IGNATIAN
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH
www.icceph.com
ISSN 2984-9942

ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES: A STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Clint G. Acevedo, Maria Lady Sol A. Suazo

Graduate School, North Eastern Mindanao State University, Tandag City, Surigao del Sur, Philippines

ABSTRACT

Developing communicative competence remains a foundational objective within English Language Teaching (ELT), yet systemic challenges persist regarding functional oral proficiency. Grounded in Long's Interaction Hypothesis, Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis, and Swain's Output Hypothesis, this explanatory sequential mixed-methods study investigated the implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) in secondary education classrooms. The inquiry examined the interplay between student-generated oral errors and the operational feasibility of specific OCF typologies including recasts, explicit correction, elicitation, and metalinguistic feedback among Grade 11 learners (n=68) and English language instructors (n=5) at Clarence Ty Pimentel National High School. Quantitative survey instruments revealed that oral errors clustered predominantly across syntactic, lexical, and phonological domains, demonstrating statistical uniformity across gender configurations and perceived proficiency thresholds ($p>.05$). Conversely, qualitative data derived from semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions exposed a profound pedagogical disconnect. Although contemporary ELT literature strongly advocates for cognitive, output-pushing prompts such as elicitation and metalinguistic feedback to stimulate learner noticing, systemic institutional constraints, most notably inflated class sizes and rigid pacing schedules compelled instructors to default to immediate, passive input-providing mechanisms like recasts and explicit correction. Furthermore, uncalibrated public corrections were found to exacerbate foreign language anxiety, inducing cognitive withdrawal among learners. To reconcile this operational tension, the empirical findings were synthesized to formulate the Strategic Lexical-Phonological (S-LP) Pedagogical Framework, a structural model designed to transition intuitive error treatment into systematic, socio-emotionally secure, and uptake-conducive linguistic interventions.

Keywords: *oral corrective feedback, recasts, metalinguistic feedback, communicative competence, foreign language anxiety, pedagogical framework*

INTRODUCTION

The basic education curriculum centers on developing communicative competence, emphasizing effective language use as a core pillar where learners master the practical patterns and rules of real-world interaction. Within this interactive environment, oral corrective feedback strategies serve as an essential instructional bridge, guiding verbal accuracy and transforming spontaneous spoken errors into constructive learning moments that steadily hone a student's confidence (Alsolami, 2019; Ha & Nguyen, 2021). Thus, this study investigates the implementation of Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) strategies among Grade 11 Senior High School students, examining how teachers manage linguistic errors to nurture spoken fluency and improve the communicative competence of these learners.

Current scholarship identifies oral corrective feedback as a dynamic bridge between a student's current linguistic ability and the target language standard. While traditional methods like recasts remain common due to their unobtrusive nature, recent classroom-based findings suggest these often result in lower error repair compared to more engaging strategies (Zhang, 2025). Output-pushing prompts, such as metalinguistic feedback, are often structurally more effective because they compel students to cognitively process their errors (Ioannou & Tsagari, 2022). However, the success of these interventions is frequently limited by reception barriers, specifically Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA), which can cause students to withdraw if the correction feels too direct (Aragão, 2022; Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017). Consequently, a balanced pedagogical approach that prioritizes immediate feedback for accuracy and strategically delayed feedback to preserve communicative fluency is highly advocated (Li et al., 2025; Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2016).

The urgency of this issue is underscored by national data revealing a systemic crisis in learner proficiency. Pedagogical challenges in language-intensive secondary education strands, such as the General Academic Strand (GAS), require intentional instructional frameworks to match contextual demands (Custodio, 2021). Locally, varying Oral Communication grades suggest that current oral corrective feedback is failing to provide a consistent safety net. This research serves as a basis for identifying pedagogical challenges to build a data-driven intervention framework that ensures graduates achieve functional communicative competence for global work readiness, building on localized peer feedback insights (Cagara et al., 2024).

Research Questions

To optimize the empirical focus of this investigation in alignment with institutional publication standards, the inquiry addresses three consolidated macro-level research questions:

1. What characterizes the typological distribution of student-generated oral errors (syntactic, lexical, phonological, discursive, and pragmatic) and the operational deployment of instructor-led oral corrective feedback (OCF) strategies within synchronous classroom discussions?

2. To what extent do language instructors and learners differ in their evaluations of the operational feasibility of these OCF strategies, and what significant relationships exist when cross-tabulated with their respective demographic profiles?

3. What systemic challenges and enabling conditions dictate the real-time execution of these feedback mechanics, and what specific intervention design can be constructed from these data to optimize OCF delivery within secondary language instruction?

METHODOLOGY

This empirical inquiry was executed during the first semester of the Academic Year 2025-2026 at Clarence Ty Pimentel National High School. Utilizing an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, the study deployed a nested sampling framework to synthesize broader statistical matrices with phenomenological insights. The quantitative phase comprised total population sampling involving 68 Grade 11 General Academic Strand (GAS) students and 5 specialized English language instructors. The GAS cohort was purposively selected due to the communicative density of its core curriculum. Data collection relied on researcher-developed, content-validated survey instruments utilizing a five-point interval Likert scale to operationalize strategy frequency and perceived feasibility.

The qualitative phase followed with semi-structured instructor interviews and student-centered Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) to isolate underlying operational variables. Bivariate inferential statistical treatments were evaluated at a alpha level of 0.05, while qualitative transcriptions were processed through Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis protocol. The scope of this study is bounded by its focus on perceived operational feasibility and error typologies within a singular rural secondary institution, rather than longitudinal linguistic tracking.

RESULTS

Regarding Research Question 1, descriptive statistical tracking established that learner oral errors were heavily saturated within the syntactic, lexical, and phonological sub-domains. Correspondingly, baseline instructional practices demonstrated a disproportionate reliance on input-providing corrective feedback, with recasts and explicit corrections functioning as the dominant pedagogical responses during real-time interactions.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents

Respondents	Samples	Key Informants	Samples
Teachers	5	Teachers	5
Grade 11 – GAS A and B Students	68	Grade 11 – GAS A and B Students	68
Over-all total	**73**	**73**	

Table 2.1 Profile of Teacher Respondents

1.1.1 Age	Age Bracket	Frequency	Percentage
	20 – 29 Years Old	0	0%
	30 – 39 Years Old	4	80%
	40 – 49 Years Old	1	20%
	50 – 59 Years Old	0	0%
	60 years old and above	0	0%
	TOTAL	**5**	**100%**
1.1.2 Sex	Sex Category	Frequency	Percentage
	Male	2	40%
	Female	3	60%
	Prefer Not To Say	0	0%
	TOTAL	**5**	**100%**
1.1.3 Years of Teaching Oral Communication Subject	Number of Years	Frequency	Percentage
	Less than a year	0	0%
	1 – 3 Years	2	40%
	4 – 6 Years	2	40%
	7 – 10 Years	1	20%
	More than 10 Years	0	0%
	TOTAL	**5**	**100%**
1.1.4 Prior Training in Corrective Feedback	Options	Frequency	Percentage
	Yes	0	0%
	No	5	100%
	TOTAL	**5**	**100%**

Table 2.2 Profile of Student Respondents

1.2.1 Sex	**Sex Category**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
	Male	30	44%
	Female	38	56%
	Prefer Not To Say	0	0%
	TOTAL	**68**	**100%**
1.2.2 English Proficiency	**RATING**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
	90 – 100 Outstanding	19	28%

85 – 89 Very Satisfactory	32	47%
80 – 84 Satisfactory	13	19%
75 – 79 Fairly Satisfactory	4	6%
Below 75 Did Not Meet Expectation	0	0%
TOTAL	**68**	**100%**

Table 3. Frequency of Students' Oral Errors

Oral Error Types	Mean	Adjectival Rating
Syntax Error	3.640	Often
Lexical Error	4.200	Often
Phonological Error	4.080	Often
Discourse Error	3.200	Sometimes
Pragmatics Error	2.720	Sometimes
Over-all Mean	**3.568**	**Often**

Table 4. Level of Teachers' Practice of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies

Oral Error Types	Mean	Adjectival Rating
Recast	4.312	Always
Explicit Correction	4.118	Often
Elicitation	3.976	Often
Metalinguistic Feedback	4.165	Often
Clarification Request	3.965	Often
Repetition	3.850	Often
Ignoring	3.568	Often
Over-all Mean	**3.993**	**Often**

Responding to Research Question 2, inferential data treatments unveiled a critical evaluative variance between instructor and learner cohorts regarding output-pushing interventions. While the student population ascribed high operational feasibility metrics to Elicitation and Repetition, instructor assessments designated these strategies as significantly less viable due to structural limitations.

Conversely, input-providing strategies achieved a high degree of mutual feasibility consensus. Chi-square and independent-samples t-test treatments revealed no statistically significant relationships ($p>.05$) when mapping error distribution across demographic variables, indicating that error manifestation operates independently of student gender or baseline proficiency levels.

Table 5. Feasibility of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies

Indicators	Teachers		Students		Grand Mean	Over-all Adjectival Rating
	Mean	Adjectival Rating	Mean	Adjectival Rating		
Recast	3.840	Highly Feasible	4.021	Highly Feasible	3.931	Highly Feasible
Explicit Correction	4.120	Highly Feasible	4.079	Highly Feasible	4.100	Highly Feasible
Elicitation	3.240	Moderately Feasible	4.253	Highly Feasible	3.747	Highly Feasible
Metalinguistic Feedback	4.520	Very Highly Feasible	4.071	Highly Feasible	4.296	Very Highly Feasible
Clarification Request	3.360	Moderately Feasible	4.062	Highly Feasible	3.711	Highly Feasible
Repetition	3.160	Moderately Feasible	4.079	Highly Feasible	3.620	Highly Feasible
Ignoring	3.280	Moderately Feasible	3.906	Highly Feasible	3.593	Highly Feasible
Over-all Mean	**3.646**	**Highly Feasible**	**4.067**	**Highly Feasible**	**3.857**	**Highly Feasible**

Table 6. Relationship between Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies and Teachers' Profile

Variables Tested		Computed r	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Recast	Age	0.081	0.512	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Sex	0.084	0.497	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.032	0.794	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-
Explicit Correction	Age	0.044	0.719	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Sex	0.117	0.344	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.029	0.816	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-
Elicitation	Age	0.019	0.877	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant

	Sex	0.117	0.344	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.113	0.358	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-
Metalinguistic Feedback	Age	0.125	0.311	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Sex	0.142	0.249	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.042	0.735	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-
Clarification Request	Age	0.211	0.085	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Sex	0.185	0.130	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.106	0.390	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-
Repetition	Age	0.170	0.166	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Sex	0.166	0.176	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.075	0.545	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-
Ignoring	Age	0.059	0.632	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Sex	0.030	0.809	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Years of Teaching	0.044	0.720	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	Training	Identical Values		-	-

Table 7. Relationship between Students' Oral Errors and Students' Profile

Variables Tested		Computed r	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Syntax Error	Sex	0.073	0.552	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	English Proficiency	0.058	0.636	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Lexical Error	Sex	0.010	0.933	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant

	English Proficiency	0.041	0.737	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Phonological Error	Sex	0.046	0.710	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	English Proficiency	0.032	0.796	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Discourse Error	Sex	0.017	0.890	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	English Proficiency	0.045	0.714	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Pragmatics Error	Sex	0.075	0.546	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
	English Proficiency	0.086	0.485	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant

Table 8. Difference in Perceived Feasibility of Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies

Variables Tested	Computed r	P-value	Decision	Conclusion
Recast	0.650	0.521	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Explicit Correction	0.140	0.886	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Elicitation	3.190	0.002	Failed to reject Ho	Significant
Metalinguistic Feedback	1.060	0.293	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant
Clarification Request	2.280	0.026	Failed to reject Ho	Significant
Repetition	3.020	0.004	Failed to reject Ho	Significant
Ignoring	1.370	0.176	Failed to reject Ho	Not Significant

Answering Research Question 3, qualitative thematic extraction isolated critical systemic bottlenecks. Excessive class sizes (exceeding 40 students per instructional unit) and dense curricular coverage targets create a structural paradox, coercing educators to abandon cognitive, output-pushing feedback in favor of rapid, conversational corrective triage. Student narratives indicated that public, uncalibrated corrective feedback functions as a primary driver of foreign language anxiety, effectively freezing active learner uptake. To systematically resolve these operational dynamics, the data informed the architecture of the Strategic Lexical-Phonological (S-LP) Pedagogical Framework, which coordinates the following structural dimensions:

- Pillar I: The Diagnostic Core establishes algorithmic linguistic profiling and diagnostic baseline mapping to preemptively isolate fossilized errors.
- Pillar II: The Methodological Bridge operationalizes a standardized dual-track decision matrix, dictating the deployment of targeted recasts for phonological slips and scaffolded elicitation for structural gaps, thereby protecting the student's affective domain while verifying cognitive noticing.

Table 9.1 Thematic Analysis of Qualitative Interview Results on the Teachers' Perceptions on Challenges and Enabling Conditions of Oral Corrective Feedback

•

Category	Theme	Subthemes
Teachers' Perception on Challenges in Using Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies	*Structural Overload and Instructional Time Scarcity*	*1. Pressure to complete a rigid curriculum.* *2. Difficulty of waiting for student responses.* *3. Encroachment of administrative call-ups.* *4. Inadequate one-hour instructional blocks.* *5. Imbalance between content delivery and feedback.*
	Learners' Affective Filter and Resistance	*1. Psychological fragility and shyness* *2. Fear of Social repercussion and Bullying* *3. Preference of TagLish over English-only* *4. Anxiety regarding public correction* *5. Defensive student attitudes toward errors*
	Variation of Students' Linguistic Needs	*1. Managing a wide spectrum of proficiencies* *2. Difficulty in prioritizing individual needs* *3. Inability to address syntax and phonology simultaneously*

		4. Large class sizes hindering personalized OCF strategy *5. Divergent student learning styles*
Teachers' Perception on Enabling Conditions in Using Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies	*Frequent Scaffolding and Trust-Making*	*1. Use of humor and subtle, non-confrontational feedback* *2. De-weaponizing mistakes to foster an error-positive culture* *3. Prioritizing rapport to ensure students feel safe taking linguistic risks* *4. Scaffolding through elicitation to bridge performance gaps* *5. Implementing subtle routines that do not disrupt the flow of interaction*
	Institutional and Instructional Support	*1. Desire for Learning Action Cell (LAC) sessions for feedbacking* *2. Advocacy for district-level professional development* *3. Transitioning from accidental to strategic instruction* *4. Need for a shared pedagogical framework between teacher and students* *5. Expanding the corrective repertoire through formal training*

Table 9.2 Thematic Analysis of Qualitative Interview Results on the Students' Perceptions on Challenges and Enabling Conditions of Oral Corrective Feedback

Category	Theme	Subthemes
Students' Perception on Challenges in Receiving Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies	*Processing and Noticing Gaps*	*1. Cognitive overload during fast-paced talk* *2. Mental exhaustion and brain-lag* *3. Failure to notice subtle recasts* *4. Difficulty distinguishing between feedback and content* *5. Over-reliance on the teacher for self-correction*
	Intellectual Surrender and Avoidance	*1. Deliberate ignoring of grammatical errors* *2. Reversion to native dialect for comfort* *3. Choosing silence to avoid correction* *4. Selective attention to easy feedback only* *5. Fatigue from repetitive correction styles*
Students' Perception on Enabling Conditions in Receiving Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies	*Positive Learning Environment*	*1. Collaborative classroom atmosphere that lowers the affective filter* *2. Peer-supportive dynamics that reduce the fear of bullying* *3. Gentle and decisive corrections viewed as positive reinforcements* *4. High student desire for rigorous active challenges like metalinguistic feedback* *5. Emotional resilience and hunger for deeper linguistic engagement*
	Real-Time Application and Repair	*1. Preference for clear and immediate*

	Availability of Metalinguistic Support such as Clues and Hints	*feedback to reduce anxiety* *2. Valuing explicit methods to resolve linguistic breakdowns instantly* *3. Using directness as an emotionally supportive tool that provides certainty* *4. Perceiving metalinguistic feedback to bridge proficiency gaps* *5. Appreciation for metalinguistic feedback as a cognitive anchor*

DISCUSSION

The empirical findings expose a structural paradox within the secondary language classroom. While second language acquisition (SLA) literature consistently highlights the cognitive superiority of output-pushing prompts for generating linguistic noticing and self-repair (Ioannou & Tsagari, 2022), ground-level classroom logistics systematically impede their application. Instructors default to immediate, non-scaffolded recasts because prompting an anxious student within an overcrowded room demands substantial time and risks breaking instructional momentum (Ha & Nguyen, 2021). However, because recasts are conversationally unobtrusive, their corrective intent is frequently missed by the learner, leading to significantly lower uptake and actual repair rates (Zhang, 2025).

Conclusions

The study concludes that real-world institutional constraints and large class sizes create a pedagogical gap, driving instructors to rely on passive, input-providing feedback mechanisms over more cognitively demanding, output-pushing strategies. Oral errors manifest uniformly across syntactic, lexical, and phonological categories, showing no significant correlation with student demographic variations. The clear divergence between theoretical recommendations and localized high school logistics highlights the need for an intentional, systematic approach to manage classroom corrections without slowing down lesson delivery.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Department of Education institutionalize standardized Oral Corrective Feedback (OCF) protocols within national teacher training structures. School administrators should steer Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) toward

instructional indices that measure student noticing and active uptake rather than focusing solely on syllabus completion. Language teachers should transition from intuitive, ad-hoc corrections to the structured delivery patterns outlined in the Pedagogical Framework. Furthermore, students should use Reflective Exit Slips to build active awareness of their individual error patterns. Future researchers should perform longitudinal investigations to track the empirical impact of the S-LP framework on actual language proficiency gains across diverse tracks.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

To safeguard participant welfare, the researcher strictly adhered to the Belmont Report's core principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice, alongside the Data Privacy Act of 2012 (RA 10173) and Department of Education guidelines. The researcher secured written parental consent paired with voluntary student assent, guaranteeing the absolute right of minor respondents to withdraw at any stage without academic penalty. During data collection, students were separated from their regular instructors to ensure they could speak honestly without fear of academic repercussions, mitigating power dynamics and distress. The researcher maintained anonymity of the respondents, safeguarded their well-being, avoided plagiarism strictly, ensured no conflict of interest, and used the results purely for research purposes.

Acknowledgments

The researcher expresses profound gratitude to the English Department Administration, the participating faculty, and the Grade 11 GAS student cohorts of Clarence Ty Pimentel National High School for their vital collaboration and administrative assistance during the execution of this study.

REFERENCES

Alsolami, S. (2019). Corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Teachers' practices and learners' preferences. Arab World English Journal, 10(2), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.16

Aragão, R. (2022). Emotional scaffolds: Anxiety and the feasibility of direct corrective feedback. System, 105, Article 102715. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102715

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cagara, M. J., Cabangon, M. L., & Daguplo, M. S. (2024). Feedback practices of teachers in modular distance learning: A qualitative inquiry. Journal of Education and Learning, 13(2), 89–102.

Custodio, R. (2021). Pedagogical challenges in language-intensive strands: A focus on the General Academic Strand (GAS). Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies, 9(3), 77–89.

Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L. T. (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a Foreign Language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? Frontiers in Psychology, 12, Article 697160. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.697160

Ioannou, S., & Tsagari, D. (2022). Effects of recasts, metalinguistic feedback, and students' proficiency on the acquisition of Greek perfective past tense. Languages, 7(1), 40. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010040

Li, S., Ou, L., & Lee, I. (2025). The timing of corrective feedback in second language learning. Language Teaching, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0261444824000478

Martin, S., & Alvarez Valdivia, I. M. (2017). Students' feedback beliefs and anxiety in online foreign language oral tasks. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 14, Article 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0056-z

Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Voices from students. Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language), 10(2), 113–133.

Zhang, C. (2025). Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake: An analysis of Chinese high-school teachers' practices in a national teaching competition. Language Awareness, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2025.2474233

APA Citation:

Acevedo, C. G., & Suazo, M. L. S. A. (2026). ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK STRATEGIES: A STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 4(6), 1234–1247. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20693358

Corresponding author: *clint.acevedo@deped.gov.ph*