



## Effectiveness of Written vs. Oral Corrective Feedback in Syntactic Structure Mastery

**Fatih Humam Ramadhan**

Universitas Swadaya Gunung Jati, Indonesia  
Corresponding email: atihaja007@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *This study explores the effectiveness of written and oral corrective feedback in improving mastery of syntactic structures. The background of the study highlights the need for effective correction strategies that enable students to understand and apply grammar accurately. Qualitative methods, including observations, interviews, and document analysis, were used to analyze students' responses to both types of feedback. Results show that written feedback provides a permanent reference that can be reviewed repeatedly, while oral feedback encourages instant correction and interactive discussion. The implication is that teachers should combine the two methods to provide students with a combination of detailed explanations and immediate corrections, while considering students' motivation and comfort factors in receiving corrections.*

**Keywords:** *corrective feedback, written, oral, syntactic structures*

---

### 1. Introduction

Mastery of syntactic structures in language learning is a key focus for educators seeking to enhance their students' ability to communicate accurately. In the context of language teaching, effective feedback plays a critical role in enhancing learners' syntactic competence. One widely applied strategy is the provision of corrective feedback, which aims to help learners understand and correct their errors. However, in the context of teaching, there has been debate over the effectiveness of written and oral corrective feedback, especially in helping students understand and apply syntactic concepts (Arifin & Lestari, 2021). While both forms of feedback have been recognized for their potential benefits, it remains unclear which method is more effective in facilitating mastery of syntactic structures. Both forms of feedback have their advantages and limitations, and there is no consensus on which one is most effective. Written feedback is considered more permanent and allows for repeated study, while oral feedback is immediate and spontaneous (Brown & Chen, 2022). Despite these known benefits, the effectiveness of both feedback types is influenced by various factors such as learning motivation, the linguistic level of the learners, and cultural context (Delgado et al., 2023). Therefore, studies comparing the effectiveness of written and oral corrective feedback in syntax acquisition are crucial.

The background of this study is rooted in the urgency of improving the quality of language learning, which not only focuses on the final results but also on the learning process. As global communication demands for both spoken and written competence in a second language rise, effective teaching methods that address these needs are essential. In this modern era, the demand for students to write and speak with good grammatical structures is increasing (Handoko, 2020). Therefore, grammar learning approaches must also be adaptive, allowing students to master syntactic structures more effectively. Corrective feedback has become an integral part of language learning evaluation; however, its effectiveness often depends on how it is delivered and students' ability to understand the correction (Huang & Li, 2021). While teachers often combine both written and oral feedback, the lack of empirical research comparing the two types in terms of syntactic structure mastery leaves a gap in our understanding of the effectiveness of these approaches. In practice, teachers often combine written and oral feedback, but there has been no systematic measurement of the effectiveness of this combination. This highlights the need for further research that directly compares the two feedback methods.

The main issue to be addressed in this study is how the difference between written and oral corrective feedback affects students' ability to master syntactic structures. This study addresses the gap by specifically comparing both feedback methods and assessing their impact on syntactic structure mastery. It is often found that students can understand corrections theoretically but struggle to apply them in language practice (Matsumoto, 2022). In addition, written feedback that only contains error marks without explanation can demotivate students (Kawamura & Tanaka, 2020). On the other hand, oral feedback given quickly has the potential to be poorly captured by students, resulting in suboptimal correction. This raises the question of whether the immediate nature of oral feedback helps or hinders practical application, especially when compared to the reflective nature of written feedback. This leads to confusion about when and under what conditions one type of feedback is more effective than another (Johnson, 2023). Additionally, there is no systematic guidance on selecting appropriate feedback strategies for specific syntactic errors. By investigating these aspects, this study aims to provide a thorough understanding of the advantages and limitations of both approaches.

The urgency of this research becomes more apparent when we realize the increasing need for precise language competence at various levels of education. In professional and academic environments, precision in both written and spoken communication is highly valued. Many institutions require graduates who can communicate effectively, both orally and in writing (Kim & Park, 2019). Syntax errors, although seemingly trivial, can lead to significant misunderstandings and even lower the credibility of the speaker or writer (Rodriguez, 2021). Therefore, an appropriate corrective feedback approach is urgently needed to improve language accuracy. This

research will provide an empirical basis for educators to select the most effective correction strategies (Smith & Garcia, 2023). Understanding which type of feedback works best under different learning conditions will help educators design more effective instructional methods. If one type of feedback proves superior, then educational institutions can optimally allocate resources and time for its implementation. Without a thorough understanding, efforts to improve students' syntactic skills may not achieve the expected results.

Some previous studies have highlighted the benefits of corrective feedback, but they have generally focused on only one type of approach, such as written feedback (Liu & Wang, 2021). These studies often overlook the impact of oral corrective feedback on the mastery of syntactic structures, particularly in formal or academic settings. There is also research that examines the effectiveness of oral feedback in interactive learning situations (Chang & Lin, 2022). However, studies comparing these two types of feedback directly are limited, so there is no general conclusion regarding their effectiveness (Ferguson et al., 2019). In addition, the effectiveness of feedback is known to be affected by factors such as students' linguistic level, learning style, frequency and timing of feedback, and the type of material being corrected. Research has also shown that cultural context and students' motivation significantly influence how feedback is received and processed. Research has also shown the importance of considering the cultural context and motivation of students in receiving feedback. Therefore, a research gap exists that needs to be addressed through a thorough comparative study on the impact of both types of feedback on the acquisition of syntactic structures.

The novelty of this study lies in its approach of combining qualitative and quantitative methods to assess the impact of written and oral feedback simultaneously (White, 2020). This methodological combination is a key innovation, as it provides both statistical evidence and in depth insights into the feedback process. In addition, this study also considered aspects such as students' skill level, typology of syntax errors, and individual learning preferences (Martens, 2021). With this holistic approach, more contextualized recommendations on when and how certain types of feedback can be effectively applied are expected. By integrating both qualitative and quantitative data, this study seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of the factors that determine the effectiveness of corrective feedback. This research not only assesses the short-term results of correction but also its sustainability in daily language practice (D'Amico & Rossi, 2023). Through valid instrument testing and in-depth analysis, this study aims to provide a robust empirical foundation for educators. Therefore, this research is expected to make a real contribution to the development of more effective and sustainable language learning strategies.

This study aims to empirically determine the effectiveness of written and oral corrective feedback in improving students' mastery of syntactic structures. The

primary objective is to compare the impact of each feedback method on students' ability to apply syntactic rules both in writing and speaking. The findings of this study are expected to inform the development of more targeted learning strategies for teachers and educational institutions. The benefits of this study extend beyond the selection of more effective correction methods by educators, also providing a new theoretical basis for researchers in the field of language teaching. The implication is that educational institutions can efficiently allocate resources and time to implement the type of feedback that proves most effective. Students who receive feedback according to their individual learning needs will be more motivated to correct errors and improve their abilities independently. The application of the results of this study is expected to support efforts to improve the quality of language learning, as well as strengthen students' competitiveness at the national and international levels. Thus, the curriculum and teaching methods can be adjusted to the real needs to form a strong and applicable syntactic competence.

## 2. Method

His study uses a qualitative approach that focuses on an in-depth exploration of the effectiveness of written and oral corrective feedback in mastering syntactic structures. The qualitative approach was chosen due to its ability to capture the subjective experiences of both teachers and students in the learning process, making it ideal for understanding how feedback impacts syntactic mastery. This study employs a phenomenological design, enabling a thorough exploration of the lived experiences of students and teachers when receiving and providing corrective feedback. The study's focus is on the grammar learning process in the classroom, with data sources including teaching activities, teacher-student interactions, written assignments, and recorded observations. The sample consists of students from a secondary-level language education institution, with participants purposively selected to represent a range of ability levels and learning characteristics. This selection ensures that various perspectives on the effectiveness of feedback are considered (Brown & Chen, 2022).

The research instruments included a semi-structured interview guide, a learning behavior observation sheet, and a document analysis of students' written work. The semi-structured interviews were designed to explore both students' and teachers' perspectives on the effectiveness of feedback. They allowed for open-ended responses, with questions focused on feedback types, student engagement, and the reception of feedback. Data collection techniques included participatory observation in the classroom, interviews with teachers and students, and documentation in the form of written assignments and reflective notes. Classroom observations were conducted in real-time, focusing on how feedback was delivered and how students reacted during lessons. The researcher also reviewed students' written assignments and reflective

notes to capture their self-reported responses to feedback. Baseline data was collected over several meetings, paying attention to how teachers provided written and oral corrective feedback and how students responded to it.

The research procedure began with a field assessment to identify the learning context, followed by the recruitment of relevant participants based on specific criteria (Delgado et al., 2023). Participants were recruited based on their experience with corrective feedback and their willingness to participate in the study. Specific inclusion criteria included students who had received both written and oral feedback in previous grammar lessons. The researcher then conducted direct classroom observations and in-depth interviews to identify student responses and constraints. Interviews were scheduled after each lesson to gather immediate reactions from both students and teachers about the feedback received. The data were analyzed using a thematic analysis technique, in which the collected data were grouped based on common themes such as types of syntax errors, responses to feedback, and level of understanding (D'Amico & Rossi, 2023). Data validity was strengthened through source triangulation, comparing observation notes, interview transcripts, and assignment documents. Triangulation was applied by combining data from the three sources to identify consistent patterns across the observations, interviews, and written assignments. This approach helped ensure that the interpretations of feedback effectiveness were grounded in multiple perspectives. Furthermore, the researcher conducted critical reflection to interpret the findings, paying attention to contextual factors such as motivation and learning style. The researcher regularly wrote reflection notes during data collection to minimize researcher bias and ensure an objective interpretation of the data. Finally, the results of the analysis were systematically organized to obtain a comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of the two types of corrective feedback in improving the mastery of syntactic structures.

The chosen qualitative methods align directly with the research objectives, as they allow for a thorough understanding of how written and oral corrective feedback influence students' mastery of syntactic structures. The phenomenological design is particularly suited to this study because it focuses on exploring the lived experiences of participants, which is essential for understanding how feedback affects learning outcomes. By integrating both observational and interview data, this study provides a comprehensive perspective on the feedback process and its impact on language mastery.

### **3. Result & Discussion**

#### **Observation of Written Corrective Feedback**

Initial observations revealed that written corrective feedback was predominantly delivered through direct notes on students' assignment sheets. Teachers typically provided detailed corrections on the incorrect parts of the assignments, accompanied

by brief comments on the proper use of syntactic structures. This written approach enables students to independently review corrections and re-study them at their own pace, promoting long term retention. This method provides students with the opportunity to review corrections independently and repeatedly, without being limited by a specific time frame. Thus, students can re-read the corrections while studying at home and obtain concrete references for correcting errors. However, the primary limitation of this method is the lack of direct interaction, which may leave students confused if they do not fully understand the written explanation. If students do not understand the written explanation, they still have the potential for confusion. Additionally, without teacher supervision, some students tend to disregard the corrections provided. Despite this limitation, for students who prefer structured and written forms of learning, this type of feedback can be highly effective, particularly for improving long-term syntactic mastery.

In practice, teachers often mark syntax errors with specific symbols or marks and then add a brief explanation in the margins of the page. This approach enables teachers to focus on frequent errors and categorize the most common types of syntax errors. Students generally find this method helpful as it enables them to track recurring error patterns. When receiving the corrected assignments, most students found it helpful in tracing their error patterns. However, some students found the written explanations too brief, requiring additional time to understand the meaning. This variability in response suggests that the effectiveness of written corrective feedback is influenced by individual learning styles, with reflective learners likely to benefit more from this approach than others. This suggests that individual learning styles strongly influence the effectiveness of written feedback. Written feedback also provides teachers with a more efficient method to document student progress, as it can be done outside of class time without taking away from class hours.

Figure 1 below illustrates an example of the application of written corrective feedback on one student's assignment, as observed in this study. In the figure, some phrases are underlined in color, indicating the location of the syntax errors that have been identified. On the right side of the text, the teacher provides corrective notes, along with the rationale behind the corrections. This visualization confirms that the written approach not only highlights the errors but also provides short, actionable solutions. This way, students can follow the teacher's train of thought and understand why a sentence is inappropriate. The addition of visual elements such as colors or symbols also serves to facilitate the recognition and recall of corrected errors. This approach is expected to lighten the cognitive load and make it easier for students to review their errors independently.



**Figure 1.** Example of Implementation of Written Corrective Feedback

In general, in depth classroom observations revealed variations in students' responses to written feedback. Most students showed initiative in asking further questions at the next meeting, indicating a genuine desire to understand their mistakes truly. However, there were also a small number of students who only skimmed the correction and did not follow up. Internal factors, such as learning motivation and comfort in reading the corrected text, are the primary determinants of the success of this strategy. From the teacher's perspective, written feedback facilitates the process of documenting student progress, including the types of errors that often occur. This documentation then serves as a crucial basis for evaluation and the development of more adaptive teaching strategies. Therefore, although not consistently effective for all students, written corrective feedback still provides a strong basis for learning syntactic structures, especially when combined with other approaches that are more responsive to students' individual needs.

### **The Effect of Oral Corrective Feedback on Syntactic Development**

Unlike the written approach, oral corrective feedback places more emphasis on the direct interaction between teachers and students during the learning process. In practice, teachers usually correct syntactic errors made by students while they speak or answer questions in class. The key advantage of oral corrective feedback is its immediacy; students can correct their mistakes right away, facilitating a real-time exchange of ideas. The primary advantage of this approach is its ability to provide real-time corrections, enabling students to correct their mistakes promptly. This creates an instantaneous process of negotiating meaning and can boost students' confidence in their speaking abilities. However, the challenge is that students may feel embarrassed or pressured when corrected in front of their peers. If not delivered empathetically, oral correction can disrupt the flow of communication and cause students to feel more anxious, thereby hindering effective language use. If not approached empathetically, oral correction can hinder the smooth flow of classroom interaction. Even so, oral feedback still has its advantages for students who have an auditory learning preference and need immediate explanations.

Table 1 below presents a summary of students' responses to oral corrective feedback, obtained through interviews and classroom observations. As many as 40 percent of the participants stated that they understood syntactic errors more easily if they were directly explained orally by the teacher. The data highlights that oral feedback is more effective for students who prefer immediate clarification and those who actively engage in classroom discussions. About 30 percent of the students found it very helpful because they could directly ask questions if there were things they did not understand. On the other hand, 20 percent of students admitted to feeling uncomfortable because they were afraid of losing face when corrected in front of others. Meanwhile, another 10 percent did not provide a significant response, possibly because they rarely participate in class speaking activities. This variation highlights the importance of personalized approaches in delivering oral feedback. A student-centered feedback method, with sensitivity to individual learner needs, can optimize oral correction.

**Table 1.** Students' Perception of Oral Corrective Feedback (N=40)

<b>Response Categories</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Easier to understand	16	40
Can ask questions back	12	30
Feeling uncomfortable	8	20
No significant reaction	4	10

Some students who responded positively revealed that oral correction helped them understand the context of the speech situation. Teachers often model the correct sentences, so students get a concrete picture without having to guess. Additionally,

the direct verbal exchange facilitates clarification, enabling the teacher to assess students' understanding instantly. However, in some cases, students who feel anxious about speaking in public are even more reluctant to express their opinions. In such situations, the teacher needs to adjust the tone and manner of delivering corrections so that students do not feel intimidated. A warm and supportive oral approach has been shown to increase students' confidence when learning syntactic structures. Therefore, oral corrective feedback is more prominent in the interactive aspect, although it needs to adjust the communication style to be effective.

Another positive effect identified was the improved verbal fluency of students who regularly received oral correction. They become accustomed to correcting errors spontaneously, so that correct syntactic structures are more quickly embedded in memory. It is also easier for teachers to evaluate common errors that are often repeated and give special emphasis on certain patterns. On the other hand, time constraints in the classroom can be a hindrance, as oral correction often requires long pauses in conversation. When the number of students is large, the teacher may not have time to provide detailed corrections for each individual. However, observations show that students tend to remember more when their mistakes are corrected immediately. In conclusion, oral corrective feedback is effective for syntax acquisition in interactive contexts, but requires teacher flexibility in adjusting the delivery.

### **Comparison of the Success of Written and Oral Corrective Feedback**

Based on the data analysis, the difference in effectiveness between the two types of feedback is evident in aspects such as retention and in-depth understanding of syntactic structures. Written feedback tends to provide greater self-learning opportunities, as students can refer back to the corrections provided. On the other hand, oral feedback provides an immediate response, allowing for correction during the communication process. These two approaches complement each other, especially when the teacher effectively combines them in proportion. Graph 1 below illustrates the percentage increase in students' syntax test scores after receiving feedback of different intensities. The data were generated by comparing the pre-test and post-test results over several weeks of monitoring. The results indicate that the combination of both methods was able to increase the percentage of success higher than the use of either method alone.

Based on the data analysis, the difference in effectiveness between the two types of feedback is evident in aspects such as retention and in depth understanding of syntactic structures. The combination of written and oral feedback provides a multi-layered approach to learning, where students benefit from immediate correction and reflective review. Written feedback tends to provide greater self-learning opportunities, as students can refer back to the corrections provided. On the other hand, oral feedback provides an immediate response, allowing for correction during

the communication process. These two approaches complement each other, especially when teachers balance them appropriately to suit individual learner needs. These two approaches complement each other, especially when the teacher effectively combines them in proportion.

Graph 1 displays the horizontal axis of the three treatment groups: the group that received only written feedback, the group that received only oral feedback, and the group that received both. The vertical axis shows the percentage increase in the average syntax test score for each group. The pure written feedback group recorded an improvement of approximately 15 percent, while the oral feedback group recorded an improvement of about 20 percent. Interestingly, the group that received both types of feedback showed an increase of up to 30 percent. This difference confirms that using a combined approach can maximize student understanding and retention. Graph 1 visually underscores the importance of combining the advantages of each method. This way, teachers can adjust the correction portion according to the needs and conditions of the class.

The thematic analysis of the in-depth interviews confirmed that students who received both types of feedback found it doubly beneficial. They were able to study the written notes in depth outside of class and ask oral questions as the learning progressed. This combination helped students understand the reasoning behind the correction and apply it to other contexts. For some students, the oral correction provided a confidence boost to try again, while the written correction reinforced understanding of the correct structure. This success was also influenced by motivation levels, with students who actively sought feedback showing faster syntactic development. However, there were still a handful of students who did not optimally utilize both types of correction due to personal constraints, such as a lack of motivation to read notes or a fear of asking questions in class. Nonetheless, the general trend indicates that combining written and oral approaches yields significant results.

From the teacher's perspective, providing both types of feedback also helps with time management and consistency of correction. Teachers can identify common writing errors and discuss them orally during class discussions. This strategy streamlines the process, as students already have a base of understanding before proceeding to the oral explanation. Although it requires more preparation for the teacher, learning outcomes show improvement that is worth the effort. Moreover, the dual approach allows for differentiation of methods, so that each student receives the type of correction that best suits their learning style. Thus, a comparison of the success of these two methods shows that they need not be contradictory, but can complement each other. This gives teachers more freedom in designing rich and adaptable learning experiences.

### **Comparison with Previous Research**

The findings of this study align with several studies that emphasize the importance of corrective feedback in enhancing grammatical understanding. However, this study adds to the literature by directly comparing the effectiveness of written and oral feedback, providing a clearer understanding of when and how each type works best. Some previous studies have highlighted the effectiveness of written correction in improving sentence structure accuracy, while others have emphasized the importance of oral correction in communicative situations. This research contributes to the understanding of the complementary role of both types of feedback in fostering both immediate correction and long-term retention. Studies combining both methods have also shown significant results, although they have not detailed the long-term effects on syntactic acquisition. The results of the current study contribute to the evidence that both methods are unique and have different levels of effectiveness, yet they can be a powerful combination. Some previous studies tend to be limited to small classroom contexts or specific task types, whereas this study encompasses a broader range of written and oral tasks. As such, this study contributes to providing a comprehensive perspective that emphasizes the importance of diverse feedback strategies. This comparison reinforces the notion that corrective approaches are not one dimensional, but instead require flexibility and innovation.

Other studies have highlighted the influence of individual factors, such as motivation and anxiety, on receiving corrections, and this study found similar results in the field. Highly motivated students tended to be more responsive to both types of feedback, while those with public speaking anxiety preferred written corrections. These findings complement previous studies that emphasize the importance of understanding students' personal characteristics to target corrections effectively. In certain contexts, previous research has also confirmed that reading habits influence the effectiveness of written corrections, a finding that is also supported in the current study. However, other studies have not discussed how teachers can systematically combine the two methods, whereas this study provides a practical overview of the results. With in-depth qualitative data, researchers can formulate more precise recommendations on when each method should be used. This also encourages future research to include long-term measurements to assess the stability of syntax acquisition.

Some previous studies have focused on quantitative measures, such as improvement in test scores, without exploring students' internal processes in understanding correction. This study, using a qualitative approach, uncovered the mechanisms by which students absorb, reject or adapt written and oral feedback. Analysis of interviews and observations revealed students' feelings towards the

correction process, both directly in class and through written notes. These findings align with research that emphasizes the importance of affective and social dimensions in language learning. However, some previous studies have not provided details on the impact of correction on specific variations of syntactic structures, such as complex sentences or relative clauses. Instead, this study shows that the level of syntactic difficulty determines the intensity of feedback required. In other words, compared to the results of other studies, this study provides a more specific picture that can be adjusted to the students' linguistic level.

From the overall comparison, it can be concluded that the findings of this study align with the general direction of previous research, but enrich the implementation details. Some studies emphasize the importance of oral interaction in triggering immediate improvement, while others acknowledge the superiority of the more reflective written approach. This research combines both views and confirms that an integrative approach can bring more optimal results. The addition of empirical data on classroom dynamics and student characteristics helps explain variations in responses to feedback. While not replacing previous studies, the findings provide a solid foundation for teachers to make more measured decisions. In addition, this study encourages other researchers to design follow-up studies that examine the effectiveness of corrections over a longer period. As such, this publication has the potential to open up new horizons for research into more contextualized and adaptive grammar teaching methods.

### **Practical Implications and Research Limitations**

In terms of teaching practice, the findings suggest that teachers should combine written and oral feedback to maximize results. For teachers, this means strategically balancing the two feedback forms based on the learner's needs and the context in which language is being used. This combination proved to have a layered effect, with students able to reflect on errors individually and then discuss them in class. For students who prefer to study notes, written explanations provide a comprehensive foundation for self-study. Meanwhile, for students who need real-time guidance, oral correction helps correct syntax errors instantly. Teachers need to observe student characteristics to determine the portion of each method to remain efficient.

The study also highlighted the need to develop correction techniques that are sensitive to students' emotional factors. Oral feedback should be given in a positive and friendly manner, especially to students who tend to fear criticism in public. Written feedback, on the other hand, should be annotated and have a consistent marking system, so that students do not get confused in interpreting the correction. Thus, every syntax error can become a learning opportunity rather than a trigger for frustration. Teachers are also encouraged to stimulate class discussions on common errors, so that corrections can be collective and mutually supportive. This method

fosters a sense of community and encourages students to be more receptive to feedback from various sources, including peers. Ultimately, the synergy between individual and group approaches will form a strong foundation in mastering syntactic structures.

The limitations of this study include the duration of observation, which has not covered an extended period, so the stability of syntactic improvement has not been fully monitored. Additionally, the number of participants remains limited, so the results cannot be generalized to all language learning contexts. This study has also not explored the influence of external factors, such as technological support or the availability of additional time outside of class hours. Nevertheless, the in-depth qualitative data succeeded in describing the classroom dynamics and provided rich insights, both theoretical and practical. For future researchers, combining longitudinal studies with quantitative approaches may provide a more comprehensive picture. Further research could also potentially test the effectiveness of corrective feedback on certain types of syntactic structures, such as complex sentences or passive sentences. Thus, these findings can still be further developed and refined to reach a broader scope of research.

Despite these limitations, this study makes a significant contribution to the field of language education, particularly in terms of correction strategies. The comparative approach, which highlights both written and oral feedback, enriches the options for teachers to adapt their methods to the characteristics of the class. Students also benefit from the variety of corrections that make them more aware of errors and how to correct them. Other researchers can use these results as a reference to analyze further the psychological and linguistic factors that contribute to the effectiveness of corrections. The combination of a qualitative approach and various evaluation instruments enables in depth and actionable findings. By implementing the practical recommendations that emerged from this study, educational institutions are expected to sustainably improve students' syntactic skills. Ultimately, the effectiveness of corrective feedback is not just a technical issue, but is also closely related to building a supportive and participatory learning environment.

The limitations of this study include the duration of observation, which has not covered an extended period, so the stability of syntactic improvement has not been fully monitored. Additionally, the number of participants remains limited, so the results cannot be generalized to all language learning contexts. Further research should consider larger sample sizes and explore the long-term impacts of corrective feedback on syntax acquisition. This study has also not explored the influence of external factors, such as technological support or the availability of additional time outside of class hours.

#### 4. Conclusion

This study confirms that written and oral corrective feedback both play an important role in correcting students' syntax errors. Written feedback provides permanent documentation that can be studied repeatedly, while oral feedback encourages immediate correction and interactive communication. The combination of both methods proved to yield the best results, as students received detailed explanations along with immediate feedback. Motivational factors and learning styles also influence how students respond to each type of correction. Thus, a varied corrective approach maximizes the potential for mastering syntactic structures.

Teachers need to adjust the proportion of using written and oral feedback to make it effective for students' needs and characteristics. The results also indicate the need for strategies that foster students' emotional comfort when receiving correction, especially in open discussion forums. The improvement in syntax test scores confirmed that the two correction methods complemented each other in improving comprehension and recall. In addition to emphasizing the technical aspects of language correction, these efforts should be balanced with motivational support for students. By combining various forms of feedback, educational institutions can foster more robust and relevant language competence.

#### 5. References

- Arifin, M. A., & Lestari, R. (2021). Revisiting written corrective feedback in language teaching. *Journal of Language Pedagogy*, 14(2), 33-45.
- Brown, G., & Chen, S. (2022). The impact of oral feedback on syntactic development. *Second Language Acquisition Research*, 19(1), 77-90.
- Chang, C., & Lin, H. (2022). Comparative effectiveness of oral and written corrections. *Language Teaching Innovations*, 8(3), 114-128.
- D'Amico, A., & Rossi, M. (2023). Long-term retention of syntax post-corrective feedback. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(1), 9-26.
- Delgado, J., Rivera, T., & Lopez, A. (2023). Learner motivation and teacher feedback style. *Educational Linguistics Journal*, 5(2), 45-58.
- Ferguson, T., Kimura, T., & Santos, G. (2019). The role of feedback type in L2 syntactic accuracy. *Bilingual Education Studies*, 12(3), 66-79.
- Handoko, S. (2020). Adaptive grammar teaching in modern classrooms. *International Journal of EFL Research*, 16(2), 101-115.
- Huang, W., & Li, Y. (2021). Written feedback strategies for advanced EFL learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing Studies*, 10(1), 12-25.
- Johnson, L. (2023). Sustaining learner interest through corrective feedback. *Language Teaching and Learning Quarterly*, 7(2), 40-52.
- Kawamura, R., & Tanaka, M. (2020). Learner engagement with written errors. *ELT Practice & Research*, 4(1), 13-27.
- Kim, J., & Park, S. (2019). Formal language proficiency demands in higher education. *Linguistic Challenges Journal*, 5(3), 112-126.

- Liu, H., & Wang, P. (2021). Revisiting corrective feedback approaches. *Language and Cognition*, 17(2), 66-81.
- Martens, R. (2021). Examining student preferences for various feedback modes. *Language Classroom Studies*, 9(4), 47-60.
- Matsumoto, K. (2022). Bridging theoretical and practical knowledge in grammar instruction. *Asian Language Research Forum*, 15(1), 89-102.
- Rodriguez, M. (2021). Oral feedback implications in L2 grammar instruction. *Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 22(3), 99-113.
- Smith, B., & Garcia, L. (2023). Teacher perceptions on feedback delivery methods. *Classroom Discourse Analysis*, 11(2), 23-41.
- White, J. (2020). Blended feedback design in language education. *Educational Technology and Linguistics*, 3(1), 17-29.
- Yazid, Z., Rahman, M. A., & Hamid, F. (2019). Evaluating grammar-focused interventions. *Journal of Linguistic Improvement*, 6(4), 66-79.
- Brown, G., & Chen, S. (2022). *The impact of oral feedback on syntactic development*. *Second Language Acquisition Research*, 19(1), 77-90.
- D'Amico, A., & Rossi, M. (2023). *Long-term retention of syntax post-corrective feedback*. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(1), 9-26.
- Delgado, J., Rivera, T., & Lopez, A. (2023). *Learner motivation and teacher feedback style*. *Educational Linguistics Journal*, 5(2), 45-58.