Students' Outlook on Oral Corrective Feedback Timing: Pedagogical Implications for the Global Workplace Environment

Satrio Binusa Suryadi[1], Farida Ulfa[2], Atiqah Nurul Asri[3], Fitrotul Maulidiyah[4], Risa Juliadilla[5], Widi Sriyanto[6]
[1]Jurusan Teknologi Informasi, Politeknik Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[2]Jurusan Teknologi Informasi, Politeknik Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[3]Jurusan Teknologi Informasi, Politeknik Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[4]Jurusan Akuntansi, Politeknik Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[5]Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Budaya, Universitas Gajayana, Malang, Indonesia
[6]Jurusan Teknologi Industri, Politeknik Negeri Media Kreatif, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract. Many studies have examined students' perceptions of oral corrective feedback in academic contexts, yet they remain limited in their focus on vocational education. This situation also links communication skills to job readiness and professional competence. Vocational students are encouraged not only to acquire English but also to develop practical communication skills aligned with market demands. Therefore, understanding their preferences for various types of corrective feedback is critical. This study aims to investigate vocational students' preferences for the timing of oral corrective feedback and to explore how these preferences relate to students' pedagogical competence. This study employed a quantitative descriptive method. The participants were first-year students taking an English course. Data collection was conducted through a structured questionnaire that measured students' preferences for the timing of OCF. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with selected participants to gain deeper insights into their perceptions and learning experiences. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, and qualitative data were thematically analyzed to identify common patterns in students' cognitive and affective responses to the timing of oral corrective feedback.

Keywords: Oral Corrective Feedback Timing; speaking competence; vocational students

1 Introduction

Errors that occur during students' speaking activities offer teachers opportunities to provide corrective feedback. Corrective feedback plays a crucial role in disseminating linguistic knowledge that can be directly applied in communication. Oral corrective feedback (OCF) is

[1]Corresponding author: stbinusa@polinema.ac.id

defined as a teacher's response that identifies students' speaking errors. In addition to identifying the types of errors made, OCF also facilitates students' greater linguistic understanding (Lyster et al., 2017), which is necessary for English mastery. A significant amount of research has explored the role of OCF in the English classroom.

An early study, Lyster & Ranta (1997) classified corrective feedback—such as explicit correction, sentence rephrasing, elicitation, clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback—and analyzed their implications for student acceptance and improvement. These initial findings also revealed the distinct roles of each feedback type. Elicitation and clarification requests tended to produce higher levels of student improvement than sentence rephrasing. Metalinguistic feedback encouraged students to become more aware of the linguistic components they were learning. This framework played a significant role in corrective feedback research, leading to a more in-depth investigation of learners' responses to corrective feedback.

Several studies have examined the timing of OCF and its impact on learners (Alzubi et al., 2022a; Barnes, 2023). Beyond the type of corrective feedback, the timing of its delivery has been recognized as a pedagogical factor influencing learners' cognitive processing, emotional responses, and communicative performance. The timing of OCF determines whether learners can maintain a flow of communication while simultaneously identifying their linguistic errors. Consequently, timing is crucial to maximizing the instructional value of corrective feedback without disrupting learners' engagement in speaking.

From a cognitive perspective, the timing of corrective feedback influences how learners process linguistic information. Immediate feedback allows learners to recognize errors while the communicative context is still active in their working memory, enabling them to build stronger associations between incorrect and correct language forms (Ellis, 2013; Lyster et al., 2017; Nuraini, 2016). However, excessive distractions during speech production can divide learners' attention between communicating meaning and processing linguistic form, potentially reducing fluency. In contrast, delayed feedback allows learners to finalize their ideas before reflecting on their linguistic performance. This sequence supports deeper metalinguistic reflection and encourages self-monitoring, particularly among learners developing communicative competence in EFL contexts (Kelahsarayi, 2014; Rousta et al., 2025).

The timing of corrective feedback also has important affective implications. Foreign language learners often experience speaking anxiety because they fear making mistakes and receiving negative evaluations from teacher or peers (Nguyen, 2015). Corrective feedback given while students are still speaking can be perceived as an interruption or public correction (Hamouda, 2011; Zare, 2026), which can increase nervousness and reduce their willingness to communicate. In contrast, feedback given after students have completed their utterances is often perceived as more supportive because it allows them to express their ideas without interruption before receiving guidance. Such an approach helps maintain student confidence, minimizes embarrassment, and creates a psychologically safe classroom environment where mistakes are viewed as opportunities for learning rather than as failures.

From a pedagogical perspective, lecturers should carefully consider the timing to provide feedback. The timing of corrective feedback should align with the learning objectives and the nature of the speaking task. During fluency-oriented activities (i.e., group presentations or role-plays), delayed corrective feedback is generally more appropriate because it maintains the natural flow of communication (Wildan & Ali, 2024) and encourages students to express their ideas freely. In contrast, immediate feedback may be more beneficial during accuracy-focused activities, such as pronunciation drills or grammar practice, where the teaching goal is to reinforce specific linguistic forms (Brindis Morales, 2024; Ellis, 2013; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). By implementing flexible feedback, lecturers can balance communicative interaction with language accuracy.

A study conducted by Fadilah et al., (2017) revealed that first- and second-year students preferred delayed feedback due to its timing. Delayed corrective feedback was perceived as more in line with the natural flow of classroom interactions since they were allowed to complete their sentences thoroughly. Consequently, students perceived immediate correction as a distraction from their concentration, making it more difficult to understand and retain the feedback. The study further emphasized that the timing of OCF is a critical determinant of students' acceptance of corrective feedback (Gamlo, 2019). When feedback is provided at an inappropriate time, it led to students' anxiety and reduced their willingness to participate in speaking activities actively.

The current findings reinforce the view that timing should be considered an integral component of effective Oral Corrective Feedback, rather than merely a procedural decision. Appropriate timing not only facilitates students' attention to linguistic errors but also supports emotional well-being (Nekuruhmotlagh, 2019; Soruç et al., 2025), encourages active participation, and promotes meaningful learning experiences. For vocational EFL learners, whose primary goal is to develop communicative competence for professional contexts, timely corrective feedback can strengthen declarative linguistic knowledge and practical communicative skills. Therefore, EFL teachers are encouraged to adopt a flexible approach to feedback timing, taking into account learners' proficiency level, speaking goals, classroom atmosphere, and psychological readiness. Such an approach is expected to maximize the pedagogical benefits of Oral Corrective Feedback while reducing speaking anxiety and promoting long-term language development.

Similar results were observed in a study by Aziz and Jayaputri (2023), which investigated the timing of OCF provision among non-English language students. They found that most students preferred delayed corrective feedback because it allowed them to adapt more comfortably to learning activities without disrupting the flow of communication. Students perceived immediate correction as additional pressure during speaking tasks, whereas delayed feedback allowed them to reflect on their errors after completing their utterances. Furthermore, they perceived corrective feedback as a diagnostic tool that facilitates language learning rather than simply correcting errors. By receiving feedback after speaking activities, learners can gradually build their linguistic knowledge while maintaining confidence in communication.

Previous research in Indonesian EFL classrooms has also shown that delayed corrective feedback positively contributes to students' language development, particularly by improving grammatical accuracy and vocabulary mastery (Halim et al., 2021). One of the main advantages of delayed feedback is its flexibility, which allows teachers to adjust the content and timing of corrections based on learners' proficiency levels, learning objectives, and classroom context. This flexibility allows lecturers to prioritize communication fluency (Czaholi, 2021) during speaking activities while still providing opportunities for reflection and language improvement afterward.

Although previous research has yielded valuable insights into learner preferences, cognitive engagement, and the pedagogical benefits of corrective feedback, existing research has largely been conducted in general academic settings (Mulyani et al., 2022; Yousefi, 2015), including secondary schools, English language education programs, and non-vocational higher education institutions (Atma and Widiati, 2015). These educational contexts generally emphasize academic language achievement, linguistic accuracy, and exam performance. Consequently, their findings may not fully reflect the learning characteristics and communicative demands experienced by vocational students, whose English learning is primarily geared toward workplace communication and professional competence (Gaffar et al., 2024).

Research investigating Oral Corrective Feedback in vocational education remains relatively limited, particularly in Indonesia. Existing studies have largely examined the

effectiveness or timing of corrective feedback in improving language accuracy (Guibangguibang, 2020; Rassaei & Moinzadeh, 2011) , while relatively little attention has been paid to how vocational students perceive various feedback strategies in relation to their practical communication needs, classroom participation, and future employability. Similarly, the role of feedback timing in balancing communication fluency, students' emotional well-being, and the development of workplace-oriented communication skills has not been sufficiently explored in vocational EFL classrooms.

This gap is significant because vocational education is unique in that students are expected not only to acquire linguistic competence but also to develop communicative competencies in authentic professional environments (Van Ha et al., 2021), such as workplace discussions, project presentations, job interviews, and interactions with international clients. Therefore, understanding students' preferences regarding the timing and delivery of oral corrective feedback is crucial for designing feedback practices that simultaneously improve language accuracy, communicative confidence, and employability.

Unlike previous studies that primarily focused on linguistic outcomes or general EFL contexts, this study explores corrective feedback through its cognitive, affective, and pedagogical dimensions in vocational higher education. Thus, this study provides empirical evidence to inform the development of context-sensitive feedback practices that support the development of language and communicative competencies needed in vocational and professional settings.

This study will specifically examine vocational students' preferences regarding the timing of OCF in English classes. The novelty of this study lies in its investigation of the timing of OCF tailored to the urgency of English use in the workplace. The research question for this study is:

"What are vocational students' perceptions of the timing of oral corrective feedback, and how does such timing influence their learning outcomes?"

2 Method

2.1 Design

A quantitative descriptive design is used for this study. This design is considered appropriate for the study because the researcher intended to examine students' perceptions of OCF timing and its relationship to students' pedagogical outcomes in English class. This study used a quantitative descriptive research design to investigate vocational students' preferences regarding the timing of OCF in English-speaking classrooms. A quantitative descriptive approach was deemed appropriate because the primary purpose of this study was to systematically describe students' perceptions and preferences regarding various corrective feedback timing strategies, rather than to examine cause-and-effect relationships or to test the effectiveness of an intervention. Furthermore, this design allowed the researchers to identify response patterns that reflect students' pedagogical needs and expectations regarding the implementation of OCF in vocational EFL classrooms.

This study specifically explored how students perceive the timing of corrective feedback and how these preferences can contribute to meaningful learning experiences in speaking instruction. Understanding learners' preferences is crucial for designing pedagogically appropriate feedback practices that not only facilitate language development but also enhance learners' engagement and confidence during oral communication activities.

2.2 Participant

The participants in this study comprised 46 undergraduate students from the Information Technology Department at the State Polytechnic of Malang, Indonesia. The participants were selected through purposive sampling because they met the specific criteria established for the study. All participants were first-year vocational students enrolled in the Bahasa Inggris Dasar course during the data collection period. They were considered suitable participants because the course emphasized developing English-speaking skills and regularly incorporated oral corrective feedback during classroom interactions.

The participants represented vocational EFL learners whose English learning is closely related to the development of communicative competence required in professional and workplace settings. Their learning experiences provided an appropriate context for investigating preferences regarding the timing of corrective feedback in speaking activities.

Primary data were collected using a closed-ended questionnaire adapted from Ha and Nguyen (2021), Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Ozturk and Ozturk (2016). The questionnaire focused on students' preferences regarding the timing of Oral Corrective Feedback during speaking activities and used a five-point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Before data collection, the instrument was reviewed by specialists in English Language Teaching to ensure its content validity, clarity, and contextual appropriateness for vocational students. Feedback obtained from the validation process was used to refine several questionnaire items before the instrument was administered to the participants.

This study applies ethical research principles by obtaining informed consent prior to data collection. Informed consent was obtained from all participants during both the pilot and main studies. The document included information on the research objectives, implementation procedures, benefits and potential risks, guarantees of data confidentiality, and the participant's right to refuse or withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences. All participants were adult students with the capacity to provide independent consent, and informed consent was obtained from each participant prior to participation in the study.

2.3 Data collection

A questionnaire was distributed online (Google Forms) to collect data on students' preferences for OCF timing. The questionnaire on the timing of oral corrective feedback was adopted from Ha & Nguyen (2021) to accommodate the participants' circumstances. The questionnaire contained 14 items on students' perspectives on the timing of corrective feedback and its implications for pedagogical aspects. Respondents filled out the questionnaire with one answer that best reflected their experiences in English classes. The questionnaire used a Likert scale (1-5). The data procedure was carried out by (1) selecting participants, (2) placement test, (3) distributing the questionnaire, and (4) calculating the data and analysing them.

Data were primarily collected via a structured online questionnaire administered through Google Forms to investigate students' preferences regarding the timing of OCF. The questionnaire was adapted from Ha and Nguyen (2021) and modified to suit the context of vocational EFL learners. It consisted of 14 items addressing students' perceptions of the timing of corrective feedback and its pedagogical implications in English-speaking classes. Respondents were asked to select one response that best represented their learning experiences using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

As this study employed a quantitative descriptive design, the questionnaire served as the primary instrument for data collection. To strengthen the interpretation of the survey findings,

semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 students purposively selected from the 30 participants in the study. The interview participants were chosen to represent a range of responses identified in the questionnaire, thereby providing additional explanations of the patterns observed in the quantitative data. The interviews were not intended to generate a separate qualitative analysis; rather, they functioned as supporting evidence to clarify and enrich the interpretation of students' preferences regarding the timing of Oral Corrective Feedback. Selecting approximately one-third of the participants was considered sufficient to obtain representative explanations while maintaining the study's primary focus on quantitative description.

The data collection procedure consisted of four stages. First, participants who met the research criteria were identified and invited to participate in the study. Second, a placement test was administered to ensure that the participants had relatively comparable English proficiency levels before completing the questionnaire. Third, the online questionnaire was distributed to all participants, followed by interviews with the selected respondents to obtain additional explanations regarding their responses. Finally, the questionnaire data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, to identify students' preference patterns. The interview findings were used solely to support and strengthen the interpretation of the quantitative results presented in the discussion section.

2.4 Data Analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed using a descriptive quantitative approach. Prior to the analysis, the questionnaire responses were coded according to a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Each item represented students' perceptions of the timing of OCF and its pedagogical implications in English-speaking classes. The instrument consisted of 14 items, and each response was converted into numerical scores to facilitate descriptive statistical analysis. Prior to its administration, the questionnaire underwent expert validation to ensure its content validity, linguistic clarity, and contextual appropriateness for vocational EFL learners.

The reliability analysis was conducted on 32 undergraduate students who participated in the pilot study. The results showed that the questionnaire demonstrated excellent internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .951, indicating that the items consistently measured the same underlying construct

The quantitative data were analyzed by calculating frequency distributions, percentages, mean scores, and standard deviations for each questionnaire item. Frequency and percentage analyses were used to describe the distribution of students' responses across the five Likert-scale categories. Mean scores were calculated to identify the overall tendency of students' preferences toward each statement regarding the timing of Oral Corrective Feedback. Higher mean values indicated stronger agreement with particular feedback practices, whereas lower mean values reflected weaker preferences.

In addition, the standard deviation was calculated to assess the variability and consistency of students' responses. A low standard deviation indicates that students held relatively similar perceptions regarding a particular feedback-timing practice, suggesting a stronger consensus that may serve as a reliable pedagogical guideline for lecturers. Conversely, a high standard deviation reflects greater variation in students' preferences, indicating that learners responded differently to specific feedback timing strategies. From a pedagogical perspective, such variation suggests that a single feedback timing approach may not adequately accommodate the needs of all learners. Instead, lecturers should consider adopting a more flexible, context-sensitive approach to determining whether corrective feedback should be

provided immediately or delayed, taking into account learners' proficiency levels, speaking objectives, classroom dynamics, and emotional readiness.

Furthermore, interpreting the standard deviation enabled the researchers to identify which aspects of feedback timing generated the strongest agreement among students and which required greater instructional flexibility. Feedback practices characterized by high agreement may be considered pedagogically appropriate for broader classroom implementation, whereas practices associated with more diverse responses should be adapted according to learners' individual differences and the communicative demands of specific speaking tasks. Consequently, the combination of mean scores and standard deviations not only describes students' preferences statistically but also provides empirical evidence to inform the development of learner-centered Oral Corrective Feedback practices in vocational English classrooms.

Finally, each questionnaire item was analyzed individually to gain a more detailed understanding of students' perceptions of the timing of Oral Corrective Feedback. The analysis focused on identifying preference patterns related to the pedagogical role of feedback timing in supporting speaking development, learner engagement, confidence, and classroom participation. Examining individual items enabled the researchers to identify specific aspects of feedback timing that were perceived as beneficial or challenging for vocational EFL learners. To strengthen the interpretation of the quantitative findings, supporting evidence from semi-structured interviews was incorporated into the discussion, enabling the researchers to provide richer explanations of the observed response patterns while maintaining the study's quantitative descriptive nature.

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Results

To portray the data, descriptive statistics were used to identify patterns in students' preferences for the timing of oral corrective feedback. The results gained a positive response from students' preferences.

Descriptive analysis of the time spent providing OCF showed high mean scores across all items, varying from M = 3.73 to M = 4.48. This suggests that students did not always agree that certain types of errors should be corrected, despite differing priorities. This finding suggests that students adapt OCF strategies to their learning needs for the target language.

The highest mean score is for the statement "All speaking errors should be corrected" (M = 4.48; SD = 0.71), suggesting that students strongly support comprehensive error correction. This is followed by "Errors related to the focus of the lesson are the most important and worth correcting" (M = 4.22; SD = 0.61) and "Errors that impede communication are the most important and worth correcting" (M = 4.19; SD = 0.74). Other items, such as frequently occurring errors (M = 4.15; SD = 0.76) and less frequent errors (M = 4.12; SD = 0.68), also show high understanding, indicating that students perceive both recurring and occasional errors as important to address. Meanwhile, the lowest mean score is found in the statement "Some errors are not related to the focus of the lesson, but they need to be corrected" (M = 3.74; SD = 0.72), although it still falls within the "agree" category. The relatively low standard deviation values (ranging from 0.61 to 0.76) indicate that students' responses are fairly consistent, suggesting a shared understanding of the importance of timing corrective feedback.

Table 1. Percentages of student's perception on OCF Timing

No.	Items	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
1	All speaking errors should be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	4,48	0,71
2	Not all speaking errors should be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	4,20	0,58
3	Errors that impede communication are the most important and should be corrected.	46	1	5	4,19	0,74
4	Errors that do not affect communication are not a priority for correction.	46	1	5	4,02	0,61
5	Some errors that do not hinder communication do not need to be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	4,08	0,61
6	Some errors that hinder communication should be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	4,02	0,39
7	Frequently occurring speaking errors are the most important and should be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	4,14	0,75
8	Frequently occurring speaking errors are important but can be corrected at the end of the lesson.	46	1	5	4,01	0,62
9	Errors related to the lesson objectives are the most important and deserve correction	46	1	5	4,21	0,61
10	Errors related to the lesson objectives are not urgent and can be corrected at the end of the lesson	46	1	5	4,04	0,49
11	Common errors occurring in class should be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	4,11	0,67
12	Common errors occurring in class do not have to be corrected immediately	46	1	5	3,87	0,42
13	Errors unrelated to the learning outcomes should be corrected immediately	46	1	5	3,73	0,71
14	Errors unrelated to the learning outcomes do not need to be corrected immediately.	46	1	5	3,51	0,57

3.2 Discussion

3.2.1 All speaking errors should be corrected immediately

The first item obtained the highest mean score (M = 4.48), indicating that most students agreed that errors in speaking activities should be corrected immediately. This finding suggests that learners value timely feedback because it helps them discover and correct errors (Alzubi et al., 2022b; Aranguiz & Espinoza, 2016). However, the relatively higher standard deviation (SD = 0.71) compared with several other items indicates that, although agreement was generally strong, some students held differing opinions regarding immediate correction. This variation implies that not all learners are equally comfortable with immediate interruption during speaking activities. Pedagogically, lecturers should provide immediate

feedback selectively, particularly when the instructional objective emphasizes linguistic accuracy rather than communicative fluency.

3.2.2 Not all speaking errors should be corrected immediately

Students also strongly agreed that not every speaking error requires immediate correction (M = 4.20). The relatively low standard deviation (SD = 0.58) indicates a high level of consensus among respondents. This finding suggests that learners recognize the importance of maintaining communication without excessive distractions. When communicating, learners are focused on their performance. Even minor distractions during communication can affect their performance, with implications for students' motivation to learn. These results support the principles of communicative language teaching, suggesting that delayed feedback may be preferable for minor errors that do not disrupt communication. According to Ellis (2013), the timing of OCF delivery plays a crucial role in helping learners notice previously overlooked language forms. These findings support recent findings on students' concerns about the feedback provided.

3.2.3 Errors that impede communication are the most important to correct

The high mean score (M = 4.19) on this item indicates that students prioritize error correction over those that interfere with communication. However, this item yielded one of the highest standard deviations (SD = 0.74), indicating greater variability in student responses. While many students considered errors that interfere with communication to be corrected immediately, others were more comfortable with their errors being corrected after speaking. This finding suggests that students differ in their thresholds for interference, highlighting the need for adaptable corrective feedback practices.

The majority of students believe that communication deserves more awareness in EFL learning. Speaking activities often lead students to make mistakes, and in this regard, they also expect lecturers to provide corrections. The timing of OCF determines the errors that must be corrected. Previous studies examining students' and teachers' beliefs about OCF tend to focus on language learning and teaching in general (Mardian & Nafissi, 2022; Nurfaidah et al., 2024). The literature on the targets of corrective feedback has been underexplored. A study by Halim et al., (2021) supports these findings, as they found that students wait for lecturer feedback sooner after completing their task. Students demand immediate feedback to help them improve their performance. Therefore, this study also highlights students' views, particularly in college settings, regarding the urgency and purpose of OCF.

3.2.4 Errors that do not affect communication are not a priority for correction

The results showed that students also agreed that minor errors do not need to be corrected immediately (M = 4.02). The relatively low standard deviation (SD = 0.61) reflects a consistent perception across respondents. Students were more likely to agree that minor errors receive delayed feedback (Rousta et al., 2025) because they would not significantly impact their performance. From a pedagogical perspective, lecturers could provide feedback on minor grammatical or pronunciation errors at the end of the session, allowing students to

complete their speeches (Kelahsarayi, 2014) and maintain a smooth flow of communication. This also avoids distracting students if they are suddenly interrupted while speaking.

3.2.5 Some errors that do not hinder communication do not need to be corrected immediately

Students agreed to receive delayed correction on aspects of errors that do not disrupt communication (M = 4.08). The relatively consistent responses (SD = 0.61) demonstrated their belief in the benefits of communication flow. Their focus on the activity's performance was crucial, so as long as the activity proceeded naturally, delayed feedback was an appropriate option. These findings reinforce the importance of balancing linguistic accuracy with communicative confidence during speaking instruction.

Students need OCF, whether or not they make errors. Students sometimes feel more comfortable when teachers provide feedback, comments, or even corrections to mistakes they might make. Even if there is a minor error, students still need feedback as a strategy to deepen their knowledge of the target language. Compared to Zulfikar (2023) study, the immediate OCF might trigger anxious feelings when students are not ready. Conversely, the timing of OCF is not part of the student response, as it is part of the learning strategies. Aliakbari et al. (2023) reported that the OCF role is as important as the process of language acquisition. He emphasised that the timing of OCF contributes to students' motivation to participate in the classroom, especially when it is given instantly. Hence, the timing of immediate OCF significantly impacts students' performance.

3.2.6 Some errors that hinder communication should be corrected immediately

This item yielded the lowest standard deviation (SD = 0.39), indicating the strongest consensus among participants. Students mostly agreed that errors that disrupt communication should be corrected immediately. This urgency is the focus of learning, as expected in class. Errors related to communication skills should receive exceptional awareness (Wildan & Ali, 2024). The very low variability indicates that this preference is nearly universal. Pedagogically, errors that hinder communication should be a top priority for lecturers during speaking activities (Zare, 2026), as they directly affect the success of students' interactions.

3.2.7 Frequently occurring speaking errors are the most important and should be corrected immediately

Students agreed that repeated errors warrant immediate corrective feedback (M = 4.14). However, this item had the highest standard deviation (SD = 0.75), indicating considerable response diversity. Some students preferred immediate correction to prevent recurrence of errors (Brindis Morales, 2024). This was intended to help them understand their errors. Others preferred delayed feedback to avoid communication breakdowns. This variation suggests that lecturers should consider the classroom context and student preferences before deciding time to correct errors.

For vocational students, speaking is the skill that requires the most feedback. The timing of OCF increases when it relates to its use in communication. Students rely on OCF from lecturers to help them communicate confidently. Speaking is used almost always in class (questions and answers, discussions, and presentations), so this aspect requires more frequent feedback than the others. Similar to the study by Nurya & Tyas (2022), which found that when students produced utterances, they needed direct guidance from their teacher. Immediate feedback is necessary to keep them on track and fully engaged in the activities.

Students also perceive that receiving corrective feedback when speaking makes it easier to demonstrate their speaking skills in learning activities.

3.2.8 Frequently occurring speaking errors are important but can be corrected at the end of the lesson

Students also acknowledged that recurring errors could be addressed after the speaking activity (M = 4.01). The relatively low standard deviation (SD = 0.62) indicates that most respondents perceived delayed feedback as an effective alternative. This is supported by students' focus on fluency (Nekuruhmotlagh, 2019) in their performance. Therefore, summarizing all the errors after speaking activities can encourage student reflection while maintaining fluency in communication.

3.2.9 Errors related to the lesson objectives are the most important and deserve correction

This item received one of the highest mean scores (M = 4.21), indicating that students desired corrective feedback aligned with learning objectives. When they received feedback that aligned with what they were learning, it clarified their understanding (Alzubi et al., 2022c; Soruç et al., 2025) and made them enthusiastic about actively participating in the learning process. The relatively small standard deviation (SD = 0.61) indicated significant agreement among respondents. This finding suggests that students expected feedback to support the learning outcomes of each speaking activity. Students' focus remained on how they understood the material (Yousefi, 2015), rather than addressing every possible error they made in class.

3.2.10 Errors related to the lesson objectives are not urgent and can be corrected at the end of the lesson

Students also agreed that lesson-related errors can be corrected after the task is completed (M = 4.04). Providing delayed feedback allows students to focus on their performance. The very low standard deviation (SD = 0.49) reflects a strong consensus that delayed correction can remain pedagogically effective (Mulyani et al., 2022) as long as it aligns with the learning objectives. Once students have completed the activity, they are more receptive to suggestions or feedback. These results support the practice of post-task feedback, which is generally recommended in communicative language teaching.

3.2.11 Common errors occurring in class should be corrected immediately.

Students agreed that infrequent errors also require immediate feedback (M = 4.11). This consideration was based on the anticipation of repeated errors that could affect their performance. The moderate standard deviation (SD = 0.67) indicates that although most respondents supported immediate correction, some students believed that delayed feedback was still helpful (Guibangguibang, 2020). However, this could be an important note for lecturers to evaluate whether the error is likely to cause misunderstandings. The feedback can be tailored to the students' natural settings.

Students view the timing of OCF on speaking as crucial, as it aligns with their needs in English classes. However, students need feedback, even if it's not always related to speaking (Rassaei & Moinzadeh, 2011). Students also respond positively to corrective feedback on writing, such as correcting omissions, grammatical errors, and other aspects of improving

their English output. But for other skills, the timing of feedback depends on the students' learning targets. For writing structures, students preferred the delayed time for corrective feedback (Nipaspong, 2022). These study supports the finding that, for writing corrective feedback, there is greater variation in timing. Students preferred immediate feedback on writing mechanics over grammatical aspects. These findings also indicate that students do not completely neglect feedback on other skills. Aspects of grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and the appropriate use of other linguistic elements remain important for obtaining adequate feedback.

3.2.12 Common errors occurring in class do not have to be corrected immediately

Although the mean score was slightly lower (M = 3.87), the low standard deviation (SD = 0.42) indicated strong agreement among students that common speaking errors do not always require immediate correction. It is natural for students to make minor errors when speaking (Öztürk, 2016), but it is still considered part of the learning process (Shirkhani & Tajeddin, 2016). This encourages lecturers to avoid interrupting students even when errors require correction. Furthermore, this finding indicates that students can distinguish between recurring and occasional errors and expect lecturers to focus on more significant language issues.

3.2.13 Errors unrelated to the learning outcomes should be corrected immediately

This item received a relatively lower mean score (M = 3.73) with relatively high variability (SD = 0.71). There appears to be a difference in opinion regarding the urgency of providing immediate feedback on material (Amalia et al., 2009) that is not a learning outcome. These results provide lecturers with input to avoid over-correcting language forms unrelated to learning objectives. This is because it can disrupt students' focus on learning. Providing unnecessary feedback can disrupt communication without offering substantial learning benefits.

3.2.14 Errors unrelated to the learning outcomes do not need to be corrected immediately

The final item received the lowest mean score (M = 3.51), indicating that students were relatively less confident about delayed feedback (Jabbari & Fazilatfar, 2012) of inappropriate errors. However, the relatively low standard deviation (SD = 0.57) indicates that respondents' perceptions remained fairly consistent. Students' focus remained on corrective feedback that aligned with established learning outcomes (Fadilah et al., 2017). This finding suggests that students still valued corrective feedback. Students expect lecturers to exercise careful consideration when deciding whether seemingly unrelated errors should be addressed immediately or postponed.

4 Conclusion

The aim of this research was to investigate students' preferences for the timing of OCF. The findings indicate that most students favour feedback provided immediately after they produce an utterance. This preference is reflected in the questionnaire results, which show mean scores ranging from M = 3.73 to M = 4.48, suggesting a generally positive attitude toward various timing options, with a clear inclination toward immediacy. These results imply that

students perceive timing not merely as a technical aspect of feedback delivery, but also as a strategic component closely related to how learning targets are prioritised during classroom interaction.

A closer examination of the data reveals that students associate immediate OCF with more effective learning outcomes, particularly in terms of understanding and internalising linguistic forms. When feedback is delivered immediately after an error, students are better able to connect the correction to the original utterance, thereby facilitating the noticing of linguistic gaps. This immediate connection between error and correction is crucial in supporting learners' cognitive processing, as it reduces the possibility of misunderstanding or forgetting the context in which the error occurred. As a result, students perceive immediate feedback as a means of accelerating their language acquisition, especially in developing speaking accuracy.

These findings are consistent with previous research, such as studies (Al-Hassaani & Qaid, 2021; Alzubi et al., 2022; Wiboolyasarin et al., 2022) which show that direct, immediate feedback plays a supportive role in helping learners identify and acquire target language forms. Immediate OCF is seen as particularly beneficial in speaking contexts, where errors occur in real time (Aranguiz & Espinoza, 2016) and require timely intervention to prevent fossilisation. However, while students demonstrate a strong preference for immediate feedback, this tendency should be interpreted with caution. Over-reliance on immediate correction may disrupt the flow of communication and affect learners' confidence, especially in more communicative or fluency-oriented activities.

References

Al-Hassaani, A. M. A., & Qaid, A. F. M. (2021). Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Speaking Skills to the Yemeni EFL Learners at Aden University: A Case Study. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, *12*(1), 374–387.

Aliakbari, M., Aryan, M., & Sourani, M. (2023). Efficacy of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Grammatical Accuracy. *Al-Adab Journal*, *1*(144), 61–84. https://doi.org/10.31973/aj.v1i144.3955

Alzubi, A. A. F., Nazim, M., & Al-Mwzaiji, K. N. A. (2022a). Learning through Correction: Oral Corrective Feedback in Online EFL Interactions. *World Journal of English Language*, *12*(8), 382–389. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v12n8p382

Amalia, Z. D. H., Fauziati, E., & Marmanto, S. (2009). Preferences for the Oral Corrective Feedback Types in Speaking Classroom : Voices From Male and Female University Students. *Proceeding of 3rd International Conference of Arts Language and Culture*, 109–116.

Aranguiz, M. F., & Espinoza, A. Q. (2016). Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies in EFL. A Pilot Study In Chilean Classrooms. *Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada*, *16*, 103–132. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19893492

Atma, Nurul; Widiati, U. (2015). EFL university teachers ' perspectives in written corrective feedback and their actual applications. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Seni*, *43*(2), 183–195. https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i3.21641

Aziz, M. F., & Jayaputri, H. E. (2023). EFL Learners' Perspective on Corrective Feedback. *Scope : Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(2), 219. https://doi.org/10.30998/scope.v7i2.14806

Barnes, A. J. (2023). Online Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Outside of Class Time: (In)effectiveness and Task Engagement. *Technology in Language Teaching and Learning*, *5*(2), 37–58. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v5n2.911

Brindis Morales, A. (2024). English language Teachers' and EFL Students' perceptions of oral errors and corrective feedback in a rural institution. *Revista Lengua y Cultura*, *6*(11), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.29057/lc.v6i11.13450

Czaholi, A. (2021). *The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback in experimental and quasi-experimental studies : A systematic literature review*. *Independen*, 36. http://lnu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1567543/FULLTEXT01.pdf%0Ahttp://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:lnu:diva-104875

Ellis, R. (2013). Corrective feedback in teacher guides and SLA. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *1*(3), 1–18.

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. https://doi.org/10.17977/um030v5i22017p076

Gaffar, M. A., Syaidina, R. A., Farida, D., Winulya, F. P., & Mufti, D. M. (2024). Speak Up! Empowering Vocational EFL Students through Oral Corrective Feedback. *Veles*, *8*(3), 26–38. https://doi.org/10.53103/cjess.v2i5.71

Gamlo, N. H. (2019). EFL Learners' Preferences of Corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities. *World Journal of English Language*, *9*(2), 28. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v9n2p28

Guibangguibang, H. R. B. (2020). Association between oral error corrections of university teacher and english majors' language anxiety in philippine higher education context. *International Journal of Language Education*, *4*(2), 183–193. https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v4i2.13601

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*(June), 370–371. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160

Halim, T., Wahid, R., & Halim, S. (2021). EFL students' attitudes toward corrective feedback: a study conducted at undergraduate level. *Saudi Journal of Language Studies*, *1*(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1108/sjls-03-2021-0004

Hamouda, A. (2011). A Study of Students and Teachers' Preferences and Attitudes towards Correction of Classroom Written Errors in Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(3), 128–141. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p128

Jabbari, A. A., & Fazilatfar, A. M. (2012). The Role of Error Types and Feedback in Iranian EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, *2*(1), 135–148. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p135

Kelahsarayi, T. R. (2014). Extrovert and Introvert Learners' Attitudes and Preferences for Error Correction in Speaking. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *4*(9), 268. https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7315.2014.00988.5

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *2*, 37–66. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2017). *State-of-the-Art Article*. *2010*(2013), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365

Mardian, F., & Nafissi, Z. (2022). Synchronous Computer-mediated Corrective Feedback and EFL Learners' Grammatical Knowledge Development: A Sociocultural Perspective. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *10*(2), 115–136. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2022.121186

Mulyani, S., Ningsih, N., & Setyaningrum, N. I. (2022). Students' Perceptions Towards Oral Corrective Feedback in a Speaking Class. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal)*, *8*(1), 174–183. https://doi.org/10.24252/eternal.v81.2022.a12

Nekuruhmotlagh, L. (2019). *Most Common Type of Corrective Feedback in Iranian Classrooms*. 2–9. https://doi.org/10.33422/areconf.2019.07.347

Nguyen, T. (2015). The Effectiveness of Online Learning: Beyond No Significant Difference and Future Horizons. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, *11*(2), 309–319.

Nipaspong, P. (2022). The Effects of Online Corrective Feedback on University Students' Self-Regulation in Writing. *Pasaa*, *64*(December), 23–51. https://doi.org/10.58837/chula.pasaa.64.1.2

Nuraini, K. (2016). The Barriers of Teaching Speaking English for EFL Learners. *ELLITE: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.32528/ellite.v1i1.159

Nurfaidah, S., Khairunnisa, U., Syukri, S., & Jamilarin, P. A. P. (2024). Exploring teachers' corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Pre-service teachers' reflections. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, *14*(2), 523–544. https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v14i2.8863

Nurya, S. W., & Tyas, P. A. (2022). EFL Students Responses' to Online Corrective Feedback in the Teaching of Academic Writing during the Covid-19. *Journal of English Language and Education*, *7*(2), 122–131. https://doi.org/10.31004/jele.v7i2.292

Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *12*(2), 22–37. www.jlls.org

Rassaei, E., & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *English Language Teaching*, *4*(2), 97. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n2p97

Rousta, B., Sarkhosh, M., & Moafian, F. (2025). Navigating the Maze of Emotions: A Deep Dive into Teenage EFL Learners' Sentiments Toward Oral Corrective Feedback. *International Journal of Instruction*, *19*(1), 567–578. https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2026.19128a

Shirkhani, S., & Tajeddin, Z. (2016). L2 Teachers' Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback and Its Linguistic Focus. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *19*(1), 181–206. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijal.19.1.181

Soruç, A., Yuksel, D., McKinley, J., & Grimshaw, T. (2025). Factors influencing EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback: the role of teaching experience. *Language Learning Journal*, *53*(1), 98–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2024.2338346

Van Ha, X., Murray, J. C., & Mehdi Riazi, A. (2021). High school EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *11*(2), 235–264. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.2.4

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

Wildan, M., & Ali, A. (2024). *EFL Undergraduate Students' Perceptions and Preferences Towards Oral Corrective Feedback Approval Sheet EFL Undergraduate Students' Perceptions and*.

Yousefi, V. (2015). Corrective feedback preferences among Iranian EFL students. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, *4*(5), 37–45. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsll.2015.1101

Zare, M. (2026). Oral corrective feedback: Iranian in-service EFL teachers' cognitions and reported practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688251391502

Zulfikar, Z. (2023). Reducing EFL Learners' Speaking Anxiety through Selective Error Correction and Group Work. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures (JETALL)*, *6*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.20527/jetall.v6i1.13298