TEACHER CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE AND THEIR UPTAKE IN EFL CLASSES

Tran Thi Bich Phuong,
Nguyen Buu Huan[i]
Can Tho University, Vietnam

Abstract

Corrective feedback plays a critical role in language teaching and learning, but little research has been done with regard to teachers' practices of corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake. This paper therefore reports on a descriptive study using qualitative approach to provide insights into strategies teachers used to deliver corrective feedback to their students' speaking performance and distribution of student uptake within EFL context. Data were collected from observations of two teachers and fifty students at a private high school in a Mekong Delta region. The findings indicate that recast and explicit correction were used the most and that clarification request, recast, and metalinguistic cue were effective in helping students recognize their errors. Implications for language teaching are also presented.

Keywords: oral corrective feedback, uptake, recast, high school

1. Introduction

Corrective feedback has been widely addressed in research on teaching and learning as it facilitates learners' interlanguage development and learning (e.g., Chaudron, 1977; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010b; Sheen, 2004; Sheen, 2007; Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Corrective feedback (CF) or error correction plays a critical role in language teaching and learning as this teaching strategy facilitates language learning and ensures linguistic accuracy (Ellis, 2009). This view implies that CF is viewed as key element in helping learners improve their learning through self-correction (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). However, making errors is considered as a natural part of language learning (Edge, 1989; Hendrickson, 1978). Thus, learning a foreign language is a gradual process which errors are likely to occur in all stages (Trustcott, 1996). Errors can come in various types such as lexical, phonological, or syntactic errors. Given that errors are developmental (Li, 2014), error correction or CF is essential. When learners use a word in a context it

---

[i] Correspondence: email nbhuan@ctu.edu.vn

does not belong to, mispronounce words, or make syntactic errors, it is necessary for learners to receive corrective feedback that makes them become aware of their errors and then avoid making such similar errors again. If the learners' errors are not corrected, they may become fossilized which ingrains in learners' mind and hinders the learners to achieve the progress of linguistic competence. CF, therefore, plays an indispensable role in learning and teaching a foreign or second language with regard to linguistic accuracy (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Sheen & Ellis, 2011) and interaction from specific linguistic forms that result in effectively increasing communicative competence (Long, 1996).

Despite the significant and long-term effects of CF on facilitating language learning and development, there has not been any research that investigates practices of oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance and their uptake within the teaching and learning context in Vietnam. This article therefore examines teachers' delivery of oral corrective feedback and its effects. The research questions that guided the study reported on in this paper were, 'What types of oral corrective feedback strategies do teachers use to provide corrective feedback on students' speaking performance? and, 'What is the distribution of student uptake following the given oral corrective feedback strategies?'

The concepts of corrective feedback, student uptake and types of oral corrective feedback strategies are clarified in order to address the research questions for this study.

2. Oral corrective feedback

Oral corrective feedback has been defined in various aspects in language teaching and learning (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Chaudron, 1977; Ellis, 2006; Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006; Lightbown & Spada, 2003; Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012). The term 'corrective feedback' was coined by Chaudron (1977) to refer to "*any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demand improvement of the learner utterance*" (p. 31). This view suggests the role of the teacher in assisting learners in correcting their errors or providing feedback to learners for their language performance. However, eleven years later, this perspective further adds to the understanding that learners are required to correct the errors in their oral production in order to keep them informed of such error to be avoided (Chaudron, 1988). The reaction of the teacher to the learner's erroneous utterances can be implicit (such as confirmation checks, repetitions, recasts, clarification requests, and even facial expressions) or explicit (such as a grammatical explanation or an over error correction) (Carroll & Swain, 1993; Schachter, 1991). Despite such claims, CF is considered as information given to learners regarding a linguistic error they have made (Loewen, 2012; Sheen, 2007). CF can be simply as "*any indication to a learner that his/her use of the target language is incorrect*" (Lightbown & Spada, 2003, p. 172) or 'responses to learner utterances containing an error' (Ellis, 2006, p. 28) but also as a "complex phenomenon with several functions"

(Chaudron, 1988, p. 152) consisting of "*(a) an indication that an error has been committed, (b) provision of the correct target language form, or (c) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these*" (Ellis et al., 2006, p. 340). In a similar vein, Yoshida (2008) describes CF as a form the teacher corrects a student's erroneous oral production.

Although there are different conceptualizations of oral corrective feedback, it is widely held that oral CF is useful to students through the help of the teacher as an initiator in correcting their inaccurate speech. For the study reported in this article, the term *oral corrective feedback* refers to any correction technique used by the teacher to indicate or respond to students' erroneous utterances by providing them with the correct form regarding their errors or giving them clues for correction.

2.1 Type of oral CF strategies

Observational and experimental studies have indicated differential effects of CF types on language learning (Li, 2010; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster & Saito, 2010a). In their influential study, Lyster and Ranta (1997) develop an analytic model to code error treatment sequences and identified six types of CF such as recast, explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. This model is also used in Sheen's (2011) study regarding an additional CF type, namely explicit correction with meta-linguistic explanation. Sheen (2011) also substitutes the term metalinguistic feedback in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study by the term metalinguistic cue which works similarly as metalinguistic feedback. Sheen's (2011) classification of oral CF strategies is categorized into two categories such as *correct form is provided* and *correct form elicited*, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Types of oral CF strategies
(based on Sheen, 2001; cited in Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012)

Correct form is provided	Correct form is elicited
Recast	Repetition
Explicit correction	Elicitation
Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation	Metalinguistic cue
	Clarification request

These types of oral CF strategies classified by Sheen (2001) and used in this study are described in detail below.

2.1.1 Recast

Recast is a "*reformulation of the learner's erroneous utterance that corrects all or part of the learner's utterance and is embedded in the continuing discourse*" (Sheen, 2011, p.2, cited in Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012; p. 65). It refers to a teacher's implicit correction of students' erroneous utterances without indication that the utterance is ill-formed or incorrect. The purpose of using recast is that the teacher does not want communication to be broken down. Hence, recast can be didactic or conversational. It can be partial or

whole (only a part or the whole utterance is reformulated, respectively) (Méndez & Cruz, 2012, p. 65). For example:

> Student (S): "*She go to school by bus.*"
> Teacher (T): "*Oh, she goes to school by bus.*"

This episode indicates that the student makes a grammatical error in conjugation. He doesn't make the verb "go" agree with the third personal subject "she." Then, the teacher corrects his error by repeating the utterance with changing the verb "go" into "goes" so that the subject and verb of the sentence are agreement. The teacher reformulates the students' utterance without indication of his error. So recast's corrective function may go unnoticed by the student. Therefore, when using recast strategy, students' attention is needed to realize teacher's correction.

2.1.2 Explicit correction

Explicit correction refers to "*the explicit provision of the correct form*" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 46). It means that the teacher clearly indicates the student's error and provides the correct form of the error to the student. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student said is incorrect. Sheen (2011) suggested some phrases such as "it's not x but y", "you should say x", "we say x not y" which usually accompany this treatment (Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012, p. 65). For example:

> S: "She go to school by bus."
> T: "*It's not "she go" but "she goes.""*

In the dialogue, with the same example of the error that the student makes as illustrated in describing recast, but in this situation, the teacher immediately indicates the student's error (it's not "she go") and provides him the correct form of the error (but "she goes"), the student, therefore, has no chance to correct him/herself. Accordingly, when using explicit correction, teacher shouldn't always reject student errors so directly in order to possibly lessen a threat to the learners face.

2.1.3 Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation

In explicit correction, a teacher does two things: indicating the error and providing the correct form of that error. Whereas, in *explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation*, the teacher provides student with the correct form and comments or information related to the student's error. In other words, *explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation strategy* provides the correct form and a metalinguistic comment on the form to the learners (Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012), as illustrated in the following example:

S: *"She go to school by bus."*
T: *"*"She goes" not "she go." Because the subject is "she", you have to put the verb in singular form "goes" not "go"."*

As illustrated in the example, with the same case of the error that the student makes; however, when using *explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation,* the teacher not only indicates and corrects the error but also provides the explanation related to the student's erroneous utterance in order to help the student become aware of his or her error and then avoid making the same error next time.

2.1.4 Repetition
Repetition is simply *"the teacher repeats the ill-formed part of the student's utterance, usually with a change in intonation"* ([Panova & Lyster, 2002, p. 584](#)) or in a question form ([Mendez & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, 2012](#)) in order to draw student's attention to their error. For instance:

S: *"She go to school by bus."*
T: *"She go?"*
S: *"She... uhm... She goes."*

In this extract, the student has conjugation error with the verb "go". So the teacher repeats the student's utterance with raising intonation at the word "go" to emphasize the error in order to make the student recognize his error and correct it himself. Generally, this current type of oral CF strategy requires only the repetition of student's erroneous utterance by teacher; therefore, the student has a chance to correct his error himself.

2.1.5 Elicitation
Elicitation refers to the techniques that teacher uses to *"directly elicit the correct form from the student"* (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 48). The techniques can be (a) asking questions (e.g., "How do we say that in English?"), (b) repeating of the student's erroneous utterance up to the point when the error occurs and allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g., "I have...") or (c) asking students to reformulate the utterance (e.g., "Say that again."). Elicitation questions differ from other questions that they are defined as metalinguistic cue in that they require more than a yes/no response. For example:

S: *"She go to school by bus."*
T: *"Say that again. She..."*
S: *"She goes to school by bus."*

The example illustrates the second (i.e., she...) and the third technique (i.e., say that again) used to elicit the student's correction. The teacher asks her student to repeat the utterance. She additionally restates her student's erroneous utterance and pauses right before the error for her student to reformulate. By this way, the student can recognize his error and correct the error himself.

2.1.6 Metalinguistic cue

This strategy is *"similar to explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation to some extent, but it differs in that there is a metalinguistic comment by the corrector, but the correct form is not provided. Self-correction is then encouraged"* (Méndez & Cruz, 2012, p. 66). For example:

> S: *"She go to school by bus."*
> T: *"You need to put the verb in singular form."*

The example illustrates that the teacher doesn't correct her student's error but she gives metalinguistic comment to help her student recognize and then correct his error himself.

Therefore, metalinguistic cue is considered as the form of metalinguistic feedback in the form of comments, information or questions. When giving metalinguistic comments, the teacher generally indicates that there is an error somewhere by saying something like "Can you find your error?"; "No, not X" or even just "No"). Metalinguistic information generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error (e.g., "You need plural" or "What about the article?") or a word definition in the case of lexical errors. Metalinguistic questions also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student (e.g., "Is it the past tense?"). With metalinguistic cue, the teacher does not provide the correct form in any cases. Instead, a self-correction by the student is expected.

2.1.7 Clarification requests

Clarification requests are like "Excuse me?", "Sorry?", "Pardon me?", or "I don't understand what you just said" indicating that the student's utterance was not understood by the teacher or contained an error in some way that reformulation is required (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995). Unlike recasts and explicit corrections which provide correct forms, this strategy invites student to reformulate or repeat the erroneous utterance clearly or correctly. For example:

> S: *"She go to school by bus."*
> T: *"Pardon?"*
> S: *"She goes to school by bus."*

This above episode indicates that, when the student makes a grammatical error in conjugation, the teacher doesn't correct it but asks for clarification by saying "Pardon?" Then, the student notices his or her error and reformulates the utterance in the right form. It can be seen that the correct form of the utterance is not provided to the student, so the student is the one who repairs his or her own utterance.

However, clarification requests may cause confusion for student because when a teacher asks for clarification by saying "Pardon?" or "Sorry?", etc., it is often impossible for student to know whether the teacher simply did not hear what the student said, whether the message is indeed misunderstood because of its ill-formedness or content, or if the teacher is using the clarification request as CF strategy. Lyster and Ranta (1997), therefore, code feedback as clarification requests only when it follows a student error.

2.2 Student uptake

Since corrective feedback (CF) is intended to help learners repair their errors, their reaction towards a given CF is worth studying. These reactions are called uptake. Lyster and Ranta ([1997](#)) define uptake as "*a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback and that constitutes a reaction in some way to the teacher's intention to draw attention to some aspect of the student's initial utterance*" ([p. 49](#)). Thus, this view implies that uptake is 'a discourse move' ([Lyster & Saito, 2010b](#); [Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013](#)) which denotes the teacher's reformulation of students' erroneous utterances and their attempts to respond immediately following the teacher's corrective feedback.

As defined above, uptake is the student's response to the teacher's corrective feedback on their erroneous utterances. Oliver ([1995](#)) codes student's responses (uptake) to CF in one of four ways: respond, ignore, no chance (to respond), or continue speaking.

In Lyster and Ranta's ([1997](#)) taxonomy, student uptake is coded repair and needs-repair uptake. Repair uptake denotes "*uptake that results in repair of the error on which the feedback focused"; and needs-repair uptake stands for "uptake that results in an utterance that still needs repair*" ([Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49](#)). In other words, repair uptake indicates that students correct their errors after receiving CF from the teacher; and needs-repair uptake signifies that students' utterance after receiving CF still contains the same or a different error that need to be corrected.

Student responses with repair are of greater value than those in need of repair. It is because needs-repair can be simple acknowledgements such as responding "yes" to the teacher's CF which indicates that "it is indeed what I meant to say (but you've just said it much better!)". Needs-repair can also be hesitations or off target in response to the teacher's CF turn but that circumvents the teacher's linguistic focus altogether, without including any further errors. Another form of needs-repair is partial repair of the initial errors (e.g., Student: My birthday in October 25th – Teacher: My birthday is... – Student: My birthday is in October 25th), and occurrences of either the same or different error. Accordingly, Lyster and Ranta ([1997](#)) categorize needs-repair uptake

into six types of utterances including the acknowledgement, hesitation, off-target response, partial repair, and occurrences of the same or different error.

Learner repair uptake entails the correct reformulation of an error and thus differs from modified output, which may or may not be a correct reformulation. Student repair can be a repetition (repetition of the initial utterance without errors as this student receives the teacher's CF). It can also be incorporation (repetition of the correct form provided by the teacher, which is then incorporated into a longer utterance produced by the student (e.g., Student: on my last birthday, I invited my friends to my party and they sing happy birthday to me – Teacher: they sang...– Student: sang happy birthday to me. It was very special...). Repair uptake can also be either self-repair or peer-repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997).

Besides the two types of uptake, no uptake is another case that likely happens. No uptake is identified when students have no response to teacher CF. No uptake may happen when teacher doesn't provide opportunities for student uptake; or student may or may not acknowledge teachers' CF and they keep talking to the teacher or their peers. Lyster and Ranta say that if there is no uptake, then there is topic continuation, which is initiated by either the same or another student (in both cases, the teacher's intention goes unheeded) or by the teacher (in which case the teacher has not provided an opportunity for uptake).

Drawn on the above perspectives of student uptake, *repair*, *needs-repair*, and *no uptake* are examined in this study to investigate the effectiveness of oral corrective feedback strategies teachers used in their classroom practices.

2.3 Oral corrective feedback and student uptake

Several studies have indicated that oral corrective feedback (CF) with its prominent position in teaching and learning is strongly connected to student uptake (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2001; Esmaeli & Behnam, 2014; Li, 2010; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Safari, 2013; Suzuki, 2005). One of the most dominant studies about different types of oral CF and their effectiveness on student uptake is Lyster and Ranta's (1997) descriptive study. The study was carried out in four French immersion classrooms in Canada with the participation of four teachers and 104 primary students ranging from ages 10 to 12. Lyster and Ranta (1997) reported that teachers mainly provided learners with six types of CF: recasts (55%), elicitation (14%), clarification requests (11%), metalinguistic feedback (8%), explicit correction (7%) and repetition of error (5%). Although recasts was the most frequent type of CF used by the teacher (55% of whole feedback), it was found to be ineffective to encourage learner uptake and repair (only 18% of whole repair uptake). Whereas, other CF types such as metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition were used with lower frequency, but they were successful in eliciting repair uptake from the student (45%, 36%, and 31%, respectively). However, explicit correction was not successful since no uptake following it took half of student uptake (50%). Thus, elicitation and metalinguistic feedback could be considered

as effective CF types, while recast and explicit correction could be considered as ineffective ones.

Suzuki (2005) used Lyster and Ranta's (1997) framework for her study regarding interactional patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake in a different context. In her study in adult ESL classrooms at Colombia University, New York City, Suzuki analyzed data from 21 hours of interaction between three ESL teachers and thirty-one adult ESL students. The findings of her study revealed that recast was also the most frequently used by teachers, which was similar to those of Lyster and Ranta (1997). However, recasts in Suzuki's study led to much more repair (65%) than those in Lyster and Ranta (18%). Besides, explicit correction which was considered as ineffective with 50% of no uptake from student in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study was the most successful CF type in Suzuki's study with 100% of repair uptake. Suzuki advocated that classroom setting, learners' age, teachers' experience, and target language were some possible explanations for the differences between her study and Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study.

Recently, another descriptive study conducted by Safari (2013) has shown the effectiveness of CF on student uptake in an Iranian communicative EFL class located in Kuwait. The data were collected from 960 minutes of observation with the participation of one teacher and 16 adolescent students at the low-intermediate level. The research findings in Safari's (2013) study supported those in the studies by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Suzuki (2005) to some extent. However, there were differences among these studies. With respect to the distribution of CF type, the findings in Safari's study is consistent with those in Lyster and Ranta's (Lyster & Ranta, 1997), and Suzuki's (2005) studies that recast was the most frequent type of CF used by the teacher. Recast in Safari's (2013) study accounted for slightly more than half (51.38%) of the total CF types used by the teacher. Recast; however, was still considered as an unsuccessful CF type with more than half (60.22%) of recasts being no use to lead to any uptake. The other types of CF were in descending order of distribution such as elicitation (21.54%), repetition (18.23%), clarification request (4.41%), explicit correction (2.76%), and metalinguistic feedback (1.65%). However, in Safari's (2013) study, metalinguistic feedback, one of the effective CF types in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, surprisingly turned into the ineffective type with 66.66% no uptake. Moreover, other types of CF such as repetition, explicit correction, clarification request, and elicitation were successful in eliciting uptake from students (93.93%, 100%, 100%, and 100%, respectively). Generally, the influence of each type of CF on student uptake has changed after sixteen years since Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study. However, since the observation was carried out with one teacher in one class, the result might not be very objective.

As indicated above, the findings in the three relevant studies of Lyster and Ranta (1997), Suzuki (2005), and Safari (2013) are inconsistent across classroom-based and the target of the studies. The effectiveness of oral CF on student uptake has changed from place to place and from time to time due to various features of classroom contexts such

as learners' age and language proficiency, and the target language in addition to teachers' experience. The effectiveness of oral CF on student uptake; therefore, may be changeable in a particular context.

Although the review of the literature confirms the impact of CF on student uptake in language learning, it necessitates teachers in particular contexts to know what may work best for their students. In addition, relevant research on CF on students' speaking and their uptake specifically in EFL contexts is still scant. Therefore, this article provides insights into the teachers' practices of oral CF strategies in relation to student uptake in Vietnamese speaking contexts.

3. The Study

A descriptive study using classroom observations was to explore teachers' practices of delivering oral CF on students' speaking performance within a Vietnamese high school context. The rationale for this choice is that observations allow for actual happenings in the classroom to be recorded in a natural way (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012).

Participants in this study were two teachers and fifty students at a private secondary school located in a city in the Mekong Delta. At the school whose EFL teachers were female, these two teachers were both non-native English speakers and had five-year experience of teaching English for students at the basic level. These students were at the basic level according to six reference levels in the framework of VSTEP (Vietnamese Standardized Test of English Proficiency) based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR). Students in Class One were at Level A2 (Waystage) and students in Class Two were at Level A1 (Breakthrough) in terms of their English proficiency level. Their age range was from 11 to 16 and therefore they learned English as a required school subject for at least from three to five years. Of the population of 120, the participating students were chosen purposefully (Berg & Lune, 2012). This selection criteria focused on students' English language proficiency at the basic level because errors were likely to occur frequently while learning or using English (Ananda, Febriyanti, Yamin, & Mu'in, 2017; Edge, 1989; Trustcott, 1996). CF was thus expected to be employed in their classrooms. In addition, with three to five years experiencing in English learning, the participating students also had some English background knowledge so that they were able to follow and respond to the oral CF strategies given by their teachers.

The data collected in the study included classroom observations and video recordings. Classroom observations were believed to be the best instrument to allow for gaining insights into the practices of teacher delivery of oral CF in a naturalistic setting compared with other data sources (Hendricks, 2013). Video recordings were employed to record actual classroom practices and detailed information. Moreover, by play-back, video recording could allow for reviewing a particular occurrence or focusing on a particular aspect which might be missing while observing.

Five period observations were conducted in each of the two teachers' class during the study. Each observation took forty-minutes. Altogether, the observational data were collected in four weeks through ten periods, accounting for four hundred minutes of classroom observations. Observations of each teacher's lessons were video-recorded and transcribed. All notes taken from observation sheets were counted and analyzed according to categories, namely error types, time of correction, types of oral corrective feedback strategies, and those of student uptake.

An observation sheet was adapted from Mackey, Gass, and McDonough's (2000) categorization of errors (i.e., phonological, lexical, and morpho-syntactic error); from Sheen's (Sheen, 2007; Sheen & Ellis, 2011) classification of oral corrective feedback strategies (i.e., recast, explicit correction, explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic cue, and clarification request); from Lyster and Ranta's (1997) classification of student uptake (i.e., repair, needs-repair, and no uptake) (see Appendix 1). Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) categorized errors into four types including morpho-syntactic, phonological, lexical, and semantic errors. However, only the three first error types were observed in this study since they were believed to occur frequently in basic level classrooms and likely to be observed easily. The last error types– semantic error; therefore, was not observed in the present study.

The first version of the present observation sheet was piloted in five classes where the teachers had similar qualifications and teaching experiences to the participants of the present study. The rationale for this pilot observation was to ensure all the items in the observation sheet are clearly defined before the actual observation. However, the first version of the observation sheet was designed for only one occurrence of delivering oral CF strategies. The second version of the observation sheet (see Appendix 2) was modified and amended, and then used in the actual study.

The observation sheet consists of two main sections. The first one is the general information including teacher code, date, estimated time, and lesson. The teacher code helps identify the observed teacher and her class. 'Estimated time' is the place to show duration of a classroom observation. And lesson is the place to display the content of the observed lesson. The second section includes five observed areas: types of error, time of correction, types of oral CF strategies, student uptake, and transcript.

With regard to the first area, *types of errors* -morpho-syntactic, phonological, and lexical are shown. The second area, *time of correction* – Immediate and Delayed are two options. The third area *types of oral CF strategies* includes recast, explicit correction, explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation, repetition, elicitation, metalinguistic cue, and clarification request. The fourth area is called *student uptake* with sub-themes (repair, needs-repair, and no uptake). The fifth area named *transcript* allows for taking notes of teachers' delivery of oral CF strategies and the distribution of student uptake following the given oral CF.

4. Findings

The findings from this descriptive study are presented into sections aligned with the two research questions. The first section focuses on types of oral CF strategies used by teachers to provide CF on students' speaking performance, followed by the distribution of student uptake following the given oral CF strategies.

4.1 Types of oral corrective feedback strategies

Of the seven CF types, recast was the most frequently used by the two teachers in the present study. Table 4.1 shows the distribution of CF types.

Table 4.1: Distribution of corrective feedback types

Feedback type	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Total
Recast	26 (43%)	37 (47%)	63 (45%)
Explicit correction	25 (41%)	10 (13%)	35 (25%)
Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Repetition	0 (0%)	11 (14%)	11 (8%)
Elicitation	3 (5%)	9 (11%)	12 (9%)
Metalinguistic cue	7 (11%)	9 (11%)	16 (11%)
Clarification request	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	3 (2%)
Total	61(100%)	79 (100%)	140 (100%)

Table 4.1 shows that recast was used the most (overall-45%, Teacher 1-43% and Teacher 2-47%). For instance, during eighty minutes of the observation in Teacher 2's class on March 15th, it was found that recast was used thirty-two times, accounting for more than half (62%) of the total number (fifty-two) of CF strategies used during the observation. The following scenario of recast illustrates this most dominant feedback move.

Student (S)	On my last [error] birthday (Error – Phonological)
Teacher (T)	My last (Feedback – Recast)
S	My last birthday, I went to at home [error] (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error– Lexical)
T	I had a party at home. (Feedback– Recast)
S	I had [error] (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error–Phonological)
T	I had (Feedback–Recast)
S	I had [error] a party at home. I invited [error] (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error– Phonological)
T	I invited (Feedback– Recast)
S	I invited my friends..we eated [error] (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error– Morphosyntactic)
T	Ate (Feedback – Recast)
S	Ate a lot of chicken and they sing [error] happy birthday to me (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error– Morphosyntactic)
T	Sang (Feedback– Recast)
S	Sang happy birthday to me. It was very ... uh... special [error] (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error– Phonological)
T	Special (Feedback–Recast)
S	Special because my parents [error (Uptake–Needs-repair) (Error–Phonological)
T	My parents (Feedback–Recast)
S	My parents bought me my first toy (Teacher 2, March 15th)

The second most used CF type was explicit correction (overall-25%, T1-41% and T2-13%). Of the total percentages of all corrective feedback types, metalinguistic cue was the third most used CF type (11%), followed by elicitation (9%) and repetition (8%). While Clarification request was used the least with only 2%. It is surprisingly to note that explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation was not used by both teachers. Repetition and clarification request were not used by Teacher 1 whereas repetition was the second most used by Teacher 2 (14%). Furthermore, Teacher 1 used four of seven types of oral CF strategies while Teacher 2 used six. It could be due in part to the fact that a particular CF strategy used by the teachers depends on their preference, students' English language proficiency level, and the student-made error type.

.

4.1.1 Distribution of student uptake following the given oral CF strategies
Table 4.2 displays the distribution of student uptake in relation to CF in the present study. CF results in uptake in more instances than no uptake (89% uptake and 11% no uptake). In other words, students recognized teacher's feedback as CF and attempted to respond to it 89% of the time. However, student-generated repair uptake was not very high. Repair uptake was successfully elicited by nearly a half of the oral CF strategies (44%). Of the total CF, 45% of CF strategies led to needs-repair and 11% were ineffective at eliciting student uptake.

Table 4.2 Distribution of student uptake in relation to oral CF strategy types

Types of student uptake	Class 1	Class 2	Total
Repair	33 (54%)	28 (35%)	61 (44%)
Needs-repair	22 (36%)	41 (52%)	63 (45%)
No uptake	6 (10%)	10 (13%)	16 (11%)
Total	61 (44%)	79 (56%)	140 (100%)

As presented in Table 4.2, 89% of oral CF strategies led to student uptake; however, whether all types of oral CF strategies were equally effective in leading to student uptake. Table 4.3 illustrates the distribution of student uptake following the different types of oral CF strategies.

It should be noted that explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation did not occur as a CF type in the present study; therefore, it was not taken into account for comparison with the other CF types that led to student uptake.

Table 4.3 Distribution of student uptake in relation to CF strategy types

	Student uptake types			
Corrective feedback types	Repair	Needs-repair	No uptake	Total
Recast	31 (49%)	31 (49%)	1 (2%)	63 (45%)
Explicit correction	14 (40%)	14 (40%)	7 (20%)	35 (25%)
Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Repetition	3 (27.3%)	4 (36.4%)	4 (36.4%)	11 (8%)
Elicitation	3 (25%)	6 (50%)	3 (25%)	12 (9%)
Metalinguistic cue	9 (56%)	6 (38%)	1 (6%)	16 (11%)
Clarification request	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	3 (2%)
Total	61 (44%)	63 (45%)	16 (11%)	140 (100%)

Table 4.3 shows that clarification request, the least frequently used in the present study, was the most successful CF type in leading to student uptake (100%). However, recast used the most in this study yielded 98% student uptake in all settings, making it the second successful CF type. Similarly, explicit correction was the second most used CF type resulted in percentage of student uptake (80%) lower than metalinguistic cue which accounted for 94% of student uptake. 75% uptake from the students were effectively elicited by elicitation. However, students did not respond to 36.4% of teachers' CF in the form of repetition. This made the percentage of student uptake to repetition (63.7%) lower than that of any other types of oral CF strategies.

In terms of repair uptake, although clarification request was more successful at eliciting student uptake than metalinguistic cue, metalinguistic cue was considered to be the most successful CF strategy at eliciting student repair uptake in this study. It is because metalinguistic cue accounted for the percentage of student repair uptake (56%) higher than the percentage of student repair uptake of any other types of oral corrective feedback strategies. The other types of oral CF strategies resulted in student repair uptake in diminishing order as follows: recast (49%), explicit correction (40%), clarification request (33%), repetition (27.3%), and elicitation (25%).

5. Discussion

Concerning types of oral CF strategies used by teachers to deliver CF on students' speaking performance, it was observed that the two participating teachers used six different types of oral CF strategies: recast (45%), explicit correction (25%), metalinguistic cue (11%), elicitation (9%), repetition (8%), and clarification request (2%). Recast was by far the most widely used strategy, followed by explicit correction while clarification request was the least frequently used. However, it is surprising to note that explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation was not used by both teachers in the present study. The students observed have been provided knowledge of English use such as grammar structures or words before taking part in their speaking activities. For that reason, in order to save time in class, the teachers did not provide explanation when they corrected students' errors. Rather, they elicited the correct form from the students and expected the students to apply what they have learned to correct the errors themselves. As a result, this made metalinguistic cue to be the third most used CF type in this study.

Furthermore, there were differences in the percentage of occurrence of the CF strategies between the two teachers. T1 used only four of seven types of oral CF strategies while T2 used six of them. Besides explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation was not used by both teachers repetition and clarification request were also not used by T1 whereas repetition was the second most used by T2 (14%). It can be concluded that employing a particular CF strategy depends on teacher's preference, students' level of language proficiency, and especially the types of error that the students made.

With regard to the distribution of student uptake following the given oral CF strategies, the findings reveal that all oral CF types used in the present study resulted in student uptake: clarification request (100%), recast (98%), metalinguistic cue (94%), explicit correction (80%), elicitation (75%), and repetition (63.7%). However, the effectiveness of different CF types resulted in repair uptake was slightly different from that of student uptake in general. The type of oral CF strategy that led to repair the most was metalinguistic cue (56%). Types of oral CF strategies other than metalinguistic cue led to student repair uptake with a smaller percentage such as recast (49%), explicit correction (40%), clarification request (33%), repetition (27.3%), and elicitation (25%).

The findings indicate that clarification request, recast, and metalinguistic cue were effective CF moves in helping the students recognize their errors. However, the percentage of repair uptake demonstrated that metalinguistic cue, recast, and explicit correction were more effective than the other oral CF strategies in helping the students correct their errors.

The findings show that even though all oral CF strategies used in the present study were effective at eliciting uptake from students with the percentage of uptake (89%) much higher than that of no uptake (11%), the percentage of repair uptake (44%) was not very high, even lower than the percentage of needs-repair uptake (45%). The reason for the percentage of needs-repair uptake higher than that of repair uptake was that in several cases, students corrected their errors when they responded to the teacher CF. However, when they continued their utterances, they made another error that turns their responses into needs-repair. The following conversation is an example for CF move.

S: *... people build [error]* (Error – Phonological)
T: *Build* (Feedback – Recast)
S: *Build wonderful [error]* (Uptake – Needs-repair) (Error – Phonological)
T: *Wonderful* (Feedback – Recast)
S: *Wonderful creations ... to attract the public [error]* (Uptake – Needs-repair) (Error – Phonological)
T: *OK. You should say public* (Feedback – Explicit correction)
S: *Public's attention [error]* (Uptake – Needs-repair) (Error – Phonological)
T: *Attention* (Feedback – Recast)
S: *Attention to the ...se...uh...* (Uptake – Needs-repair) (Error – Phonological)
T: *Serious* (Feedback – Recast)
S: *Serious problems of hunger.* (Uptake – Repair)

(T1 – March 8th)

5.1 Distribution of different types of oral corrective feedback strategies

With respect to the types of oral CF strategies used to deliver CF to students, the findings in the present study are in line with those in the studies conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Safari (2013), and Suzuki (2005). These authors indicate that recast is

the most frequently used CF strategy. One possible explanation for recast preferred to be used more frequently than any other types of oral CF strategies is that when using recasts, the correct form is provided without breaking down communication. Accordingly, recast was the fastest way teachers responded to students' errors. In addition, giving corrective feedback by recast, teachers did not explicitly indicate students' errors; therefore, it helped to save student's face.

On the other hand, the distribution of oral CF strategies other than recasts in the present study is different from previous studies by Lyster and Ranta (1997); Safari (2013), and Suzuki (2005). For instance, while explicit correction and metalinguistic cue were not frequently used in Lyster and Ranta's (1997), Safari's (2013), and Suzuki's (2005) study, these two CF strategy types were the second and third most used in the present study. Likewise, clarification request, the second most used in Suzuki's (2005) study, was used the least in the present study. A possible explanation for the differences is that the distribution of different types of oral CF strategies depends on classroom context, teacher's preferences, students' level of language proficiency, and particularly the type of error students may make.

5.2 Distribution of student uptake in relation to types of CF strategies

With regard to the effectiveness of different types of oral CF strategies in eliciting student uptake, the findings in the present study did not support those in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) and Safari's (2013) study. It was that recast considered ineffective CF type in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) and Safari's (2013) study was the second most successful CF type in the present study with 98% of student uptake. In addition, metalinguistic cue which was the most successful at eliciting repair uptake from the students in the present study was the most ineffective CF type in Safari's (2013) study with 67% of no uptake.

As presented above, the findings of the distribution and the effectiveness of different types of oral CF strategies in the present study were not consistent with those in Lyster and Ranta's (1997), Safari's (2013), and Suzuki's (2005) study. The differences in the research findings seem to be attributable to the different research settings and various aspects of classroom contexts such as learners' age and their level of English language proficiency, the target language, and teachers' experience (Suzuki, 2005). As a result, one could be the effective CF strategy in this study but turns into ineffective in other study and vice versa. Consequently, it seems impossible to make any generalizable claim as to which CF strategy is more likely to effectively lead to student repair uptake. However, it can be concluded that the popularity of recast has not changed over time and places. Rather, recast is a type of oral CF strategy preferred to be used most frequently.

6. Conclusions

This study attempted to explore teachers' practices of delivering oral corrective feedback on students' speaking performance in EFL classrooms and the distribution of student uptake following the given oral CF strategies. The findings indicate that recast was the most frequently used CF strategy. However, metalinguistic cue was considered the most successful CF strategy in this study because it results in students' repair uptake more than recast and other CF strategies.

The findings on the distribution of student uptake reveal that clarification request, recast, and metalinguistic cue were effective in helping students recognize their errors. However, in order for students to correct their errors accurately, metalinguistic cue, recast, and explicit correction were found to be more effective than the other oral CF strategies.

The findings of the present study contribute to the CF language teaching literature with regard to students' speaking performance at high schools particularly in Vietnam in several ways. This study not only deepens understanding of the nature of oral CF in relation to student uptake in the process of learning speaking but also provides teachers with insightful views into the impact of oral CF on speaking instruction. Importantly, the findings raise awareness of the roles teachers play as motivating or supporting students by implementing innovative ways to promote student speaking performance.

Several pedagogical implications relevant to delivery of oral CF on students' speaking performance in EFL classrooms are drawn. It was observed that participating teachers who delivered CF by their experience neither had knowledge about types of oral CF strategies nor understood the effectiveness of CF on student uptake. It is therefore necessary for teachers to be involved in professional development training workshops or seminars on how to deliver oral CF in order to use different oral CF strategies effectively in their speaking practices.

Corrective feedback is widely recognized to be the most effective when students recognize and correct their errors themselves. Moreover, an old Chinese proverb goes, *"Tell me, I forget. Show me, I remember. Involve me, I learn."* Therefore, teachers should encourage students to take active roles in error correction by eliciting the correct form or providing them with opportunities to treat errors.

As the participating students with different English proficiency background, it appears to offer grounds for further research to identify factors influencing how teachers deliver oral CF and student uptake in speaking classes of mixed ability students. Longitudinal research about the effectiveness of oral CF on error correction is needed to examine whether oral CF can help reduce students' errors or their corrected errors may be repeated later in other speaking situations.

About the authors

Tran Thi Bich Phuong has been a teacher of English at Vietnamese American high school since 2010. She earned a master's degree in education, focusing on principles and teaching methods of English language at Can Tho University in 2017. Her research interests include language teaching for undergraduate students and young learners, classroom management, and corrective feedback in students' written and speaking performance.

Dr. Nguyen Buu Huan is a senior lecturer in English at Can Tho University. He was the recipient of Fulbright grant for his master's in Rutgers University, USA (2001) and NZAID scholarship for his PhD studies in Massey University, New Zealand (2010). He teaches in his area of reading and supervises a number of masters' theses. His areas of research include action research, teacher change, language learning, ESP, and curriculum planning. He is now involved in writing teaching materials for undergraduate students at the university and is a regular reviewer for Thai TESOL.

References

1. Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Mu'in, F. (2017). Students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English Department of Lambung Mangkurat University academic year 2015-2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(3), 176-186.
2. Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (8th Ed.)*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
3. Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15*(3), 357-386.
4. Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning, 27*(1), 29-46.
5. Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction*. New York: Longman.
7. Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review, 19*(1), 18-41.
8. Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.
9. Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning, 51*(2), 281-318.
10. Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339-368.

11. Esmaeli, F., & Behnam, B. (2014). A study of corrective feedback and learner's uptake in classroom interactions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 3*(4), 204-212.

12. Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education (8th Ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill Humanities.

13. Hendricks, C. (2013). *Improving schools through action research: A reflective practice approach (3rd Ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

14. Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent research and practice. *Modern Language Journal, 62*(8), 387-398.

15. Kucera, J. (2009). *QAR and its effects on the reading comprehension performance of fourth grade students.* (MA thesis), Goucher College.

16. Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309-365.

17. Li, S. (2014). Oral corrective feedback. *ELT Journal, 68*(2), 196-198.

18. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2003). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

19. Loewen, S. (2012). The role of feedback. In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.), *The Routlege Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 24-40). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

20. 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). New York: Academic Press.

21. 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.

22. Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010a). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265-302.

23. Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010b). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265-302.

24. Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(1), 1-40.

25. Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(4), 471-497.

26. Mendez, E. H., & del Rosario Reyes Cruz, M. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 14*(2), 63-75.

27. Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 17*(4), 459-481.

28. Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

29. Safari, P. (2013). A descriptive study on corrective feedback and learners' uptake during interactions in a communicative EFL class. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(7), 1165-1175.

30. Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research, 7*(2), 89-102.

31. Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(2), 263-300.

32. Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversation interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

33. Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. New York: Springer.

34. Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.

35. Suzuki, M. (2005). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. *TESOL and Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 1-21.

36. Trustcott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

37. Yoshida, R. (2008). Learners' perceptions of corrective feedback in pair work. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*(3), 525-541.

Appendix 1

Types of oral corrective feedback strategies (Sheen, 2011, cited in Méndez & Cruz, 2012)

Types of oral CF strategies	Explanation
Recast	Reformulation of the learner's erroneous utterance
Explicit correction	Provision of the correct form
Explicit correction with meta-linguistic explanation	Provision of the correct form and meta-linguistic comment
Repetition	Repetition of the learners' erroneous utterance
Elicitation	Repetition of the learners' erroneous utterance up to the point when the error occurs
Meta-linguistic cue	Provision of meta-linguistic comment but not the correct form
Clarification requests	Clarification is requested (e.g., "Sorry?", "Pardon me?")

Types of student uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 49)

Student uptake types	Description
Repair	Correct errors after receiving corrective feedback
Needs-repair	Utterance after receiving corrective feedback still contains errors that need to be corrected
No uptake	No response to the given corrective feedback

Appendix 2

Observation Sheet (Adapted version)

Teacher code: Date: Estimated time: Lesson:

Type of error	Time of correction	Type of oral CF strategies							Student uptake			Transcript
		Rc	EC	EC with M	Re	E	M	CR	R	NR	NU	
Morphosyntatic ☐ Phonological ☐ Lexical ☐	Immediate ☐ Delayed ☐											

Notes:

Rc: Recast	CR: Clarification Request	M: Metalinguistic Cue
E: Elicitation	EC: Explicit Correction	Re: Repetition
EC with M:	Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation	
NU: No uptake	NR: Needs repair	R: Repair