EXAMINING STUDENTS' ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PREFERENCES FOR IMPROVING SPEAKING PROFICIENCY

[1]Lailatul Nurjanah*, [2]Hasti Rahmaningtyas, [2]Rahmati Putri Yaniafari
[1]Graduate Program of English Department, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia.
[2]English Department, Faculty of Letters, State University of Malang

ABSTRACT

This article examined the fundamental OFC types that students prefer for oral corrective feedback to improve their speaking ability in speaking class. It aims to give a clearer understanding of beliefs alignment between teachers and students, thus enabling them to choose appropriate OCF techniques that will enhance students' performance. This study also contributes to the comprehension of OCF use in the educational context of Indonesia which is aimed at evidencing data-based learning. This research was carried out at Universitas Negeri Malang specifically in the Department of English and used descriptive quantitative design through surveys where respondents were 116. The instrument of this study was a questionnaire. The result indicates that when providing OCF, student emotions and preferences should be considered since these directly affect both the kind of feedback to be given and its effectiveness. In terms of the "delivery" of the feedback, students prefer metalinguistic and recast feedback types. However, there are some discrepancies in terms of their perceived effectiveness among students. Notably, metalinguistic, repetition, as well as recast OCF types, proved most advantageous concerning proficiency development. Furthermore, indirect OCF is more favored than direct administration timing. This research implies that metalinguistic, repetition, and recast feedback are types of OCF that are suitable for use in speaking classes with the aim of improving speaking performance. Since this research has not provided a data-based explanation of how students' preferred OCF helps improve their performance, future research is expected to conduct an in-depth exploration of its successful use.

Keywords: *Oral corrective feedback (OCF); students' preference; speaking perfomance*

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi preferensi mahasiswa terhadap jenis umpan balik koreksi lisan untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara mereka dalam kelas. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk memberikan wawasan yang lebih dalam tentang keselasarasan keyakinan guru dan mahasiswa, membantu pendidik dalam memilih metode umpan balik koreksi lisan yang efektif untuk perkembangan mahasiswa. Selain itu, penelitian ini berkontribusi pada pemahaman peran umpan balik koreksi lisan dalam konteks pendidikan di Indonesia, mempromosikan praktik pembelajaran berdasarkan bukti. Dilaksanakan di Universitas Negeri Malang, khususnya Departemen Bahasa Inggris, penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kuantitatif melalui survei, dengan 116 responden yang menyelesaikan kuesioner. Hasil penelitian menyoroti pentingnya mempertimbangkan emosi dan preferensi mahasiswa saat memberikan umpan balik koreksi lisan, karena hal ini secara langsung mempengaruhi pemilihan jenis umpan balik dan

efektifitasnya. Mahasiswa lebih menyukai jenis umpan balik metalinguistik dan recast untuk "cara penyampaiannya". Namun, ada beberapa perbedaan pendapat dalam preferensi mahasiswa mengenai efektifitas jenis umpan balik koreksi lisan dalam meningkatkan kemampuan. Terutama, jenis umpan balik koreksi lisan metalinguistic, pengulangan, dan recast, yang dianggap paling bermanfaat untuk meningkatkan kemampuan. Selain itu, umpan balik koreksi lisan yang disampaikan secara tidak langsung lebih disukai daripada yang disampaikan secara langsung.

Kata Kunci: *Preferensi siswa; umpan balik korektif lisan; waktu*

INTRODUCTION

One of the factors that can significantly impact the optimization of the speaking learning process and its outcomes pertains to the beliefs held by both educators and students (Borg, 2015; Novitasari et al., 2022). It is worth emphasizing that beliefs wield substantial influence over the affective domain, evaluation processes, the initiation of pedagogical actions, and resistance to changes in the educational context (Bosrg, 2011). Therefore, both teachers' and students' beliefs are important to consider in learning because in the context of spoken language acquisition, teachers and students are both active participants. Teachers' have the role as partners who give the students' needs consistently (Nurjanah, 2023).

One factor that triggers the incongruent of teachers' and students' beliefs about corrective feedback is the application of corrective feedback (Agudo, 2013). Corrective feedback is when errors made by students in speaking classes are corrected to provide an understanding of their mistakes so that the same mistakes do not occur in the future (Mohamed, 200g). Without being corrected, students will be trapped in the shackles of the mistakes they made for a long time until someone tells them. Corrective feedback has been proven to trigger teachers and students to be more interested in applying linguistic knowledge to acquire a second language (Ellis, 2017). Corrective feedback was also suitable for boosting the learners' development (Li & Vuono, 2019).

Studies show that giving feedback in an over-correction way can cause students to lose self-confidence so that they have decreased performance in the future, while error correction that is not given at all can make students maintain their mistakes for a long time because they think they do not produce any mistakes (Calsiyao, 2015; Méndez & Cruz, 2012). Through the fact that the provision of corrective feedback can affect students' self-confidence; the provision of corrective feedback must be adjusted to various factors, one of which is students' anxiety. In addition, the previous research also stated that corrective feedback should not embarrass students or offend their self-confidence (Elsaghayer, 2014; Ulfa Mattarima et al., 2022).

In line with Méndez and Cruz (2012), Calsiyao, (2015), and Elsaghayer (2014), it was found that corrective feedback is essential to develop interlanguage skills, but the delivery must be apparent (Maolida, 2013). A study reinforces that corrective feedback was needed to prevent the fossilization of faults (Khunaivi & Hartono, 2015). However, providing feedback must pay attention to the

appropriateness of time so that students do not feel confused because they are interrupted by the teacher. Breaking the speech flow of the students is not recommended because it can damage students' focus and lower their motivation (Muslem, Zulfikar, & Asrila, 2017).

Regarding the way of giving corrective feedback, in general, there are two types of corrective feedback: written and oral (Li & Vuono, 2019). Although they have different delivery methods, both have proven effective (Ellis, 2017). However, so far, the existing research on corrective feedback is mainly related to written form, while corrective feedback research in oral form is still minimal and is still held in foreign contexts outside Indonesia. It uses the oral method to provide corrective feedback, especially in speaking lessons implemented in Indonesia, which is still not evidence-based. Research on oral correcstive feedback in Indonesia's education context is needed so that learning activities can be carried out evidence-based. Therefore, the scope of this research will focus more on Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). There are six types of OCF (Lee, 2013).

Table 1. Types of oral corrective feedback (Lee, 2013)

OCF Type	Explanation	Example
Repetition	Repeating mistakes made by students while highlighting the wrong part.	S: I will presented.. T: I will presented..? S: I will present..
Recast	Reformulating the wrong phrase or word to explicitly indicate the correct one.	S: I will find the picture on the magazine? T: In the magazine
Clarification Request	Showing students that their speech cannot be understood so that students formulate it.	S: Why do you spend with your friends? T: What? (Or, Sorry?)
Explicit correction	**Identifying the errors, indicating the errors, and correcting the errors.**	**S: On June.** **T: Not on June, in June.** **We say, "It will start in June.**
Meta-linguistic feedback	Giving technical linguistics information about the error without explicitly notifying the answer.	S: She doesn't have any self-confident. T: Self-confident is an adjective
Elicitation	Asking students to correct by pausing so that students can correct the wrong word or phrase.	S: This ice is very hot. T: It's very.? S: Cold.

Various types of OCF are classified according to the way feedback is delivered. Teachers or lecturers must be able to determine the correct type of OCF based on student preferences to be applied in a class. A study showed a good response from students regarding the types and timing of OCF applied by their teacher (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016). Students prefer recast and clarification types, while metalinguistic feedback is complex and creates anxiety. Students also

feel uncomfortable with direct feedback, making them not actively speak in the next class. Other studies have shown a positive response to other types of OCF, namely explicit correction (Suryoputro & Amaliah, 2016). Students think that explicit correction makes them aware of their mistakes, motivates them to improve their speaking skills, and improves their pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary. The results of further research on first- and second-year students stated that students agreed that OCF should be applied to students' speaking development **(Fadilah et al., 2017)**. For the timing, students prefer delayed OCF over direct. In this study, explicit and metalinguistic OCF types achieved the lowest scores on student anxiety.

Other research from the teacher's side shows that teachers only examine fatal mistakes that hinder communication so as not to disturb students' self-confidence and damage the flow of communication (Jean, 2011). One study also found that teachers had a two-fold concern about OCF. First, they worry that OCF can disrupt the flow of communication and speech. Second, they worry that OCF can cause students' anxiety because they feel ashamed to be corrected publicly (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005). Meanwhile, most studies reported that students expect more OCF from teachers (Nurjanah, 2021). For example, one study showed that students supported receiving corrective and explicit feedback on oral production while their teachers were firmly in opposition (Lee, 2013). Various previous studies indicate the importance of research about OCF being carried out further to adjust students' expectations, desires, and preferences for OCF the teacher must do. It is because those factors will affect the students' oral proficiency improvement. Although some studies investigated the importance of OCF, there are still limited study which directly explore students' preference about that.

As an emphasis, this research is essential because it relates to various inquiries that are still being discussed today. This research can also provide more insight into the suitability of teachers' and students' beliefs. In addition, it can also help teachers or lecturers determine the type of OCF that is effective for student learning development. In previous studies, several studies related to OCF have been conducted. However, most of them are done in the ESL of Western countries. There is still minimal research on the scope of EFL, especially for secondary or college levels in Indonesia. Still, minimal research explicitly examines the most appropriate type of OCF to be applied based on student preferences. The researchers believe that related to the existence of English majors at the university level, research on student preferences for OCF is also needed, especially in Indonesia. The researchers also believe that with this research, broader insights can be found related to the type of OCF, and its application can benefit both parties, namely students and lecturers. Therefore, the author intends to conduct a study entitled "Students Preferences Towards the Type of Oral Corrective Feedback for Oral Proficiency Improvement in Speaking Class of the English Department of State University Malang."

Based on the background described above, the research question in this study can be written as follows:

1. What type of oral corrective feedback do the students prefer given by the lecturer for oral proficiency improvement in the speaking class of the English Department of Universitas Negeri Malang?

2. When is the suitable time for oral corrective feedback given by the lecturer based on students' preferences in speaking class at the English Department of Universitas Negeri Malang?

METHOD

This research design used a descriptive quantitative survey. Sugiyono (2018) survey method is a quantitative research method used to obtain data that occurred in the past or currently, about beliefs, opinions, characteristics, behavior, variable relationships and to test several hypotheses about sociological and psychological variables from samples taken from certain populations. In this study, the researchers collected data using online questionnaires and then analyzed the data statistically. Then, descriptive analysis was used to describe the object under study through sample data and make valid general conclusions.

This study was conducted at a speaking course at the undergraduate level of the English Department of the State University of Malang. In this study, researchers chose the English Department students cohort of 2020 to find out about the students' preferences for the types and timing of oral corrective feedback given by their teacher in speaking class for their oral proficiency improvement. This study used a research sample to represent the population of interest. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is a technique for determining samples with certain considerations using criteria (Sugiyono, 2016). In this case, the author takes a sample from a population determined using several criteria. The criteria used are as follows. First, the respondents must be active English department students of Universitas Negeri Malang who are at the undergraduate level. Respondents must also come from the cohort of 2020. Then, respondents at least have taken the Basic Speaking courses. In this study, the sample taken by the researchers amounted to 116 subjects from a total population of 242 subjects. Determination of the number of samples was carried out using an online sample calculator with a 95% confidence level and 5% interval.

In this study, the researchers collected data using a questionnaire. The question items used in the questionnaire were obtained from the process of adapting pre-existing instruments. Some items were adjusted in terms of language according to the context of the language used in the English Department of the State University of Malang so that prospective respondents who would answer the questionnaire would not confused. Some questions related to students' feelings after getting a specific type of OCF are also added to suit the goals of this research. Concerning adapting instruments, instrument validation was carried out by two experts in the field to assess the validity of each item in the adopted and adapted instrument. The questionnaire used is in the form of close-ended questions and an open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire. The researchers used a Likert scale for the close-ended questions. The answer category used in this scale has four choices, namely strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree, which has its score for each category of answers. The items of the instrument were taken from

Alkhammash, & Gulnaz, 2019; Ha et al., 2021; Kartchava & Ammar, 2014; Nisa, 2018; Septianisa, 2021.

The data analysis used was descriptive analysis. Sugiyono (2017) Descriptive analysis is statistics used to analyze data by describing or illustrating the data that has been collected. In this study, the data was the result of the questionnaire. The data then was processed using Microsoft Excel to calculate the items percentages as the statistical data. The statistic data result then described and used to explain the object under study which was the students' preference on the type of OCF to make a valid general conclusion.

FINDINGS

The findings highlight that while a majority (61.74%) of students perceive OCF as necessary, only a smaller portion (42.61%) agree that it directly strengthens their speaking skills. However, an overwhelming majority (98.27%) observed some level of improvement after receiving OCF, indicating its positive impact on student learning.

Table 2 S**tudents' preferences for OCF**

Items	Freq. and Percentage			
	SA	**A**	**D**	**SD**
The lecturer's oral corrective feedback (The lecturer's response to students' spoken errors) is essential for students in English learning, especially in English speaking classes.	71	**0**	3	41
	61.74%	**0%**	2.6%	35.65%
I think that correcting learners' errors orally can negatively affect their self-esteem and consequently discourage them from speaking.	3	0	71	41
	2.6%	**0%**	61.74%	35.65%
The lecturer's corrective feedback helps students to consolidate their English speaking.	**49**	**0**	**3**	**63**
	42.61%	**0%**	2.6%	54.78%
I do not feel any improvement after being given OCF by my lecturer.	**2**	**0**	**67**	**46**
	1.73%	**0%**	**58.26%**	**40%**
If I make an error in my speaking, I want my lecturer to correct it.	**62**	**0**	**2**	**51**
	53.91%	**0%**	**1.73%**	**44.35%**
If I make an error when answering my lecturer's question, I want my lecturer to correct it.	**51**	**0**	**4**	**60**
	44.35%	**0%**	**3.47%**	**52.17%**
If I make an error when presenting something in English to the whole class, my lecturer does not need to correct it.	**0**	**0**	**66**	**49**
	0%	**0%**	**57.39%**	**42.61%**
If I make an error while talking in a group-work activity, my lecturer does not need to correct it.	**2**	**0**	**64**	**49**
	1.73%	**0%**	**55.65%**	**42.61%**
	29	**0**	**6**	**80**

If I make an error related to the lesson's focus, my lecturer should correct it.	**25.22%**	**0%**	**5.21%**	**69.57%**
I didn't feel any changes in my speaking proficiency after my lecturer gave me oral error corrective feedback for my speech.	**3**	**0**	**61**	**51**
	2.6%	**0%**	**53%**	**44.35%**
I feel some improvements after getting oral corrective feedback; I can recognize my errors, do self-correction and self-repair, and even do more proper speech.	**52**	**0**	**3**	**60**
	45.22%	**0%**	**2.6%**	**52.17%**
Oral corrective feedback from the lecturer in speaking class helps me know my strengths and weaknesses in speaking.	**61**	**0**	**3**	**51**
	53%	**0%**	**2.6%**	**44.35%**

Based on the data, Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) preferences among respondents are highlighted by the data with two crucial aspects. Due to whether OCF is proper or not, some of the respondents prefer it (48.7%), while most of them do not like it when feedback seems to ignore their "feelings" and "preferences" in strongest disapproval rates of 62.61% and disagreement rates of 37.39%, respectively. Metalinguistic and recast OCF types obtain major responses above 20% at 36.52% and 20.87% respectively while others have less than these figures below 20%. From these findings, teaching should prioritize metalinguistic and recast OCF types as they facilitate a more inclusive, preferred learning environment for students. With this strategic approach in mind, there will be a better variety of OCF strategies that appeals to different learners without disregarding learner preferences as well as being in tandem with what students desire.

Table 3. Students' **preferences of the OCF types**

Items	Freq. and Percentage			
	SA	A	D	SD
The lecturer has to use proper OCF techniques to correct students' speaking class errors.	56	**0**	**4**	**55**
	48.7%	**0%**	3.47%	47.83%
The lecturer can give OCF as they like without paying attention to the students' feelings and preferences.	0	0	43	72
	0%	**0%**	**37.39%**	**62.61%**
If I make an error, I want my lecturer to repeat what I said and pause before the error so I can correct it myself (e.g., I have…).	14	**0**	35	66
	12.17%	**0%**	30.43%	56.39%
I often do not understand what I have to say to continue when the lecturer gives OCF by saying what I said again and pausing before the error,	**6**	**0**	**44**	**65**
	5.21%	**0%**	**38.26%**	**56.52%**
	11	**0**	**34**	**70**

If I make an error, I want my lecturer to repeat my wrong words with changes in intonation so that I can recognize the error and correct it by myself.	**9.56%**	**0%**	**29.57%**	**60.87%**
The feedback given by the lecturer by repeating my wrong words makes me feel judged.	**7**	**0**	**63**	**45**
	6.08%	**0%**	**54.78%**	**39.13%**
If I make an error, I want my lecturer to give me comments or language rules or information so that I can correct it by myself. (e.g., You need the past tense).	**42**	**0**	**12**	**61**
	36.52%	**0%**	**10.43%**	**53.04%**
The explanation given by the lecturer when giving feedback made me even more confused, and I did not recognize my error.	**4**	**0**	**85**	**26**
	3.47%	**0%**	**73.91%**	**22.61%**
If I make an error, I want my lecturer to ask me to repeat it, like 'Sorry? What?/ What did you say? / Or can you repeat it?'	**13**	**0**	**35**	**67**
	11.3%	**0%**	**30.43%**	**58.26%**
Clarifying what I said made me forget my speech's following sentence or topic.	**8**	**0**	**63**	**44**
	6.95%	**0%**	**54.78%**	**38.26%**
If I make an error, I want my lecturer to give me the correct form by repeating the whole utterance and reformulating the wrong part. (e.g., We do not say, "I went to the train station yesterday", but we must say, "I went to the train station yesterday").	**21**	**0**	**28**	**66**
	18.26%	**0%**	**24.35%**	**57.39%**
The corrections given explicitly make me embarrassed and not confident about the next sentence or topic.	**4**	**0**	**72**	**39**
	3.47%	**0%**	**62.61%**	**33.91%**
If I make an error, I want my lecturer to tell me explicitly that there is an error and give me the correct form (e.g., Student: I will found them; Teacher: emm, "will find..").	**24**	**0**	**25**	**66**
	20.87%	**0%**	**21.74%**	**57.39%**
Explicit correction, even for some phrases, made me uncomfortable continuing the speech.	**4**	**0**	**65**	**46**
	3.47%	**0%**	**56.52%**	**40%**

Metalinguistic, repetition, and recast types of OCF are most desired in helping students' proficiency improvement, which is indicated by the acquisition of positive percentages for 40.87%, 28.7%, and 21.74%, respectively. This implies that students find importance in discussions about language use, strategic repetition for reinforcement, and subtle error reformulation without explicit correction. These preferred OCF types may be major contributors to improvement of students' proficiency. While other types of feedback get a positive percentage below 20%. Teachers should alter their feedback methods to include these favored

OCF approaches, towards a more effective and well-thought-out language learning milieu.

Table 4. Students' preferences for the type of OCF that is considered most helpful for their improvement

Items	Freq. and Percentage			
	SA	**A**	**D**	**SD**
When the lecturer gave OCF by saying what I said again and pausing before the error, I was trained to do self-correction/repair, improving my oral proficiency.	21	**0**	**26**	**68**
	18.26%	**0%**	22.61%	59.13%
By correcting errors by myself, I recognize my errors, which lead to my self-correction and oral proficiency improvement.	33	0	22	60
	28.7%	**0%**	**19.13%**	**52.17%**
The information from the lecturer related to my error enriched my knowledge of grammar, which led to my oral proficiency improvement.	47	**0**	**4**	**64**
	40.87%	**0%**	3.47%	55.65%
By the repetition request, I can recognize my errors, which improves my oral proficiency.	**16**	0	34	65
	13.91%	**0%**	**29.57%**	**56.52%**
When my lecturer reformulated the sentence's wrong part, I was aware of my error, which led to my improvement in oral proficiency.	**21**	0	27	67
	18.26%	**0%**	**23.48%**	**58.26%**
The explicit correction made me aware of my error, which improved my oral proficiency.	**25**	0	23	67
	21.74%	**0%**	**20%**	**58.26%**

Responses to statements stating the use of direct OCF implementation get a low positive percentage. The response to the desire to get feedback as soon as an error produced only reached a positive percentage of 13.04%

Table 5. Students' responses to the questions related to the aspect of direct OCF

Items	Freq. and Percentage			
	SA	**A**	**D**	**SD**
I want my lecturer to correct me as soon as I make an error, even though I was doing a speech presentation in front of the class.	15	**0**	**59**	**41**
	13.04%	**0%**	51.3%	35.65%
The lecturer should not delay giving feedback before students forget about their errors.	9	0	58	48
	7.82%	**0%**	**50.43%**	**41.74%**
The lecturer should correct my error directly on the	5	0	25	85

31

spot.	4.34%	**0%**	**21.74%**	**73.91%**
If I make an error that can interfere with my lecturer's or peers' understanding, my teacher should correct it immediately.	**30**	**0**	**5**	**80**
	26.09%	**0%**	**4.34%**	**69.57%**
If I make an error related to the grammar focus or the lesson's new vocabulary, my lecturer should correct it immediately.	**22**	**0**	**8**	**85**
	19.13%	**0%**	**6.95%**	**73.91%**

The information presented has shown how students responded to the implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) through which indirect methods received a positive percentage, though low one that surpassed the direct method. This indicates that indirectly correct methods are preferred by respondents with an inclination towards learners. Furthermore, the response to wanting feedback after speaking is also quite positive which stands at 18.26%. While this might appear as a small number, it is worth noting that there was considerable interest among respondents in being given some feedback to their speeches. Taking into account these findings, educators can adapt their OCF techniques, focusing on indirect strategies and adding post-speaking feedback possibilities so as to suit students' tastes better and potentially improve language learning efficacy.

Table 6. Student Responses to the questions related to the aspect of giving OCF Indirectly

Items	Freq. and Percentage			
	SA	A	D	SD
The lecturer should wait and correct my error after I have finished speaking.	21	**0**	**18**	**76**
	18.26%	**0%**	15.65%	66.09%
The lecturer should not interrupt speech to provide feedback.	22	0	23	70
	19.13%	**0%**	**20%**	**60.87%**
The lecturer should wait until the end of the activity I was involved in to correct my error.	9	0	57	49
	7.82%	**0%**	**49.57%**	**42.61%**
The lecturer should note or remember my error and correct it in front of the class at the end of the lesson.	**21**	**0**	**41**	**53**
	18.26%	**0%**	**35.65%**	**46.09%**
If I make an error that is not important, my teacher should not correct it and leave it.	**0**	**0**	**72**	**43**
	0%	**0%**	**62.61%**	**37.39%**

DISCUSSION
Type of OCF the Students Prefer

This research was conducted because of the importance of providing more insight into the suitability of teachers' and students' beliefs, which can help lectures determine the type of OCF that is effective for students' learning development. This research also aims to add insight into OCF in Indonesia's education context so that learning activities can be carried out on evidence-based learning. From the data, it was found that OCF was considered significant. It is following what was found by (Maolida, 2013). However, the results also show that OCF does not strengthen students' speaking skills. OCF only prevents the fossilization of errors and corrects the errors produced (Khunaivi & Hartono, 2015). With these results, it does not mean that there is no improvement in students because, with OCF, students know their mistakes and can find their strengths and weaknesses in speaking. In fact, according to the data of this study, students did not consider OCF to have a negative impact on their self-esteem in speaking. It contradicts the findings of (Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2005), which describe concerns that applying OCF can cause anxiety and decrease self-confidence and self-esteem in students. It is because college students have entered the young adult phase where their self-esteem is better. After all, their basic emotional intelligence is mature enough (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016).

The findings also revealed that using the proper technique was not the main thing to consider in giving OCF. However, paying attention to students' feelings and preferences when giving OCF is necessary. It is in line with the finding of Elsaghayer (2014), which explains that corrective feedback should not embarrass students or offend their self-confidence. This is further supported by the response of several students in the open-ended question that if they get an embarrassing OCF, it can make them blank and experience a decrease in performance. They tend to be afraid to answer the questions asked during the class actively.

The findings also reveal that the most preferred OCF types for students are metalinguistic and recast feedback types. As revealed by the results of student responses in the open-ended question item in the questionnaire, metalinguistic feedback is preferred because it is related to explaining the correction process. The findings regarding the preference for metalinguistic type OCF are contrary to the findings of Fadilah et al. (2017), in which, in his research, he stated that first- and second-year students did not have a preference for metalinguistic feedback because it was considered too complicated and long-winded. Meanwhile, this study revealed another thing: by explaining technical linguistics in correcting errors, students find it helpful to understand and correct the errors produced. Then, recast is in great demand because it is related to reformulating the wrong phrase or word to indicate the correct one explicitly. According to the results, with recast feedback, students do not need to guess in correcting mistakes. It is more recorded in memory. Students also find it very helpful because of the direct knowledge and practice. This finding regarding the preference for recast type OCF contradicts the findings of (Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk, 2016). If, in the findings of this study, recast feedback is considered

easy because it is easy to remember, according to Olmezer's findings, it is revealed that students consider recast feedback too ambiguous because there is no detailed explanation.

The multi-faceted nature of different Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) methods and the detailed aspects of our findings, are some of the things that make it desirable. Elicitation, which may cause confusion to students who find it difficult to continue words after a pause, is on a different level from Lee's (2013) standpoint that considers it important because of its capacity to encourage deeper thought. Explicit correction is less popular mainly because there is no explanation about it hence requiring a comprehensive approach. Clarification requests are felt by some as disruptive due to any possible interruptions even though they can be useful if well-focused and related to specific linguistic goals (Ellis, 2017). In contrast to Ellis's findings that elicited criticism for repeating itself too much, repetition was undesirable in our study showing the possibility for variations in individuals' responses. These results highlight the need for various perspectives on OCF methods; individual traits can determine how feedback strategies are received and their effectiveness.

There has been a slight unalignment in the results of the previous part on the part of students' preference for the type of OCF that is considered most helpful for their proficiency improvement. Metalinguistic, repetition, and recast types of OCF are most desired in helping students' proficiency improvement. For metalinguistic and recast feedback, it aligns with results related to students' preference for OCF in the context of "ways of giving or delivery". Metalinguistic is considered most helpful for their proficiency improvement because with metalinguistic feedback, students' knowledge is enriched, leading to improved oral proficiency. This finding supports previous findings by Ha et al. (2021) which revealed that metalinguistics is considered very helpful because the explanations given are used to avoid misunderstandings and confusion. Recast is considered helpful for students' proficiency improvement because it makes them more aware of their errors which lead to my oral proficiency improvement. It contradicts the findings regarding recast in Esther Lee (2013) research, which states that recast is less effective for language acquisition. Meanwhile, repetition, which in the previous aspect was not a preference, is considered helpful for students' proficiency improvement. A possible reason for this is that by highlighting errors through repetition and intonation changes, students can recognize their errors, improving oral proficiency. Although it is not used as a preference in the context of " ways of giving or delivery ", repetition becomes a preference in the context of "being helpful for students' proficiency improvement". It may be related to attitude and awareness of the importance of admitting good things even though they are not desired. Repetition feedback is an effective and sound type of OCF for oral proficiency improvement but is not a preference because of the context, which often shocks students and makes them down. The findings regarding students' preference for OCF repetition for oral proficiency improvement support the previous findings of Khunaivi & Hartono (2015), which stated that OCF repetition trains students to correct their pronunciation so that students can independently adjust their output.

The Suitable Time for OCF Given by The Lecturer Based On Students' Preferences

Positive responses related to indirect OCF were higher than positive responses to direct OCF. According to the data collected, giving OCF, the lecturer should not interrupt the speaking done by the students. Breaking the flow of speech is not desirable. Students prefer to give feedback directly carried out at the same place and moment but delivered after the performance, conversation, or other speaking activity has been completed or at least wait for a pause until there is a blemish to enter in giving feedback. Statements about lecturers should not delay feedback getting a very high negative response, which is very supportive that the giving of OCF should be more adjusted to the time of the opportunity or gap so that the OCF given does not interrupt or even give OCF is more desirable to do after performance, conversation, or other speaking activities have been completed. This finding is in line with what Fadilah et al. (2017) previously said, giving OCF should not interrupt the speaking flow that students are doing. Both this study and the research of Fadilah et al. agreed that giving OCF should not interrupt and damage students' speech flow and should not make students burdened and feel humiliated.

With the findings from this study that students' feelings and preferences must be considered in giving OCF, it is a signal for teachers that positive feedback is now more emphasized than negative feedback. It is supported by previous findings by Elsaghayer (2014), which stated that what students might feel after receiving OCF should be considered. That way, it can be said that all negative things in giving OCF to students and things that might make students feel embarrassed, shocked, or down must be handled appropriately.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research calls attention to the vital part played by Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in reinforcing oral language abilities, giving students a glimpse of their speaking capacities, showing areas for improvement and acknowledging strengths. Nevertheless, the results underscore the importance of accounting for student's emotions and wishes as these are factors influencing feedback preference and its connotation for learners themselves. Students have shown a preference for metalinguistic feedback and recasts type regarding delivery, pointing to a desire to discuss about language use or even rephrase minor error. However, it is important to note that there is a slight difference with regard to perceived usefulness while student preferences for metalinguistic, repetition and recast types concerning improvement of oral proficiency are convergent. Implicitly, the study suggests indirect OCF is more appropriate than direct OCF when time of feedback delivery has been factored in. Thus, we conclude that our results have implications in terms of designing our OCF techniques based on what the students may prefer hence taking into account not only the kind of feedback but also when and how it should be done in order to support students' development in spoken English.

Many areas still need to be researched as a follow-up to this research. For example, why does the less desirable repetition in giving or delivery have a high preference level in helping improve students' oral skills? Or what if two types of OCF are combined, e.g., explicit elicitation and correction? Would that result in another level of preference? Also, this research has not answered what happens if the given OCF interferes with the flow of speech. This study also has not answered the effect of students' characters on their acceptance of the given OCF. Much more needs to be known and proven regarding matters related to OCF.

REFERENCES

Agudo, J. D. M. (2013). An Investigation into How EFL Learners Emotionally Respond to Teachers" Oral Corrective Feedback. *Colombia Applied Linguist Journal*, *15*(2), 265 – 278.

Alkhammash, R., & Gulnaz, D. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques: An Investigation of the EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices at Taif University. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *10*.

Borg, S. (2015). Teacher cognition and language education: *Research and Practice.* India: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System*, 39(3), 370-380.

Calsiyao, I. (2015). Corrective Feedback in Classroom Oral Errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College Students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, *3*(1), 394–400.

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.

Elsaghayer, M. (2014). Affective damage to oral corrective feedback among students in Libyan secondary schools. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, *4*(6), 74–82.

Esther Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, *41*(2), 217–230. doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022

Fadilah, A. E., Anugerahwati, M., & Prayogo, J. A. (2017). EFL students'preferences for oral corrective feedback in speaking instruction. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 5(2), 76-87. doi.org/10.17977/um030v5i22017p076

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

Hernández Méndez, E., & Reyes Cruz, M. D. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in TeachersProfessional Development*, 14(2), 63-75.

Jean, G. & D. S. (2011). Grammar learning in English and French L2: Students' and teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, *44*(4), 465–492.

Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2014). The noticeability and effectiveness of corrective feedback in relation to target type. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(4), 428–452. doi.org/10.1177/1362168813519373

Khunaivi, H., & Hartono, R. (2015). Teachers and Students Perceptions of Corrective Feedback in Teaching Speaking. *English Education Journal*, *5*(2), 14–20.

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness*, *14*(2–3), 112–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668828

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, *84*, 93–109. doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006

Maolida, E. H. (2013). A Descriptive Study of Teacher's Oral Feedback In an ESL Young Learner Classroom in Indonesia. *K@Ta*, *15*(2), 117–123. doi.org/10.9744/kata.15.2.117-124

Maria Ulfa Mattarima, S., Afifi, N., & Suci Qamaria, R. (2022). English Study Club: How Students' Mental Attributes Reflect Their Motivation. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture*, *9*(1), 120–134. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v9i1.18975

Mohamed, N. (2006). *An exploratory study of the interplay between teachers' beliefs, instructional practices & professional development* (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).

Muslem, A., Zulfikar, T., & Asrila, I. (2017). Students' perception of oral corrective feedback in speaking classes. English Education JournalNo Title. *Students' Perception of Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Classes. English Education Journal*, *8*(3), 275–291.

Nisa, Y. A. (2018). *Students' Perception on the Use of Oral Peer-Feedback in Critical Listening and Speaking 2 Course*.

Novitasari, Wahyuningsih, N., & Agustin, H. N. (2022). Improving Students' Speaking Skills Through CLIL In Tourist Guiding Online Class. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language, Teaching and Linguistics*, *9*(1), 53–68. https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v9i1.20903

Nurjanah, L. N. (2021). *Students' preferences towards types of oral corrective feedback for their oral proficiency improvement in speaking class/Lailatul*

Nurjanah (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Negeri Malang).

Nurjanah, L., & Effendi, M. I. (2023). Strategi dalam Mengajar. Indocamp. https://www.indocamp.com

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Öztürk, G. (2016). *Types and Timing of Oral Corrective Feedback in Efl Classrooms: Voices From StudenİngilizceNin YabanciDil OlarÖğretildiği SiniflardDüzeltici SözlüDönütlerinTürleri Ve ZamanlamasiÜzerineÖğrenciGörüşleri. 1971.* http://www.novitasroyal.org/Vol_10_2/2.OlmezerOzturk&Ozturk.pdf

Septianisa, V. (2021). *EFL Undergraduate Students' Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences: A Survey Study.* (Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Indonesia).

Sugiyono. (2016). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D, Cetakan ke-24. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.

Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). EFL Students' Responses on Oral Corrective Feedbacks and Uptakes in Speaking Class. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *3*(5), 73–80.