

Exploring Teacher Rationale for Oral Error Correction Strategies in Libyan EFL Classrooms

Najwa A. Jroush* 

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

n.jaroush@uot.edu.ly

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

EFL, Teacher Beliefs,
TOCF, Oral Classrooms,
University students .

This exploratory study, conducted at the University of Tripoli, Faculty of Languages, English Department, investigates Libyan EFL teachers' beliefs about error correction strategies in oral classrooms. Using semi-structured interviews and thematic analysis, the study explores how teachers conceptualize error correction. Findings show that responses to the teacher's oral corrective feedback (TOCF) vary based on individual preferences and emotional reactions. Immediate TOCF was valued for pronunciation, whereas delayed and indirect TOCF was preferred for grammar and vocabulary. While immediate TOCF prevents fossilization, teachers strategically employ delayed TOCF depending on error type and context.

استكشاف توجهات المعلم في توظيف استراتيجيات تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية في فصول اللغة الإنجليزية
كلغة أجنبية في ليبيا

نجوى جروش

الملخص

الكلمات المفتاحية:
استراتيجيات التصحيح
الشفهية، الفصول الشفهية،
اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية،
توجهات المعلمين، طلبة
الجامعات..

تبحث هذه الدراسة الاستكشافية بجامعة طرابلس، كلية اللغات، قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، في توجهات معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية الليبيين حول استراتيجيات تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية. تم استخدام مقابلات للمعلمين وتحليل موضوعي لنصوص الاجابات لاستكشاف تصورهم حول طريقة تصحيح الأخطاء. وتظهر النتائج اختلاف الاستجابة لطرق التصحيح الشفهية للمعلم حسب التفضيلات الفردية ومشاعر الطلبة. حيث حظيت الفورية بتقدير في الأخطاء المتعلقة بالنطق، بينما فضلت المؤجلة وغير المباشرة في القواعد والمفردات. وفي حين يمنع التصحيح الفوري ترسخ الأخطاء، يوظف المعلمون استراتيجيات التصحيح تبعاً لنوع الخطأ وسياقه.



Check for updates

Received: 13 July 2026. Revised: 24 July 2026. Accepted: 01 August 2026. Published: 1 September 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Licensee FLJ. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY\) license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Introduction

The word "feedback" can mean different things depending on the context. In this study, though, it refers to the information students receive about how they're doing, intended to help them develop their performance and skills (Westberg & Hilliard, 2001). While feedback is a broad concept, corrective feedback is a more focused type, one that specifically deals with pointing out learners' errors. Lightbown and Spada (1999) describe it as "any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect" (p. 171). So, when corrective feedback is mentioned here, it means the kind of feedback teachers give simply to fix language errors made by learners. However, not all errors are corrected similarly. Based on the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are six main types of oral corrective feedback: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. The following table outlines the definition of these six strategies, including their formal definitions and corresponding interactional patterns.

Types of OCF	Definition	Example
Recast	"Involves the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a learner's utterance, minus the error." (p.46)	S: "She enjoy learning English?" T: "Yes, she enjoys learning English."
Translation	"A teacher translation of a correct form of the learners' answer in L1." (p.582)	T: "What color is the sky?" S: "Azraq." (in Arabic) T: "Blue. The sky is blue."
Clarification Request	"A feedback type in which the teacher asks a question, indicating to the learners that there is a problem with the language production." (p.47)	S: "I buyed some apples yesterday." T: "Sorry, what was that?"
Metalinguistic Explanation	"A teacher making comments or indicating to the learners that there is an error in the language production." (p.47)	S: "She don't like coffee." T: "Remember, with 'she,' we don't use 'don't.' What do we use instead?"
Elicitation	"A feedback type when teachers ask for completion of their	S: "Last night, I watch a movie." T: "Last night, I...?"

	learners' own sentence by pausing and allowing learners to correct themselves.” (p.48)	
Explicit Correction	“Any feedback technique that involves a teacher simply providing a learner with the correct answer.” (p.46)	S: "He swam very fast." T: "Actually, it's 'swam.' He swam very fast."
Repetition	“A teacher repeating learners’ wrong utterance, highlighting it with intonation.” (p.48)	S: "She have a new phone." T: "She HAVE a new phone?" S: "Oh, she has a new phone."

Teachers need to realize that their CF beliefs (i.e., attitudes and preferences) may not always match those of their students (Kaivanpanah et al., 2021). X. V. Ha et al. (2021) find that students prefer CF for all error types and desire peer correction during classes, while teachers are less confident in peer correction and are more reluctant to give CF. Also, there are discrepancies between teachers' and students' beliefs concerning TOCF timing, with students opting for immediate CF and teachers being less favorable due to concerns about emotional state and speech flow disruption (J. Ha et al., 2021). García Mayo and Muñoz (2016) observe that EFL students tend to appreciate explicit correction, whereas teachers favor recast techniques. By contrast, Kurvers et al. (2018) discovered that advanced-level students prefer self-repair strategies, opposing their teachers' inclination towards recasts.

The above contradictions may necessitate a detailed examination of the central aspects of TOCF strategies in language teaching and learning, especially in EFL contexts. The advantages of these strategies include identifying errors during language learning, enhancing students' language proficiency (Yusovi et al., 2022), and improving overall language development (Fu & Li, 2022). This capitalizes on understanding teachers' and students' beliefs about TOCF strategies, as these beliefs significantly impact classroom dynamics and learning outcomes (Halim et al., 2024). Furthermore, teachers determine which errors require attention in EFL classrooms. This often necessitates teachers to intervene to balance the need for accuracy with the practical realities of the classroom, despite the absence of a universally accepted method for deciding which errors to correct. Communication breakdowns are the most critical issues that teachers need to address, while

they may pay less attention to minor errors that do not obstruct understanding and do not entail significant focus (ibid). Additionally, some teachers may adopt an alternative approach, considering local errors that do not substantially affect message clarity as unnecessary to correct while prioritizing global errors that hinder intelligibility and disrupt communication, along with errors that provoke negative reactions and stigmatization (Chen, 2020). This approach distinguishes between local errors, which are minor errors such as grammatical errors, spelling errors, or incorrect usage of articles, and global errors, which are more significant issues like fragmented sentences, run-on sentences, or syntax errors that alter the meaning of a sentence or paragraph. By focusing on global errors first, teachers can address the most critical issues that affect overall comprehension before refining smaller details (ibid).

Furthermore, teachers utilize several TOCF strategies to improve students' speaking abilities and minimize communication errors in EFL settings. These strategies are designed to offer prompt feedback on students' spoken language, hence promoting learning through engagement and practice. The successful enactment of these correction strategies relies on customizing them to meet the unique needs and attributes of individual students. Teachers must take into account various factors, including the fragility of the language ego, levels of anxiety, self-confidence, and receptiveness to correction (García Mayo & Muñoz, 2016). Teachers' diligent observation and assessment of these strategies are a must (Jroush, 2026) to guarantee effective teaching, which frequently demands a combination of strategies adapted to the specific requirements and preferences of students. Teachers' selection of a correction approach should be consistent with educational objectives, student characteristics, and the dynamics of the classroom (ibid). Notably, timing is very crucial in the employment of TOCF strategies in oral language classes. A thorough understanding of the optimal timing for TOCF underscores the intricacies of timing issues in second language acquisition and its potential to foster effective error-correction strategies within language teaching contexts (Xu, 2021). It can have a profound impact on student motivation, fluency, and accuracy. Consequently, teachers tend to explore various methods for implementing TOCF in language instruction, which include immediate correction (i.e., correcting an error as it arises), delayed correction (i.e., addressing an error after the communication has continued), and collective correction (i.e., offering feedback on common errors afterward). In this process, teachers regularly strive to balance the enhancement of fluency with the maintenance of accuracy, adapting their correction techniques as necessary (Li & Hu, 2024).

Problem of the Study

Despite the theoretical importance of OCF, there is a significant gap between pedagogical ideals and classroom realities in Libyan higher education. Many EFL instructors at the university level operate based on intuitive beliefs rather than formalized training in feedback strategies. Furthermore, the specific socio-emotional challenges of Libyan students, who may face high levels of anxiety in oral performance, create a tension for teachers: the need to correct errors to prevent fossilization versus the need to foster a risk-taking environment. There is a lack of empirical research documenting the specific rationales Libyan teachers use to resolve these tensions, leading to inconsistent feedback practices that may not optimally support student learning.

The study seeks to provide answers to the following questions:

1. How do teachers perceive the importance of TOCF in oral practice classes, and what strategies do they employ?
2. How do teachers manage their preferences for immediate versus delayed corrective feedback, and what methods do they use to assess the effectiveness of their chosen TOCF strategies?
3. How can teachers balance the use of different TOCF strategies while fostering a low-anxiety, risk-taking atmosphere that encourages both self-correction and peer involvement?

Literature Review

There is a lot of debate about how errors are handled and corrected in a foreign language classroom, largely because teachers and students often view errors differently, and because the correcting practice varies depending on the teaching approach utilized. Sociocultural theory supports the use of TOCF, which highlights the significant role of social interaction and mediation in language learning (Vygotsky, 1978). In this sense, TOCF can be seen as a form of scaffolding, where the teacher provides temporary support and guidance to facilitate students' language development. As students take part in oral interactions with the teacher, they receive feedback that helps them co-construct knowledge and develop their language skills. Similarly, with greater attention to teacher–student interaction, the Interaction Hypothesis suggests that language learning occurs through meaningful communication and interaction between learners and their environment (Long, 1996). According

to this hypothesis, TOCF helps students recognize and correct linguistic errors, facilitating language development. Building on this interaction- and scaffolding-based view, the Noticing Hypothesis suggests that students must consciously notice the gap between their interlanguage and the target language to learn (Schmidt, 1990). TOCF is vital in drawing students' attention to their errors and encouraging them to notice discrepancies. This heightened awareness enables students to reformulate their language output and move closer to the target language. Moreover, consistent with the Interaction Hypothesis, TOCF not only raises awareness but also encourages productive participation in meaning-focused communication (Long, 1996). Through this interactional pressure to speak and respond, learners are more likely to generate and modify output in response to feedback, aligning with the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985). Over time, repeated cycles of feedback-driven reattempts can enhance linguistic competence and accuracy.

Back-and-forth CF strategies in EFL oral classrooms have been widely examined over the past decade, providing valuable insights into the effectiveness of different error correction approaches and highlighting the importance of understanding students' attitudes toward feedback in EFL contexts. Many studies in this area focus on students' attitudes and preferences regarding TOCF strategies and shed light on various aspects of error correction in EFL classrooms. For instance, Yousefi and Nassaji (2021) conducted a comprehensive literature review on the role of CF and instruction in L2 pragmatics development. Their study highlights the crucial impact of pragmatics on overall language competence highlighting the challenges that EFL students face in mastering this skill. This aligns with the study, which centers on error correction strategies in oral classrooms, as pragmatics development is often closely tied to speaking proficiency. The authors note that CF has been considered essential for commanding pragmatic knowledge, particularly in light of its difficulty and late acquisition in second language learning contexts. This underscores the importance of effective error correction strategies in developing students' communicative competence, which is central to the current study.

Expanding on these findings, Yüksel et al. (2021) investigate the disparity between the beliefs and practices of university teachers in-class OCF. This study observes 20 English language teachers from a private university in Turkey, finding discrepancies between what teachers believed and what they did during lessons. Interestingly, those teachers with the greatest incongruence tend to stick to their decisions even after observing unsuccessful OCF practices. This study underscores the importance of bridging the gap between teachers' stated beliefs and actual classroom practices, which is

critical for implementing effective error correction strategies. Moreover, Nuraeni and Fadhly (2018), in their qualitative study, which identifies five errors committed by EFL students in speaking classes, including pronunciation, grammatical, lexical, semantic, and pragmatic errors. This study discovers that the recast strategy is frequently used by teachers to correct students' errors. This study contributes to the understanding of the types of errors encountered in EFL speaking classes and the corresponding correction strategies employed by teachers, providing valuable context for similar studies on students' perceptions of error correction strategies. Furthermore, Amiryousefi (2016) investigates the influence of confirmatory vs. corrective feedback on various aspects of EFL students' academic self-concept, attributions, second language speaking, class performance, and English achievement. This researcher divides two intact classes of female elementary EFL students into groups receiving either corrective or confirmatory feedback. Confirmatory feedback refers to indications of the accuracy of responses, providing learners with information that their utterances or performances were correct without offering guidance on how to improve. The results show that teachers' corrective discourses influence students' academic self-concept, attributions, and language attainment. This study demonstrates the potential of corrective feedback to shape students' academic identities and language proficiency, highlighting the broader implications of effective error correction strategies beyond mere identification.

Building on evidence that feedback shapes learners' academic identities, Fitriana's (2017) study explores students' attitudes toward teachers' corrections in oral production. Through a questionnaire administered to vocational high school students and interviews with ten students, the researcher unveils students' favoring of teachers as correctors, but openness to peer correction. Students expect teachers to give them corrections immediately and for all types of errors. Additionally, personality traits and teaching styles are identified as influential factors in students' willingness to accept corrective feedback. Similarly, Fu and Li (2022) extend this line of inquiry by testing whether the timing of corrective feedback affects L2 development. Fu and Li's (2022) comparative study deals with the differential effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on the learning of the English past tense. This study assigns 145 seventh-grade EFL students to four groups: Immediate CF, Delayed CF, Task Only, and Control. Their findings suggest that immediate corrective feedback is more facilitative of L2

development than delayed feedback, supporting the importance of addressing linguistic errors before they become fossilized in the interlanguage.

Methodology

This study incorporates a qualitative approach to cultivate a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter. It includes 5 teachers, all holding an M.A. in English, and teaching oral classes at various levels, though their years of experience differ. The participants decide to take part in this study after being initially informed of the study's purpose. The semi-structured interview questions are developed based on the reading of previous work in the field, particularly the studies of Nurjanah et al. (2024) and Asmara et al. (2022).

Study design

This study correlates with the teacher semi-structured interview as a qualitative research technique that involves conducting in-depth interviews with participants using a set of open-ended questions (Buys et al., 2022), exploring how Libyan EFL teachers utilize CF within the specific institutional and sociolinguistic context of the University of Tripoli. Semi-structured interviews (35–50 minutes each) are conducted using an open-ended protocol centered on TOCF strategies they implement and their reasoning behind choosing certain strategies in oral practice classes.

Sampling and participants

The study is contingent upon the convenience sampling technique, which is a non-random selection method commonly used in applied linguistics. This technique involves selecting participants based on accessibility, willingness to participate, and proximity to the study location (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The participants are five Libyan EFL teachers with ≥ 3 years of experience teaching oral practice courses from the Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages, University of Tripoli. While convenience sampling allows researchers to gather data quickly and efficiently, the findings obtained from it are not generalizable due to the bias of the sample (Emerson, 2021). All interview participants' identities were protected through anonymized pseudonyms (e.g., Teacher A, Teacher E).

Data collection

In the current study, thematic analysis is employed to uncover the underlying meanings and interpretations embedded in teachers' responses to the semi-structured interview questions. Teacher responses to the semi-structured interview questions are analyzed thematically following the thematic analysis

method developed by Braun and Clarke (2020). This method involves the systematic coding and categorizing of textual data to identify recurring themes and patterns related to the implementation of TOCF strategies. The goal is to understand specifics about how TOCF strategies are applied and how they influence students' perceptions and preferences. The analysis process requires careful examination of transcripts, noting initial thoughts, grouping similar categories, and refining themes until a comprehensible account is established (Dabboub & Giornazi, 2024).

Results

This section exhibits the analysis of the results gathered from the semi-structured interview conducted with five teachers, labeled TA, TB, TC, TD, and TE. The analysis focuses on teachers' approaches that they follow when providing TOCF to students during oral practice classes, their teaching methods, and their beliefs on the effectiveness of TOCF strategies in boosting student self-confidence, as well as their efforts to establish a supportive classroom environment. Teachers' responses are analyzed thematically following the thematic analysis method developed by Braun and Clarke (2020), where responses are analyzed, coded, and categorized on seven aspects reflecting teachers' views on TOCF in oral practice classes.

Importance of TOCF: Teacher Perspectives on TOCF Efficacy and Confidence-Preserving Strategies in Oral Practice

Based on the responses provided by the interviewed teachers, all five teachers emphasize the critical role of TOCF in enhancing students' oral proficiency. This consensus underscores the fundamental importance of effective feedback mechanisms in language learning. It also highlights the long-term benefits of implementing robust TOCF strategies. This is evident in the answer provided by TC, who states that "TOCF is essential for pinpointing and correcting errors, which significantly boosts students' performance in oral practice classes." Similarly, TD adds that "Without proper TOCF, students might continue to make the same errors, hindering their progress in developing accurate speech patterns." Yet, despite teachers' shared belief in TOCF efficacy in oral practice classes, the teachers demonstrate flexibility in their approaches, highlighting the multifaceted nature of these instructional techniques. For instance, TA stresses the need for balancing between immediate correction and allowing students to complete their thoughts. Besides, TB advocates tailoring TOCF to meet individual students' needs. This opinion discrepancy signifies the adaptability of TOCF strategies to

different teaching styles and student populations. In tandem with managing these instructional dynamics, maintaining students' self-confidence during oral practice classes appears to be a common concern among teachers. Thus, they favor employing various strategies to ensure that students remain motivated and self-possessed in their speaking abilities while errors are addressed. Teachers keep stressing the impact of positive reinforcement as a crucial means of raising students' morale during TOCF sessions. To exemplify, TE notes that she always attempts to formulate corrections constructively, concentrating on what her students do properly instead of criticizing their errors and demoralizing them. This approach lines up with the sandwich feedback concept technique that TB declares, where encouraging comments should envelop TOCF. In the same context, TD touches on the perfect time for TOCF to maintain students' self-confidence. She remarks, "Timing is crucial. Sometimes, immediate correction can be too harsh, so I prefer to delay feedback until students have finished speaking." This understanding of TOCF timing denotes the complexity of TOCF delivery and the necessity for considering various factors that can affect students' oral performances.

Teachers' Approaches to TOCF Timing and Assessment of Strategy Effectiveness

Preferences regarding the optimal timing of TOCF lead to another discrepancy among teachers. While TA and TD seem to lean towards immediate TOCF to prevent error fossilization and enhance retention, TB and TE recommend a more delicate approach, which can be attuned based on the nature of errors and the context in which they occur. In this regard, TC explicates that, "Immediate correction is effective for obvious errors, but for subtle errors, I prefer using delayed feedback to allow students to reflect on their performance." This balanced tactic mirrors teachers' sensibility and understanding of the complex interplay between timing and effectiveness in TOCF delivery. Consequently, exploring this complex landscape requires assessing the effectiveness of TOCF strategies, which presents a challenge for teachers, owing to the subjective nature of oral communication improvement. Hence, teachers resort to exploiting a combination of observation, peer feedback, and formal assessments to monitor students' growth and improvement in oral classes. TB clarifies that she uses a blend of methods during her oral practice classes, including student self-assessments and formal speaking tests to evaluate the impact of her TOCF strategies. Moreover, TE reports that she pays close attention to students' participation levels and willingness to engage in oral activities. She adds that improved self-

confidence often manifests as involvement in class discussions increases. Undoubtedly, employing such multifaceted modes facilitates the comprehensive evaluation of student development over time and ensures that the endorsed TOCF strategies do not deviate from the learning objectives.

Managing Instructional Challenges and Fostering Low-Anxiety, Risk-Taking Classrooms

Often, teachers encounter challenges in providing TOCF, including managing emotional responses to corrections and guaranteeing equal attention for all students. Teachers address these issues by fostering supportive classroom environments where errors are considered opportunities for student development by integrating group activities and peer correction to enhance collaborative learning during oral practice classes. In particular, TD testifies that she encourages her students to view errors as stepping stones towards improvement. She elaborates that the creation of an optimistic atmosphere helps decrease anxiety levels that some students experience when they get TOCF. This practice correlates with TC's strategy of framing corrections positively, indicating a shared understanding among teachers of the pros of sustaining a supportive learning environment. A primary mechanism for fostering such an environment, teachers utilize peer correction as part of their TOCF strategies. TB accounts for implementing peer feedback in oral practice classes, saying that, "Peer correction can be very effective, especially for pronunciation issues." However, she elaborates that she always establishes clear guidelines to ensure constructive feedback. This approach not only smooths language learning but also builds a sense of community among students, reinforcing the collaborative nature of language learning. In addition, TE accentuates the value of inspiring self-correction during oral activities. She often pauses after student's finish speaking and asks them to reflect on their performance. She claims that this helps develop students' metalinguistic awareness and boosts their zest to participate actively in the correction process. Fostering this active engagement aligns directly with the broader objective of establishing a classroom environment that encourages risk-taking and experimentation with language, which is a universally recognized goal as a must by the teachers interviewed. TA affirms that "Errors are an integral part of the learning process." She explains that these errors can be lessened through teachers setting up a comfortable environment that encourages students' exploration and risk-taking and expands their linguistic capabilities. TD confesses that she incorporates numerous activities designed to reward creativity and effort, such as role-play scenarios or group

discussions on current events. She believes that these activities help students see the practical application of language skills and reduce fears linked with making errors. In the same vein, TB asserts the long-term benefits of applying different approaches. She is convinced that when students feel confident enough to take risks, they are more likely to engage actively in class, leading to improved overall language proficiency. This perspective gives prominence to the interconnectedness between TOCF strategies, students' self-confidence, and the broader learning environment.

Discussion

The analysis of the teacher semi-structured interview results provides a reflective insight into the implementation of TOCF in oral practice classes, which embraces direct correction, indirect hints, and collaborative problem-solving strategies. Teachers' use of these multi-task strategies matches the study outcomes of Irfani and O'Boyle (2024), which advocate for the adaptation of multiple strategies to meet the diverse needs of students, thus reinforcing the notion of 'teacher responsiveness' of Vygotsky (1978). The interviewed teachers consider both immediate and delayed TOCF strategies to be instrumental in promoting learning outcomes, as well as in enhancing comprehension and retention. This result agrees with the study findings of Öztürk (2023), which maintain that both immediate and delayed TOCF strategies contribute positively to language learning. Moreover, this result highlights the effectiveness of TOCF timing in augmenting students' academic performance and overall language proficiency (Li & Xu, 2020). Such an output resonates with the notion of 'teacher efficacy', which influences instructional strategies and boosts student motivation and engagement, ultimately leading to higher-quality academic achievements (Bal-Taştan et al., 2018).

Teachers report operating reflective practices and metacognitive strategies during oral practice sessions to encourage self-correction among students, thus enhancing the effectiveness of self-regulated learning (Kobayashi, 2020). The application of these strategies points to the complexity of TOCF strategies and accentuates the need for adaptable OCF strategies, which is consistent with the study findings of Çankaya (2020). Consequently, teachers often turn to peer correction as a collaborative learning strategy, which can significantly improve speaking fluency and accuracy (Li & Hu, 2024) and motivate students to take ownership of their learning. This approach nurtures greater engagement, communication, and responsibility among students rather than TOCF alone (López et al., 2022). Chekol (2020) adds that peer

feedback increases student involvement in providing and receiving feedback from peers and leads to more substantial educational improvements.

Moreover, teachers tend to implement scaffolding activities that empower students to take risks and experiment with language, even in the face of potential errors. This result is parallel with the study findings of Suryani and Argawati (2018), which illustrate a strong positive correlation between high levels of risk-taking and improved speaking skills, evident from participants' demonstration of greater fluency and accuracy in their oral presentations. This result also advocates students' engagement in challenging tasks without fearing negative repercussions, which is crucial for enhancing their language practice and enriching their learning experiences (Smith, 2020).

Teachers activate a diversity of techniques to assess the effectiveness of their TOCF strategies on students' oral communication abilities, focusing on both cognitive and emotional dimensions of learning. These techniques involve observational assessments, peer correction, and formal testing (Wang, 2021). Nevertheless, this endeavor poses numerous challenges for teachers, who often struggle to deal with unforeseen emotional reactions and students' varying levels of proficiency while striving to ensure that all students receive fair attention. Besides, the gap between TOCF strategies and students' preferences for CF creates an obstacle for teachers, impeding their ability to utilize effective problem-solving strategies in oral practice classes. This barrier can adversely affect the language learning process, as students may feel disheartened when their expectations are unmet and may discourage teachers from providing TOCF in these settings (Nguyen & Luu, 2021).

Teachers are dedicated to finding solutions to the challenges they encounter when offering TOCF. Thus, they adopt reflective and metacognitive strategies aimed at empowering students to engage actively in their learning and promote self-correction (Pan, 2024). Likewise, these strategies can foster a sense of belonging among students (Watson et al., 2024) and establish robust learning communities that facilitate genuine communication and provide students with opportunities to be more active and productive in speaking activities (Zulfikar, 2022). To this end, J. Ha et al. (2021) advise teachers to participate in professional development programs that include workshops followed by experiential and reflective activities to examine and reconsider their beliefs about the enactment of TOCF strategies in their oral practice classes.

Conclusion

This exploratory study sought to answer what types of TOCF are utilized and how they contribute to student improvement by investigating the beliefs and strategies employed by Libyan EFL teachers regarding error correction in oral practice classes, offering valuable insights into the complex dynamics of corrective feedback within this specific educational context. By adopting a semi-structured interview approach, the research examines teachers' conceptual understanding and their practical application of OCF, while examining its impact on student engagement and learning outcomes.

In response to the research questions, the findings indicate a generally positive student perception of teachers' OCF strategies, correlating these interventions with actual improvements in self-esteem, reduced hesitation, and enhanced fluency, accuracy, pronunciation, and vocabulary retention. Crucially, the study revealed that the effectiveness of TOCF is influenced by individual learner preferences and emotional responses. While immediate TOCF was highly valued for its role in addressing pronunciation and accuracy and fostering confidence, delayed and indirect approaches, such as repetition and reformulation, were often perceived as less confrontational and more suitable for grammar and vocabulary development. A significant takeaway was the students' appreciation for explicit explanations accompanying corrections, which proved vital for deeper understanding and effective application of corrected forms.

Teachers, recognizing the preventative role of immediate TOCF against fossilization, demonstrated a strategic and adaptive use of both immediate and delayed feedback, tailoring their choices to error types and interactional contexts. Their pedagogical decisions were further shaped by practical considerations, including the delicate balance of emotional management within the classroom and the imperative for equitable student participation. This highlights the nuanced challenges teachers face in fostering linguistic development while simultaneously cultivating a supportive and affectively positive learning environment. Future research and teacher development should therefore move beyond technical training in feedback types toward supporting reflective decision-making grounded in situated classroom realities.

REFERENCES

Amiryousefi, M. (2016). Influence of teachers' feedback discourses on EFL learners' academic self-concept, attributions, L2 speaking, class performance,

and L2 achievement: Confirmatory feedback in focus. *Teaching English Language*, 10(1), 39–61.

Asmara, C. H., Auliya, P. K., & Muhammad, R. N. (2022). Oral corrective feedback: What do students prefer and why? *TLEMC (Teaching and Learning English in Multicultural Contexts)*, 6(2), 115–122.

Bal-Taştan, S., Davoudi, S. M. M., Masalimova, A. R., Bersanov, A. S., Kurbanov, R. A., Boiarchuk, A. V., & Pavlushin, A. A. (2018). The impacts of teachers' efficacy and motivation on students' academic achievement in science education among secondary and high school students. *EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(6), 2353–2366.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2020). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage Publications.

Buys, T., Casteleijn, D., Heyns, T., & Untiedt, H. (2022). A reflexive lens on preparing and conducting semi-structured interviews with academic colleagues. *Qualitative Health Research*, 32, 2030–2039. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10497323221130872>

Çankaya, E. A. (2020). Investigating flexibilities of the classroom teachers for four operations based on different strategies. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 13(4), 646–662.

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.

Chen, A. A. (2020). Alternative approaches to error correction in educational settings. *Journal of Language and Education*, 10(2), 15–30.

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

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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X20987123>

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.

García Mayo, M. P., & Muñoz, C. (2016). *Oral corrective feedback in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.

Ha, J., Murray, G. G., & Song, H. (2021). Exploring teachers' and learners' beliefs about corrective feedback in EFL contexts. *Applied Linguistics*, 42(2), 251–273.

Ha, X. V., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, P. B. (2021). Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classroom: A teaching and learning perspective. *Heliyon*, 7, 1–8.

Halim, H., Hamzah, M. I., & Zulkifli, H. (2023). Secondary school teachers' conceptions of assessment: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 124, Article 102311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102311>

Irfani, B., & O'Boyle, A. (2024). Teacher practices and student preferences of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classrooms: A Vygotskian perspective. *Training, Language and Culture*, 8(1), 101–114.

Jroush, N. A. (2026). Libyan EFL university students' insights on teacher error corrective feedback strategies in oral practice classes. *Faculty of Arts Journal*, (42), 1. <https://journals.uot.edu.ly/index.php/faj/issue/view/254>

Kaivanpanah, M., Alavi, S. M., & Hashemi, M. (2021). Investigating the effects of error correction strategies on EFL learners' writing performance. *Journal of Applied Linguistic Studies*, 17(2), 123–144.

Kobayashi, A. (2020). Examining the effects of metacognitive instruction in oral communication for EFL learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 17(2), 597–615.

Kurvers, R., van der Linden, E., & van Hout, R. (2018). Effects of peer feedback on L2 writing performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 42, 53–67.

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), Article e25849. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e25849>

Li, X., & Xu, J. (2020). Effects of oral corrective feedback on writing fluency in Chinese university students. *System*, 88, Article 102336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102336>

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.

López, T. L., Martínez, E. A., & Trejo, Ó. M. N. (2022). Peer-correction as a strategy to improve teenagers' speaking skills in foreign language learning. *Revista CPU-e*, (35), 25–52.

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

Nguyen, N. X., & Luu, N. Q. H. (2021). EFL learners' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback for pronunciation. *International Journal of Science and Management Studies*, 4(4), 266–281.

Nuraeni, L., & Fadhly, F. Z. (2018). Teachers' correction strategies on students' errors in EFL speaking class. *Indonesian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 1(2), 39–44.

Nurjanah, L., Rahmaningtyas, H., & Yaniafari, R. P. (2024). Examining students' oral corrective feedback preferences for improving proficiency. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 11(1), 23–38.

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.

Pan, F. (2024). Enhancing students' language learning autonomy: Student-centered approaches in the classroom. *Transactions on Social Science, Education, and Humanities Research*, 4, 74–80.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A cognitive approach. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language acquisition and universal grammar* (pp. 137–174). Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M. (2020). Educating risk: How fear of failure is stifling creative practice within higher education. In *Educating animators academic conference 2019: Teaching the world's most expressive art form*. Manchester Animation Festival and the University of Salford.

Suryani, L., & Argawati, N. O. (2018). Risk-taking and students' speaking ability: Do they correlate? *Journal of English Language Teaching in Indonesia*, 6(1), 34–45.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wang, X. (2021). Cognitive and affective learning in English as a foreign language/English as a second language instructional-learning contexts: Does teacher immediacy matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 759784. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.759784>

Watson, J. H., Gieringer, N., & Mills, M. S. (2024). Strategies for cultivating belonging in online learning spaces. In *Humanizing online teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 162–184). IGI Global.

Westberg, J., & Hilliard, J. (2001). *Fostering reflection and providing feedback: Helping others learn from experience*. Springer.

Xu, M. (2021). Timing of corrective feedback in second language acquisition: A systematic review. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 43(2), 251–273.

Yousefi, M., & Nassaji, H. (2021). Corrective feedback in second language pragmatics: A review of research. *TESL-EJ*, 25(1), 1–14.

Yüksel, D., Soruç, A., & McKinley, J. (2021). Teachers' beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in university EFL classes. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 31(3), 362–382.

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.

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.