



BEYOND ERROR CORRECTION: ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN ESL/ EFL PRONUNCIATION INSTRUCTION

Robin, Audrey Nicole D., Rebato, Princess P., Borac, Marcos Jr. G.,
Cabsag, Niña Mae Y., Celis Marlon A., Pecayo, Janine D., Rebato, Jim Kian

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra28761>
DOI No: 10.36713/epra28761

I. INTRODUCTION

Pronunciation plays a fundamental role in second-language teaching, as it directly influences learners' ability to communicate effectively, speak intelligibly, and develop fluency. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms, learners often struggle to pronounce words and sentences. They have difficulty producing accurate sounds, stress, and intonation. Research attributes these errors to mother tongue interference, limited exposure to authentic language input, and lack of motivation (B. R., Aravind, & Rajasekaran, 2021). To address these errors, language teachers often employ oral corrective feedback as an instructional approach. According to Li (2021), OCF consists of comments or responses made by language teachers or interlocutors regarding errors in speech production to help correct mistakes and guide learners toward more accurate speech. Through feedback, learners can improve by recognizing mispronounced words and developing better phonological awareness of the target language.

Through appropriate OCF, learners can identify the gap between their current pronunciation and the expected pronunciation, which supports the development of more accurate and intelligible speech in the target language.

Previous research on second language acquisition has examined various oral corrective feedback strategies that teachers use in the classroom, such as recast, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition. (Li, 2021). Some of these strategies directly provide error correction, while others require learners to reflect more on their errors and attempt self-correction. Understanding how these strategies are applied in the context of pronunciation teaching is integral for the improvement of classroom practices and supporting the learners' pronunciation development.

Although there is substantial research on corrective feedback, most studies focus on specific feedback strategies within broader language instruction instead of focusing on pronunciation. Studies that examine oral corrective feedback strategies in pronunciation instruction remain scattered across contexts. Consequently, there is a need to synthesize existing literature to gain a clearer understanding of how these strategies are used, their effectiveness, and their implications for pronunciation teaching in EFL and ESL classrooms.

This narrative literature review examined oral corrective feedback strategies used in pronunciation teaching in EFL/ESL classrooms. Specifically, this study aimed to:

1. Identify and synthesize the oral corrective feedback strategies used by teachers to address the pronunciation errors of learners.
2. Analyze recurring themes and patterns regarding the effectiveness of these strategies in pronunciation instruction.
3. Determine the pedagogical implications of these strategies to provide actionable insights for language teachers to improve their classroom practices and better support learners' pronunciation development.

II. SCOPE AND CRITERIA OF LITERATURE SELECTION

This narrative literature review examined the application and effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) specifically within the context of pronunciation instruction in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms. The scope of the research encompassed a detailed analysis of various OCF strategies, including recasts, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition, as they are applied to phonological errors. Furthermore, the review addressed feedback directed at both segmental features, such as individual vowel and consonant sounds, and suprasegmental components, including stress, intonation, and rhythm, to provide a holistic view of pronunciation development.

Beyond identifying these strategies, the study focused on synthesizing existing research to uncover recurring themes regarding the pedagogical effectiveness of feedback in promoting learner "noticing," self-correction, and long-term intelligibility. By evaluating how different types of feedback influence the learner's ability to bridge the gap between their current production and target pronunciation, the review aimed to establish clear patterns of success across diverse instructional settings. Ultimately, the study concluded by determining the pedagogical implications of these findings, offering actionable insights and evidence-based recommendations for language practitioners to optimize their feedback delivery and better support learners' oral proficiency.

To maintain a specific focus on phonological development, this study was strictly bound by several instructional and linguistic constraints. The review was limited to oral corrective feedback within the context of English language teaching (EFL/ESL), specifically excluding written feedback or feedback provided in non-language-learning disciplines. Furthermore, the error domain was focused exclusively on pronunciation errors, meaning that feedback regarding grammatical accuracy, lexical choice, or



sociolinguistic appropriateness was excluded unless these elements directly intersect with phonological production. By narrowing the focus to English-specific instruction, the study ensures that the synthesized findings remain highly relevant to the unique phonetic and phonological challenges inherent in the English language.

Methodologically, this study was delimited to a narrative literature review, focusing on the synthesis of existing qualitative and quantitative research rather than the collection of primary data through classroom observations or interviews. To ensure the relevance of pedagogical trends and the currency of the findings, the review primarily focused on peer-reviewed journals and academic publications from the last 15 years. This boundary ensures that the insights gathered reflected modern classroom dynamics and the most recent advancements in second-language acquisition theory, providing a robust foundation for the study's pedagogical recommendations.

III. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study utilized a qualitative narrative literature review guided by Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis

framework to synthesize existing literature on Oral Corrective Feedback strategies in English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language Classrooms. Thematic analysis framework was used to identify, analyze, and interpret patterns across the selected literature. This research design is appropriate because it ensured systematic and precise analysis of existing studies, leading to well-defined themes that provide a comprehensive understanding of oral corrective feedback strategies across EFL and ESL contexts.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before analyzing the different studies reviewed, the researchers first gathered existing literature and studies related to the topic from reliable search engines and databases, such as Google Scholar, ResearchGate, ERIC, and Google, to accumulate sufficient scholarly sources to support the narrative study.

After the gathering process, the researchers then filtered the related literature and studies for analysis using a 15-year timeframe from publication to the present. The researchers included international, national, and local studies, which resulted in a final 27 related literature and studies used in the narrative study for review.

Figure 1.

Beyond Error Correction: Oral Corrective Feedback in ESL/ EFL Pronunciation Instruction	
Search Engines Utilized	Google Scholar Research Gate ERIC Google
Criteria for Choosing Studies	Fifteen year timeframe from publication to the present
Geographical Classification of Sources	International Studies National Studies Local Studies
	Only 27 studies were used for the review after the application of the criteria in filtering the data.

Data Analysis Procedure

The literature was analyzed using the six-phased framework of Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. First, the researchers familiarized themselves with the data gathered through repeated reading of existing studies and taking notes. Second, initial codes were generated by gathering relevant concepts from the data. Third, similar codes were grouped to form potential themes. Fourth, the generated themes were reviewed and refined to ensure coherence, consistency, and relevance to the objectives of the study. Fifth, the themes were clearly defined and named according to the central ideas they represented. Lastly, the data was synthesized and interpreted into the findings of a structured narrative literature review.

After following this process, three major themes emerged: 1.) Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies used in Pronunciation, 2.) Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback in Pronunciation Training, and 3.) Pedagogical Implications of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies.

IV. THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Based on the thematic analysis of the related literature, three major themes were identified: 1.) Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies used in Pronunciation, 2.) Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback in Pronunciation Training, and 3.) Pedagogical Implications of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies.

Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies Used in Pronunciation

Teachers use a variety of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies to correct learners' pronunciation errors in the ESL and EFL classroom. The strategies used can be categorized into broad categories: explicit and implicit corrective feedback. In addition to the type of feedback, the timing of feedback is also considered an important aspect of how these oral corrective feedback strategies are implemented in pronunciation instruction.

Explicit Corrective Feedback

Explicit corrective feedback is often characterized by its clarity and immediacy. It is a type of corrective feedback where



teachers directly identify errors and provide corrections. Those who use explicit feedback believe that it enables students to notice language gaps right away and acquire new forms (Soe, 2022). In ESL and EFL classrooms, previous studies indicate that explicit corrective feedback is commonly used and favored by teachers.

1.1. Explicit Corrective Feedback improves pronunciation.

Several studies claim that teachers prefer explicit corrective feedback over other strategies as it better supports pronunciation development. In a study by Bougataia and Brigui (2023), they compared the effectiveness of Explicit Corrective Feedback with recasting and noted that explicit corrective feedback was more effective and more frequently employed in classroom settings. Although both seemed to improve students' pronunciation accuracy, those who explicitly received feedback repaired more errors than those who were subjected to recasting or those who did not receive feedback at all. The study further explains that explicit feedback is very clear and direct, which improves learners' focus and helps them notice their faulty utterances and correct them right away, avoiding fossilization and leading to more correct and natural pronunciation. The straightforward nature of explicit corrective feedback and its positive influence on students' pronunciation make teachers gravitate towards using the strategy.

1.2. Explicit Correction Frequently Used. Studies reveal that explicit correction is commonly used in ESL and EFL classrooms. Gitsaki and Althobati (2011) found that ESL teachers in beginning and intermediate classes employ a range of corrective feedback strategies; explicit corrective feedback is the one most often used for language teaching, including pronunciation instruction. The research posits that teachers frequently correct pronunciation errors explicitly, as it better supports learners' pronunciation development.

Implicit Corrective Feedback

Implicit corrective feedback is an indirect, subtle strategy for error correction, where teachers do not directly point out errors so as not to interrupt the flow of communication. This strategy encourages learners to notice and self-correct their mistakes. Moreover, using implicit feedback types is considered less face-threatening compared to explicit feedback. They are often considered more supportive of communication, which can help maintain learner comfort and reduce anxiety during interaction. Under implicit corrective feedback, there are still more specific feedback types, such as recast, elicitation, repetition, and clarification requests. (Ellis, 2021). These strategies are used in ESL and EFL classrooms for pronunciation instruction.

1.1 Recast commonly used. Previous research reveals that recast is a commonly used implicit feedback strategy among second and foreign language classes.. In a study conducted by Kurniawati and Ayouni (2023), recast was found to be the most dominant type of corrective feedback used during language instruction, accounting for the majority (66.7%) of feedback instances. Research titled *Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms* also supports this claim; their findings suggest that recasts were the most common type of corrective

feedback across different instructional settings, including CLIL and immersion classrooms (Lyser et al., 2015). These findings suggest that recasts are widely used by teachers as a practical and commonly employed strategy for providing corrective feedback during pronunciation instruction.

1.2. Elicitation and repetition used in L2 instruction.

Implicit feedback types such as elicitation and repetition are also used in pronunciation teaching as part of English as a second and foreign language instruction. Elicitation involves prompting students to self - correct their errors by pausing to allow completion, asking questions, or encouraging learners to reformulate their utterance. Repetition, on the other hand, involves the teacher repeating errors and adjusting intonation to draw attention to it (Capili et al., 2021). Alkammash and Gulnaz (2019) found that both elicitation and repetition were preferred by teachers, highlighting their frequent use in language learning classes and pronunciation development.

1.3. Clarification request used. Clarification request is done through phrases like, "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand to indicate that the message has not been understood or to signal that the student's utterance contained some mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is needed (Capili et al., 2021). Alongside explicit feedback, Gitsaki and Althobati (2011) mention the use of clarification requests as an oral corrective feedback strategy. Although clarification requests aren't used as often as other feedback types, they are still used occasionally by ESL and EFL teachers.

Timing of Corrective Feedback

Another crucial aspect of OCF is the timing of the feedback delivered. Ergül (2023) distinguished between immediate feedback, provided to students right after they make an error during a task, and delayed feedback, given after the completion of a task or activity.

1.1. Immediate feedback vs. Delayed feedback. In the study of Qorihah et al. (2025), it shows that immediate feedback is used when accuracy is the priority, especially when repeated errors disrupt meaning or communication, while delayed feedback is preferred when the goal is fluency, confidence, and reduced anxiety during speaking. In pronunciation instruction, this means teachers may correct pronunciation problems instantly when they interfere with understanding, but they may also wait until the activity ends if immediate interruption would reduce fluency or make students less willing to speak. Additionally, in the study of Van Ha et. al (2021), students generally preferred immediate feedback because they wanted to notice and correct errors right away. In contrast, teachers often preferred delayed feedback after the activity or at the end of the lesson because they felt on-the-spot correction could embarrass learners or interrupt speech flow.

1.2. Combined timing approach used. Qorihah et. al (2025), highlight a combined timing approach, where teachers shift between immediate and delayed feedback within the same lesson. This blended strategy shows that feedback timing is not fixed, but depends on learning objectives, student affective conditions, task demands, and the presence of recurring errors.



The authors argue that effective oral corrective feedback in pronunciation-related speaking work is flexible and context-sensitive rather than limited to only one timing pattern. Overall, this suggests that, in pronunciation instruction, corrective feedback should be flexible and depend on the lesson goal, the type of error, and whether the task is aimed at accuracy or fluency.

Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback in Pronunciation Learning

Oral corrective feedback supports the pronunciation development of learners by helping them minimize their pronunciation errors. Since teachers use a variety of corrective feedback strategies, these also vary in their effectiveness in supporting the pronunciation development of ESL and EFL learners. These differences are generally discussed in terms of pronunciation accuracy improvement, learner uptake and response, and the effectiveness of different feedback types.

Pronunciation accuracy improvement

One of the most remarkable outcomes observed across the reviewed studies is the improvement of learners' pronunciation accuracy. In line with this, OCF is not only regarded as a corrective tool but rather an avenue that directly helps learners refine their phonological awareness through guided input and repetition.

1.1 Feedback improves pronunciation. Several studies provided strong evidence that feedback improves pronunciation. A study conducted by Alahmed and Jala (2022) found that learners who received oral corrective feedback showed significant improvement in pronunciation scores in comparison to learners who did not receive feedback. Their findings highly suggest that corrective feedback helps learners become aware of their errors and their articulation accordingly, which leads to a more accurate pronunciation over time. Additionally, their research supports the idea that oral corrective feedback promotes the development of phonological awareness.

1.2 Improve language proficiency. A related study by Maawa and Ortega (2019) revealed that oral corrective feedback contributes to improvements not only in pronunciation but also in overall English proficiency. The findings of their study showed that learners become more accurate in producing sounds, and correspondingly, they can communicate their ideas efficiently and effectively. This study also supports the improvement of language proficiency, shown in pronunciation accuracy that is closely linked to a broader linguistic competence.

1.3. Improves speaking performance. Another study by Kurniawati and Ayouni (2023) emphasized the role of oral corrective feedback in improving a learner's speaking performance. Their study revealed that learners who received consistent feedback tend to demonstrate enhanced fluency and confidence in speaking activities. Moreover, this suggests that pronunciation accuracy promotes a more effective oral communicative competence. As learners become more aware of their pronunciation errors, they are more likely to engage in

active speaking without the fear of making mistakes, as they are capable of correcting them in the first place

Learner Uptake and Response

An effective way to gauge the effectiveness of a teaching strategy is to assess how well the students respond to it. Learner uptake refers to the immediate response of learners following the correction of teachers, including attempts to modify or repair incorrect utterances (Zhang et al., 2022). In ESL and EFL classrooms, successful learner uptakes are often associated with repetition and metalinguistic cues. Moreover, intermediate learners often show more successful uptake following feedback compared to other levels due to their sufficient language knowledge.

1.1 Successful learner uptake. Certain feedback strategies can result in higher or more successful learner uptake. According to Gitsaki and Althobati (2011), repetition has been found to achieve 100% uptake amongst students, as it guides learners to notice their errors and self-correct them. This implies that repetition yields positive results in pronunciation teaching.

1.2. Repetition and Metalinguistic Effectiveness. Repetition and metalinguistic feedback as effective strategies Gitsaki and Althobaiti (2011) also emphasize that repetition and metalinguistic cues are effective in prompting a positive learner response.

These strategies guide learners to reflect on their errors rather than simply receiving the correct form from the teacher, which increases their participation and engagement in the correction and pronunciation learning process.

1.3 Intermediate learners perform better. Additionally, Christina Gitsaki and Naif Althobaiti (2011) further mention that intermediate learners tend to demonstrate higher levels of successful uptake than beginners and other proficiency levels. This is because they already have sufficient knowledge and language input to process feedback, but still need support to improve.

Effectiveness of Feedback Types

Feedback plays a critical role in language learning by providing learners with information about their performance and guiding them towards improvement (Ur, 1996), as cited by Alahmed & Jala (2022).

1.1. Explicit vs. Recast. Among various types of oral corrective feedback, recast and explicit corrective feedback have garnered considerable attention for their effectiveness in enhancing English pronunciation skills. Explicit corrective feedback involves directly indicating errors and providing the correct form, thus making learners aware of their mistakes clearly (Nadya, 2021, as cited by Alahmed and Jala, 2022). In contrast, recast feedback subtly reformulates the learner's erroneous utterance without overtly highlighting the error, serving as an implicit corrective strategy during communicative activities (Sheen, 2006, as cited by Alahmed and Jala, 2022).

Empirical evidence from studies with Iraqi intermediate EFL learners indicates that both recast and explicit corrective feedback significantly improve pronunciation skills;



however, explicit corrective feedback tends to be more beneficial. This superiority is attributed to its clarity and directness, which better facilitate learners' awareness and correction of their pronunciation errors, especially among low proficiency students who might not recognize implicit forms of feedback like recasts. Therefore, while recasts provide valuable modeling of correct forms, explicit corrective feedback appears to have a stronger positive impact on learners' ability to produce more accurate English pronunciation.

1.2. Feedback Effectiveness Varies. The effectiveness of oral corrective feedback types varies across contexts, with no single strategy consistently identified as the most effective. Su and Tian (2016) argue that there is no single best type of corrective feedback, as its effectiveness depends on factors such as learners' proficiency, instructional context, and the nature of pronunciation activities. Furthermore, Rod Ellis (2011) argues that the different feedback types function differently depending on how learners respond and process the corrective input given by the teacher. Some studies suggest that explicit correction is superior among other strategies (Alahmed and Jala, 2022). While others argue that recasting remains widely used and is preferred by teachers (Kurniawati & Ayouni, 2023). Additionally, the effectiveness of feedback may vary according to learner level. For example, recasts are considered less effective for beginner learners, as they may face difficulty in noticing implicit corrections, while more advanced or intermediate learners are better able to benefit from such feedback (Gitsaki & Althobaiti, 2011).

Overall, the findings posit that the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback types varies depending on multiple factors, and no single strategy can be considered dominant or superior across ESL and EFL classrooms.

Pedagogical Implication of Oral Corrective Feedback

The final theme presents the pedagogical implications of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation instruction. The reviewed studies suggest that the effectiveness of OCF depends not only on the type of feedback used but also on how it is delivered and adapted to learners' needs. The findings emphasize that teachers must adopt a flexible and strategic approach in providing feedback, taking into account factors such as learner proficiency, classroom context, and instructional goals. In addition, learners' preferences and emotional responses play an important role in how feedback is received, highlighting the need for a learner-centered approach.

Use of Varied Feedback Strategies

This highlights the importance of using multiple oral corrective feedback strategies in pronunciation instruction. The reviewed studies suggest that relying on a single type of feedback is not sufficient, as learners have diverse needs and respond differently to correction. Instead, the use of varied and combined feedback strategies allows teachers to address accuracy, fluency, and learning needs while adapting to different classroom contexts

1.1. Teachers use multiple strategies. In ESL and EFL classrooms, teachers use a variety of OCF strategies as research has consistently shown that "one size does not fit all". Since

the type of learners varies, they also respond differently to different feedback strategies. This prompts the teacher to conduct differentiated instruction and adjust their OCF based on the type of error, proficiency of the learners, and the instructional setting (Alkhamash & Gulnaz, 2019). The use of multiple strategies helped teachers develop the speaking proficiency of learners and address their learning needs accordingly.

1.2. Combining strategies recommended. Because there is no universal strategy that will fit every learner and learning environment, previous research has suggested using a combination of strategies. Being equipped with multiple strategies or approaches allows educators to tackle different learning goals and address diverse learner needs, proficiency levels, and classroom situations more effectively (Alkhamash & Gulnaz, 2019). This is further supported by Kurniawati & Ayouni's (2023) research, which posits that teachers commonly combine strategies such as recasts, elicitation, repetition, and explicit correction to address pronunciation errors in EFL classrooms. Moreover, the research mentioned that different strategies may address different phonological errors and proficiency more effectively. For instance, recasts are often used for incorrect pronunciation and sound production, whereas elicitation and explicit correction may be more suitable when learners need guidance in recognizing and self-correcting their errors.

Ultimately, findings suggest that employing varied feedback approaches enable educators to respond more flexibly and effectively to diverse classroom situations.

Learner Centered Feedback Delivery

The emotions and preferences of learners should be considered in pronunciation teaching as they are a determining factor for its success. The effectiveness of error correction is not only determined by its type, but also by the manner in which it is given. Previous research suggests that learners respond more positively to feedback that is sensitive to their emotional needs and personal preferences, highlighting the need for a more learner-centered feedback delivery.

1.1. Private feedback preferred. Previous research indicates that learners prefer getting feedback privately rather than in front of the whole class. Primarily because it is perceived as significantly less threatening than being corrected in front of others (Cases et al., al 2025). According to Patra et al. (2025), this type of corrective feedback is critical as it bridges the gap between the students' current performance and their goals, allowing for improvement without negatively affecting motivation and emotional well-being. Cases et al. (2025) also believe that when feedback is helpful and private, learners are more likely to take risks in learning and persevere through challenges. Similarly, Kovač (2024) supports the importance of private corrective feedback as this builds trust and respect between the student and the teacher.

Overall, private feedback supports both the affective and cognitive aspects of pronunciation learning by reducing negative emotions such as fear or anxiety and encouraging more confident participation.



1.2. Respectful Feedback Reduces Anxiety. The way teachers correct errors plays a crucial role in the emotional responses of learners, particularly in pronunciation teaching, where students are often required to produce the language orally. Feedback that is respectful and supportive helps build a non-threatening environment, which positively influences their class performance. When teachers are considerate and encouraging, learners are less afraid to take risks, and they repeatedly practice pronouncing sounds, which develops their pronunciation. This is supported by Cases et al. (2025), who found that learners respond more positively to feedback delivered with sensitivity to their feelings. Similarly, Calsiyao (2015) emphasized that learners prefer feedback that maintains their confidence and does not discourage participation. Overall, respectful feedback enhances pronunciation instruction by reducing their anxiety, which prompts them to be more engaged, and provides them with more opportunities for practice.

1.3. Selective and Meaningful Feedback. Although learners express a desire to be corrected for their pronunciation errors, the majority of them believe that not every error should be corrected. According to Calsiyao (2015), students want to receive feedback and dislike it when their errors are ignored, as it prevents them from improving their English. However, they also believe that correcting every minor error can be counterproductive, and may ruin a student's confidence, make them feel overwhelmed, or make them view their speaking performances as failures. Moreover, the research finds that overcorrection distracts the flow of thought and raises the stress levels of students. In response, the study suggests that teachers should adopt a selective approach to feedback, focusing only on errors that may affect intelligibility and communication. By prioritizing meaningful correction, ESL teachers can support the development of communicative competence while maintaining learners' confidence and encouraging continued participation in pronunciation practice.

Improving Pronunciation Instruction

Oral corrective feedback can enhance and inform pronunciation teaching practices, particularly pronunciation teaching. The usefulness of feedback extends beyond just correcting errors; it improves speaking skills, supports overall language development, and helps teachers improve their teaching strategies. Moreover, it also shows that attention to phonological errors is important since pronunciation affects the clarity and intelligibility of learners when communicating.

1.1. Feedback Improves Teaching. Previous research indicates that Oral Corrective Feedback enhances the teaching practices of ESL and EFL educators. Research by Maawa and Ortega (2019) emphasizes that oral corrective feedback helps identify pronunciation errors and difficulties of learners and allows them to tailor their instructional strategies accordingly. This suggests that oral corrective feedback is not only beneficial for students, it also serves as a reflective tool for teachers to improve their pronunciation teaching practices.

1.2. Feedback Supports Language Development. According to studies, the use of Oral Corrective Feedback helps support the language development of learners. Sui and Tian (2016)

mentioned that OCF helps learners recognize, process, and reduce their linguistic errors, contributing to both accuracy and communicative competence. Their research suggests that as learners become more aware of their errors, they are able to self-correct during communication, leading to more effective and integrated language development.

Similarly, Kurniawati and Ayouni (2023) found that oral corrective feedback supports language development through improving learners' pronunciation accuracy, fluency, and confidence in speaking tasks. Maawa and Ortega (2016), on the other hand, support language development through helping teachers notice pronunciation errors of students and enabling them to adjust their teaching strategies according to learners' needs.

Overall, these findings suggest that Oral Corrective Feedback contributes to language development by enhancing the speaking performance of learners, improving learner accuracy, and making instruction more responsive and targeted.

1.3. Teachers Prioritize Phonological Errors. Gitsaki and Althobaiti (2011) found that ESL and EFL teachers tend to prioritize phonological errors when providing oral corrective feedback, particularly those that affect intelligibility. This suggests that Oral Corrective feedback in pronunciation teaching is often focused on errors that interfere with meaning and comprehension rather than correcting every minor inaccuracy. By prioritizing phonological issues, teachers help ensure that learners' speech becomes clearer and more understandable, which is essential for effective communication and building communicative competence.

V. SYNTHESIS OF FINDINGS

The reviewed literature consistently highlights the significant role of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in improving pronunciation instruction in ESL and EFL classrooms. Through Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis, three major themes emerged: **Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies used in Pronunciation, Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback in Pronunciation Learning, and Pedagogical Implications of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies.** These themes collectively demonstrate that OCF is not only a corrective mechanism but also an important instructional tool that supports pronunciation development, learner engagement, and communicative competence.

The first theme reveals that teachers employ a variety of corrective feedback strategies in pronunciation instruction, particularly explicit and implicit feedback approaches. Explicit corrective feedback was found to be both highly effective and frequently used because of its clarity and directness in helping learners notice and repair pronunciation errors. Studies by Bougataia and Brigui (2023) and Gitsaki and Althobaiti (2011) support the idea that explicit correction promotes learner awareness and successful pronunciation improvement. On the other hand, implicit corrective feedback strategies such as recast, elicitation, repetition, and clarification requests were also commonly used in classrooms. Moreover, the timing of corrective feedback emerged as another aspect of pronunciation instruction. Findings from Qorihah et al. (2025) and Ha et al. (2021) suggest that both immediate and delayed feedback are



useful depending on the instructional goal, learner needs, and classroom context.

The second theme focused on the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation learning. The reviewed studies consistently indicate that OCF improves pronunciation accuracy, speaking performance, and overall language proficiency. Research by Alahmed and Jala (2022), Maawa and Ortega (2019), and Kurniawati and Ayouni (2023) demonstrate that learners who receive both corrective feedback become more accurate in producing sounds and more confident in oral communication. Furthermore, learner uptake and response were identified as important indicators of feedback effectiveness. Gitsaki and Alhibaiti (2011) found that repetition and metalinguistic feedback produce high levels of successful learner uptake, particularly among intermediate learners. However, the findings also reveal that the effectiveness of feedback types varies depending on the learner's proficiency and instructional context. While explicit corrective feedback was found to be more beneficial for beginner learners, recast was considered less effective for lower proficiency learners who may struggle to recognize implicit corrections. These findings suggest that no single feedback strategy can be considered universally superior across all learning contexts.

The third theme highlighted the pedagogical implications of oral corrective feedback in pronunciation instruction. The reviewed studies emphasize that effective feedback requires flexibility, learner sensitivity, and strategic implementation. Teachers were found to use varied feedback strategies to accommodate different learner needs and instructional situations. Research by Alkhamash and Gulnaz (2019), Qorihah et al. (2025), and Kurniawati and Ayouni (2023) suggests that combining multiple feedback strategies enhances both pronunciation accuracy and communicative fluency.

In addition, learner-centered feedback delivery emerged as a crucial factor in successful pronunciation instruction. Studies by Cases et al. (2025) and Calsiyao (2015) revealed that learners prefer respectful, private, and selective feedback because it reduces anxiety and supports confidence during speaking activities. The findings also indicate that OCF contributes to improving pronunciation instruction by supporting language development, enhancing speaking performance, and helping teachers prioritize phonological errors that affect intelligibility. Overall, the literature suggests that an effective pronunciation teacher depends not only on correcting errors but also on how feedback is delivered and adapted to learners' linguistic and emotional needs.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the findings of this narrative literature review, several recommendations are proposed for teachers, researchers, and language institutions involved in teaching pronunciation instruction in ESL and EFL classrooms.

First, language teachers are encouraged to use a variety of oral feedback strategies rather than relying on a single approach. Since learners differ in proficiency level, learning preferences, and responsiveness to feedback, the use of explicit correction, recast, elicitation, repetition, clarification requests, and metalinguistic feedback should be adapted according to classroom needs and instructional goals. Teachers should also

consider combining immediate and delayed feedback strategies to balance pronunciation accuracy and speaking fluency.

Second, teachers are encouraged to deliver feedback in a learner-centered and supportive manner. The reviewed studies suggest that respectful, private, and selective feedback reduces learner anxiety and encourages active participation in speaking activities. Teachers should therefore focus on pronunciation errors that affect intelligibility and avoid excessive correction that may discourage learners or interrupt communication.

Third, language institutions and teacher education programs should provide training and professional development opportunities related to oral corrective feedback strategies in pronunciation instruction. Such training may help teachers develop greater awareness of how different feedback types influence learner uptake, confidence, and pronunciation development.

Lastly, future researchers are encouraged to conduct additional studies focusing on oral corrective feedback in different ESL and EFL contexts, particularly in pronunciation instruction. Further research may explore the long-term effects of feedback strategies, learners' perceptions of corrective feedback, and the effectiveness of feedback across different proficiency levels or age and groups.

VII. IMPLICATIONS FOR PRONUNCIATION TEACHING

The findings of this review provide several important implications for pronunciation teaching in ESL and EFL classrooms. The reviewed literature demonstrates that oral corrective feedback is a valuable instructional tool that supports learners in improving pronunciation accuracy, intelligibility, and communicative competence. As such, pronunciation instruction should not focus solely on the production of sounds, but also on the strategic use of corrective feedback to guide learners toward more accurate speech.

The findings further imply that teachers should adopt a flexible approach in providing pronunciation feedback. Since no single corrective feedback strategy is universally effective, teachers must consider learner proficiency, instructional goals, classroom interaction, and learner preferences when selecting feedback types. Explicit feedback may be more beneficial for beginners who require clear guidance, while implicit strategies such as recast and elicitation may be more suitable for learners with higher proficiency levels.

Additionally, pronunciation teaching should incorporate learner-centered feedback practices. Respectful, supportive, and context-sensitive correction creates a positive learning environment that encourages learners to participate more confidently in speaking activities. Teachers should prioritize phonological errors that affect intelligibility and communication while allowing learners opportunities for self-correction and reflection.

Finally, the findings highlight the importance of integrating pronunciation instruction into meaningful communicative activities. Oral corrective feedback becomes more effective when learners are engaged in speaking tasks that promote interaction, self-monitoring, and communicative use of language. Therefore, pronunciation teaching should combine



accuracy-focused instruction with communicative practice to support both fluency and intelligibility.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This literature review examined the Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies used in English as a Second Language and English as a Foreign Language classrooms. The review also tackles their effectiveness and their pedagogical implications for pronunciation teaching.

The findings reveal that ESL and EFL teachers use a variety of feedback strategies. Among these, explicit corrective feedback was frequently identified as highly effective because of its immediacy, clarity, and directness. At the same time, implicit feedback strategies such as recasts, repetition, elicitation, and clarification requests are also widely used and contribute positively to pronunciation learning by encouraging learners to notice their own errors and attempt self-correction.

Furthermore, findings from across studies consistently show that OCF is effective in enhancing pronunciation. It improves accuracy, intelligibility, communication skills, and overall language proficiency. A strong indication of the effectiveness of OCF is the positive learner uptake among learners, particularly through repetition and metalinguistic feedback. Through OCF, students have become more aware of pronunciation errors, and are guided towards more accurate and intelligible speech. The review further revealed that no single feedback strategy can be considered universally superior across all ESL and EFL contexts. While explicit corrective feedback was often found to be more beneficial for beginner and low-proficiency learners because of its directness, implicit strategies such as recasts also remain effective depending on learners' proficiency level, instructional objectives, and classroom context.

Moreover, the findings also imply that teachers should ensure that feedback remains respectful, selective, meaningful, and supportive. They are found to reduce learner anxiety, increase confidence, and encourage active participation in pronunciation and speaking activities. Additionally, using a variety of corrective feedback strategies instead of consistently using a specific one, is encouraged to ensure balance between accuracy and communicative fluency, as well as to address diverse learners' needs. Effective pronunciation instruction requires a flexible and learner-centered approach to feedback delivery. The findings also highlighted the importance of prioritizing phonological errors that affect intelligibility and communication.

Oral corrective feedback is an integral component of pronunciation instruction that supports both language development and competency. Furthermore, effective pronunciation instruction depends not only on error correction but also on how feedback is strategically delivered to address the emotional and linguistic needs of learners. This stresses the fact that teachers should carefully select and adapt corrective feedback strategies to create supportive learning environments that foster meaningful pronunciation improvement and more confident oral communication.

REFERENCES

1. Alahmed, K. I. & Jalal, B.R. (2022). *The Effect Of Using Recast And Explicit Corrective Feedback On Improving English Pronunciation Of Iraqi Intermediate School Students*. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(10).
2. Alkhamash, R., & Gulnaz, F. (2019). *Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques: An investigation of the EFL teachers' beliefs and practices at TAIF University*. *Arab World English Journal*, 10(2), 40–54. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.4>
3. B.R, Aravind & V., Dr Rajasekaran. (2021). *A STUDY ON THE DIFFICULTIES IN PRONUNCIATION OF ESL LEARNERS*. *International Journal of Advanced Research*. 9. 242-251. 10.21474/IJAR01/13400.
4. Bougataia, E., & Brigui, H. (2023). *The efficacy of recast vs. explicit corrective feedback on students' English pronunciation of common words: The case of English department students at Ibn Tofail University*. *American Journal of Education and Technology*, 2(4), 62–73. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ajet.v2i4.2179>
5. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). *Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis*. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise*
6. Calsiyao, I. (2015). *Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College students*. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 3(1). <https://www.researchpublish.com/upload/book/Corrective%20Feedback%20in%20Classroom%20Oral%20Errors-1253.pdf>
7. Capili, K. C. G., Gloria, M. N. J., & Ilustre, R. (2022). *Corrective feedback in K-12 English: Characteristics, purposes, and examples*. *International Journal of English Language Studies*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijels.2022.4.3.4>
8. Cases, Trisha & Gonzaga, Angeline & Anila, Marinella & Catam-isan, Lowella & Cuevas, Michelle & Salundaguit, Lady & Valle, Noel & Valle, Lisle. (2025). *Preferred Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies: Insights from Pre-Service Teachers in a Philippine State University*. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*. 24. 323-345. 10.26803/ijlter.24.6.15.
9. Ellis, R. (2021). *Explicit and Implicit Oral Corrective Feedback*. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 341–364). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Ergül, Hilal. (2023). *Review of Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (Eds.). (2021). The Cambridge handbook of corrective feedback in second language learning and teaching*. Cambridge University Press.. *TESOL Journal*. 15. 10.1002/tesj.726.
11. Fu, M., & Li, S. (2022). *The effects of immediate and delayed corrective feedback on L2 development*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(1), 2–34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263120000388>
12. Gitsaki, C. (2025). *UQ eSpace*. www.academia.edu/73794258/UQ_eSpace
13. Gitsaki, C., & Althobaiti, N. (2011). *ESL teachers' use of corrective feedback and its effect on learners' uptake*. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(4), 197–219.
14. Ha, Van X., Nguyen, L. T., & Hung, B. P. (2021). *Oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: A teaching and learning perspective*. *Heliyon*, 7(7), e07550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07550>
15. Kovač, M. M. (2024). *The importance of corrective feedback*. *Metodički obzori*, 19(1), 51–66.



16. Kurniawati, B., & Ayouni, N. (2023). Oral corrective feedback in EFL classroom. *JETLi: Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics*, 4*(1), 72–81.
[\[https://doi.org/10.55616/jetli.v4i1.552\]](https://doi.org/10.55616/jetli.v4i1.552) (<https://doi.org/10.55616/jetli.v4i1.552>)
17. Li, S. (2021). Oral corrective feedback. In *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 353-357). Springer, Cham.
18. Lyster, Roy & Saito, Kazuya & Sato, Masatoshi. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*. 46. 1-40. 10.1017/S0261444812000365.
19. Maaawa, P. K. L., & Cruz, R. O. (2019). REMEDIAL AND CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY. *International Journal of Language Education*, 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.26858/ijole.v1i1.7794>]
20. Monadjem, S. (2024). Self and peer-correction techniques in teaching. *MARIO Education*. <https://marioeducation.com/self-and-peer-correction-techniques-in-teaching/>
21. Patra, I., Alazemi, A., & Al-Jamal, D. (2022). The effectiveness of teachers' written and verbal corrective feedback during formative assessment on language learners' academic anxiety, academic performance, and attitude toward learning. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(19). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00169-2>
22. Qorihah, D. K., Anam, S., & Munir, A. (2025). Teachers' strategies in providing immediate and delayed corrective feedback in EFL speaking class. *Journal on Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 13(2).
<https://ejournal.iainpalopo.ac.id/index.php/ideas/article/view/8260/5221>
23. Quinto, J. B. (2020). Corrective feedback in oral communication. *Journal of International Education*, 2.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Joseph-Quinto/publication/358781100_Corrective_Feedback_in_Oral_Communication/links/6214f725eb735c508aea4da0/Corrective-Feedback-in-Oral-Communication.pdf Li, S. (2021). Oral corrective feedback. In *Research Questions in Language Education and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 353-357). Springer, Cham.
24. Soe, Thiri. (2022). Corrective Feedback in Language Teaching. 155-162.
25. Su, T., & Tian, J. (2016). Research on corrective feedback in ESL/EFL classrooms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(2), 439–444. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0602.29>
26. Zhang, J., Cao, X., & Zheng, N. (2022). How learners' corrective feedback beliefs modulate their oral accuracy: A comparative study on high- and low-accuracy learners of Chinese as a second language. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 869468.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.869468>
27. Zhu, Yan & Wang, Beilei. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*. 28. 1-29. 10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755.