

Exploring ESP Students' Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback

Roro Millatu Al Ghaniy
Universitas Islam Indonesia, Indonesia
233220102@uii.ac.id

Article History

Received: 2025-02-03
Reviewed: 2025-04-11
Accepted: 2025-09-20
Published: :2025-09-30

Highlights

ESP students strongly wanted oral corrective feedback from lecturers. Concerning the types of oral corrective feedback, ESP students preferred explicit correction, followed by elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback

ABSTRACT: Although some researchers show negative views toward oral corrective feedback, many believe that oral corrective feedback is beneficial for correcting the students' errors and improving their speaking skills. This survey study aims at investigating ESP students' oral corrective feedback preferences in speaking class. One hundred and sixty-five students from different study programs participated in the study. Moreover, a closed-ended questionnaire was employed to collect the data. The results revealed that the students strongly wanted their lecturers to fix their spoken errors. Students expressed a stronger preference for error corrections provided by lecturers rather than peers. Concerning the types of errors, a huge number of the students either agree or disagree toward oral correction on grammatical errors, pronunciation errors, and inappropriate vocabulary usage and expressions. Furthermore, students preferred explicit correction the most, followed by elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback. Exploring students' preferences of oral corrective feedback assists lecturers to find the most effective way of delivering feedback that suits the students' needs. By implementing the effective feedback, not only students' errors can be corrected but their speaking skills can be improved.

Keywords: oral corrective feedback (OCF), ESP, student preferences; error correction, speaking skill

Introduction

Teaching speaking skills mainly aims at improving students' communicative efficiency by exposing them to as much English as possible and minimizing their oral errors. Numerous strategies have been developed to achieve this goal, including Corrective Feedback (CF). (Li, 2010) affirmed that CF is a "response to learners' non-target-like L2 production." In language learning, teachers offer either oral or written corrective feedback. The current study specifically focuses only on Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF). In many empirical and observational studies, OCF was implemented with the aim of facilitating students' language learning (Mackey & Philip, 1998; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 2012; Russel & Spada, 2016).

Despite its significant role in language learning, the effectiveness of OCF remains the topic of debate. Some studies viewed OCF negatively as it can potentially harm students' openness to learning, lower their confidence, and increase anxiety (Brown, 2009; Calsiyao, 2015; Ellis, 2009; Krashen, 1982, 1985; Swain & Lapkin, 1995; Truscott, 1999). Conversely, other studies showed affirmative views toward OCF implementation. For instance, Khunaivi and Hartono (2015) reported that OCF could reduce language errors and prevent fossilization. In addition, OCF offers several

advantages for enhancing speaking abilities, such as increased error recognition, motivation to get involved in a conversation, correct grammatical errors and mispronunciation, and expanded vocabulary (Suryoputro & Amaliah, 2016).

Studies have also indicated that despite its disadvantages, OCF is highly valued in foreign language teaching. Students, in general, perceived OCF positively regardless of their language or foreign language anxiety (Geçkin, 2020; Rassaei, 2015; Sakiroglu & Ünsal, 2020). They also held positive beliefs about OCF (Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019). Like students, teachers also shared common beliefs toward the significance of OCF in foreign language teaching (Bao, 2019; Ha & Murray, 2023; Kartchava & Ammar, 2014; Yüksel & Soruç, 2021). However, teachers' views concerning the importance of OCF and their practices in the classroom setting were different due to the class circumstances.

Researchers have classified diverse OCF types preferred by students in language learning. According to Yang (2016), metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and recasts were favored by most CSL students to correct almost all kinds of errors. Amalia et al. (2019) found that male students preferred explicit correction while female students recast. Moreover, a study by Laeli and Setiawan (2019) revealed that teachers used recast, repetition, and clarification requests more frequently than the other OCF techniques. Although the previous three techniques were mostly used to correct errors, the students preferred to receive OCF using repetition and explicit correction. Fadhilah et al. (2017) reported that explicit feedback was mostly preferred by freshmen and sophomore students, followed by metalinguistic and repetition techniques to correct their speaking errors. Putri & Yumarnamto (2024) found that pre-service English teachers were given explicit correction and recast to correct their verbal errors.

Recognizing that each individual might share distinctive preferences toward OCF, investigating students' preferences for OCF is significant in helping teachers select and implement effective feedback that suits the student's needs. Therefore, preferences about OCF gain more research attention because this variable offers more insights into the diverse OCF preferences among students and how effective those OCF types are in reducing errors and improving English-speaking skills. Current literature shows that prior research has been typically done with EFL students taking academic English courses (Amalia et al., 2019; Fadhilah et al., 2017; Laeli & Setiawan, 2019) and pre-service teachers (Putri & Yumarnamto, 2024). They have not examined students' preferences for OCF in the context of ESP. In fact, learning ESP is particularly difficult as it requires students to learn English following their major. For instance, law students learn English for law purposes, which involves many law terms. The learning topics and activities are set following the workplace setting. Because ESP is more complex than general and academic English, it triggers students to make oral mistakes while practicing speaking frequently. The prior statements support the notion that exploring ESP students' preferences for OCF is significant. By exploring the students' preferences, it is anticipated that the study can assist teachers in finding

effective OCF in a speaking course. As a result, students' awareness of errors and speaking skills can be improved.

Based on the introduction above, the researcher developed the research problems below:

1. What perceptions do the students have about applying OCF in the ESP-Speaking course?
2. What preferences do the students have for the provider of OCF in the ESP speaking course?
3. What preferences do the students have regarding the frequency of OCF in correcting the error types?
4. What are the students' preferences for the OCF techniques for correcting their errors in the ESP-Speaking course?

Types of OCF

Lyster and Ranta (1997) classified OCF into several types that have been widely applied in research (Esther Lee, 2013; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Yoshida, 2008). The classification includes explicit correction, recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition. (see Table 1).

Table 1

OCF Categories

OCF Categories	Description	Example
Explicit correction	A response that explicitly show the errors the students made accompanied by target reformulations	Student: I write him a letter. Lecturer: “ Write ” is the present verb. You need to use the “ wrote ” to explain something that happened in the past.
Recasts	A response that addresses students' non-target utterances using L2 reformulations. Lecturers often repeat the students' utterances in the correct form without mentioning their mistakes straightforwardly.	Student: I write him a letter. Lecturer: Oh, you wrote him a letter?
Elicitation	A response that guides students to their errors by pausing. Lecturers frequently ask the students to fix and finish the sentence that contains errors.	Student: Yesterday, I write a letter for him. Lecturer: Yesterday, I ...
Metalinguistic feedback	A response that emphasizes the explicit form. This type requires lecturers to give a suggestion without calling attention to the errors directly	Student: I write him a letter yesterday. Lecturer: When we talk about something in the past, how does the verb change?

Clarification requests	A response in which the lecturers request students to rephrase their difficult-to-understand statements.	Lecturer: Did you finally write him a letter? Student: Yes. I write him a letter yesterday. Lecturer: Could you say that again?
Repetition	A response that indicates the errors by repeating the errors using stress or intonation.	Student: I write him a letter yesterday. Lecturer: I write ?

Types of Error and Their Effect on OCF

Prior studies discovered that error types have significantly influenced how students perceive and react to OCF (Yoshida, 2010). Mackey et al. (2007) reported that teachers' corrections for lexical errors were likely to be noticed by students in two introductory Arabic classes but not for phonological ones. On the other hand, Gass and Lewis (2007) found that students taking Italian courses could recognize phonological and lexical OCF but not morphological errors. A study conducted by Moroishi (2002) revealed that students in Japanese classes had difficulty identifying recasts for morphological errors. In addition, they misinterpreted the phonological error corrections for lexical recasts.

Furthermore, Yoshida (2010) found that students of Japanese as a foreign language had difficulty comprehending the teacher's recasts for their pragmatic errors. Pragmatics is an important aspect of L2 learning since it deals with particular social and cultural contexts. Thus, Tyler (2012) strongly recommended that all aspects of microlinguistics, including pragmatics, be considered whenever teachers provide OCF. The features of linguistic aspects used by the teachers in correcting the errors might be the reason why students have difficulty understanding them. VanPatten (1996), cited in Yang (2016), stated that language input, particularly OCF joined with communicative effectiveness, is likely to be understood. For example, it was discovered that short recasts focusing on pronunciation were effective for learning pronunciation (Lyster et al., 2013).

Hence, the current study examines how OCF relates to grammatical, phonological, lexical, and pragmatic errors in the context of language learning.

Preferences of OCF

Previous studies often found that students strongly preferred OCF (Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014; Zhu & Wang, 2019). Regarding the students' favored OCF types, Yang (2016) reported that CSL students mostly favored metalinguistic feedback followed by explicit correction and recasts for correcting all errors. Amalia et al. (2019) found that students in Indonesia preferred explicit correction and recast. Moreover, Laeli and Setiawan (2019) discovered that teachers used recast, repetition, and clarification requests more frequently than the other OCF techniques. Although the previous three techniques were mostly used to correct errors, the students preferred to receive OCF using repetition and explicit correction. Fadhilah et al. (2017) reported that explicit feedback was mostly preferred by freshmen and

sophomore students, followed by metalinguistic and repetition techniques to correct their speaking errors.

Method

This study used a survey research design for two key reasons. First, the present study primarily aims at describing ESP students' preferences. Survey research design fits well with the objective as it enables researcher to capture the preferences of a large group of students in a systematic way. According to Creswell (2012), a survey study defines a population's views, beliefs, habits, or characteristics. Following that, survey research is also helpful for identifying the perspective of individuals on policy matters and supplying relevant data for evaluating programs in educational institutions. Second, this research selected a group of students through random sampling. Creswell (2012) stated that random sampling in a survey enables the researcher to select a sample typical of the population to draw conclusions or claims.

Participants

The study was done at a private university in East Java, Indonesia. The researcher was interested in conducting a study at this university because ESP is a required subject for first-year students. The course mainly aims to improve students' communication skills. Thus, students must attend two speaking classes every week during their first semester. The study's target population was second-semester students who had taken ESP.

Furthermore, a convenience sampling of 165 ESP students was chosen to take the survey because of the sample's accessibility. Every participant agreed to participate in the study, and their confidentiality and privacy were ensured. The participants, aged 17 to 19, were second-semester students enrolled in the ESP program at the university.

Research Instruments

Close-ended questions were employed to get the data from participants. They were distributed via Google Forms. The instrument in this study is briefly described in the following table:

Table 2

Research Instruments

No.	Variable	Instrument	Data	Analysis
1	ESP Students' perceptions toward (OCF)	Students' perceptions of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF)	The students' perceptions	The total scores of the questionnaire filled out the Likert Scale (<i>Scale 1 to 5</i>)

The questionnaire was primarily used to determine how students preferred teachers providing OCF in the speaking course. A modified version of the questionnaires from Katayama (2007) and Zhang & Rahimi (2014) were used to collect the data. There are 14 statements with five Likert scales ranging from Strongly Agree (5 points) to Strongly Disagree (1 point) for items number 1 to 4, Always (5 points) to


Never (1 point) for items number 5 to 9, and Very Effective (5 points) to Very Ineffective (1 point) for items number 10 to 16. The questionnaire was initially created in English. However, the student's English proficiency may not be insufficient to provide perceptive answers. Therefore, the questionnaire was translated into Indonesian.

After the questionnaire was generated, it was then evaluated and validated by five professional ESP lecturers. Based on their feedback, two items (e.g., items no. 3 and 10) were revised for clarity. Later, a pilot test with 50 students found one invalid item (e.g., item no. 12) leading to its removal, and the final result showed that the questionnaire items were valid and reliable with Pearson Correlation of each item was above 0.279 (level of significance 5%) and Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is 0.840.

Data Collection and Analysis

In collecting the data, the researcher asked the assistance of ESP-speaking instructors to distribute the questionnaires in their classes. The instructors encouraged the students to complete the questionnaires based on their personal preferences for OCF. It took about five minutes to finish the questionnaires. After completing the questionnaires, the students might submit their answers by clicking the Google Form's submit button. After the data were collected, the researcher organized and arranged them to prepare them for analysis.

During the analysis, the data were examined in multiple stages. Initially, the survey responses were verified. A 5-point Likert Scale was used to score the students' OCF preferences. After the variable scores were entered into the table, the Statistical Package and Social Software (SPSS) was employed to analyze the data statistically. The percentage of respondents who answered each survey question is included in the calculation. The research procedures are briefly explained in Figure 1 which outlines



the steps from data collectionn to analysis.

Figure 1. Research Procedures

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The Necessity of OCF

This section aims to answer the first question regarding ESP students' perceptions of OCF. The data source for this question was the OCF questionnaire, which includes an item for this. The following table describes the mean score of the respondents selecting the options.

Table 3

ESP students' responses (OCF items number 1)

	N	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	SD
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Q1 I want my lecturer to the oral errors I made in speaking English	165	59	30	11	0	1	4.46	.736

As shown in Table 2, there is a strong agreement for receiving OCF in speaking course. Initially, 59 percent of students wanted their lecturers to fix any mistakes they made when speaking in English. 30 percent of the students agreed to receive OCF for their spoken errors. A smaller number of the students (11) were undecided (neutral) about OCF given by the lecturers in a speaking course. Only 1 percent of the students strongly disagreed with the lecturers' OCF. Overall, the first questionnaire item received a mean score of 4.46.

Provider of OCF

This section answers the second research question concerning ESP students' views toward the provider of OCF. One item examined how students valued peer correction to correct speaking errors. Table 3 describes the students' percentage of selecting the item.

Table 4

ESP students' responses (OCF items number 3)

	N	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	SD
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Q2 I want my peers to correct the oral errors I made in speaking English	165	23	26	35	10	6	3.49	1.134

As described in Table 3, 23 percent of ESP students strongly valued peer correction. Then, 26 percent of the students said they would agree if their peers fixed their errors. Furthermore, 35% of the students expressed no opinion regarding peer correction (neutral). A smaller percentage of the students (10 percent) disagreed with peer correction. In contrast, 6 percent of the students strongly objected to peer correction. The mean score of the second questionnaire item is 3.49.

Errors to be Corrected in a Speaking Course

This part addresses the third research question about ESP students' preferences regarding errors that must be corrected. The questionnaire about the types of errors is divided into several items. One item refers to overall errors, while the rest refer to grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, inappropriate expressions, and inappropriate discourse. Table 5 shows the percentage of ESP students selecting the options about their views for the overall errors.

Table 5
ESP students' responses (OCF items number 2)

		N	SA	A	N	D	SD	Mean	SD
		%	%	%	%	%	%		
Q3	Lecturers should correct all oral errors that students make in speaking English	165	47	30	20	3	0	4.21	.868

Table 4 shows ESP students wanted the lecturers to correct all their spoken errors. Of the students, 47 percent of the students strongly preferred the lecturers to correct all their speaking errors. Next, 30 percent of the students agreed to the lecturers' overall corrections for their speaking practice. A smaller percentage of the students (20 percent) were neither in agreement nor disagreement with the lecturers' overall corrections. Based on the mean score, ESP students generally favored the lecturers' overall corrections for their spoken mistakes in speaking ($M=4.21$).

In addition, despite students preferring OCF for all speaking errors, they respectively wanted to get OCF in grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse. Table 4 shows the percentage of students choosing the item.

Table 6
ESP students' responses (OCF items number 4-8)

		N	S A	A	N	D	S D	Mean	SD
			%	%	%	%	%		
Q4	Grammar	165	12	36	45	5	2	3.49	.852
Q5	Pronunciation, accent, and intonation	165	15	31	39	12	3	3.43	.989
Q6	Vocabulary usage (words, phrases)	165	15	36	38	10	1	3.53	.907
Q7	Inappropriate expressions	165	13	35	38	12	2	3.43	.944
Q8	Inappropriate discourse	165	13	27	45	12	2	3.35	.936

Based on Table 5, the majority of the students (45%, 39%, 38%, 38%, and 45%) preferred their errors in (1) grammar, (2) pronunciation, accent, and intonation, (3) vocabulary usage, (4) expression usage, and (5) discourse to be corrected sometimes. Furthermore, of the five items eliciting the students' preferences of the types of oral errors to be corrected, the two items, vocabulary usage ($M=3.53$) and grammar ($M=3.49$) received the highest mean scores. The item regarding corrections on inappropriate expressions received the lowest mean score ($M=3.35$).

Preferences of OCF Techniques

This part addresses the final research question concerning the ESP students' preferences for OCF techniques in a speaking course. OCF techniques were divided

into six categories: recast, explicit corrections, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and repetition. Table 7 shows the ESP students' preferences for OCF in a speaking course.

Table 7
ESP students' responses (OCF Number 9-14)

		N	VE %	E %	N %	I %	VI %	Mean	SD
Q9	Recast (Lecturer restating student's utterance correctly while avoiding to point out the errors)	165	26	28	28	13	5	3.56	1.164
Q10	Explicit corrections (Lecturer correcting the students' error and explaining grammatical explanation to student)	165	55	30	14	1	1	4.38	.792
Q11	Elicitation (Lecturer encouraging the student to finish and correct the sentence)	165	29	36	25	4	5	3.80	1.058
Q12	Metalinguistic feedback (Lecturer providing a suggestion or clue without pointing out the error explicitly)	165	25	32	28	9	5	3.64	1.104
Q13	Clarification request (Lecturer requested for clarification on the student's statements)	165	23	35	30	8	4	3.64	1.053
Q14	Repetition (Lecturer highlights the student's error by altering his/her tone of voice)	165	24	26	27	13	11	3.38	1.276

As described in Table 6, 26 percent of ESP students considered recast very effective. 28 percent rated it as ineffective, and 28 percent rated it neither effective nor ineffective. In contrast, 13 percent of students rated recast as ineffective, while 5 percent rated it as very ineffective.

Furthermore, most ESP students (55 percent) deemed explicit correction very effective. Following that, 30 percent of the students valued explicit correction as effective. 14 percent of students rated explicit correction neither effective nor ineffective. On the contrary, a few students (1 percent) rated explicit correction ineffective and very ineffective.

Next, 29 percent of ESP students rated elicitation as very effective. A larger number of students (36 percent) rated it effective. Furthermore, 25 percent of students rated it neither effective nor ineffective. Conversely, 4 percent of students rated it ineffective, while 5 percent valued this technique as very ineffective.

Moreover, 25 percent of ESP students rated metalinguistic feedback very effective. A comparatively larger proportion of the students (32 percent) thought metalinguistic feedback was effective. 28 percent of the students considered metalinguistic feedback neither effective nor ineffective. In the meantime, 9 percent of students rated this feedback ineffective, and 5 percent of students rated metalinguistic feedback ineffective.

In addition, 23 percent of ESP students regarded clarification requests as very effective. A higher percentage of the students (35 percent) rated clarification requests as effective. Additionally, 30 percent of the students were neutral concerning clarification requests. This indicates that the students thought the clarification request was neither effective nor ineffective. On the other hand, 8 percent of students thought that clarification requests were ineffective, and 4 percent thought it was very ineffective.

Finally, 24 percent of students rated repetition very effective, 26 percent rated the technique effective, and 27 percent rated repetition neither effective nor ineffective. In contrast, 13 and 11 percent of students rated repetition as ineffective and very ineffective.

Based on Table 6, the highest mean score went to explicit correction (Q10, $M=4.38$), followed by elicitation (Q11, $M=3.80$), metalinguistic feedback (Q12, $M=3.64$), clarification request (Q13, $M=3.64$), recast (Q9, $M=3.58$), and repetition (Q14, $M=3.38$). According to the descriptive statistics, it can be concluded that ESP students preferred either to be given the correct form for their oral errors or to receive lecturers' explanations concerning the rules of language.

Discussion

ESP Students' Perceptions Toward the Necessity of OCF

The current research initially aims to explore ESP students' views on the importance of OCF. The findings showed that the students strongly wanted their lecturers to fix the errors during speaking practice. The present study's findings align with students' positive responses to OCF (Al Ghaniy & Anugerahwati, 2023; Geçkin, 2020; Rassaei, 2015; Zhu & Wang, 2019). Furthermore, other studies also found that despite experiencing anxiety, EFL students favored OCF in oral communication classes (Al Ghaniy & Anugerahwati, 2023; Fadilah et al., 2017; Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). One obvious explanation why EFL students strongly had positive views toward OCF is because it offers many advantages, specifically for improving speaking skills. Katayama (2007) stated that OCF helps students acquire a foreign language more effectively by increasing their awareness of errors and accuracy when speaking it.

ESP Students' Perceptions Toward the Provider of OCF

The study's second objective is to investigate ESP students' views toward the provider of OCF. Generally speaking, CF can originate from lecturers, peers, and students themselves. This study focused on finding out what the students believed about peer-correction.

In accordance with the study's findings, many students perceived peer-correction positively. This result was consistent with the prior research findings (Al Ghaniy & Anugerahwati, 2023; Fadilah et al., 2017; Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Katayama, 2007; (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). In general, peer corrections offer many advantages for foreign language learning. Cohen (1975:419), cited in Katayama (2017), stated that peer correction improves students' awareness of errors. Furthermore, Tsang and Tsai (2007) added that peer feedback could give positive feelings and benefits for subsequent learning. However, students' abilities should be considered to maximize the advantage of peer correction. In the same way, Ellis (2009) clarified that if the students are familiar with the linguistics system, peer corrective feedback may be useful. This indicates that peer correction can be successfully executed if students have adequate knowledge of linguistics systems, including error recognition, identification, and corrections.

Nevertheless, despite the positive views toward peer correction, a significant number of students (35 percent) expressed neither agreement nor disagreement with peer correction. Fewer students (10 and 6 percent) disagreed and strongly disagreed with peer correction. The different views toward peer correction were due to the students favoring more on lecturers than peer corrective feedback. Prior research (Fadilah et al., 2017; Maolida, 2013; Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017) reported that EFL students favored teachers' feedback over peer correction because it was more credible.

ESP Students' Preferences of Types of Errors to be Corrected

The current study investigated the ESP students' perspectives regarding the errors that need fixing. The types of errors are separated into communication errors and errors from several domains, including grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse.

Regarding the communication errors, many ESP students (47 percent) strongly agreed with the lecturers' overall correction. This finding aligns with results from previous studies (Fadilah et al., 2017; Tomczyk, 2013). Students' favorable attitudes toward the lecturers' overall error correction were because it helped them to improve their speaking accuracy. Moreover, overall error correction assists students in learning the target language, improving their language awareness, and avoiding repeating the same errors. The previously mentioned statements aligned with the prior research (Li, 2010; Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Prior studies found that CF assists students in recognizing inconsistencies not only in their language system but also in the target language.

Conversely, the present study's findings concerning overall error correction contrasted with the previous research (Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Sheen, 2007;

Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). These studies reported that students were strongly against overall correction. Zhang & Rahimi (2014) explained that since students are primarily concerned with communicating their intentions, close attention should be given to the errors that undermine the meaning of communication in a speaking course. Similarly, Martin & Valdivia (2017) confirmed that lecturers' overall correction triggers anxiety, confusion, and disappointment. It can also discourage students' motivation to learn the target language. Consequently, lecturers are suggested to correct errors that interfere with communication.

Additionally, most students in the current study agreed that their grammatical phonological, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse errors should sometimes be corrected. These results were inconsistent with the earlier investigations (Fadilah et al., 2017; Katayama, 2007). Previous research reported that most students agreed always to receive feedback for their grammatical, phonological, lexical, pragmatic, and discourse errors. In this study, several factors explain why students preferred to receive OCF occasionally. First, students mostly found it difficult to receive corrections constantly. Second, giving students too much correction can be perplexing and make students feel inferior. If this situation continues, more students will be reluctant to speak English. Calsiyao (2015) similarly found that over-correction could lower students' self-confidence and future performance.

ESP Students' Preferences of OCF Techniques

The study's final objective was to examine ESP students' preferences for OCF techniques in a speaking course. OCF techniques were divided into six: (1) recast, (2) explicit corrections, (3) elicitation, (4) clarification request, and (5) repetition.

The current research results revealed that students mostly preferred explicit correction for correcting their oral errors. This result was consistent with the prior research (Al Ghaniy & Anugerahwati, 2023; Katayama, 2007; Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Putri & Yumarnamto, 2024). These studies found that explicit feedback assists students in identifying errors and encourages them to make appropriate corrections. A possible explanation for this finding is the students' English-speaking skills. Based on the researcher's prior examination, most ESP students were at beginner to lower-intermediate levels. Therefore, they found it difficult to practice speaking English and comprehending what others were saying. Giving implicit feedback would make it more difficult for them to notice and acknowledge their oral errors. As a result, students' errors could not be effectively corrected, and their motivation and self-confidence could be negatively affected. Providing explicit CF would be more useful at this point as students could comprehend the CF and correct their errors immediately.

Furthermore, this study indicated that elicitation and metalinguistic feedback received the second and the third highest percentage. This finding was similar to previous studies (Ha & Nguyen, 2021; Martin & Valdivia, 2017; Yang, 2016; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Elicitation necessitates the students to revise and complete the sentence that contains errors. Requesting students to revise and complete the sentence

helps students recall their understanding of the material they have learned and revise their errors with the correct form. On the contrary, metalinguistic feedback strongly emphasizes providing explicit explanations of forms, which might offer comprehensive details regarding the reasons why the form should be utilized in a specific way (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015).

After elicitation and metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests surprisingly received the fourth highest percentage. This finding runs opposite to Yang's (2016) study with CSL students, Zhang & Rahimi's (2014) with Iranian students, and Martin & Valdivia's (2017) research with students in an online learning setting. These studies reported that clarification requests made students experience anxiety and frustration as it was difficult to apprehend the objective of teachers' OCF, and they did not know how to respond to it. Nevertheless, the present study reported that some students with higher English proficiency levels could recognize lecturers' intention to correct errors and make corrections themselves. Compared to beginner-level learners, Lyster and Ranta (2012) confirmed that intermediate-level learners might be better at recognizing the teacher's intentions and correcting their errors.

Moreover, recast was revealed to be the fifth most effective OCF method. Using this method, lecturers repeat students' utterances in the correct forms without paying attention to the errors. Recast aids students in identifying and fixing errors right away. The favorable attitudes toward recast reported in contemporary research were similar to those of earlier investigations (Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017). A prior study reported that students preferred recast due to the online learning environment. In addition, repetition received the least attention in the present study. Using this method, the teacher changes the tone of his/her voice to highlight the students' errors. This method might be unclear to some students as they have to identify and correct their errors without any clear and explicit clues from lecturers. These results aligned with the previous research (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015; Katayama, 2016; Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Katayama (2006) affirmed that repetition is "potentially unclear to learners" as it comprises nonverbal cues and does not facilitate their self-correction (p.1257).

Conclusion

The present research studies students' OCF preferences in the ESP-speaking course. Overall, OCF was considered essential for improving speaking skills in the course. In addition, the students' attitudes toward peer corrections were positive. Most students strongly agreed with overall corrections. This suggests that students wanted their lecturers to correct all oral errors they produced while speaking English.

Furthermore, ESP students requested corrective feedback on their grammatical, phonological, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse errors. However, instead of correcting the errors in the previously-mentioned domains, the students only wanted to receive feedback on errors in one or two domains that significantly interfere with communication. In other words, correcting errors in all domains was not necessary if

the errors in grammar, phonology, vocabulary usage, pragmatics, and discourse did not significantly inhibit the process of transferring information. Regarding the priority of errors in five domains, the students preferred vocabulary usage errors to receive corrections more frequently. In addition, concerning the types of OCF methods, many ESP students rated explicit correction ($M=4.38$) as the most effective method to correct the students' errors followed by elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, and recast. Repetition, on the other hand, was the least favorable method as this method is more implicit and potentially makes it difficult to understand the feedback.

There are several limitations in the present study. First, this study only explores ESP students' preferences for oral corrective feedback (OCF) quantitatively. To gain more comprehensive findings for the preceding variable, future researchers are suggested to study OCF in wider contexts and settings to obtain broader results concerning the prior variables. Second, the current research only employs questionnaires to explore the students' preferences toward OCF. Hence, the forthcoming research is advised to be conducted using structured interviews and observations to collect data. Implementing those two additional instruments helps researchers to gain more reliable data.

References

- Brown, A. V. (2009). Students' and Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Foreign Language Teaching: A Comparison of Ideals. In *Source: The Modern Language Journal* (Vol. 93, Issue 1).
- Calsiyao, I. S. (n.d.). Corrective Feedback in Classroom Oral Errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College Students. In *Print) International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research* (Vol. 3). www.researchpublish.com
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Esther Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022>
- Geçkin, V. (2020). Do Gender Differences Affect Foreign Language Anxiety and Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback? * Cinsiyet Farklılıkları Yabancı Dil Kaygısını ve Sözlü Düzeltici Geribildirim Tercihlerini Etkiler Mi? *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 13(3), 591–608. <https://doi.org/10.30831/akukeg.647447>
- Ha, X. Van, & Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(1), 137–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- Ha, X. Van, & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and Sources of Oral Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: Are Students' and Teachers' Beliefs Aligned? *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160>

- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *Language Learning Journal*, 43(1), 74–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.705571>
- Kartchava, E., & Ammar, A. (2014). Learners' Beliefs as Mediators of What Is Noticed and Learned in the Language Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(1), 86–109. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.101>
- Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. In *Language Learning* (Vol. 60, Issue 2, pp. 309–365). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 265–302. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520>
- Mackey, A., Al-Khalil, M., Atanassova, G., Hama, M., Logan-Terry, A., & Nakatsukasa, K. (2007). Teachers' Intentions and Learners' Perceptions about Corrective Feedback in the L2 Classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 129–152. <https://doi.org/10.2167/illt047.0>
- Maolida, E. H. (2013). A Descriptive Study of Teacher's Oral Feedback In an ESL Young Learner Classroom in Indonesia. *K@ta*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.15.2.117-124>
- Martin, S., & Alvarez Valdivia, I. M. (2017). Students' feedback beliefs and anxiety in online foreign language oral tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0056-z>
- Millatu, R., Ghaniy, A., & Anugerahwati, M. (n.d.). Learners' Anxiety and Their Perceptions Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in ESP-Speaking Class. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, 10(3), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um011v10i32022p100-113>
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241>
- Putri, A.R., & Yumarnamto, M. 2024. Teachers' feedback and professional growth in teacher education: implications for feedback literacy. Tell: Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal. <https://doi.org/10.30651/tell.v12i1.22162>.
- Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System*, 49, 98–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.01.002>
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
- Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). EFL Students' Responses on Oral Corrective Feedbacks and Uptakes in Speaking Class. In *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* (Vol. 3, Issue 5). www.ijllnet.com
- Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of Oral Errors and Their Corrective Feedback: Teachers vs. Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(5). <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.924-931>

- Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error. *System*, 61, 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.08.004>
- Yoshida, R. (n.d.). *How Do Teachers and Learners Perceive Corrective Feedback in the Japanese Language Classroom?*
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78–93. <https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0>
- Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, 42(1), 429–439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.012>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>

