

The Effects of Oral Explicit Correction Techniques on High School Students' English-Speaking Skills

Pham Hoang An^{1*}

¹Tra Vinh University, Tra Vinh Province, Vietnam

*Corresponding author's email: phamhoangan.c3mx@soctrang.edu.vn

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-5849-3097>

 <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.25433>

® Copyright (c) 2025 Pham Hoang An

Received: 01/05/2025

Revision: 04/07/2025

Accepted: 12/07/2025

Online: 30/07/2025

ABSTRACT

Keywords: explicit corrective feedback, speaking skills, high school EFL, student interaction, second language acquisition

Oral corrective feedback (CF) is a crucial tool in second language acquisition; however, its application in Vietnamese schools in the Mekong Delta region remains underexplored. This study employed a mixed-methods research approach, combining qualitative classroom observations and a quantitative survey, to investigate how English teachers utilized explicit verbal error correction in the classroom. Specifically, four English teachers were selected as the subjects of observation. Each teacher was directly observed during an English lesson, focusing on the feedback strategies they employed when students made errors in communication. Additionally, 171 students from these classes participated in a closed-ended questionnaire to collect learners' views on the effectiveness and impact of explicit corrective feedback on their learning process. The data were analyzed using content analysis for qualitative data and descriptive statistics for quantitative data. The integration of field observations and learner feedback allowed the study to provide a comprehensive and in-depth examination of the implementation of explicit corrective feedback.

Introduction

Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) has been extensively studied in the field of language education, particularly in supporting learners to recognize and correct their mistakes during the learning process. Studies by Chaudron (1977), Lyster and Ranta (1997), Sheen (2004, 2007), Lyster and Saito (2010), and Sheen and Ellis (2011) have confirmed the important role of CF in helping learners develop their language skills, including the capability to recognize and correct mistakes in communicative situations. CF can be considered a key factor in increasing language accuracy and improving learners' communicative skills (Ellis, 2009).

According to Sheen and Ellis (2011), CF not only helps learners recognize their own errors but also creates opportunities for them to develop the ability to self-correct, a critical skill in

learning second languages. In fact, mistakes are a critical part of the language acquisition stages, and can appear in the form of lexical, grammatical, or pronunciation errors (Edge, 1989; Hendrickson, 1978). Therefore, providing timely corrective feedback can prevent the reinforcement of these errors, helping learners to progress in using the target language (Li, 2014). Corrective feedback is considered a significant tool for enhancing students' accuracy in a language and supporting their overall development (Long, 1996).

However, although CF has been recognized for its obvious effects in improving learners' language abilities, there is still a lack of research on its application in oral communication, especially in the environment of general education in Vietnam. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by examining the application of explicit correction techniques by teachers to high school students in English-speaking regions of the Mekong Delta.

Literature review

Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF)

Oral Explicit Correction has been studied and defined in various ways in the area of language teaching and learning. Long (1991) found that explicit correction is considered a form of feedback in which the teacher directly corrects the student's mistakes, providing the correct form of the language, and asks the learner to repeat the error correctly. Sheen (2004) also asserts that explicit corrective feedback occurs when the teacher precisely shows the error and supplies the correct form, helping the learner to identify and correct their own language error.

In this way, explicit correction is considered a highly effective method for improving students' language accuracy (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Loewen (2012) describes this technique as a direct intervention in the student's mistakes, where the instructor not only points out the mistakes but also provides specific information about the correct form. By highlighting errors and providing the correct form, explicit error correction creates targeted learning opportunities that help students improve their ability to use the language more accurately.

Yoshida (2008, as cited in Phuong and Huan, 2018) also emphasized that explicit error correction is often used in correcting students' pronunciation errors, especially in second-language classes. This method is not only effective in detecting and correcting errors, but also helps students become aware of phonetic or grammatical elements that need improvement during the learning process. Also, according to Ellis (2015, p. 23), this technique involves direct feedback from the teacher on the errors that students make during speaking, helping learners to correct them immediately.

In this research, explicit oral error correction is understood as “any feedback from a teacher that supports students in noticing and correcting their mistakes by giving the correct language form or clear guidance on how to fix the errors” (Phuong and Huan, 2018, p. 3). Using this method in English-speaking classes helps students improve their language accuracy and encourages them to recognize and self-correct mistakes naturally, which in turn enables them to communicate more effectively.

The Contribution of Explicit Correction in Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

Oral Explicit Correction can be considered very important in SLA because it helps students to recognize and correct their mistakes in a transparent and direct manner. In SLA, “acquisition” can be understood as the process where learners gain the ability to use and understand linguistic elements correctly in real-life conversations (Ellis, 2015). Ellis (2015, p. 23) also mentions that “acquisition” can be measured by how well learners can use specific language features

accurately and naturally when communicating in real-life situations.

Explicit correction really has importance in SLA. According to Lyster et al. (2012, p.10), “CF is not only beneficial but may also be necessary to push learners forward in their L2 development”. This technique has an important position in the transfer of language development from intentional second language use (L2) to spontaneous and reflexive use of the second language, helping those who learn to use the language accurately in real-life communicative situations (Ranta and Lyster, 2007; Lyster and Sato, 2010). This finding is consistent with sociocultural theory, which posits that corrective feedback helps students transition from external support (provided by instructors) to internal self-regulation, as asserted by Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), Nassaji and Swain (2000), and Sato and Ballinger (2012).

In this context, explicit error correction helps learners identify and correct errors immediately, thereby promoting more accurate language use in communication (Ellis, 2006). Meaning negotiation theory (Pica, 1994; Long, 1996; Gass, 1997) suggests that progress in SLA occurs when learners engage in the process of negotiating meaning in communication, particularly when they encounter misunderstandings or make errors in their language use. In this process, explicit error correction techniques provide “negative evidence” of learners’ language inaccuracies, while simultaneously providing “positive evidence” of correct language use (Long, 1996). It is these adjustments that help learners modify their output and gradually improve their language abilities (Ellis, 2015).

Lyster and Saito (2010) assert that the knowledge gained from explicit error correction situations in communication tends to be applied more by learners in spontaneous communication contexts, thereby helping learners maintain accuracy in language use and increase their ability to communicate effectively. Phuong and Huan (2018) also noted that explicit error correction, particularly in pronunciation, can yield significant benefits for students, enhancing their pronunciation accuracy and increasing their confidence in communication.

Therefore, explicit oral error correction techniques not only help students identify and correct errors but also effectively promote the process of second language acquisition, thereby improving students' communication skills in English learning environments.

Types of Explicit Oral Correction

Verbal explicit correction is a crucial method in language teaching, enabling students to identify and correct their errors directly. The following are common types of explicit correction used in language teaching:

a) Sentence correction

This method involves teachers giving students sentences with corrections so that they can learn from them. In Hernández Méndez and Reyes Cruz’s 2012 study, they found that this technique refers to the purpose of providing explicit information about the correct form.

For example:

- Student: "I have a dog."
- Teacher: "It's not 'has', it's 'I have a dog'."

This sentence form not only highlights the error but also helps students learn how to use the correct verb with the subject 'I'.

b) Providing grammatical explanations

Teachers providing explicit grammatical explanations of errors can help students achieve a deeper understanding of the grammatical structure or vocabulary. According to Ellis (2009), metalinguistic feedback includes providing explicit comments on the type of error, such as using error codes or brief grammatical descriptions.

For example:

- Student: "She don't like it."
- Teacher: "We use 'doesn't' instead of 'don't' with singular subjects like 'she' in the present simple."

c) Correcting questions

When students make errors in the use of question words or question structures, teachers can correct the error by giving the perfect question form (Ellis, 2009).

For example:

- Student: "Why you are late?"
- Teacher: "We have to put the auxiliary verb before the subject: 'Why are you late?'"

The instructor of the classes not only points out grammatical errors but also provides the correct sentence patterns to support students' comprehension and enable them to ask questions more accurately in communication situations.

Effects of Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback

Research has shown that explicit correction has good impact on improving students' grammatical precision. In 2008, Bitchener and Knoch found that giving explicit corrections helps students enhance their grammar accuracy in writing and also in real-life communication. This method can support students in reducing mistakes when interacting and help them understand important grammar rules faster.

However, applying explicit corrective feedback should be flexible and suitable for each student. In some situations, if the feedback is too strong or occurs too frequently, it may make students feel less confident and impact their natural communication. Because of this, teachers should carefully consider when using this feedback method to ensure that learners still feel comfortable and willing to participate in communication activities without worrying too much about being criticized.

Learner's Uptake in Second Language Acquisition (SLA)

Uptake is considered a crucial concept in second language acquisition (SLA) research, which refers to learners' immediate reaction to a teacher's feedback. It includes cases where learners correct their mistakes after receiving feedback, as well as when they do not correct the errors or still require additional support to improve (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Uptake is not only about fixing errors, but also related to students' ability to understand and remember the information provided by the teacher's feedback. According to Lightbown and Spada (2013), learner uptake can be seen as "what learners notice and/or retain in second language input or instruction," meaning that uptake occurs not only in error correction but also during the process of learning and memorizing grammar and vocabulary points.

Uptake is considered a "discourse move," a way of communicating in class, rather than a clear measure of language learning (Mackey, Gass, and McDonough, 2000). However, some studies

suggest that uptake may be connected to language learning and can help learners process and memorize language structures more effectively (Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen, 2001). Uptake also reflects how learners understand and respond to teacher feedback, which can affect their learning and support them in improving their language accuracy.

Types of Acquisition: "Repair" and "Need (to be) Repair(ed)"

Lyster and Ranta (1997) had already classified learner acquisition into two main types: one is "repair" and the other is "need (to be) repair(ed)." The "repair" type occurs when the learner corrects their mistake immediately after receiving feedback from the teacher. For example, in a conversation, if the teacher points out a grammar mistake and the student immediately provides the correct answer, this is considered successful acquisition.

On the other hand, "need repair" acquisition occurs when the learner is unable to correct the mistake or continues to use the incorrect form after receiving feedback. For example, in the following conversation:

Teacher: "How much do you tip in a fast-food restaurant?"

Student 1: "No money." (vocabulary mistake)

Teacher: "What's the word?" (asking for a suggestion)

Student 1: "Five... four..." (need correction)

Teacher: "What's the word... in a fast-food restaurant?" (give more hints)

Student 2: "Nothing." (correct answer)

Teacher: "Nothing, yeah. Okay, what tip should you leave for the following..."
(continue lesson) (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)

In this example, Student 1 still did not completely correct the vocabulary mistake and required additional hints from the teacher to provide the correct answer. Meanwhile, Student 2 had already provided the correct answer and completed the correction process, which is considered a successful acquisition. This shows that not all learner responses will lead to correct answers immediately, and in some cases, the teacher still needs to provide additional support for students to fully correct their mistakes.

The Importance of Reception in SLA

Reception plays a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. It helps teachers to check how well students understand the information and improve their language ability. Some researchers argue that reception does not directly indicate formal learning, but it can be a sign of the learning process, demonstrating that students are able to comprehend and apply linguistic knowledge. Reception theory emphasizes the notion that when learners notice and respond to feedback, they can become more aware of their own mistakes and make progress in language learning (Panova and Lyster, 2002).

Moreover, reception also helps teachers change their teaching and feedback methods, ensuring that students not only receive feedback but also truly understand and apply it in real conversations. Some research finds that when teachers encourage students to think and find the correct answer independently, it can improve their learning and help them use language more effectively (Ellis, 2006).

Previous Studies Related to this Project

Many researchers have found that explicit correction (EC) is significant in helping students to improve their language skills, especially in second language classrooms. These correction techniques not only support learners in finding and correcting their grammar and pronunciation mistakes, but also play an essential role in improving their confidence and English

communication skills. Case studies by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001), and Safari (2013) all demonstrate that EC has a positive impact on helping students recognize their errors and develop their language skills.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) demonstrated that EC is a valuable method for learners to identify and correct grammatical and pronunciation errors, particularly in French language classes. However, they also note that the effectiveness of this method is not always high, as students do not always notice or apply corrections properly. This means that using EC should be suitable for various learning contexts and student groups.

Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001) studied EC in ESL classes and found that this method can be very helpful for students in correcting grammar mistakes. However, they also point out that student success depends on factors such as age, language level, and teacher's experience. Explicit feedback may be most effective when used in a class with close teacher support, allowing students to remember and apply grammar rules correctly.

Another study by Suzuki (2005) finds that the uptake rate of EC feedback varies significantly in each case, especially when students do not fully understand the correction. This shows that it is essential to adjust error correction methods according to students' abilities and demands, ensuring that feedback is understood and utilized effectively.

Recent research, such as Amador (2022), Nguyen and Tran (2023), and Roussel and Williams (2021), has also confirmed that EC is effective in improving students' speaking skills, especially in regions like the Mekong Delta. Amador's (2022) study shows that students who receive EC feedback are more likely to correct their mistakes compared to those who do not receive feedback, and their pronunciation and grammar also improve better. Similarly, Nguyen and Tran's (2023) research, which focuses on first-year students in the Mekong Delta, found that EC makes a significant improvement in students' pronunciation and grammar when they participate in oral presentations. However, these studies also suggest that EC's effectiveness depends on whether students are ready to learn and what kind of mistakes they need to correct.

Besides, Roussel and Williams' (2021) study finds that EC not only helps students' language skills but also makes them more confidence in communication. This is particularly important in English class because students often feel shy about using English in real-life situations. They also suggest that EC should be applied flexibly to fit with each student's ability and classroom conditions.

Moreover, other research, such as Wang and Wang (2020) and Pham and Nguyen (2022), also shows that EC plays an important role in developing students' language skills. However, they recommend that EC should go together with other teaching methods to be more effective. Especially in Mekong Delta area, where students may find it hard to learn English, EC should be used in a way that matches with their needs and situations.

Overall, oral corrective feedback is a clearly effective way to improve English speaking skills for learners, especially in areas like the Mekong Delta. However, to make it work best, teachers should use this method in a flexible way that matches each student's learning condition, and also combine it with other techniques to help students improve their learning.

Research gap

The research gap in studying about using explicit correction (EC) in teaching English speaking skills to high school students in the Mekong Delta can be pointed out below:

Although many studies have already explained the effects of EC feedback on learning foreign languages, especially in ESL classrooms, a significant gap in research remains regarding how

this method applies in the Mekong Delta, where the culture and learning habits differ. Most research before focuses on other learning environments, like English classes in big cities or English-speaking countries, but not much specific research talks about how EC use in countryside, especially for high school students in the Southwest of Vietnam (Amador, 2022; Nguyen and Tran, 2023; Roussel and Williams, 2021).

Additionally, although existing research indicates that EC is useful for improving language skills, there is a lack of in-depth analysis on its effectiveness in the specific situation of first-year university students, particularly in speaking skill lessons. Previously, most studies have focused on grammar and pronunciation, but few have discussed how EC affects students' confidence and real communication ability, especially in normal conversations where students often feel shy and lack confidence in speaking English (Roussel and Williams, 2021; Wang and Wang, 2020).

In addition, previous studies often overlook the significant factor of differences in students' ability to receive feedback, particularly those with weak or uneven language backgrounds. Although EC can help students identify and correct errors, applying this feedback effectively can be difficult when students do not fully understand or absorb the corrections given (Suzuki, 2005). Therefore, further research is needed on how to adapt EC to different groups of students in terms of their level, receptivity, and attitude towards feedback.

Finally, there is currently no research specifically examining the combination of EC with other teaching strategies to maximize the effectiveness of this method, especially in speaking skills classes at schools in the Mekong Delta. Therefore, research is needed to explore these factors, thereby proposing more flexible and suitable teaching methods in this specific learning environment.

The above research gaps present opportunities to study further and effectively apply EC in enhancing the English-speaking skills of K-12 students in Soc Trang Province, while expanding the understanding of the impact of this method in various learning environments and with students from diverse backgrounds in other languages.

Research Questions

To fulfill the purpose of the study, the survey sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What kinds of explicit corrections do teachers utilize in English-speaking lessons for high school students?
2. How often do they utilize these kinds of explicit corrections in their classrooms?
3. How often do students receive explicit corrective feedback during their learning?

By focusing on the explicit error correction strategies teachers use in English-speaking classrooms, this study not only provides a deeper understanding of teaching methods in the high school context but also makes significant contributions to improving pedagogical practices in language teaching in Vietnam.

Methods

Pedagogical Setting

In this project, the author uses a mixed-methods descriptive case study to investigate how teachers in a Vietnamese secondary school context provide explicit corrective feedback on students' speaking performance in the classroom.

To answer three research questions related to the types, frequency of use, and uptake of explicit corrective feedback in secondary English-speaking lessons, this study employs a qualitative and quantitative descriptive research method.

The study is designed as a case study, focusing on English classes in four public secondary schools in Soc Trang province, Vietnam. The aim is to examine how teachers use explicit corrective feedback in their teaching practice, as well as to collect data from students about their experiences of receiving this type of feedback.

Participants

Four teachers, who taught speaking skills to high school students, were selected via purposive sampling based on their experience (a minimum of 5 years) and qualifications (TESOL certification). Simultaneously, 171 students (Grade 10, intermediate proficiency) were chosen via convenience sampling to participate in a questionnaire and collect data on the frequency with which they received explicit corrective feedback during their learning process.

Data were collected through two main sources:

Classroom observations: Each teacher was observed during an English-speaking lesson. The observation form was designed to record the types of explicit corrective feedback that teachers used (e.g., direct correction, corrected repetition, and correct model provision), as well as their frequency during a lesson.

Student questionnaire: A semi-structured questionnaire was administered to students after each lesson to gauge their views on the extent to which they received explicit corrective feedback from their teachers and the degree to which they paid attention to and responded to this type of feedback.

Data collection & analysis

To conduct observations for this project, the author carried out the research primarily in the actual classrooms of the participants. The data from the classroom observations were analyzed using deductive content analysis with a coding framework based on Lyster and Saito (2010) to identify the types of feedback used and their corresponding frequencies. Inter-coder reliability was ensured through double-coding by two researchers, achieving 85% agreement. Meanwhile, the data from the questionnaires were processed using descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage) to reflect the level of students receiving explicit corrective feedback in the classroom.

The integration of quantitative (survey) and qualitative (classroom observation) methods ensures both reliability and depth in addressing the three research questions posed. The quantitative survey data were triangulated with the qualitative classroom observations using an explanatory sequential design.

Results/Findings

This study presents three parts, each corresponding to one of the three research questions. These parts include types of explicit corrective feedback (CF) strategies and how often teachers use them to provide feedback on students' speaking performance as well as the distribution of students' acquisition after each oral CF strategy.

Types of oral explicit corrective feedback strategies

Table 1.

Distribution of explicit corrective feedback types

Feedback type	Teacher 1	%	Teacher 2	%	Teacher 3	%	Teacher 4	%	Total	%
Sentence correction	18	60%	10	56%	19	61%	14	64%	61	60%
Correcting questions	8	27%	6	33%	7	23%	5	23%	26	26%
Providing grammatical explanations	4	13%	2	11%	5	16%	3	14%	14	14%
Total	30	100%	18	100%	31	100%	22	100%	101	100%

The distribution of oral explicit CF types can be seen in Table 1. The findings reveal that sentence correction was the most popular type of feedback used by the four high school teachers in their classes, ranging from 56 to 64 percent, with an overall rate of 60 percent in a forty-five-minute class. The following case can illustrate the high frequency of sentence correction in the classes observed:

Table 2.

Distribution of Students' Uptake Following Oral Explicit Corrective Feedback

Student (S)	<i>He go to school from Monday to Friday.</i> (Error – Using the wrong form of verb)
Teacher (T)	<i>No, it's not go. It's 'He goes to school from Monday to Friday.'</i> (Feedback – Sentence correction)
S	<i>He goes (Uptake-Repair) to school by bus</i> (Error – Pronouncing the wrong sound for 'bus' like 'push')
T	<i>by bush or by bus?</i> (Feedback – correcting question)
S	<i>by bus (Uptake-Repair). He like music class very much.</i> (Error – Using the wrong form of verb)
T	<i>He likes music class very much.</i> (Feedback– Sentence correction)
	(Teacher 1, February 19th)

After sentence correction, correcting question is the second most preferred type of explicit corrective feedback by teachers. In fact, 26% of the feedback from the four teachers falls into this category. Providing grammatical explanations is the least popular type of feedback used by teachers, perhaps because it takes time to explain the grammar points and review old lessons for students.

*Distribution of students' uptake following each of CF strategies***Table 3.**

Distribution of students' uptake in each of observed classes

Types of student uptake	Class 1 (Teacher 1)	%	Class 2 (Teacher 2)	%	Class 3 (Teacher 3)	%	Class 4 (Teacher 4)	%	Total	%
Repair	13	52%	15	63%	20	74%	18	75%	66	66%
Needs-repair	7	28%	3	13%	5	19%	6	25%	21	21%
No uptake	5	20%	6	25%	2	7%	0	0%	13	13%
Total	25	100%	24	100%	27	100%	24	100%	100	100%

The distribution of K-12 students' uptake in the four classes' observation is illustrated in Table 3. Explicit corrective feedback from teachers promotes students' uptake more than no uptake, with 87% and 13% respectively. This may imply that students can recognize the feedback given by teachers and respond accordingly, indicating a high motivation to learn English. In addition, of the two types of repair, students prefer repair uptake (at 66%), which is approximately two-thirds of the CF provided by those teachers. The rate for no uptake for explicit CF strategies is quite low (13%).

To examine the effectiveness of types of verbal explicit CF strategies in promoting students' uptake, the author conducts the following distribution:

Table 4.

Distribution of students' uptake following each of CF strategy types

Explicit CF types	Student uptake types						Total	%
	Repair	%	Needs-repair	%	No uptake	%		
Sentence correction	35	53%	10	48%	5	38%	61	60%
Providing grammatical explanations	13	20%	5	24%	2	15%	14	14%
Correcting questions	18	27%	6	29%	6	46%	26	26%
Total	66	100%	21	100%	13	100%	101	100%

According to the statistics in Table 4, the data indicate that sentence correction is the most outstanding and effective type of explicit correction, at 60%, because students' uptake of this kind of correction strategy was the most prevalent (accounting for 53% of all repair uptakes). It can be concluded that this method helps students recognize and correct their mistakes immediately. However, 48% of students in need of repair uptake and 38% have no uptake means that there are still a number of students who have not recognized their errors or have not made exact corrections for themselves immediately.

Correcting questions accounts for 26% of the feedback, but it has a 46% no-takeup rate. This

means that students may have difficulties recognizing errors when their teachers only provide questions instead of offering direct feedback. However, 27% of students still correct their mistakes successfully, which means that it can be effective in certain cases, particularly when students recognize their own errors.

Providing grammatical explanations is the least used strategy, with only 14% in the feedback. Similarly, the effectiveness of this strategy is significantly lower than that of sentence correction. In fact, only 20% of students can correct their mistakes successfully, while 24% in needs-repair uptake, and 15% have no uptake. This means that explaining grammatical points can help students understand more deeply but it does not bring instant effectiveness in correcting mistakes in speaking.

Discussion

Regarding verbal explicit corrective feedback that teachers employ to assess their students' speaking performance, three main strategies can be observed: sentence correction (60%), correcting questions (26%), and providing grammatical explanations (14%). Sentence correction is the most preferred type of these teachers, followed by correcting questions, while providing grammatical explanations is the least used strategy. To save time in the classroom, these teachers encourage students to correct their own errors with the knowledge they acquired in previous classes.

In terms of the frequency of using explicit CF, the four teachers employed most of the strategies at varying levels. It is also noticeable that these teachers preferred the sentence correction strategy most, followed by correcting questions and providing grammatical explanations. It can be inferred that choosing explicit CF is influenced by the preference of teachers, students' proficiency and especially the various corrective feedback strategies for errors that students made. Moreover, with the same error, teachers can employ different strategies to help their students recognize and correct their mistakes. For example, in an observed class, there was a conversation like the following:

Table 5.

Example of Verbal Explicit Corrective Feedback and Students' Uptake

Student 1 (S1)	<i>He become a hardworking student in his class</i> (Error – wrong form of verb)
Teacher (T)	<i>He becomes a hardworking student in his class</i> (Feedback–Sentence correction)
S1	<i>He becomes a hardworking student in his class. He tries to solves every...</i> (Uptake–Repair)
T	<i>He tries to solve</i> (Feedback–Sentence correction)
S1	<i>*keeps silent*</i> (No uptake)
T	<i>Is there anything else?</i>
Student 2 (S2)	<i>He tries to solve every exercises.</i> (Error – plural noun)
T	<i>He tries to solve every exercise.</i> (Feedback–Sentence correction)
S2	<i>He tries to solve every exercise.</i> (Uptake–Repair)

The outcomes of this study align with previous research on explicit corrective feedback in

teaching speaking skills, particularly in enhancing student accuracy and confidence (Sari, 2023). This finding is similar to the results of the current study, in which sentence correction was the most commonly used method by teachers to correct students' grammatical mistakes (60%).

Additionally, in 2009, Ellis emphasized that the effectiveness of corrective feedback depends on the type of errors students make, as well as their language proficiency level. This finding is consistent with the current study's finding that the choice of corrective feedback type is clearly influenced by teacher preference, student proficiency, and, in particular, the various forms of corrective feedback used to address errors made by students.

Moreover, this study found that teachers can employ different strategies to correct the same error, depending on the classroom context. This finding is consistent with Sheen's 2007 study, which suggests that a combination of different strategies by teachers helps students recognize and correct their errors more effectively.

In terms of the distribution of students' reactions towards oral explicit CF strategies in this study, all oral explicit CF was used, leading to students' participation. Sentence correction was the most successful in facilitating correction uptake (60%), followed by correcting questions (26%) and providing grammatical explanations (14%). This means that sentence correction and correcting questions were effective in encouraging students to recognize their errors, even when uptake of forms of correction was considered.

Regarding the various oral corrective feedback (CF) methods that prompt students to respond, the outcomes of this study are somewhat similar to those of Bitchener and Knoch (2008), which found that providing explicit correction helps students improve their grammar accuracy in speaking skills. This result is in contrast with the study of Lyster and Ranta (1997) which stated that explicit correction is an ineffective CF strategy.

The differences in the findings of those studies can be attributed to variations in research scenarios and factors across diverse classroom contexts, such as students' age, English proficiency levels, target language, teachers' preferences, and teaching experience (Suzuki, 2005; Kaivanpanah et al., 2015). As a result, an explicit CF strategy that seems effective in one study may yield contrasting results in another study, and vice versa.

Self-reflection

This project provided an insight into oral explicit CF strategies used, the ways students interact with these strategies, and the frequency of these strategies in the classroom. In fact, the results regarding frequency provided insight into teachers' preferences and the distribution of strategies in the classroom. Therefore, researchers can identify which explicit CF strategies were used most and more effective in promoting students' learning. In addition, by observing teachers' activities and analyzing explicit correction strategies in EFL classes (such as sentence correction, correcting questions, and providing grammatical explanations), the study provided valuable information about these strategies and contributed to informing teaching activities that improve students' learning results. Moreover, the study focuses mainly on how students interact with explicit correction strategies, which helps researchers understand how learners manage and combine corrected versions, a process that is crucial in understanding how learners identify and make corrections. This contributes to the theories about second language acquisition (SLA) by clarifying the process of identifying errors and correcting them.

However, it is crucial to acknowledge that there are hidden limitations in the SLA process for this project. Although this project provided valuable information about classroom activities and students' interactions, it cannot capture the full complexity of SLA processes, which are

influenced by individual, social, and contextual factors. Additionally, this qualitative study may be influenced by the authors' views and interpretations of the results. This project also provided an instant photo of the interactions in the classroom at a specific time, which is limited in capturing long-term effects on language development or the trajectory of SLA over time. For further research, it is suggested that longitudinal studies tracking students' learning progress would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the sustained impact of explicit corrective feedback on SLA.

Conclusion

The purpose of this descriptive study is to investigate the types of verbal explicit CF given by teachers to their students' errors in EFL classes, the frequency of those methods, and the extent to which students engage with corrective feedback. The outcome is that sentence correction is the most popular strategy used by teachers, following by correcting questions and providing grammatical explanations. In addition, sentence correction promotes a high level of repair uptakes, but a number of students need further repair or show no uptakes, indicating they struggled with recognizing errors or making immediate corrections. Correcting questions had a high no uptake rate, suggesting that indirect feedback can be challenging for students. Finally, providing grammatical explanations had lower effectiveness in improving students' spoken accuracy.

The findings of this study contribute to the progress of teachers by understanding how to support their students in high schools in Vietnam to improve their speaking skills. This study not only enhances knowledge about how to make explicit CF, which influences student participation in speaking activities, but it also provides teachers with valuable insights into the effects of explicit CF in speaking instructions. This study reminds teachers that they can use a variety of strategies, including new ones, to promote and support students in developing their speaking skills.

This study suggests important teaching ideas to enhance the speaking skills of students in EFL classes, particularly those in K-12. To use these strategies more effectively in teaching English, it is essential that teachers attend seminars or workshops where they can learn to provide effective feedback.

References

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 465–483.
- Amador, D. (2022). The effect of explicit correction on English language learners' speaking skills: A study at universities in Vietnam. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 15(3), 124–139.
- Amador, J. (2022). The effect of explicit corrective feedback on university students' oral proficiency in Vietnam. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition*, 34(2), 123–137.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for adult second language learners. *System*, 36(2), 239–252. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.01.002>
- Chaudron, C. (1977). The role of feedback in second language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 11(2), 115–128.

- Creswell, J. W., & Guetterman, T. C. (2018). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Đình, T. T. H., Đăng, H. D., & Hoàng, T. T. H. (2024). Các lỗi thường gặp trong kỹ năng nói tiếng Anh của sinh viên, thực trạng và giải pháp. *Tạp chí Nghiên cứu Khoa học và Phát triển*, 11–18.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction: A teacher's view*. *ELT Journal*, 43(2), 135–142.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: Theoretical perspectives. Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). The methodology of task-based teaching. In N. Van Den Branden (Ed.), *Task-based language education* (pp. 63–78). Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- Ellis, R. (2015). *Understanding second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(3), 407–436. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588031>
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387–398.
- Hernández Méndez, E., & Reyes Cruz, M. R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 14(2), 63–75.
- Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2019). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(1), 74–93.
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language acquisition: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309–365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Li, S. (2014). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language acquisition: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(4), 441–463.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Loewen, S. (2012). The role of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. In S. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 347–360). Routledge.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A critical review of theory and research. In R. P. L. A. Doughty & C. J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 1–13). Cambridge University Press.

- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(3), 269–292.
- Lyster, R., Ranta, L., & Ballinger, S. (2012). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 34(2), 125–151.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. M., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive and interpret feedback? In J. Williams & M. Burden (Eds.), *Language learning and teaching: Research in SLA* (pp. 490–502). Cambridge University Press.
- Mertler, C. A. (2021). *Introduction to educational research* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Nguyen, T. H. (2024). The role of explicit correction in improving L2 speaking accuracy. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 3(2), 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.24322>
- Nguyen, T. M., & Tran, D. Q. (2023). The role of explicit correction in enhancing speaking skills for first-year university students in the Mekong Delta. *Asian Journal of Language Education*, 14(3), 203–217.
- Nguyen, T. M., & Tran, L. Q. (2023). Explicit correction in speaking classes: The case of freshmen in the Mekong Delta. *TESOL Journal*, 24(2), 45–58.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4), 573–595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588242>
- Pham, T. B., & Nguyen, K. H. (2022). The influence of explicit corrective feedback on the oral communication skills of university students in Vietnam's Mekong Delta region. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(2), 98–110.
- Phuong, N. T. M., & Huan, L. T. (2018). Exploring corrective feedback techniques in EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language Teaching*, 30(3), 1–7.
- Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning? *Language Learning*, 44(3), 493–527.
- Roussel, D., & Williams, A. (2021). Explicit corrective feedback and student engagement in speaking tasks: Evidence from Southeast Asia. *TESOL Quarterly*, 55(4), 984–1002.
- Roussel, S., & Williams, J. (2021). Explicit correction in Southeast Asia: A case study of English-speaking classes in Vietnam. *Asian EFL Journal*, 28(1), 37–52.
- Safari, P. (2013). The impact of corrective feedback on the uptake of Iranian EFL learners. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 1–16.
- Sari, R. (2023). Corrective feedback in EFL speaking classes: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *International Journal of Language Instruction*, 2(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.54855/ijli.23214>
- Sheen, R. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Their relationship. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3), 409–426.

- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
- Sheen, R., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In M. H. Long & C. J. Doughty (Eds.), *The handbook of language teaching* (pp. 528–543). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Slimani, A. (1992). A study of learners' responses to corrective feedback in SLA. *System*, 20(1), 1–12. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(92\)90002-I](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(92)90002-I)
- Suzuki, M. (2005). Investigating the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(1), 107–133. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588470>
- Suzuki, M. (2005). The effectiveness of explicit corrective feedback in ESL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(3), 103–127.
- Wang, L., & Wang, C. (2020). The impact of explicit corrective feedback on speaking proficiency in EFL contexts. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 45–61.
- Wang, L., & Wang, J. (2020). The role of explicit correction in second language acquisition: A focus on university students in China. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(4), 100–115.
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Corrective feedback in second language learning: A study of Japanese learners of English. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 30(1), 99–115.

Biodata

Pham Hoang An is an English teacher at a high school in the Mekong Delta, Vietnam. With 15 years of teaching experience, I have worked with students of diverse educational backgrounds. My interests include English language teaching methodologies and adapting instruction to meet learners' varying levels of cognitive development.