Libyan EFL University Students' Insights on Teacher Error Corrective Feedback Strategies in Oral Practice Classes

Najwa A. Jroush

Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Languages, University of Tripoli, Libya

n.jaroush@uot.edu.ly

ABSTRACT

Teacher oral corrective feedback plays a pivotal role in detecting and correcting students' errors, enhancing their speaking skills and self-confidence, and reducing their hesitation in public speaking encounters. This survey study documents university students' preferences and perceptions of teacher oral corrective feedback strategies used in oral practice classes. It taps into the experiences of 84 Libyan EFL university students at the English department, at the Faculty of Arts and Languages, Tripoli, Libya. In doing so, the study employs a student questionnaire to gather data and runs descriptive statistics in the form of percentages to analyze the obtained data. Findings reveal that students have positive attitudes towards teacher oral corrective feedback strategies. They believe that such feedback increases self-esteem, reduces hesitation, and improves fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary retention. Furthermore, findings indicate that students incline towards immediate, delayed, and indirect forms of teacher oral corrective feedback. Finally, findings also showcase that students prefer self and peer-correction feedback, since it can boost their linguistic abilities, encourage risk-taking, and mitigate confrontational atmospheres. The study acknowledges the benefits of the practical employment of teacher oral corrective feedback strategies in Libyan EFL oral practice classes. It recommends that teachers take into account the diversity, sensitivity, and complexity associated with teacher oral corrective feedback, highlighting the necessity for teachers to tailor these strategies to accommodate the various needs and preferences of students.

Keywords: EFL, Oral Practices classes, Perceptions, Preferences, Teacher Oral Corrective Feedback, University Students

الملخص

تُعدّ استراتيجية تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية التي يمارسها المعلم عنصرًا محوريًا في تشخيص أخطاء المتعلمين وتقويمها، بما يسهم في دعم مهاراتهم في التعبير الشفهي وتعزيز ثقتهم بأنفسهم، وتقليل مظاهر التردد لديهم في مواقف التحدث أمام الجمهور. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى رصد تفضيلات وتصورات طلبة الجامعات بشأن استراتيجيات تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية التي يعتمدها المعلم داخل محاضرات التدريبات الشفهية. ولتحقيق أهداف الدراسة، استُقصِيَت آراء (84) طالبًا ليبيًا يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بكلية الآداب واللغات، طرابلس، ليبيا. وقد جُمِعت البيانات باستخدام استبيان للطلبة، واعتمدت الدراسة إحصاءات وصفية تمثّلت في النِّسَب المئوية لتحليل النتائج . أظهرت النتائج أن اتجاهات الطلبة نحو استراتيجيات التصحيح الشفهي للمعلم جاءت إيجابية؛ إذ يعتقدون أن هذه

الاستراتيجية تسهم في تعزيز احترام الذات، وتخفض مستوى التردد، وتحسن الطلاقة والدقة والنطق، فضلاً عن دعم استبقاء المفردات. كما بينت النتائج أن الطلبة يميلون إلى أنماط التصحيح الفوري والمتأخر وغير المباشر. وإضافةً إلى ذلك، كشفت الدراسة عن تفضيل واضح لأساليب التصحيح الذاتي وتصحيح الزملاء، لما توفره من فرص لتعزيز القدرات اللغوية، وتشجيع المتعلمين على المخاطرة والمبادرة، وتقليل طبيعة المواجهة أو الأجواء الصدامية داخل الصف. وتختتم الدراسة بتأكيد أهمية الإفادة من التطبيق العملي لاستراتيجيات تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية داخل محاضرات التدريبات الشفهية للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في ليبيا. كما توصي الدراسة بضرورة أن يأخذ المعلمون بعين الاعتبار التنوع والدرجات المختلفة من التعقيد المرتبط باستراتيجية التصحيح الشفهي، مع التأكيد على ضرورة مواءمة هذه الاستراتيجيات لتلبية الاحتياجات والتفضيلات المتباينة للمتعلمين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، فصول التدريبات الشفهية، إدراك، تفضيلات، استراتيجية التصحيح الشفهي من المعلم، طلبة الجامعة

Introduction

Error correction is essential for language learning, skill enhancement, and appropriate contextual usage (Yousefi & Nassaji, 2021) in both EFL and ESL environments (Hung & Vo, 2024). It alerts teachers to recurring errors that may persist even among advanced students. Not only this, but it also encourages teachers to offer Corrective Feedback (CF) on language-related issues to assist students in building their linguistic knowledge. The error correction process entails teachers' analysis of written and oral errors by investigating their potential origins. It also allows students to develop a more profound comprehension of the languages they major in by reflecting on the reasons behind their errors (Kulik & Kulik, 2020). In context, error correction addresses the fundamental factors contributing to students' errors. Researchers categorize language learning errors into two primary types: interlingual and intralingual. Interlingual errors arise from the influence of students' native language or another previously learned language, resulting in interference errors (Sari, 2016). Conversely, intralingual errors occur when students misapply the rules of the second language, leading to conflicts and deviations from target-language norms (Haryanto, 2018).

There is increasing evidence supporting the effectiveness of Teacher Oral Corrective Feedback (TOCF) in the EFL context (Brown & Liu, 2015),

defined as "a reactive type of form-focused instruction that encourages students to pay attention, thereby facilitating learning" (Lyster & Sato, 2013, pp. 231-255). In oral classes, teachers apply TOCF to rectify and mitigate students' linguistic errors in their target language production (Van Ha et al., 2021), enhance students' language learning quality, and motivate them to continue their studies (Khurana & Puri, 2023). Besides, this feedback helps students recognize the differences between their interlanguage and the norms of the target language (Van Ha et al., 2021). Yet, the presence of contextual elements disrupts the TOCF efficacy (Ha, 2023). It yields negative outcomes and hinders fluency (Criado et al., 2022). This fact underscores the necessity for teachers to take the complex nature and gravity of errors into account before they implement TOCF in oral classes (Kelechi Nzerem & Bob, 2021). They thoughtfully evaluate the potential disadvantages of their overabundance of TOCF strategies in oral practice sessions (Zhu & Wang, 2019), leading to adverse academic and psychological effects on the part of students (Calsiyao, 2015).

In Libya, there is little research shedding light on how EFL university students perceive TOCF and what forms of TOCF they prefer in oral classes (Milad & Mohammadzadeh, 2021). Thus, this study seeks to document the preferences and perceptions of Libyan EFL university students regarding teacher oral corrective feedback strategies applied in oral practice classes. It capture1s the experiences of 84 Libyan EFL university students at the English department, at the Faculty of Arts and Languages, Tripoli, Libya.

Problem Statement

Despite the importance of TOCF in EFL oral classrooms, a significant gap remains between instructional practices and learner expectations. In the Libyan context, empirical research regarding student preferences is still sparse, and the studies that do exist are inconsistent and unclear on how factors like students' proficiency levels, learning styles, and cultural backgrounds shape their preferences. As a result, teachers may apply feedback strategies that do not align with their students' needs, potentially hindering rather than developing students' oral proficiency.

This Study attempts to answer the following questions :

1. How do Libyan EFL university students perceive the TOCF strategies implemented in oral practice classes?
2. What are Libyan EFL university students' preferred timing for TOCF strategies?
3. What preferences do Libyan EFL university students have towards TOCF strategies in oral practice classes?

Literature Review

Chekol's (2020) quasi-experimental study inspects the influence of peer feedback on EFL students' speaking achievement and their perceptions of this approach. The researcher assigns one section of grade eleven students to receive peer feedback sessions for six weeks. Findings indicate statistically significant improvements in overall speaking achievement, particularly in grammar, fluency, and vocabulary. However, improvements in pronunciation skills are less noticeable. Most students develop positive perceptions towards peer feedback, suggesting its potential value in enhancing students' active participation in the learning process. In addition, Zhu and Wang (2019) conduct a large-scale survey that sheds light on EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback (OCF), aiming to understand how these preferences translate into actual perceptions and behaviors in EFL oral classrooms. They administered a 44-item questionnaire to over 2,600 Chinese EFL students and identified seven factors influencing students' attitudes toward corrective feedback. Findings show that participants have a positive attitude towards corrective feedback, preferring immediate feedback over delayed feedback and output-prompting feedback over input-providing feedback. These findings correspond with empirical Second Language Acquisition research on the effectiveness of error correction, suggesting a consistent trend across educational contexts.

The conduct of this study is backed by three theories: the Learner Uptake Theory of Sheen (2004), the Interactional Feedback Theory of Lyster and Ranta (1997), and the Cognitive Feedback Theory of Flavell in the 70s. Firstly, the Learner Uptake Theory of Sheen (2004) and the Interactional Feedback Theory of Lyster and Ranta (1997) highlight the disparity between teacher feedback and students' subsequent use of corrected forms in practical communicative classes. They emphasize the importance of understanding how students react to diverse types of teacher feedback and

whether they successfully integrate corrections into their interlanguage system. This theoretical foundation accentuates the significance of investigating the discrepancies between the provision of teacher feedback and students' subsequent use of corrected forms in real-world classroom settings.

Lastly, the Cognitive Feedback Theory of Flavell in the 70s offers crucial insights into how students process and utilize teacher feedback during real-time interactions (Wiboolyasarin et al., 2022). This theory complements frameworks present in the Learner Uptake Theory and Interactional Feedback Theory by examining the internal mechanisms through which students interpret and respond to oral feedback. The Cognitive Theory of Feedback concerns cognitive processes such as attention, working memory, and metacognition when processing feedback. These mental operations influence how students perceive, interpret, and incorporate corrections into their interlanguage system. Understanding this theory is essential for developing effective error correction strategies in EFL oral practice classes, as it highlights the importance of considering the cognitive demands placed on students during feedback interactions. By realizing the complex mental processes of receiving feedback, teachers can tailor their corrective feedback approaches to better support students' cognitive development and promote more effective language learning outcomes (Dabboub & Giornazi, 2024).

Methodology

Study design

This study employs a quantitative method because it enhances the efficiency and speed of collecting and analyzing large datasets by running automated statistical analyses using software packages (Creswell & Creswell, 2018) .Yet, the quantitative method may lack depth in capturing human experiences and subjective interpretations. Sampling and participants.

Sampling and participants

The study is based on the convenience sampling technique, which is a non-random selection method commonly used in social science studies. This technique involves selecting participants based on accessibility, willingness to participate, and proximity to the study location (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Convenience sampling allows researchers to gather data

quickly and efficiently, but findings obtained from it are not generalizable, due to the bias of the sample (Emerson, 2021). In this study, 84 Libyan EFL students are recruited, with an age range of 18 to 24 years. All participants are enrolled in oral practice 1 and 2 courses at the Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages, University of Tripoli.

Data collection

The study uses a closed-ended student questionnaire as a quantitative data collection method to explore students' perceptions and preferences regarding TOCF strategies that their teachers employ in oral practice classes. The questionnaire is self-made by the study researcher based on the reading of previous literature. It has been evaluated and approved by three professors in the English Language Department at the Faculty of Arts and Languages, Tripoli, Libya. A questionnaire is a systematic method for gathering information, allowing for statistical analysis of data to summarize large amounts of information in a convenient form (Akintunde et al., 2021). Questionnaires are beneficial in research studies since they can efficiently reach many respondents and facilitate the collection of standardized, quantifiable data (Kirkpatrick, 2016).

Students are requested to fill out an online questionnaire created by Google Forms to ensure effective and appropriate data collection via displaying percentages and visual charts. The questionnaire consists of two sections. The first section collects demographic information about the participants, including their gender and age. The final section includes 4 indicators focusing on:

A- Student perceptions on TOCF strategies. Students are questioned about whether they like or dislike receiving TOCF and how that TOCF affects them emotionally and practically.

B- students' preferred timing for TOCF strategies. Students are asked whether they prefer immediate or delayed TOCF strategies.

C- students' favorite TOCF techniques. Students forward their techniques, whether they choose meta-linguistic feedback, repetition, explicit correction, clarification request, or recast feedback.

The indicators are extended into statements that are presented on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Neutral, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly Disagree. Participants are requested to indicate

their degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement, except for the last indicator (D), where they have to tick the choice they think is the best.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics in percentages are run to analyze students' responses to the questionnaire questions without making far-reaching generalizations, as the study sample is not randomly selected. Descriptive statistics is a fundamental analytical technique used to summarize and describe quantitative data in research studies (Field, 2018). Recently, Google Forms has been used as an automated statistical analysis tool on its own, which can handle quantitative data due to its capability to offer a systematic numerical analysis of the gained data within a click, delivering insights into participants' perceptions and preferences of TOCF strategies in the oral practice class (Karabacak, 2018).

Results

1. **Students' Perceptions on TOCF Strategies**

Table 1: Satisfaction with TOCF

1. Statement	**Strongly Agree**	**Agree**	**Neutral**	**Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**	**Total**
I like receiving oral corrective feedback from my teacher regarding each error I make, as this significantly improves my learning experience and encourages me to develop my speaking skills further.	25 **(30%)**	34 **(40 %)**	17 (20%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	100 %

Table 1 displays students' responses to TOCF allotted to all errors they commit. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 30% and 40 %, respectively. That is, 70% of students express positive attitudes towards receiving TOCF on all the errors they make in oral practice classes. This view attests that these students actively seek out real-time corrections to rectify errors promptly, boost their learning

experiences, excel in their oral performances, and become fluent speakers. Nevertheless, it is imperative to notice that 20% of students opt to remain neutral on this matter, hinting that a balanced approach to TOCF delivery is a must in oral practice classes. Additionally, a small group of students 10% appears to despise getting TOCF on every single spoken error, revealing that some students find constant public TOCF unnecessary. Overall, results claim general liking among students for thorough corrections and guidance on spoken errors, though some students can benefit from implementing alternative feedback strategies.

Table 2: TOCF as a Remedial Measure

2. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I consider the oral corrective feedback provided by teachers to be highly impactful, as it consistently motivates me to strive for excellence and to prevent the recurrence of similar errors in the future.	50 (60%)	26 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	100%

Table 2 presents students' responses on whether TOCF provokes them to boost their oral skills and makes them exert an effort not to repeat the same errors in the future. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 60% and 30%, respectively. That is, overwhelmingly 90% of students confess that TOCF steadily reminds them to avoid reiterating errors. This result signifies the TOCF value in reinforcing learning and fixing speech accuracy and fluency over time. Only a small percentage of students (10%) completely disagree with this statement, demonstrating negative attitudes towards TOCF for some reason. Yet, as a whole, results highlight the perceived efficacy of TOCF in aiding students' retention of correct information and mitigating imminent errors.

Table 3: Students' Attitudes Towards Intrusive TOCF

3. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I find it quite frustrating when my teacher interrupts me to point out my errors, as it disrupts my concentration and causes me to lose my train of thought rapidly.	8 (10%)	8 (10%)	0 (0%)	26 (30%)	42 (50%)	100%

Table 3 presents students' responses on whether they like to get interrupted by their teachers when they commit errors in class and if they get upset with such feedback. The highest percentages are between strongly disagree and disagree, 30% and 50%, respectively. This evidences that most students (80%) disagree with the statement given, confirming that they feel thrilled to have TOCF and that they do not get offended by it at all. However, results cannot ignore that 20% of students despise intrusive TOCF. These confounding results point to a divided perspective among students regarding the desirability of having TOCF. They also call for teachers to exploit a balanced TOCF approach that considers students' different learning styles and emotional impact, especially as some students are sensitive to TOCF and may get discouraged, due to embarrassment and lack of self-confidence. Such an approach accentuates the need for teachers to deliver corrections in a way that inspires students' interactive participation and lessens their anxiety.

Table 4: Discomfort with Teachers' Vigilant Attitudes

4. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I have a strong dislike for my teacher's relentless focus on finding and correcting every error I make, as it discourages me and makes me doubt my speaking abilities.	8 (10%)	50 (60%)	5 (6%)	8 (10%)	13 (15%)	100%

Table 4 gauges students' responses to the fact that their teachers are always alert to correct the errors they make, causing them to become confused and disappointed. This result addresses students' feelings toward the expectation of constant TOCF. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 10% and 60%, respectively. This indicates that 70% of students express concern over the prospect of their teachers being overly watchful about correcting every error they make, which they feel pressured or apprehensive about in such a learning environment. On the contrary, 25% of students do not share these worries, reflecting comfort with attentive TOCF. The remaining 6% of students are neutral, suggesting adaptability to various teaching styles or mixed feelings about TOCF. These diverse responses pinpoint the need for teachers to stop being pedantic all the time. Instead, teachers should tolerate some errors and view them constructively rather than critically to create a supportive learning atmosphere.

Table 5: Indifference towards TOCF

5. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I am indifferent to receiving corrective feedback from my teacher regarding my errors, as my primary focus is on achieving high grades and successfully passing the oral practice course.	8 (10%)	8 (10%)	17 (20%)	34 (40%)	17 (20%)	100%

Table 5 shows students' responses on whether they take TOCF seriously. The highest percentages are between strongly disagree and disagree, 40% and 20%, respectively. This result discloses that while a majority of students (60%) value receiving TOCF, there is a notable minority who either express indifference (20%) or agreement (20%) with the statement. This manifests that traditional correction methods may not engage all students effectively, pointing to the need for alternative strategies that fortify positive engagement with TOCF.

2. Students' Preferred Timing for TOCF

Table 6: Reactions on Instant TOCF

1. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I would rather my teacher provide me with timely corrective feedback on my errors, as it increases my awareness of these errors, motivates me to self-correct, and enriches my overall learning experience.	34 (40%)	34 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (20%)	100%

Table 6 inquires about students' responses to receiving immediate TOCF on their errors. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 40% and 40%, respectively. Thus, this result underscores a strong preference for instant TOCF, supported by 80% of students. This aligns with the principles of form-focused instruction, which stress the value of real-time TOCF. Such immediacy allows students to adjust their language use promptly by establishing a lively and interactive learning environment. This method not only raises students' awareness of their errors but also encourages self-correction, contributing to a more engaged and proactive learning experience. However, it is important to note that a minority of students (20%) do not desire immediate TOCF, probably due to reservations about adverse feelings or interruptions.

Table 7: Reactions on After-Class TOCF

2. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I favor receiving oral corrective feedback from my teacher after class, as it enhances my comprehension of errors and aids in the retention of information within a	33 (40%)	17 (20%)	17 (20%)	0 (0%)	17 (20%)	100%

more relaxed setting.						

Table 7 presents students' responses to receiving after-class TOCF. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 40% and 20 %, respectively. Results reflect a preference for delayed TOCF by 60% of students, denoting a desire for privacy, reflection, and a less-stressed environment for processing TOCF. Delayed TOCF allows students to grasp information at their own pace, potentially leading to deeper understanding and retention. It also promotes metacognitive skills by encouraging students to independently identify and correct their errors. This is followed by a minority of students who express indifference (20%) and contradiction (20%) with the statement. This shows the need for teachers to implement both immediate and delayed TOCF to cater to students' favorite timing for TOCF.

Students' Favorite TOCF Techniques

Table 8: Preference for Meta-linguistic Forms of TOCF

1. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I favor having my errors corrected and explained, as this approach enhances my long-term retention of grammatical structures and improves my communicative competence.	50 (60%)	26 (30%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	0 (0%)	100%

Table 8 requests students' responses on getting meta-linguistic TOCF. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 60% and 30%, respectively. This result unveils a strong predisposition towards informative feedback, with 90% of students preferring their errors to be corrected and explained. The emphasis on meta-linguistic feedback

highlights the importance of understanding the rationale behind corrections, which aids in preventing error recurrence and enhancing learning. By explaining why the original usage is incorrect and how the corrected version improves the sentence or expression, teachers can provide students with valuable insights beyond mere corrections.

Table 9: Preference for Repetition Forms of TOCF

2. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I appreciate it when my teacher reiterates my errors to highlight them, thereby improving my accuracy and expanding my vocabulary.	25 (30%)	34 (40%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	17 (20%)	100%

Table 9 seeks students' responses to teachers who tend to repeat errors to draw attention. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 30% and 40%, respectively. This result shows that 70% of students find repetition effective for becoming more aware of their errors, particularly for pronunciation issues or when they are not fully conscious of their errors. Moreover, it supports using repetition as a pedagogical tool, indicating its effectiveness in capturing students' attention and encouraging reflection on errors. Yet, 30% of students find this practice uncomfortable, confirming the need for varied feedback strategies that accommodate different learning styles and comfort levels.

Table 10: Preference for Explicit Forms of TOCF

3. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I favor having my errors pointed out and rectified, as this approach can enhance my language abilities and assist me in identifying and amending my errors.	42 (50%)	34 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	100%

Table 10 reports students' responses to explicit correction. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 50% and 40%, respectively. This result indicates that 90% of students prefer their errors to be corrected immediately and clearly, suggesting a strong preference for prompt feedback that enables students to adjust their language use in real-time and maintain focus on the task at hand. This preference aligns with the provision of timely feedback to reinforce learning and minimize confusion. Besides, the preference for explicit correction underlines the importance of swift intervention in the learning process.

Table 11: Preference for Clarification Request Forms of TOCF

4. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I prefer when the teacher uses phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I do not understand" to clarify my errors. This feedback improves my understanding of English by highlighting my grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary errors, helping me avoid them in the future.	76 (90%)	0 (0%)	8 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	100%

Table 11 demonstrates students' responses to clarification requests. The highest percentage is strongly agreed, where 90% of students stress that using negotiated feedback and indirect prompts like "Excuse me?" or "I do not understand" instead of direct corrections can make feedback less confrontational and more conducive to learning. Students' support for these indirect methods of drawing attention to misunderstandings or errors indicates universal support for creating a supportive learning atmosphere through polite questioning. This approach allows students to feel less threatened while receiving necessary feedback, potentially leading to increased engagement and self-reflection.

Table 12: Preference for Recast Forms of TOCF

5. Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
I appreciate it when my teacher rephrases my errors without explicitly indicating their inaccuracies. This approach enhances my speaking skills while also being mindful of my feelings.	34 (40%)	25 (30%)	8 (10%)	0 (0%)	17 (20%)	100%

Table 12 reveals students' responses to recast forms of TOCF. The highest percentages are between strongly agree and agree, 40% and 30%, respectively. The result uncovers that most students (70%) prefer reformulation over direct correction, suggesting that students perceive indirect feedback to be less confrontational and more conducive to learning. Additionally, results disclose that reformulating errors involves restating the incorrect phrase or sentence in a grammatically correct way, and can be less threatening than direct correction. A small proportion of students (20%), however, choose direct feedback, signifying varied preferences among students. This diversity in preferences highlights the importance of offering multiple feedback options to accommodate individual learning styles and sensitivities.

Discussion

The analysis of students' attitudes towards TOCF strategies and their preferences for these strategies indicates diversified outcomes, emotional reactions, and levels of engagement among students. Most students are inclined towards receiving TOCF, believing it enriches their learning experience. They perceive their teachers' corrections as motivating, viewing them as valuable opportunities for personal growth. Specifically, this student group trusts the ability of TOCF to effectively aid them in avoiding the repetition of errors, which underscores the importance of immediate feedback in reinforcing their learning process. These results support the study findings of Nhac (2021), which proclaim that many students regard TOCF as a beneficial learning tool. TOCF can enhance

students' oral performance, alleviate anxiety, and positively influence their academic self-concept and language proficiency (Zulfikar, 2022; Ghanizadeh et al., 2020).

On the contrary, there appears to be another student group who feel embarrassed and uncomfortable when they are being corrected in public settings. These students tend to detest teachers' frequent error corrections and desire less intrusive forms of TOCF. They vent dissatisfaction with overly meticulous teachers, who constantly correct errors, seeing such practices as unhelpful and discouraging. This sentiment is also echoed in the study findings of Hartono et al. (2022), which warn that students may experience feelings of demoralization and diminished self-confidence, potentially hindering their academic progress and self-esteem as a consequence of immediate TOCF.

Students' dispositions about the timing of the TOCF delivery are varied. Many students favor immediate TOCF, due to its promptness and interactive nature (Zhu & Wang, 2019), while others value delayed feedback for the privacy and time it allows for reflection. It is noted that the interruption of students' performances by teachers to address errors, particularly in the presence of peers, can diminish students' motivation to excel in oral presentations and impede their language development (Wiboolyasarin et al., 2022). This result specifies that students' perceptions of TOCF and their willingness to accept it are shaped by their personality traits, learning styles (Swift & Peterson, 2018), skepticism about its effectiveness (Zhu & Wang, 2019), as well as the personalities and teaching approaches of teachers (Fitriana, 2017). The results obtained clearly indicate that discrepancies between students' preferences and TOCF strategies can significantly hinder effective learning and reduce the overall quality of educational outcomes (AlGhafri et al., 2023). Thus, in this study, two distinct groups of students emerge, including those who are self-assured and respond favorably to TOCF and those who easily feel unsettled and discouraged by it.

The presence of conflicting perceptions on TOCF timing necessitates teachers' application of flexible TOCF strategies to cater to students' diverse preferences and learning styles. This result displays that immediate TOCF is more effective in enhancing students' language proficiency than delayed feedback. This output aligns with the study findings of Rassaei (2024) and Fu & Li (2022), which suggest that immediate TOCF can

bolster students' cognitive skills and activate their working memory, facilitating the automatic absorption and application of teacher corrections. Additionally, it corroborates the findings of Zohrabi and Behboudnia (2017), demonstrating that immediate TOCF can mitigate pronunciation errors. Teachers' attending to errors can efficiently capture students' attention, foster enthusiasm (Sadeghi & Belali, 2020), and reduce their foreign language anxiety (FLA) when speaking publicly. This perspective contrasts with Öztürk's (2023) study, which finds that delayed TOCF yields greater gains than immediate TOCF.

The participants in the present study exhibit a strong penchant for informative feedback that elucidates the reasons behind the incorrect usage and illustrates how the revised version enhances the expression uttered. Support for indirect correction methods, such as repetition and reformulation, agrees with the study findings of Li and Xu (2020), which concluded that some students desire less confrontational feedback approaches in EFL contexts that concern certain error types.

Students' inclination towards indirect feedback techniques, such as reformulating errors without explicitly identifying them, stipulates that they may perceive such feedback as less argumentative and more helpful for their learning process. This result agrees with the finding of Li and Xu (2020) that there is a fondness among students for indirect feedback in EFL settings. This entails teachers adapting their feedback techniques to align with the learning preferences and comfort levels of their students, thus employing a more sophisticated approach to feedback delivery. This standpoint differs from findings from other studies, which indicate that explicit correction can effectively enhance certain students' abilities in autonomous problem-solving and critical thinking (Paul & Al-Mamun, 2024; Yusovi et al., 2022). It also stresses the need for teachers to deliver OCF on all facets of language areas like pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and intonation to guarantee a wide-ranging approach to language learning to attain the best learning results, enhance language proficiency, and cultivate both effective communication abilities and linguistic precision within EFL ecologies (Alsolami, 2019).

Conclusion

Student responses to TOCF strategies exhibit personal learning preferences and emotional reactions. Consequently, teachers are obligated

to use adaptable feedback delivery strategies in oral practice sessions. Moreover, students demonstrate positive attitudes toward instant TOCF, asserting that it enhances self-esteem, diminishes hesitation, and contributes to improvements in fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary retention. Additionally, students perceive delayed and indirect types of CF, such as repetition and reformulation, as more effective for addressing grammar and vocabulary errors. This approach fosters a supportive learning environment that promotes self-correction, encourages linguistic exploration and risk-taking, and reduces confrontational atmospheres inside oral practice classes. Students prefer clear explanations of the inaccuracies in their original usage, illustrating how the revised version enhances the expressions they use. There is also unanimous recognition of the essential function of immediate TOCF in detecting and correcting students' pronunciation and accuracy errors. This practice helps to prevent the fossilization of errors, boosts students' self-confidence, and refines their speaking abilities in EFL oral practice sessions. Nevertheless, teachers continue to utilize delayed TOCF, considering the characteristics of the errors and the contexts in which they arise.

This study recommends that oral practice teachers cater to different students' needs, preferences, and emotional well-being. These include recasting forms, clarification requests, metalinguistic clues, elicitation, and repetition. Moreover, TOCF strategies should be modified by teachers to accommodate the varied needs and comfort levels of their students. This approach ranges from frequent and immediate corrections for certain students to more subtle or less intrusive feedback for others. Furthermore, the context and purpose of oral activities need to be considered by teachers when adjusting the timing and frequency of corrections. Specifically, lower-level students may benefit from more frequent corrections, while higher-level students might appreciate less intrusive feedback. Creating a supportive environment for communication is crucial; thus, teachers' focus on fluency rather than accuracy for lower-level students is recommended. Conversely, accuracy and targeted feedback on grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation may be emphasized for more advanced students. Incorporating peer correction sessions can increase student participation and engagement in the learning process. However, it is recommended to ensure teachers provide supportive environments for these sessions to avoid negative experiences. Lastly, providing explanations along with

corrections can help students understand the nature of errors and how to avoid them in the future. This approach can make corrections less argumentative and more educational, especially when combined with indirect techniques like recasting and reformative feedback. These proactive measures can lead to positive student attitudes towards TOCF strategies. Besides, it can facilitate effective language learning, increase students' linguistic capabilities, and promote their cognitive and emotional development in a supportive learning environment.

Suggestions for Further Research

Further research can explore several areas to deepen the understanding of TOCF in EFL oral practice courses, which involve:

1. Doing comparative studies to investigate how different cultural contexts influence students' preferences for TOCF strategies. This can comprise comparing findings from the University of Tripoli with those from similar institutions in other universities.
2. Conducting longitudinal studies to inspect how students' preferences for TOCF evolve as they progress through their EFL learning journey.
3. Exploiting the effectiveness of peer feedback correction sessions in increasing student participation and engagement in the learning process. This can be done by studying the impact of different peer feedback structures, such as small group discussions versus one-on-one exchanges, and exploring how peer feedback affects students' perceived competence and motivation. To this end, teachers can consider training students to provide effective peer feedback that balances accuracy with sensitivity to their peers' feelings.
4. Joining teacher training programs to develop and evaluate training programs aimed at improving EFL teachers' ability to adapt their error correction strategies to individual student needs and preferences.

References:

Akintunde, O., Adeyemi, F. B., & Adeniran, T. (2021). Survey research methods in educational settings. *Journal of Educational Research, 114(6)*, 1021-1035.

AlGhafri, M., Mirza, C., & Gabarre, C. (2023). Students' Attitudes Towards Oral Corrective Feedback: A Case Study from Oman. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 14(3)*, 406-417.

Alsomali, A. (2019). The role of corrective feedback in improving EFL learners' speaking proficiency. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 43*, 102-113.

Brown, H. D., & Liu, J. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson Education.

Calsiyao, M. T. (2015). The effects of corrective feedback on EFL learners' speaking proficiency. *Journal of Language and Linguistics, 14(3)*, 1239-1258.

Chekol, A. D. (2020). Investigating the influence of using peer feedback on EFL students' speaking achievement and their perceptions towards peer feedback. *Arabic Language, Literature & Culture, 5(3)*, 23-34.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications.

Criado, R. M., Fernández, C., & Martínez, F. J. (2022). Contextual factors affecting the effectiveness of teaching oral communication skills. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice, 19(2)*, 147-164.

Dabboub, A., & Giornazi, M. (2024). *A comprehensive review of naturalistic written corrective feedback (WCF) in L2 writing instruction: Pedagogical insights and future research directions.* Faculty of Languages Journal-Tripoli-Libya, 1(30). https://doi.org/10.56592/flj.v1i30.1454

Emerson, R. (2021). Convenience Sampling Revisited: Embracing Its Limitations Through Thoughtful Study Design. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 115*, 76 - 77.

Fitriana, R. (2017). Students' Attitude toward Correction. *Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching, 2(2)*, 177-190.

Fu, M., & Li, S. (2022). The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 44(1)*, 2-34.

Ghanizadeh, A., Amiri, A., & Jahedizadeh, S. (2020). Towards Humanizing Language Teaching: Error Treatment and EFL Learners' Cognitive, Behavioral, Emotional Engagement, Motivation, and Language Achievement. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 8(1)*, 129-149.

Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The Impacts of Teachers' Oral Corrective Feedback to Students' Psychological Domain: A Study on EFL Speech Production. *Cogent Education, 9(1)*, 2152619.

Haryanto, T. (2018). Intralingual errors in Indonesian EFL learners' writing. *Journal of English Teaching, 12(2),* 123-138.

Hasanah, U., & Syafar, A. (2021). The use of student-centered learning (SCL) to develop students' speaking skills. *E-Journal of ELTS, 9 (3),* 257-266.

Hung, V., & Vo, T. (2024). Error recognition in EFL and ESL environments: A review of feedback strategies and attitudes towards correction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 1(1),* 1-10.

Karabacak, U. (2018). An Overview of Google Forms and Google Sheets: Practical Use for Teaching and Learning. Computers in Education Journal, 9(3), 235-247.

Kelechi Nzerem, J. K., & Bob, P. O. (2021). The Role and Significance of Error Linguistics in a Second Language Environment. *Ansu Journal of Language and Literary Studies, 1(5),* 1-9.

Khurana, R., & Puri, R. (2023). View of Oral Corrective Feedback with LESLLA Students. *Les Langues en Situation de Santé Publique, 12(1),* 1-15.

Kirkpatrick, M. D. (2016). *Evaluating qualitative evidence in education research*. Sage Publications.

Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. C. (2020). Meta-analytic reviews of educational interventions: A critical review of findings. *Educational Psychologist, 55(4),* 345-364.

Li, X., & Hu, W. (2024). Peer versus teacher corrections through electronic learning communities and face-to-face classroom interactions, and EFL learners' passion for learning, speaking fluency, and accuracy. *Heliyon, 10(4),* e25849.

Li, X., & Xu, J. (2020). Effects of oral corrective feedback on writing fluency in Chinese university students. *System, 88,* 102336.

Liu, T., & Aryadoust, V. (2024). Orchestrating Teacher, Peer, and Self-Feedback to Enhance Learners' Cognitive, Behavioral, and Emotional Engagement and Public Speaking Competence. *Behavioral Sciences (Basel, Switzerland), 14(8),* 725.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback in language teaching. Scandinavian *Journal of Educational Research, 41(3),* 251-271.

Lyster, S., & Sato, M. (2013). Form-focused instruction in Japanese EFL contexts: *A study of the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 oral acquisition*. In R. Lyster & J. K. H. Park (Eds.), Formative assessment in second language teaching (pp. 231-255).

Milad, N., & Mohammadzadeh, B. (2021). Libyan EFL learners' attitudes towards oral interactional corrective feedback: A case of Sirte University. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, *11*(1), 53-70. https://www.jltl.com.tr/index.php/jltl/article/view/249

Nhac, H. T. (2021). Effect of Teachers' Corrective Feedback on Learners' Oral Accuracy in English Speaking Lessons. *IJLTER. ORG*, *20(10)*, 313-330.

Öztürk, Y. (2023). The effect of delayed and immediate oral corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation in emergency distance education. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi, 13(1)*, 573-587.

Paul, P., & Al-Mamun, A. (2024). Students' perception of oral corrective feedback in developing English speaking skills. *BELTA Journal*, *7(1)*, 1-13.

Rassaei, E. (2024). Immediate vs. delayed prompts, individual differences in working memory, and L2 development. *Language Awareness*, *33(3)*, 649-672.

Sadeghi, K., & Belali, J. (2020). The role of corrective feedback timing in task engagement and oral performance. *Applied Research on English Language*, *9(2)*, 229-252.

Sari, N. (2016). Error types in Indonesian EFL learners' writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *15(3)*, 1015-1034.

Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, *8(3)*, 263-300.

Swift, V., & Peterson, J. B. (2018). Improving the effectiveness of performance feedback by considering personality traits and task demands. *PloS one*, *13(5)*, e0197810.

Wiboolyasarin, K., Kamonsawad, R., Jinowat, N., & Wiboolyasarin, W. (2022). EFL Learners' Preference for Corrective Feedback Strategies in Relation to Their Self-Perceived Levels of Proficiency. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*, *5(1)*, 32-47.

Yousefi, M., & Nassaji, H. (2021). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Pragmatics: A Review of Research. *TESL-EJ*, *25(1)*,1-14.

Yusovi, V. N., Asmiyah, S., & Muhtarom, M. (2022). Oral Feedback for English Language Learners Development. *FOSTER: Journal of English Language Teaching*, *3(4)*, 197-205

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey. *Language awareness, 28(2)*, 139-161.

Zohrabi, M., & Behboudnia, N. (2017). The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on segmental word-level pronunciation errors. *Applied Research on English Language, 6(2)*, 237-266.

Zulfikar, Z. (2022). Reducing EFL learners' speaking anxiety through selective error correction and group work. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures (JETALL), 6(1)*, 1-16.

Appendix A

Student Questionnaire on Using TOCF in Oral Practice Classes

Dear Students,

Thank you for participating in this questionnaire, which aims to gather your insights regarding using oral corrective feedback in oral classes. Your responses will contribute significantly towards understanding the effectiveness of these strategies and how they can be best implemented in oral practice classes. Please note that this questionnaire should take approximately 3 to 6 minutes to complete. You are encouraged to choose the responses that best reflect your views. Rest assured that your responses will remain confidential. Your participation is highly appreciated.

Part 1: Demographic information

1. **Gender**: Male ☐ Female ☐
2. **Semester**: _____
3. **Age**: 20-24 ☐ Less than 20 ☐

Part 2: Indicate your personal opinion about whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Neutral, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement.

A-Perceptions towards receiving teacher oral corrective feedback					
Statements	**Strongly Agree 1**	**Agree 2**	**Neutral 3**	**Disagree 4**	**Strongly Disagree 5**
A1. I like receiving oral corrective feedback from my teacher regarding each error I do, as this significantly improves my learning experience					

and encourages me to develop my speaking skills further.					
A2. I consider the oral corrective feedback provided by teachers to be highly impactful, as it consistently motivates me to strive for excellence and to prevent the recurrence of similar errors in the future.					
A3. I find it quite frustrating when my teacher interrupts me to point out my errors, as it disrupts my concentration and causes me to lose my train of thought rapidly.					
A4. I have a strong dislike for my teacher's relentless focus on finding and correcting every error I do, as it discourages me and makes me doubt my speaking abilities.					
A5. I am indifferent to receiving corrective feedback from my teacher regarding my errors, as my primary focus is on achieving high grades and successfully passing the oral practice course.					
B- Preferred timing for teacher oral corrective feedback					
B1. I would rather my teacher provide me with timely corrective feedback on my errors, as it increases my awareness of these errors, motivates me to self-correct and enriches my overall learning experience.					
B2. I favor receiving oral corrective feedback from my teacher after class, as it enhances my comprehension of errors and aids in the retention of information within a more relaxed setting.					
C- Favored teacher oral corrective feedback techniques					
C1. I favor having my errors corrected and explained, as this approach enhances my long-term retention of grammatical structures and improves my communicative competence.					
C2. I appreciate it when my teacher reiterates my errors to highlight them, thereby improving my accuracy and expanding my vocabulary.					
C3. I favor having my errors pointed out and rectified, as this approach can enhance my					

language abilities and assist me in identifying and amending my errors.					
C4. I prefer when the teacher uses phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I do not understand" to clarify my errors. This feedback improves my understanding of English by highlighting my grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary errors, helping me avoid them in the future.					
C5. I appreciate it when my teacher rephrases my errors without explicitly indicating their inaccuracies. This approach enhances my speaking skills while also being mindful of my feelings.					
D-Types of deep-seated errors that teachers should correct					
Tick the errors you think teachers should correct in oral practice classes					
1.	Pronunciation errors that encompass the incorrect articulation of vowels, consonant clusters, word stress, silent letters, intonation and rhythm, as well as linking and reduction.				
2.	Vocabulary errors, which include incorrect word order in questions, mixing up countable and uncountable nouns, poor word selection, unnecessary repetition of the subject, errors in subject-verb agreement, incorrect prepositions, confusion with pronouns, mixing up words that are similar in the L1 and inappropriate language usage and stress placement.				
3.	Accuracy errors, which comprise errors in grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary and pluralization.				
4.	Fluency errors, which involve repetitions, pauses, hesitations, incorrect arrangement of words and connectors, excessive use of simple structures, inconsistent verb tenses, direct translations from the L1, mispronunciations, unclear thoughts and confusion with homophones.				
5.	Persistent errors that may become fossilized if not addressed, which embrace incorrect use of articles and subject-verb agreement, tense confusion, use of improper prepositions and word order in questions, misunderstanding of countable versus uncountable nouns, direct translation of idiomatic phrases, recurrent mispronunciation of particular words, over application of grammatical rules and mixing up subject and object pronouns.				