

*Appendice**Table 2. Colaizzi's thematic analysis results*

Student s Code	OCF Strategy	Theme Cluster	Emergent Theme	Description	Statements
S 1	Elicitation	Self-repair opportunity	Cognitive engagement	Self-repair fosters more in-depth cognitive processing.	<i>"When I mispronounce words, I'd rather not be told the exact error. This approach allows me to think for myself and come up with the correct answer".</i>
S 2	Explicit Correction	Explicit guidance	Clarity of correction	Clear input reduces vagueness and supports natural comprehension.	<i>"When the teacher directly corrects my mistakes, it is easier to follow the lesson, and I feel more comfortable participating in class activities. Immediate correction helps me understand and stay engaged".</i>
S 3	Elicitation	Self-repair opportunity	Learning Retention	Internal processing strengthens memory and learning retention.	<i>"When I speak English, I occasionally forget vocabulary. When this occurs, I make an effort to recall the word and say it straight away".</i>
S 4	Recast	Implicit feedback limitation	Cognitive Challenge	Implicit feedback's ambiguity reduces its efficacy for learners.	<i>"I'm worried that if I make a mistake in English, people will laugh at me.</i>

					<i>I will comprehend my errors if the lecturer gently points them out to me”.</i>
S 5	Clarification Request	Clarification strategy	Reflective Thinking	Feedback encourages metacognitive awareness and language monitoring	<i>“I find it easy to remember when I mispronounce words, when the lecturer repeats the incorrect word or sentence; that way, it really sticks in my mind”.</i>
S 6	Metalinguistics Feedback	Emotional Support	Affective Development	Constructive feedback builds learners’ confidence in speaking	<i>“We gained a deeper understanding when a mistake occurred, the lecturer provided a clue—such as pointing out imprecise vocabulary, incorrect structure, or a missing preposition—while still allowing us to provide the correct answer”.</i>
S 7	Recast	Emotional Support	Cognitive Challenge	Implicit feedback's ambiguity reduces its efficacy for learners.	<i>“I am understanding that speaking English flawlessly is impossible. When the lecturer points out my mistakes, I understand it better”.</i>
S 8	Repetition	Repetition	Feedback	Lack of explicit signal reduces	<i>“If I make a mistake and the</i>

		Limitation	Clarity Issue	effectiveness of repetition strategy	<i>lecturer only repeats my words, it confuses me. If there were a hint, perhaps I could figure out what the mistake was”.</i>
S 9	Elicitation	Self-repair opportunity	Cognitive engagement	Active involvement enhances understanding and retention of language forms	<i>“Instead of being given the right answer for every mistake, it seems that the errors that need to be addressed are those that we do not understand”.</i>
S 10	Recast	Emotional Support	Affective Development	Constructive feedback builds learners’ confidence in speaking	<i>“When the lecturer doesn't immediately provide the correct answer, it confuses me; however, if they offer a clue, I can attempt to answer it—and that makes things much easier for me”.</i>
S 11	Repetition	Instructional Alignment	Pedagogical Relevance	Feedback aligned with lesson objectives supports targeted learning	<i>“When a lecturer repeats our words or gives clues, such as signalling a missing subject or verb, it helps us correct errors and understand the meaning. These cues reinforce learning and help us remember corrections”.</i> <i>“If I get the</i>

Suryadi et al. (2026)

S 12	Explicit Correction	Explicit guidance	Functional Accuracy	Feedback prioritizes meaning over form in communication	<i>feedback instantly—and shown exactly where the mistake lies—it's easy to remember, and I can put it into practice right away.”</i>
S 13	Elicitation	Self-repair opportunity	Cognitive engagement	Self-repair promotes deeper cognitive processing	<i>“When I mispronounce words, I really appreciate it when the lecturer gives me a moment to try again. It challenges me, and I enjoy it”.</i>
S 14	Recast	Self-repair Opportunity	Cognitive Engagement	Self-repair promotes deeper mental processing.	<i>“When the lecturer asked me to correct the mistake, I tried to answer as much as I could.”</i>
S 15	Recast	Self-repair Opportunity	Learning Retention	Memory and learning retention are strengthened by internal processing.	<i>“Sometimes it is easier to notice the mistake when the lecturer gives a hint during the task, so I can perform confidently.”</i>
S 16	Clarification Request	Clarification strategy	Reflective thinking	Feedback encourages metacognitive awareness and language monitoring	<i>“Lecturers provide corrections and the correct answer when errors occur. However, it's more challenging when the lecturer just gives hints and lets us try until</i>

					we get the right answer.”
S 17	Metalinguistics Feedback	Emotional Response	Affective Factors	Excessive feedback negatively impacts emotional state and participation	“If the hints are repeated many times, it makes us more anxious and makes it harder to identify our mistakes. Once is enough—just give us some time to think”.
S 18	Metalinguistics Feedback	Emotional Support	Affective Development	Constructive feedback builds learners’ confidence to perform better.	“When corrections were given—with or without hints, regarding vocabulary or structure—they facilitated the development of our language skills.”
S 19	Elicitation	Self-repair opportunity	Learning Retention	Internal processing strengthens memory and learning durability	“If the lecturer responds to a wrong utterance by simply providing hints, it really makes us think—and helps us remember the learning process long afterward.”
S 20	Explicit Correction	Explicit guidance	Learning Retention	Internal processing strengthens memory and learning retention.	“Sometimes, when the lecturer points out our mistakes and provides the corrections directly, without making us guess, it helps me better understand exactly what the lecturer

					<i>intended.”</i>
S 21	Clarification Request	Clarification strategy	Reflective thinking	Feedback encourages metacognitive awareness and language monitoring	<i>“We'll be more confident if we know where our mistakes lie before the lecturer tells us”.</i>
S 22	Explicit Correction	Self-repair opportunity	Learning Retention	Internal processing strengthens memory and learning retention.	<i>“When we make a mistake and fix it immediately—even if assisted by the lecturer—it makes the lesson stick in our minds even more effectively.”</i>
S 23	Repetition	Clarification strategy	Reflective thinking	Feedback reshapes students' awareness and helps them understand the learning efficiently.	<i>“When a mistake occurred, and the lecturer went over the incorrect part repeatedly, it helped me remember and understand it better.”</i>
S 24	Metalinguistics Feedback	Emotional Response	Affective Factors	Excessive feedback negatively impacts emotional state and participation	<i>“We often make mistakes when using inappropriate grammar or vocabulary. Just give a hint, don't tell us the correct answer”.</i>
S 25	Repetition	Emotional Support	Affective Development	Constructive feedback builds learners' confidence to perform better.	<i>“If the hints are repeated, I feel confident in correcting previous mistakes or mispronunciations”.</i>
					<i>“Confirming</i>

Suryadi et al. (2026)

S 26	Clarification Request	Clarification strategy	Learning Retention	Internal processing strengthens memory and learning retention.	<i>our knowledge by restating what we said helps us better grasp the corrections provided."</i>
S 27	Explicit Correction	Explicit guidance	Reflective thinking	Feedback encourages metacognitive awareness and language monitoring	<i>"If we make a mistake, the lecturer corrects it without giving a hint, making it easier for us to remember and understand what we've learned."</i>
S 28	Clarification Request	Emotional Response	Affective Factors	Excessive feedback negatively impacts emotional state and participation	<i>"When I mispronounced a word during a presentation, the lecturer just repeated the words that needed to be corrected; it actually made me nervous"</i>
S 29	Metalinguistics Feedback	Self-repair Opportunity	Learning Retention	Internal processing strengthens memory and learning retention.	<i>"I immediately understand if the lecturer says "mind the tenses", or "an incorrect verb", without having to tell me what the correct one is."</i>
S 30	Repetition	Emotional Response	Affective Factors	Excessive feedback negatively impacts emotional state and participation	<i>"Having the lecturer repeat the incorrect word helped me pinpoint the exact error—and, even better, it didn't make me nervous".</i>