



Teacher's Oral Feedback in Speaking Activity at the Tenth Grade of Senior High School

Nurul Azmi^{1*}, Ariatna²

^{1,2} English Language Education, Universitas Negeri Medan, Indonesia

Email: nnurazmi66@gmail.com^{1*}, ariatna@unimed.ac.id²

* Corresponding Author: nnurazmi66@gmail.com

Abstract. This study aimed to identify the types of teacher oral feedback strategies used during speaking activities and to describe their implementation at the tenth grade of MAN Pematangsiantar. This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design. The data were collected through classroom observation, supported by video recording, audio recording, and field notes, involving one English teacher and thirty-six students of grade tenth. The data were analyzed using the oral corrective feedback framework proposed by Ellis (2009) and the learner error categories proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), as adapted by Faris (2018). The qualitative data were analyzed through the procedures proposed by Miles, et al. (2014). The findings revealed that the teacher used four out of six oral feedback strategies, namely recast, clarification request, explicit correction, and elicitation. Recast was the most frequently used strategy (45.4%), followed by clarification request (27.2%), explicit correction (18.1%), and elicitation (9.09%). Repetition and paralinguistic signal were not observed during the classroom interactions. Furthermore, the implementation of oral feedback was triggered by four types of learner errors, namely grammar errors, vocabulary errors, pronunciation errors, and L1 use. Grammar and pronunciation errors were the most frequently occurring errors.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback; Learner Errors; Oral Feedback; Speaking Activity; Teacher Feedback.

1. INTRODUCTION

Speaking is commonly developed through classroom interaction. Bambaeroo and Shokrpour (2017) argue that student who has speaking skill are better equipped to participate actively in classroom discussion, expressing idea and understand academic content. Manire et al. (2023) also explain that the ability to express oneself verbally is crucial for success in presentation, debates, and other academic activities. Therefore, in order to develop students' speaking ability, teachers can implement various speaking activities in the classroom. Activities such as dialogue, survey, picture description, picture differences, role play, story completion, and story-telling can be fun and formative to promote students' speaking skills (Suban, 2021). Through this speaking activities teachers can assess students' level in speaking, provide opportunities for students to speak, and give students insight into language structures and function (Lightbrown & Spada, 2006). However, the effectiveness of speaking activities depends not only on the activities themselves but also on the strategies used by teacher to facilitate learning, one of the strategies is giving feedback to the student (Killian, 2016)

Teacher feedback plays an important role in guiding students' speaking performance by increasing their awareness of their strengths and areas that need improvement during classroom interaction (Mahara & Hartono, 2024). Feedback is one of the key factors in developing students' language proficiency (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013), which can also

motivate and boost students' confidence in speaking activities (Fadzil et al., 2021). Studies have found that the types of corrective feedback commonly used in speaking activities include elicitation, explicit correction, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, recasts, and clarification (Yusovi, Asmiyah, & Mutarom, 2021). This is also similar with type of oral feedback strategies proposed by Ellis (2009). According to Mahara and Hartono (2024) students who receive constructive feedback are better able to identify and correct their speech errors, which helps improve their language comprehension and use. It can be concluded that teacher feedback contribute to learner' language development.

In teaching process, teacher need to be able to implement a variety of oral or written corrective feedback strategies (Ellis, 2009). However, research indicate that teacher often struggle to fulfill the true purpose of feedback due to inadequate training and lack of comprehension about feedback strategy (Karim & Mohammad, 2022). Several study found that the reason for teacher rarely used feedback are student inappropriate respond and lack of time to provide feedback for student (Hidayat et al., 2024). Another study found that teacher often used verification feedback indicating correctness (Gan, An, & Liu, 2021). While praise is good to boost student confidence in speaking or writing, it does not give clarity and is often found ambiguous (Ellis, 2009).

Students stated that when teacher give feedback such as "excellent" or "very good" or giving grade, they found it ineffective in adresssing spesific learning gaps or guiding improvement (Sewagengn & Dessie, 2020). Hounsell, Hounsell, and Litjens (2008) argue that effective feedback should not only inform students about their performance but also guide them on how to improve. Arrafii and Kasyfurrahman (2024) found that in practice, while giving feedback, teacher do not attempt to elaborate or offer detailed information that will help student to improve their work or performance. In conclusion, the literature consistently highlights that teacher feedback is frequently ineffective due to its limited clarity and lack of actionable guidance.

This issue was also evident in the local classroom context. Based on observations conducted in a tenth-grade English classroom at MAN Pematangsiantar It was found that the teacher's feedback practices reflected similar patterns. During the observation of students' presentation performance about procedure text, the researcher found that after students ended their presentation, the teacher did not provide any comments or feedback related to their performance and only give acknowledgement such as "Good, give applause!" Furthermore, the observation revealed students tended to read directly from their presentation materials. This condition indicates a need for teacher feedback to support students' speaking development.

Indonesian studies have consistently shown that feedback practices in EFL speaking classrooms face persistent challenges. Tumini and Trisanti (2025) reported that at the secondary level, teachers tend to rely heavily on recasts and apply oral corrective feedback inconsistently throughout the lesson, indicating the need for more strategic and intentional planning when responding to students' errors. Furthermore, Mahara and Hartono (2024), in *The Effect of Corrective Feedback to Improve Students' Motivation in Speaking Skills*, emphasized that although corrective feedback plays an important role in learning, excessive and inappropriate correction may reduce EFL students' motivation to speak. Based on the issues identified in previous studies and the classroom observation, this research is conducted with the aim of examining the implementation of teacher feedback in EFL speaking classrooms, particularly focusing on the types of feedback used and how they are delivered during speaking activity in the classroom.

2. THEORITICAL REVIEW

Speaking is an interactive process of producing, receiving, and processing information to construct meaning (Florez, 1999, as cited in Bailey & Nunan, 2005). Similarly, Cameron (2001) explains that speaking is the active use of language to express meaning, while Harmer (2001) emphasizes that speaking fluently requires both linguistic knowledge and the ability to process language spontaneously. According to Brown (2004), speaking proficiency consists of six main components, namely grammar, vocabulary, comprehension, fluency, pronunciation, and task accomplishment. Since speaking involves real-time communication, learners naturally produce errors during classroom interaction (Ariatna, 2012; Strong & Buyukerol, 2024). Rather than being viewed as failure, these errors are considered a normal part of language learning and provide opportunities for teachers to facilitate language development through appropriate feedback (Harmer, 2007). Feedback is an important element in the teaching and learning process because it provides information that helps learners improve their performance (Askew, 2000). In speaking classrooms, oral corrective feedback is commonly used to respond directly to students' erroneous utterances. Ellis (2009) classifies oral corrective feedback into six strategies: recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and paralinguistic signal. The implementation of these strategies is closely related to learner errors. Based on Lyster and Ranta (1997), as adapted by Faris (2018), learner errors can be categorized into grammar errors, vocabulary errors, pronunciation errors, and L1 use. Appropriate oral corrective feedback enables students to recognize their errors, produce more accurate language, and improve their speaking performance during classroom interaction.

Previous studies consistently highlight the importance of teacher oral feedback in speaking instruction. Puspitasari et al. (2023) found that recast was the most frequently used corrective feedback strategy in speaking classrooms, whereas Puteri (2023), Safira (2024), Sirait and Anggraini (2025), and Yusovi et al. (2023) reported explicit correction as the dominant strategy and emphasized positive teacher and student perceptions toward oral corrective feedback. Other studies also demonstrated that corrective feedback contributes to students' speaking development and motivation. However, most previous studies primarily focused on identifying the types of oral feedback or teachers' perceptions rather than describing how different feedback strategies are implemented in response to specific learner errors during speaking activities. Therefore, this study investigates both the types of teacher oral feedback strategies and their implementation during speaking activities at the tenth-grade level.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive qualitative research design to identify the types of teacher oral feedback strategies and describe their implementation during speaking activities at the tenth grade of MAN Pematangsiantar. The study involved one English teacher and 36 tenth-grade students as the research participants. Data were collected through classroom observation supported by video recordings, audio recordings, and field notes. The observation focused on teacher-student interactions during speaking activities, particularly the teacher's oral corrective feedback and students' errors utterances. The formula by Triola (2022) was used to calculate the frequency of teacher oral feedback during speaking activities in the classroom. The collected data were analyzed using the interactive model of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), which consists of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing. To ensure the trustworthiness of the findings, data triangulation was conducted by comparing information obtained from different data collection techniques.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research Result

Types of Teacher Oral Feedback Strategies

During the classroom observations, the researcher found that the teacher employed various oral feedback strategies throughout two 40-minute learning sessions. The lessons was about modal verb and procedure text.. Since modal verbs are part of the language features used in procedure texts, both meetings were interconnected. The researcher identified the frequency

of each oral feedback strategy based on Ellis (2009) and analyzed classroom interactions through transcription.

The findings from the first meeting showed that the teacher provided oral feedback mainly during the explanation and question-and-answer sessions. Four types of oral feedback strategies were identified: recast, clarification request, explicit correction, and elicitation. In contrast, repetition and paralinguistic signals were not used. In the second meeting, the teacher employed only three strategies, namely recast, clarification request, and explicit correction, while repetition, elicitation, and paralinguistic signals were absent.

Overall, the teacher provided 22 instances of oral feedback across the two meetings. Recast was the most frequently used strategy, accounting for 45.4% of all feedback, followed by clarification request with 27.2%. Explicit correction was used less frequently, while elicitation appeared only twice, and repetition and paralinguistic signals were not observed. The teacher provided oral feedback when students produced erroneous utterances during explanations, while giving examples, and during question-and-answer activities. The following are several examples of oral feedback provided by the teacher based on Ellis (2009):

a. Recast

In recast, the teacher responds to the learner's incorrect utterance by repeating it in corrected form without directly pointing out the error. The teacher usually reformulates the student's utterance by correcting aspects such as pronunciation, grammatical structure, or word choice. The following dialogues are an example:

Student : I will competition

Teacher : I will win the competition. *Aku akan menang di pertandingan. Oke, mana verbnya? Mana modalnya?* (Okay, which one is verb? Which one is modal?) (recast)

b. Clarification Request

Clarification request occurs when the teacher gives signals or questions such as "what?" or "pardon?" or asks the word that was heard but is still unclear. The teacher asks the student to repeat what has been said because it is unclear, not heard properly, or not understood by the teacher. In meeting 1, the following example is:

Student : Present, miss (unclear utterance)

Teacher : Absent? (clarification request)

Student : Present, miss

c. Explicit Correction

Explicit correction occurs when student made mistake and the teacher explicitly or directly points out the erroneous utterance or points out the mistake while also providing the correct form to the students. From the data explicit correction was found in meeting 1, here is one of the example:

Student : I must on time

Teacher : I must....

Student : on time

Teacher : *No la no, yang ada verb nya.* (No, no. Used the one with a verb) I must study before examination. (explicit correction)

d. Elicitation

In elicitation, the teacher repeats a part of the learner's utterances while leaves the incorrect section and using rising intonation to encourage the learner to complete or correct the utterance independently. Elicitation was only found in meeting 1, with following example:

Student : I will competition

Teacher : *Apa?* (What?) I will.... (elicitation)

The Implementation of Type of Teacher Oral Feedback Strategies

Teacher oral feedback may occur because students make errors during interaction in the classroom. Based on the theory by Lyster and Ranta (1997), which was adapted by Faris (2018), there are four types of learner' errors that can cause teacher feedback occur in the classroom. These errors include grammar error, vocabulary error, pronunciation error, and unsolicited L1 use or when student used Indonesian language while teacher asking them in English. Based on the data collected from the two meetings, it was found that there were 22 erroneous utterances that made teacher respond by providing various types of oral feedback. These errors occurred during classroom interaction, such as when student was asked to give example, answered questions, or responded to the teacher' explanation. The following are examples of each type of erroneous utterances:

a. Grammar Error

After analyzed the data, it was found that the grammar errors mostly occurred in the form of incorrect grammatical forms. Students often forgot to add verbs when making sentences or sometimes used words that were not appropriate for their function in the sentence. The following is one of the example:

Student : I must be (**grammar error**)

Teacher : *Mengapa pakai be?* (Why using be?) I must wear uniform at school. *Mana modalnya?* (Which one is modal?) (**explicit correction**)

b. Vocabulary Error

Vocabulary error occur when learners choose incorrect word to express their idea. This error may also occur when student do not have understanding about the meaning of the word. Based on the data obtained after the observation, students produced vocabulary error 4 times during two meetings. Here is the following example:

Teacher : *Swim atau play. Yang terakhir, modal verb used to show obligation. Apa obligation?* (Swim or play? Lastly, modal verbs are used to show obligation. What is obligation?)

Student : *Permasalahan* (**vocabulary error**)

Teacher .: *Huh? Obligation apa? Kewajiban. Buat contohnya kewajiban, obligation. Should, Must.* (Huh? What is obligation? Kewajiban. Make an example. Obligation. Should. Must. Yes) (**clarification request**)

c. Pronunciation Error

Pronunciation error can be happen when student made mistake in pronouncing the word or sound incorrectly, making the utterance difficult to understand. From two meetings, it was found that pronunciation error occurred 8 times, make it the second highest error that occurred after the grammar error. This is the following example:

Teacher : *Apa pilihan B?* (What is option B ?)

Student : Recipe (re-sep) (**pronunciation error**)

Teacher : Recipe (re-s3-pi). Yes. *Resep.* (**recast**)

d. L1 Use

L1 Use or unsolicited L1 use occurs when student use their first language, in this context Indonesian, to respond even though the teacher expect them to answer in English. Since the observed classroom in this research used both Indonesia and English, not all interaction were categorized as L1 use. In meeting 1, no utterance of L1 use were found, while meeting 2, the researcher identified L1 use with the following example:

Teacher : Yes, B. Goal, material, and step. *Itu adalah structure of procedure text. Kalau yang C. How about C? Identification and description. Apa itu? What generic structure?*

Student : Teks deskripsi (**L1 Use**)

Teacher : Descriptive text. **(recast)** *Kalau orientation, complication, resolution? Apa?* (How about orientation, complication, resolution? What is that?)

When teacher asking a question in English, student also need to answer it in English. Eventhough, teacher explanation used Indonesia, when answering question, student are expected to answer in English. By providing the recast, teacher give student feedback on their error.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that the teacher primarily used recast, clarification request, explicit correction, and elicitation to respond to students' errors during speaking activities in learning modal verbs and procedure text. Furthermore, grammar and pronunciation errors were the most frequently observed, which also aligns with Harmer (2007), who emphasizes that oral feedback commonly given during speaking activities, included correction of errors.

Based on the data analysis, recast was the most frequently used oral feedback strategy (45.4%) during speaking activities. This finding is consistent with Puspitasari et al. (2023), who also reported recast as the dominant corrective feedback strategy in speaking classrooms. These recasts are effective because they help learners recognize that a correction is being provided, identify the specific error they made, and become more aware of the difference between their language used and English (Asari, 2015). The frequent use of recast suggests that the teacher prioritized maintaining communication flow during speaking activities. According to Long (2007, as cited in Goo, 2007), recasts help maintain the flow of communication and preserve the speaker's intended meaning. This makes the correction less noticeable and less disruptive than more explicit types of corrective feedback. In this study, most classroom interactions occurred during teacher explanations and question-and-answer activities related to modal verbs and procedure texts. In such contexts, the teacher often needed to correct students quickly while keeping the lesson moving. Therefore, recast may have been considered the most practical strategy because it simultaneously addressed errors and maintained student participation. This finding also supports Mellany, et al (2021), who emphasize the teacher's role as a facilitator who guides students toward accurate language use while encouraging active classroom interaction.

Clarification request was the second most frequently used strategy (27,2%). Unlike recast, clarification request does not directly provide the correct answer but instead signals that the learner's utterance is unclear or requires further explanation. Consistent with Ruswandi, et al (2025), that highlighted the positive role of oral corrective feedback in reducing students' anxiety, the frequent use of clarification requests may reflect the teacher's effort to provide feedback in a way that encourages student while maintaining a supportive classroom atmosphere. During the observation, clarification request was commonly used when students spoke too softly or produced unclear pronunciation. This suggests that the teacher was not only concerned with grammatical accuracy but also with ensuring comprehensible communication. Such practice is important because speaking requires learners to express meaning that can be understood by others, as emphasized by Cameron (2001).

However, this finding contrasts with studies by Safira (2024), Puteri (2023), Simarmata (2023), Yusovi et al. (2021), and Sirait and Angraini (2025), who reported explicit correction as the dominant feedback strategy. One possible explanation for this difference is the variation in classroom context and instructional focus. In the present study, the teacher mainly conducted speaking activities through explanation sessions and question-and-answer interactions. Such situations may encourage the use of recast because it allows correction to occur naturally within ongoing communication. While both recast and explicit correction are used as feedback in this study, they are delivered in very different ways. Explicit correction requires the teacher to directly identify and explain the error, whereas recast provides correction in a less disruptive manner. Explicit correction was perceived to be effective in supporting students' speaking development because it provides clear and direct feedback, enabling learners to identify their errors and access the correct forms more easily (Khasanah et al., 2025).

In this study, repetition and paralinguistic signals were not observed during the two classroom meetings. This finding is similar to studies by Safira (2024) and Puteri (2023), which found that repetition was rarely used in speaking activities. In contrast, Samosir (2022) reported that repetition was frequently utilized. This absence of repetition was closely related to the nature of the lessons, which focused primarily on teacher-led explanations and question-and-answer interactions. In these situations, teachers often prefer strategies like recast, clarification requests, explicit correction, and elicitation because they provide immediate correction. This preference aligns with findings by (Yoshida, 2010), who found that even when teachers occasionally use prompts like elicitation or metalinguistic feedback for capable learners, they still rely on recasts more frequently due to time constraints. In contrast, repetition and paralinguistic signals require learners to independently identify and fix their errors, which takes

more time. Furthermore, using paralinguistic signals can be challenging and time-consuming for teachers, as it demands highly clear and accurate guidance (Azizi et al., 2014).

In terms of error types, grammar and pronunciation errors occurred most frequently, highlighting the areas where students needed the most support. Grammar errors were the most frequently observed learner errors during the two meetings. This finding may be related to the learning material discussed during the observation, particularly modal verbs, which require students to apply specific grammatical structures when producing sentences. Many students omitted verbs or produced incomplete constructions such as “I will competition” and “I must on time.” According to Brown (2004), grammar is a fundamental component of speaking proficiency because learners must organize words into meaningful and acceptable structures. Therefore, the high occurrence of grammar errors may indicate that students were still developing their ability to apply grammatical knowledge during spontaneous oral production. This finding also supports Harmer (2007), who argues that grammatical errors are a natural part of language learning and provide opportunities for teachers to offer corrective feedback. Pronunciation errors were also frequently observed during classroom interaction. Many of the errors involved English words whose pronunciation differs significantly from Indonesian spelling conventions, such as “should” and “recipe.” These findings suggest that students may have relied on first-language pronunciation patterns when producing English words. As Brown (2004) states, pronunciation is an essential component of speaking ability because it affects the clarity and comprehensibility of spoken language. Therefore, the teacher frequently responded to pronunciation errors through recast and clarification request, allowing students to hear the correct form and become aware of unintelligible utterances. This approach helped maintain classroom interaction while supporting students' pronunciation development. Salsabila et al. (2025) found that teacher feedback can effectively support the improvement of students' pronunciation, particularly in terms of clarity, accuracy, intonation, and word stress.

Meanwhile, vocabulary errors occurred less frequently than grammar and pronunciation errors in this study. Brown (2004) states that vocabulary is an essential component of speaking ability because it enables learners to express meaning effectively. Since the observed lessons involved familiar vocabulary related to modal verbs and procedure texts, students appeared to experience fewer difficulties in word choice. Furthermore, the teacher frequently provided examples and explanations of key vocabulary during classroom interaction, which may have helped students use the required words appropriately. Similarly, L1 use was rarely observed during the study. Although students occasionally produced grammatical and pronunciation errors, they generally attempted to communicate in the target

language rather than relying on Indonesian. The low occurrence of L1 use suggests that students were willing to participate in English interaction despite limitations in language accuracy. This finding is consistent with Swain's (1995, as cited in Pannell, 2017) view that language development occurs when learners actively produce output and reflect on their language use, particularly when feedback encourages them to notice and modify their utterances. Therefore, the findings suggest that students were more likely to experience difficulties with language accuracy, especially grammar and pronunciation, than with expressing meaning or attempting communication in English.

5. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The English teacher employed four oral feedback strategies based on Ellis (2009) such as: recast, clarification request, explicit correction, and elicitation, while repetition and paralinguistic signals were not utilized. Recast was the most dominant strategy used (45.4%), followed by clarification request (27.2%), explicit correction (18.1%), and elicitation (9.09%). These strategies were triggered by student errors in grammar (the most frequent), pronunciation, vocabulary, and unsolicited L1 use, typically occurring during material explanations (modal verbs and procedure texts), question-and-answer sessions, and exam evaluations. The preference for recasts indicates that the teacher aimed to provide immediate correct language models to maintain classroom communicative flow without disrupting students' speaking confidence. However, this study faces limitations due to institutional constraints, including school construction and an exam period conflict, which restricted data collection to only two classroom meetings and may not fully reflect long-term feedback practices.

Based on these findings, several suggestions are proposed for teachers, students, and future researchers to improve learning practices. Teachers are recommended to continue providing oral feedback while integrating other strategies like elicitation, repetition, and paralinguistic signals to encourage active participation and support diverse learning needs. Students are encouraged to actively respond to feedback and practice corrected forms to improve their grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, and overall speaking confidence. Finally, future researchers are suggested to explore oral feedback using different theoretical frameworks, such as Brookhart (2008) on effective feedback or Hattie and Timperley's (2007) model, to better evaluate its effectiveness and provide a broader understanding of how feedback influences language development.

REFERENCES

- Ariatna. (2012). Communicative Language Teaching (CLT): an Evolution in Revolution. *Jurnal Bahas Unimed*, (84), 78464.
- Arrafii, M. A., & Kasyfurrahman. (2024). Evaluation of teacher feedback quality in English language instruction at secondary schools. *Journal of English Language Proficiency*, 1(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.36312/jelap.v1i1.3870>
- Asari, Y. (2015). How to effectively provide recasts in foreign language classrooms. *Dialogue*, 1(13), 1-9
- Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for learning*. Routledge.
- Azizi, M., Behjat, F., and Sorahi, M. A.(2014). Effect of metalinguistic teacher corrective feedback on writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. *international journal of language and linguistics international journal of language and linguistics. Special Issue: Innovations in Foreign Language Teaching*, 2(6), 54–63. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.s.2014020601.18>
- Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (2005). *Practical English language teaching: Speaking*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bambaeeroo, F., & Shokrpour, N. (2017). The impact of teachers' non-verbal communication on success in teaching. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 5 (2), 51–59.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. ASCD.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. Longman.
- Cameron, L. (2001). Teaching languages to young learners. *Cambridge University Press*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733109>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1 (1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- Fadzil, I. M., Said, M., & Ehsan, N. (2021). Exploring ESL teachers' insights on corrective oral feedback in a Malaysian secondary education context. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 6 (9), 504-512. <https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v6i9.993>
- Faris, I. N. I. (2018). *Teachers' corrective feedback on young learners' oral errors in EFL classrooms* [Master's thesis, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia]. Repositori UPI. <https://repository.upi.edu/34474/>
- Gan, Z., An, Z., & Liu, F. (2021). Teacher feedback practices, student feedback motivation, and feedback behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 1-14 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697045>
- Goo, J. (2020). Research on the role of recasts in L2 learning. *Language Teaching*, 53(3), 289–315. <https://doi:10.1017/S026144482000004X>
- Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed). Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed). Longman.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>

- Hidayat, M., Umalihayati, U., Hilman, H., & Rachman, A. (2024). Feedback challenges and strategies in EFL classrooms. *English Learning Innovation*, 5(1), 86–97. <https://doi.org/10.22219/englie.v5i1.30295>
- Hounsell, D., McCune, V., Hounsell, J., & Litjens, J. (2008). The quality of guidance and feedback to students. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(1), 55–67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360701658765>
- Karim, A., & Mohammad, R. (2022). Does teachers' feedback serve its real purpose? *Journal of Education & Social Sciences*, 10(2), 41–48. <https://doi.org/10.20547/jess1022210204>
- Khasanah, M., Mahbub, M. A., & Al Fauzi, F. (2024). Exploring teachers' corrective feedback on EFL speaking performance: Narrative study of Indonesian private university. *Linguapedia*, 8(2), 50–62. <https://doi.org/10.56013/linguapedia.v8i2.3045>
- Killian, S. (2016). *Top 10 evidence-based teaching strategies*. University of Nebraska–Lincoln. <https://newsroom.unl.edu/announce/csmce/5272/29630>
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Mahara, A. D., & Hartono, D. (2024). The effect of corrective feedback on students' motivation in speaking skills. *Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(4), 42–53. <https://doi.org/10.37329/cetta.v7i4.3649>
- Manire, E., Kilag, O. K., Cordova, N., Tan, S. J., Poligrates, J., & Omaña, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence and English language learning. *Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(5), 485–497.
- Mellany, Risnawati, & Zasrianita, F. (2021). Teacher and students' talk in speaking classroom interaction. *Jadila: Journal of Development and Innovation in Language and Literature Education*, 2(1), 25–35.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Pannell, J., Partsch, F., & Fuller, N. (2017). The Output Hypothesis: From theory to practice. TESOL Working Paper Series, 15, 126-159.
- Puspitasari, N., Regina, Riyanti, D., Apriliawati, R., & Rosnija, E. (2023). An analysis on the teacher's oral feedback in teaching English: A descriptive qualitative research at SMK Negeri 6 Pontianak in academic year 2022/2023. *Journal of Scientific Research, Education, and Technology (JSRET)*, 2(2), 605–613. <https://doi.org/10.58526/jsret.v2i2.128>
- Puteri, N. A. (2023). *Teacher's oral feedback in teaching descriptive text of grade VII* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Negeri Medan]. Digilib UNIMED. <https://digilib.unimed.ac.id/id/eprint/58658/>

- Ruswandi, R., Sukma, R. F., & Rahim, N. F. (2025). The impact of teachers' oral corrective feedback (OCF) on students' anxiety in speaking class. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 12(2), 727–751. <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v12i1.3432>
- Safira, N. (2024). *An observation of an EFL teacher's oral corrective feedback* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Indonesia]. DSpace UII. <https://dspace.uui.ac.id/handle/123456789/51572>
- Salsabila, M.A., Haryanto, Sakkir, G. (2025). The effect of teacher oral corrective feedback on students' pronunciation. *International Journal of Business, English, and Communication*, 3 (1), 16-24.
- Samosir, F. (2022). *Teacher's oral feedback towards students' response in speaking skill* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Negeri Medan]. Digilib UNIMED. <https://digilib.unimed.ac.id/id/eprint/64372/>
- Sewagegn, A., & Dessie, A. (2020). The value of feedback in primary schools. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 19(10), 338–354. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.19.10.19>
- Simarmata, M. (2023). *Teacher's oral feedback in English classroom interaction* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Negeri Medan]. Digilib UNIMED. <https://digilib.unimed.ac.id/id/eprint/58345/>
- Sirait, J. J. P., & Anggraini, H. W. (2025). Students' and teachers' perceptions on oral corrective feedback toward students' speaking performance. *Education of English as a Foreign Language Journal (EDUCAFL)*, 8(2), 16–28. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.educafl.2025.008.02.02>
- Strong, B., & Buyukerol, E., O. (2024). *The role of making and correcting errors in second language learning*. <https://contact.teslontario.org/the-role-of-making-and-correcting-errors-in-second-language-learning/>
- Suban, T. S. (2021). Teaching speaking activities in EFL classrooms. *Lectio: Journal of Language and Language Teaching*, 1(1), 41–50.
- Triola, M. F. (2022). *Elementary statistics* (14th ed.). Pearson.
- Tumini, & Trisanti, N. (2025). Investigating oral corrective feedback in teaching speaking. *Journal of English Language and Education*, 10(4), 1–15.
- 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>
- Yusovi, N. V., Asmiyah, S., & Muhtarom, M. (2023). Oral feedback for English language learners' development. *Foster: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 197–205. <https://doi.org/10.24256/foster-jelt.v3i4.119>