Corrective feedback strategies identified in different classroom interaction contexts to enhance oral development

Estrategias de retroalimentación correctiva identificadas en diferentes contextos de interacción en el aula para potenciar el desarrollo de las habilidades orales

Verónica Pimienta Rosales
Ariel Vázquez Carranza
Liliana María Villalobos González

Verónica Pimienta Rosales
veronica.pimienta@academicos.udg.mx
Universidad de Guadalajara, México
ORCID: 0009-0009-4154-311X

Ariel Vázquez Carranza
ariel.vazquez@academicos.udg.mx
Universidad de Guadalajara, México
ORCID: 0000-0002-4017-0827

Liliana María Villalobos González
liliana.villalobos@academicos.udg.mx
Universidad de Guadalajara, México
ORCID: 0000-0002-9722-7724

https://doi.org/10.32870/vel.vi27.379

Recibido: 01/09/2024
Aceptado: 20/10/2024
Publicado: 30/04/2026

ABSTRACT: In teaching English as a foreign language, using Corrective Feedback (CF) strategies is crucial for developing speaking skills by helping students improve accuracy, fluenc , and appropriateness (Hartono et al., 2022). A descriptive study with a mixed-method focus explored CF strategies used in two English language groups from the FILEX program (International Training for Foreign Languages) at the University of Guadalajara, Mexico. The study analyzed class video recordings to identify CF strategies teachers used to correct students and encourage self-correction or peer repair, considering classroom interaction types. The main goal was to assess if CF tactics and interaction contexts supported or hindered students' conversational opportunities and oral development. Three of four classroom types described by Seedhouse (2004) were identified. Results show that structural classes exhibited more varied CF strategies, with explicit strategies most common but less supportive of speaking practice. CF strategies were less evident in functional and procedural classes, where paralinguistic tactics helped avoid interruptions and maintain conversational flow. The task-based context was not observed, as no interaction focused on completing tasks. Findings encourage language professionals to reflect on how CF strategies and classroom interaction types influence noticing forms, making linguistic adjustments, maintaining conversational flow, promoting interaction, and enhancing oral skills.

KEYWORDS: corrective feedback, classroom interaction contexts, oral development, and interaction.

RESUMEN: En la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera, el uso de estrategias de retroalimentación correctiva (CF) resulta fundamental para desarrollar las

COMO CITAR: Pimienta Rosales, V., Vázquez Carranza, A., & Villalobos González, L. M. (2026). Corrective feedback strategies identified in different classroom interaction contexts to enhance oral development. *Verbum et Lingua*, 27, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.32870/vel.vi27.379

habilidades orales, ya que ayuda a los estudiantes a mejorar la precisión, la fluidez y la adecuación (Hartono et al., 2022). Un estudio descriptivo con un enfoque de métodos mixtos exploró las estrategias de CF utilizadas en dos grupos de inglés del programa FILEX (Formación Internacional en Lenguas Extranjeras) de la Universidad de Guadalajara, México. El estudio analizó grabaciones de vídeo de las clases para identificar as estrategias de CF que los profesores utilizaban para corregir a los estudiantes y fomentar la autocorrección o la corrección entre compañeros, teniendo en cuenta los tipos de interacción en el aula. El objetivo principal era evaluar si las tácticas de CF y los contextos de interacción favorecían o dificultaban as oportunidades de conversación y el desarrollo oral de los estudiantes. Se identificaron tres de los cuatro tipos de interacción en el aula descritos por Seedhouse (2004). Los resultados muestran que las clases de carácter estructural presentaban estrategias de Retroalimentación Correctiva (RC) más variadas, siendo las explícitas las más comunes, aunque las menos propicias para la práctica oral. Las estrategias de RC resultaron menos evidentes en las clases funcionales y procedimentales, donde las tácticas paralingüísticas ayudaban a evitar interrupciones y a mantener la fluidez. No se observó un contexto basado en tareas, ya que ninguna interacción se centró en su realización. Estos hallazgos animan a los profesionales de la enseñanza de idiomas a reflexionar sobre cómo las estrategias de RC y los tipos de interac-ción en el aula influyen en la percepción de las formas lingüísticas, en la realización de ajustes lingüísticos, en el mantenimiento de la fluidez, en el fomento de la interacción y en la mejora de las habilidades orales. **PALABRAS CLAVE:** retroalimentación correctiva, contextos de interacción en el aula, desarrollo oral e interacción.

1. Introduction

Within language learning, Corrective Feedback (CF is considered a controversial issue that generates ideas in favor of or against. Those ideas in favor state that feedback contributes to language development since it allows learners to notice if their interlanguage forms deviate from the desired target language forms. This gap noticing motivates learners to seek correct utterances by reformulating and restructuring their oral and written production (Ha & Nguyen, 2021. Similarly, Ellis (2016 claims that CF is a form-focusing device that reacts to students´ errors. Conversely, ideas against it claim that feedback inhibits language learning and discourages learners from using it (Ellis, 2009. These antagonistic perspectives have motivated numerous researchers to study CF practices based on who should provide the feedback (teacher or student, the frequency, the kind of feedback, and the timing (immediate or delayed.

Nevertheless, there is increasing evidence within the interactionist view of language that CF can facilitate language development in the form of negotiation of meaning (VanPatten, 2003. More in-depth, through conversational exchange practices, students are guided to notice the errors and seek strategies of repair acts without interrupting the conversational flow. This process enables acquisition by triggering an internal process of attention and rehearsal, which forces students to move from a semantic level of language processing to a syntactic one. Under this interactional perspective, Sheen (2011) and Nassaji (2020) explored the role of interactional feedback in the classroom and found that CF tactics facilitate language development. In addition, Chehr Azad et al. 's (2017) findings supported the positive effects of CF in improving students' oral accuracy. Likewise, Li and

Iwashita (2019) confirmed the effectiveness of CF strategies of recasts and negotiation of meaning in oral interactions in which the primary instructional approach was focused on grammar and accuracy. Similarly, in Nurjanah et al. (2024), metalinguistic, repetition, and recasts are CF strategies identified as more suitable for speaking classes and improving speaking performance.

Alternatively, from a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1979), acquisition results from interaction and assistance in students´ Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). This view suggests that language problems could be solved through interaction, collaboration, and feedback from class peers or a more knowledgeable other. However, for language teachers and class peers to provide successful strategies for CF during class interaction, Ellis (2009) suggests that teachers should develop their ideas about effective CF strategies based on the teacher's teaching philosophy and students' beliefs. In addition to the above, it is important to consider that in the class setting, the oral discourse is governed by an institutional reality and practice in which teachers are the ones who are expected to signal and give turns for class participation. The latter is because, as organized and agreed upon by the school as a social institution, teachers have the right, obligation, and control of class interaction (Sert, 2015). In this sense, the opportunities for providing CF strategies are constrained by the type of classroom interaction context promoted or followed by the teacher. That is, the type of feedback provided will be conditioned by the kind of class pedagogy that could be focused on the language form, meaning, procedures, or tasks. Under this perspective, teachers are in a certain way responsible for providing learning practices or situations to maximize linguistic contributions in a balanced and democratic way for all the students. This leads to explaining why, most of the time, the feedback provided to participants in the classroom is merely oriented towards the notation of the form and not towards the maintenance of class conversation or interaction (Sert, 2015).

Given the above, this paper aims to report the results of a descriptive study oriented to explore and examine the CF strategies of recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit instruction, elicitation, and paralinguistic signals employed in two English language classes to correct errors or invite students to self-repair errors. This study was conducted by collecting six class video recordings transcribed and analyzed to identify the type of classroom interaction contexts and the CF strategies mentioned. The latter aimed to determine if the CF strategies and classroom interaction contexts identified were adequate to maintain or inhibit conversational opportunities and contribute to oral development in teaching English as a foreign language.

2. Justification

In the educational teaching context of FILEX at the Campus of Health Sciences at the University of Guadalajara in Mexico, developing clear, precise, and empathetic communication skills in a foreign language is essential for learners' professional development. In the current globalized world, healthcare professionals may often have the opportunity to

work with colleagues, patients, and other stakeholders from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Schkinder, 2024). Consequently, students with strong English language skills are more likely to become effective communicators in the target language. They are less likely to face communication breakdowns that may cause serious consequences for a patient's care and safety (Schkinder, 2024). In addition, strong communication and interactional skills contribute to developing other competencies such as intercultural awareness, critical thinking, problem-solving, and reflective practice. Also, it enables learners to seek opportunities for global mobility and career advancement in a foreign country. Thus, by considering all the aforementioned factors, it becomes relevant to analyze the discursive patterns in classroom interaction contexts and the CF tactics used by teachers in the FILEX program to describe how class lessons contribute to developing students´ speaking skills in the target language.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Corrective Feedback

Feedback in the language classroom can be implicit or explicit, also known as positive or negative feedback, respectively (Ellis, 2009). Implicit feedback is a teaching practice commonly evoked in communicative events as a result of the negotiation of meaning and from the interest of the interlocutors in maintaining discourse and social interaction. In some cases, the negotiation of meaning results from cooperation and solidarity between the interlocutors during the communicative transaction. The practice of implicit feedback is carried out when the teacher echoes the speech event with prosodic elements or through gestures, alluding to an error in production. This, in turn, invites the learner to self-correct or carry out a linguistic correction on their own (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).

Furthermore, implicit feedback is provided through confirmation checks and the verification of discourse during a conversation. This type of feedback allows the flow of a communicative transaction not to be interrupted despite indicating an error in speech. To compensate for interaction, interlocutors may attempt to maintain the conversational flow through linguistic strategies such as recasts, comprehension checks, paraphrasing, and circumlocution. In other words, interlocutors may use one or several of these strategies to make themselves understood or to help the addressee respond appropriately according to the intent of the utterance (Varonis & Gass, 1982). Several studies support the notion that the notation of form leads to the negotiation of meaning in task-based activities, which leads to learners making linguistic self-correcting adjustments or repairing moves as a product of interaction (Gass & Selinker, 2001).

On the other hand, explicit feedback is characterized by applying metalinguistic instructions where a request for attention to form or the use of specific explicit language rules is observed. Some examples of explicit feedback occur when the teacher directly indicates to the student that he or she has made a grammatical error. Another example is when the teacher asks the student to repeat the sentence to indicate that the answer is

unsatisfactory. For this effect, teachers may face the dilemma of delivering immediate or delayed feedback after the speech event. The decision may be conditioned on the learning goals or teachers' beliefs about language learning. For instance, if the lesson aims to achieve accuracy, the best option is to provide immediate feedback.

In contrast, if the lesson aims to develop fluency, the teacher will provide delayed feedback to avoid interruptions and maintain the conversational flow. Similarly, if the lesson aims to create a safe and caring learning environment, teachers may opt for delayed feedback to protect students' feelings. Studies conducted on these grounds have concluded that it is almost impossible to arrive at any general conclusion and determine the efficiency of delayed or immediate feedback. Nevertheless, according to Long (1996), attention to form is a learning mechanism considered key to language learning. This concept refers to selective attention to parts of specific speech production patterns that diverge from the expected realizations of the target language. Similarly, Schmidt (1990) argued that noticing the gap is essential since language learning cannot occur without attention to form and meaning. That is, without realizing it, it is impossible for "output" (any aspect of outgoing production) to become "uptake" (comprehensible production). Furthermore, Schmidt argues that when there is a difference between the target language form and the native language form, learners will not notice the discrepancy until attention is drawn to it.

As Ellis (2009) states, Corrective Feedback (CF) is a form of negative feedback that appears to respond to students´ statements containing errors. The response is a type of repair initiation (Schegloff et al., 1977; see Walper, 2022) that may take the following forms: 1) a declaration that the error has been made; 2) the provision of the appropriate language form; 3) metalinguistic details regarding the error´s nature. In other words, when an error is identified in the student's utterance, the teacher requests clarification before providing a recast or a repetition. Students are triggered and then are invited to repair through a series of moves listed by Ellis (2009) as recasts, clarification requests, repetitions, explicit corrections, elicitations, and paralinguistic signals. Thus, the value of CF lies in the idea that feedback should be provided in context and during interaction (VanPatten, 2003).

3.3 Speaking skills

The development of speaking skills in language teaching stands out as a highly complex task that requires not only linguistic or grammatical knowledge of the target language but also involves a series of strategic, social, and discursive knowledge that governs the use of the language (Richards & Rodgers, 2003). Specifically, the nature of conversations implies not only having the ability to emit and understand verbal messages but also requires the ability to use and identify cultural and extra-linguistic features of nonverbal language like gestures and body postures; as well as paralinguistic characteristics of stress, intonation, and tone that are used to fulfill a communicative transaction. Among the most common purposes that motivate individuals to communicate orally are the interest or need to disseminate information and knowledge, establish social contact between peers, and maintain

or conclude some social relationship or interaction (Richards & Renandya, 2002). However, for such communicative transactions to be carried out effectively and appropriately, participants must consider contextual aspects such as roles and relationships between conversational actors, communicative intentions, and the possible consequences of the linguistic choices used in the conversation (Grundy, 2000). To deal with this complex process, linguists and language teaching professionals have devoted much of their research to understanding the nature of speech production and its relationship with the context to propose reflective approaches to observe the phenomenon of oral production.

3.3 Interactional competence

Interactional competence is maintaining interaction in the communicative event (see Hall et al. 2011). This is possible when the participants can perform an immediate analysis of turn-taking with precision and appropriateness, adopting cooperative postures in the interaction. More in-depth, it is a process based on a delicate and complex maneuver that requires constructing and reconstructing speech and showing specific pragmatic knowledge through linguistic and paralinguistic rules that allow language users to meet their communicative objectives (Barraja-Rohan, 2011). Within this process, speech turns to imply the "how" and "when" of the linguistic contribution. The overlaps of the participants are also considered, as well as the use of paralinguistic elements (pauses, gestures, silences, glances, laughter, disturbances, hesitations, stuttering, etc.). Sequential organization, conversely, refers to the moment-by-moment construction of interaction. The core unit for sequential analysis is the adjacency pair, which consists of two turns produced by different speakers, one after the other; the turns have a typological relationship; that is, the first part of the pair requires a particular action as the second part. The second part of the pair can occur immediately or later (Schegloff, 2007). Likewise, within interactional competence, repairing linguistic actions is of utmost importance (Barraja-Rohan, 2011). Repairs are those modifications made in verbal behavior, either to modify the form of the grammatical structure or the meaning of the linguistic contribution. The various types of repair can be carried out self-directedly or requested as part of the negotiation process (see Schegloff et al. 1977; Walper, 2022).

3.4 Classroom interaction and foreign language learning

Social interaction is the primary means by which the socialization process occurs. Through verbal and non-verbal realizations, individuals can interact with the social context. These social interactions do not arise from the result of individual actions or decisions, but rather obey to actions that are collectively constructed by the members of a society or belonging to an institution, such as a hospital, a government office, a bank, or a school; spaces where linguistic choices are governed by the social context in which they occur (Drew & Heritage, 1992). In the educational context, the classroom is a setting where knowledge and meaning are constructed between teachers and students through language and social interaction. This bidirectional relationship allows us to describe and analyze how discourse and inter-

action occur in the context of language teaching (see Vázquez Carranza, 2022). In these terms, oral discourse in classroom interaction is characterized by its institutional features, where the control of speaking turns is given or assigned by the teachers who are the ones with the right, obligation, and control of the class interaction.

Furthermore, most speech sequence and discourse organization is carried out through adjacent transitions with expected lexical selections and subsequent positive or negative evaluations of a linguistic contribution (Sert, 2015). According to Seedhouse (2004), classroom interaction can be classified or organized into four context types: structural, functional, task-oriented, and procedural. In the first structure-based context, priority is given to the correct use of grammatical forms. In this context, the teacher has strict control over the appointment of speaking turns, feedback, and repair practices. Thus, linguistic realizations that the teacher does not correctly evaluate denote instances of explicit feedback accompanied by long pauses. The second functional-based context focuses on the semantic meaning of the communicative event by favoring fluency and semantic meaning. A greater variety of sequence organization is observed with limited moments of interruptions in the conversational flow by the teacher. In addition, functional contexts allow for better opportunities for verbal contributions since teachers do not show strict control of speaking turns. The feedback type is mainly indirect; the communicative transaction is not interrupted if given explicitly. The third task-based context is oriented to fulfilling task completions that increase the usage of deictic markers, gestures, and restricted exchange opportunities. This is because shift changes are subject to the type of pedagogical intervention that refers to completing a task. Finally, the procedural context focuses on long interventions by the teacher to grant instructions (see Vázquez Carranza & Villalobos Gonzalez, forthcoming). In this setting, it is reported that teachers' shifts are generally longer and with little or no intervention from the students. The above is carried out, despite the constant markers and meaning checkers in English such as: "okay?", "yes?", "all right?", etc., used by teachers. To sum up, according to Seedhouse (2004), these four scenarios help to know and understand the relationship between the type of pedagogical activity and the structure and properties of the interactional contexts that can be observed in the language classroom.

4. The Study

4.1 Research Methodology

A descriptive study was conducted following a mixed-method research design with the main objective of exploring the CF strategies employed in two language groups and identifying the different classroom interaction contexts to determine if the ones used contribute to students´ development of English speaking skills. As posited in Creswell´s (2012) terms, a descriptive study is oriented to observe, analyze, describe, and gain an understanding of a specific phenomenon without influencing it.

In this particular case, class video recordings were obtained, transcribed, and examined from two English language courses to address the following specific objectives: 1) To examine

and classify the kinds of classroom interaction contexts in each lesson, 2) To identify the type and frequency usage of CF strategies employed by teachers in each of the class contexts, and 3) To explore the pedagogical advantages of CF strategies in different classroom interaction contexts to enhance the development of speaking skills oral development.

The following research questions were generated in light of the objectives aforementioned: 1) What kind of classroom interaction contexts were found in each lesson?,2) What type and frequency usage of CF strategies were employed by teachers in each of the class contexts?, and 3) What are the pedagogical advantages of CF strategies in different classroom interaction contexts to enhance the development of speaking skills?

4.2 Data Collection and Analysis

For data collection purposes, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered from an oral corpus consisting of six video-recorded class sessions, each lasting between 25 to 30 minutes, with three recordings per group. The video recordings were transcribed following some of the orthographic conventions proposed by Jefferson in Wooffitt (2005) for school contexts (see Appendix A). These orthographic conventions represent various characteristics of oral discourse that are exemplified in written form to signal turn-taking, pauses, overlaps, prosodic aspects of speech rhythm, etc. In addition, the taxonomy of CF strategies proposed by Ellis (2009) was used as a reference to identify and code instances of feedback in each of the classroom interaction contexts found. This taxonomy considers CF strategies of recast, repetition, clarification request, explicit correction, elicitation, and paralinguistic signals (see Appendix B).

4. 3 Context and Participants

The context of the study was the extracurricular English language program identified as FILEX (for its Spanish Acronym) which stands for International Training for Foreign Languages) offered at the Campus for Health Sciences of the University of Guadalajara, Mexico. This English teaching program has an academic offer of six levels of general English with duration of six months for each level. Classes are taught on Saturdays from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The language classes at FILEX are offered to both: the school community and the general public. The participants who provided their written consent to be part of this research were two groups of English with a total of 17 students and their teachers of English who hold a degree in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Each teacher was in charge of imparting language instruction to a group of basic English equivalent to an A2 level of the Common European Framework of Reference for the Languages (CEFR). For student and teacher participation, a convenience sampling technique was employed (Creswell, 2012) since the two groups that agreed to participate were available at the moment of the study.

5. Findings

In this descriptive study, findings obtained from the class video recordings are reported in the following two sections. The first section exemplifies the different classroom interaction contexts identified in each of the six lessons. This segment also provides a description about the pedagogical implications that each kind of CF strategy and interactional context can offer to speaking development. To attest which classroom setting was best suited for speaking development, the second section provides data on the type and frequency of CF strategies used in each of the contexts that were identified.

Findings Part 1: Type of Interactional Class Contexts

As stated in the literature review section, classrooms are institutionalized settings that exhibit conventional pedagogical, discursive, and interactional patterns that according to Seedhouse (2004) can be divided into four types of contexts that can be classified as structural, functional, task oriented, and procedural. Using this classification as a reference for analysis, the six video class recordings displayed instances of three of the four contexts mentioned. These contexts were the semantic-functional in four lessons, the structural in two lessons, and the procedural context in the six lessons. This last one was found in combination with the structural and functional contexts. As for the task-based context, this was not observed in the class videos since no discursive elements or interactional strategies focused on completing projects or tasks were identified. However, although this interactional context was not present in the observed classes, this data does not provide enough evidence to suggest that this pedagogical practice is not considered by the teachers who participated in this study. Relevant findings from the three contexts identified are illustrated in Excerpts 1- 5 depicted below.

Excerpt 1.

Functional Context

This excerpt sample corresponds to a class context with a semantic purpose. For this lesson, students were asked to individually select and read information provided by the teacher about a famous historical figure. Once the information was revised, students were asked to embody the character and pretend to be in an interview so that the rest of the classmates could ask yes-no questions in the simple past about the selected famous figure. Thus, as illustrated in lines 70-82, the student identified as S4 had chosen to characterize and introduce famous comic writer Stan Lee, so that students could practice the grammar point in the form of an interview with questions and answers (S1, S2, S3, S5, S6, S7, S8, S9, and S10).

Lines 70-82

70	T: OK, guys (2) be quiet so we can listen, OK?
71	S4: Stan Lee. He was the inventor of many superheroes and he...he * born in December the twenty-two in New York, New York. He is Stan Lee.
72	((some students laughed))
73	S7: And what happened when you * 17 years old?
74	S4: I started to work at Timely Comics
75	S10: What was your first success?
76	S4: Eh...in 1940, I created Captain America because we *are in the middle of the second war
77	S8: What happened when you were 19 years old?
78	S4: When I was 19 years old, I went to the war, I didn't fight ah (.) I drew cartoons
79	S5: What was your most important life event?
80	S4: I got married in 1947 when I was 24 years old.
81	S5: And last question is (.)what were your greatest successes?
82	S4: Those were the fantas (1) fantastic four, Spiderman, Hulk and Captain America.

Utterances portrayed in lines 70-82 indicate that in this functional context, adjacent contributions favored speaking turns among classmates (S4 - S5, S7, S8, and S10), which were controlled by the students and guided by the teacher as stated by Sert (2015). Hence, it can be suggested that this context helped in enhancing students´ oral fluency and maintaining the conversation flow. This was achieved by avoiding the usage of explicit feedback. However, one notable disadvantage of this type of interaction is the lack of equal opportunities or reciprocity in the interaction regarding organization, timing, and sequence. These transactions in the form of interviews excluded the participation (S1, S2, S3, S6, and S9) of students who were perhaps less proficient, confident, or disengaged in the task.

Concerning the type of CF strategies employed in excerpt 1, it is observed that despite the linguistic errors seen in lines 71, 73, and 76, these contributions did not receive any feedback from the teacher or the interlocutors, which allowed the conversational flow to be maximized. However, although the objective of the lesson was on the semantic aspect of the language, it is worth mentioning the importance of noticing the form, perhaps through the employment of non-verbal discursive strategies that could be used to trigger students to participate in self-directed or supported error repair moves among class peers (Ellis, 2009). Also, if we take into account Schmidt´s (1980) and Long´s (1996) arguments in favor of "noticing the form" during interaction as an essential element in the process of language development,

it is through CF that students are forced to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing. Similarly, through a positive or negative evaluation of the linguistic choice in the form of a CF during the conversational exchange, students are not only triggered to repair the linguistic act to achieve understanding but with the intent to create, maintain, and cooperatively construct the interaction as reported by Barraja-Rohan (2011). Hence, the act of repair move becomes a relevant component in developing interactional competence.

Excerpt 2.

Structural Context

The excerpt in lines 24-35 provides an example of a class scenario focused on grammatical knowledge in which the teacher explained the structure of "going to" for future plans. As seen, the language lesson was introduced with questions that were subsequently answered by the teacher and the students (S2, S7, and S3) to elicit samples of the future tense. This adjacent participation is found with turns guided and controlled solely by the teacher. Therefore, students were not encouraged to initiate, generate, or direct a turn in the conversation. As a consequence, the opportunities to enhance speech production were limited and controlled by the teacher.

Lines 24-35

24	T: I am going to (.) NO↑, (sería) I am studying or I am going to study without ING ↑.
25	S2: >< To mean that tomorrow I am going to do it?
26	T: OK↑, what are your plans for tomorrow? So talk about your plans.
27	((Teacher looked at students expecting a reply)) (5)
28	S7: ((Student raised his hand))
29	T: ((Teacher pointed at the student (S7) and assigned turn)) Yes ↑, Mario tell us? What are your plans for tomorrow? For, example, I am going to the gym. What about you?
30	S7: What a *casualty, I am going to the gym *too. I love (.)
31	T: [Do you mean? ((teacher browse her face)) What a COINCIDENCE ↑] £. You are also going to the gym? Great!
32	S7: Yes, what a coincidence teacher ((hih, hih))
33	T: Ok↑. Who else? What are your plans for tomorrow? (4)
34	T: Maria? ↑ What about you?
35	S3: Eh… I am going to the mall

As reported in Table 1 below, the structural class contexts were mainly characterized by the use of explicit feedback strategies employed by the teachers, as seen in line 31(excerpt 2), which leads to the creation of sequences with a more significant number of interruptions

that prevent the interactional and conversational flow from being maximized (lines 31 and 33). Thus, even though the structural context offers excellent opportunities to employ implicit CF strategies, these opportunities were missed by the teacher since instead of providing the correct construction at first (explicit feedback), the teacher should have allowed students to implement a repair move by only signaling through indirect feedback that there was a mistake in their contribution. By doing so, the students could have learned how to negotiate and construct meaning in discourse. Moreover, if we look at the contribution in line 30, the student (S7) showed enthusiasm in commenting and providing a more elaborate response. However, instead, the teacher interrupted his participation and inhibited his opportunity to participate. This contribution can lead us to reflect on the importance of not limiting students to express ideas even when there is an incorrect construction.

Excerpt 3.

Structural Context

Even though explicit feedback was the most common strategy in structural contexts (see Table1), a few examples of implicit feedback with recasts and repetition were also noted as shown in excerpt 3 (lines 39-43). To provide some context for this excerpt, the teacher had initiated the lesson with a small talk by eliciting examples of actions taken place in the morning before arriving to school like "I had breakfast, I bought a coffee, I took the bus, etc." These language samples were asked with the objective of using them to review the structure of the simple past in a personalized way. In this regard, the linguistic contribution of student (S7) was implicitly corrected by the teacher in lines 39 and 43 with CF strategies of recast and repetition. This type of implicit feedback lead student (S7) to maintain the linguistic contribution, notice the form, and repair the error.

38	S7: Because in the *" journey " always.
39	T: On the way↑ ((Teacher gazed at the student))
40	S7: Yes, always. I was*" bought ", bought food on the (2) way
41	SS´s : ((students laughed and didn't let S finish))
42	S7: Yes ~
43	T: AH, it would £ you always buy ↑ food on the way to school£ , right?
44	S7: Yes ~
45	T: What else? Tell me more
46	S7: (5) ((Troubling face gesture))

However, despite the teacher's effort to rescue the student's (S7) intervention in line 45, the student abandons his contribution with a long pause and a troubling gesture. This example highlights the importance of motivating students to continue with their speaking

production despite their errors and the negative evaluation received from class peers (as seen in line 41). If feedback is not used correctly, it could inhibit class participation, interaction, and student learning. This passage also emphasizes how crucial is to give delayed feedback, even when the lesson´s main focus is on structure (Ellis, 2009)

Excerpt 4.

Procedural Context

The language sample depicted in excerpt 4 (lines1-5) corresponds to a type of procedural class interaction context in which the main characteristics are the long turns and speaking periods employed by the teacher when offering explanations or giving task instructions (Seedhouse, 2004). Even though these long contributions limit students' opportunities to participate in class, sometimes these contributions are necessary so that teachers can provide details about class content, activities, or instructions (As illustrated in line1 where teacher gives task instructions). The above without leaving aside that teachers' class contributions need to be made with moderation and control of teacher talking time. Otherwise, they could impact student learning by minimizing students´ opportunities for speech production and interaction in class time. That is, procedural participation could be economized by trying to minimize teacher talking time and the employment of extra-linguistic elements such as gestures, mimicry, body movements, among others. Another good opportunity to maximize students´ participation in the speech event is by inviting them to rephrase or paraphrase task instructions to their class peers. In this way, the teacher is accomplishing the goal of the task and is also ensuring a more active and democratic participation in the class.

Lines 1-6

1	T: Ok! So, as I told you, we are going to have a communicative activity, ok? For this activity, we are going to be talking about childhood, okay? So…I brought some questions, I hope that the questions are not too personal, yeah? If you don't want to talk about them, you can just ignore them and you can just let your partner talk. We are going to be working in…in pairs and if I tell you: ok switch partners, then you are gonna be switching a partner, yeah? And if, amm …after each question I'm going to be eliciting answers from…from you guys, okay? Now, let's see. Ok, there you go! So, it says: Childhood discussion questions. Are you already working in pairs? Are you already in pairs? ((Teacher stared at the students))
2	Ss's: ((some students say yes or Yeah))
3	T: Yeah? Okay! So, the first question is. Can you read it please, Fanny ?
4	S3: Yes, teacher. What was your *favorite cartoon program? Explain, why?
5	T: Very, good. So, FANNY↑. ((Teacher gazed at the student)). What was your FAVORITE↑ cartoon program? (Teacher corrected pronunciation of the word)
6	S3: Ok ~

As for the opportunities for error correction in the procedural contexts, these are limiting but not absent as seen in line 5. In this transaction, the teacher repeated the phrase and signaled emphatic stress on the mispronounced word. Another salient aspect identified in this excerpt is the use of paralinguistic signals (gestures or facial expressions as in line 5) that could be exploited to promote class participation. Hence if paralinguistic features are used purposefully, they can also be used to signal an error and invite students to repair their utterances without being interrupted as in line 5. So, even though the pedagogical nature of the event is to give instructions or provide explanations, the teacher can also take advantage implicit CF strategies to enhance speaking development such as the use elicitations and clarification request to check for understanding of task instructions.

Excerpt 5.

Procedural and Structural Contexts

Also, within the combination of structural and procedural contexts as seen in excerpt 5 (in lines 39-42), a large number of code alternations from English to Spanish were observed as initiated by student (S1) to seek for clarification of meaning (lines 40 and 41) from the grammatical explanation provided by the teacher to contrast future tenses.

Lines 39-42

39	T: Do you guys have any questions?
40	S1: Teacher↑ (.) entonces "I AM GOING" sería ¿Para referirme que mañana si lo voy a hacer?
41	S1: =No sé si ya es seguro, si no es seguro, si es una predicción, so dependiendo es lo que tienen que usar.
42	T: ¡AH! Mira deja te explico la diferencia de cuándo es un plan o predicción a futuro ((Teacher offers a smiling face))

These code alternations from English to Spanish are maintained by the teacher (in line 42) to facilitate the understanding of class content, as well as mitigating any possible perceived misunderstanding, which is also compensated by non-verbal elements through smiles or gestures of approval on the part of the teacher. Once again, this excerpt also indicates that paralinguistic signals were not totally exploited as means for providing implicit CF practices that may force student to seek for clarification of meaning in the target language.

Findings Part 2: CF strategies

This section reports the frequency usage of the different types of CF strategies coded and tallied in each of the class contexts identified in the study (see Table 1).

Table 1
Frequency use of CF Strategies

CF Strategies	*Structural Context*	*Functional Context*	*Procedural Context*
Recast	2	0	0
Repetition	3	1	0
Clarification Request	0	2	1
Explicit Correction	6	0	0
Elicitation	4	0	3
Paralinguistic Signal	6	4	7

Frequency counts depicted in table 1, shows that the type of class setting that displayed more frequent and diverse examples of CF strategies was the structural context. This speech behavior was expected considering that the focus of the lesson is on the notation of the form. However, considering that a greater emphasis is perceived in the usage of prompts and explicit corrections, the opportunities that this context offers for appropriately using FC strategies were not exploited, entailing that the teacher keeps control of the contributions and the output, thus reducing opportunities to use repair moves, negotiate meaning, and enhance speech production. Teachers should take advantage of structural contexts by not only focusing on language form, but also on the opportunities to use CF for social interaction and cooperation as proposed by Sert (2015).

Conversely, in the functional context, it was observed that instances of CF were poorly addressed. The strategy that showed the most frequent usage was the employment of paralinguistic features in the four lessons through the use of the teacher´s body language, eye contact, and gestures when reacting to errors. The usage of clarification requests and repetitions were found in a limited way, suggesting that the emphasis of the class was on meaning and not on interaction. In regards to the usage of direct or explicit feedback strategies, these were not found perhaps upon the belief that form notation may inhibit class participation and interrupt the conversational flow. However, teachers may also consider the benefits proposed by Long (1996) and Schmidt (1990) about the importance of noticing the form in language development. Noticing can be signaled through various means of CF strategies that do not only emphasize the usage of explicit types of corrections that interrupt the conversation. Instead, teachers can promote clarification requests and recasts in collaboration with class peers to self-repair utterances, promote democratic interactions, and maximize opportunities for oral development.

In a similar vein, the procedural setting also displayed a few instances of CF strategies, with paralinguistic features being the most frequent, followed by elicitation tasks in which

students were asked to complete utterances with the correct form. As previously mentioned, the potential of paralinguistic signals to provide opportunities for repair moves is evident in this context, suggesting that professors should be aware of this opportunity in their language practices.

6. Conclusions

The main interest in this research was to highlight the importance of identifying the impact of different CF strategies used in other class interaction contexts on speaking skills. This is to encourage future specialists in language teaching to reflect and determine if their current CF strategies used in specific class interaction contexts allow them to maximize students´ speech production opportunities and, therefore, contribute to the ability to negotiate meaning, notice the gap, repair utterances, maintain interaction, and construct speech in collaboration as part of a social transaction, as stated by Barraja-Rohan (2011).

Based on the observed class lessons, this analysis identified three examples of classroom contexts in which the semantic-functional type scenario is followed by the structural space, combined with the procedural context. The semantic-functional scenario was characterized by the restricted use of both explicit and implicit CF strategies, perhaps because of the following three reasons pointed out by Ellis (2009) which are: 1) to create a safe and caring class atmosphere without CF strategies so that students could feel confident to speak, 2) to prioritize fluency over accuracy, 3) to avoid interruptions and maintain the conversation flow. However, as a result of the few opportunities for students to notice the form and negotiate meaning in discourse through the use of CF strategies, this may impact the development of students' speaking accuracy, along with the possibility to move from a semantic to a syntactic level of language processing as suggested by VanPatten (2003). Also, it must be taken into consideration that although the opportunities to maintain the speaking turns between students were higher compared to the structural and procedural contexts, the participation among classmates in the semantic context was unequal, so only one section of the group could practice their speaking skills, while the rest of the group remained passive, thus restraining their opportunities to improve their speaking skills. Hence, some alternatives to increase students' oral participation in semantic and functional contexts include incorporating tasks that promote more democratic participation, such as pair or group work. In addition, we should encourage students to learn to negotiate meaning through implicit and explicit CF strategies to help classmates communicate and maintain conversational flow. This could be done by pairing students with different linguistic proficiency levels so that the more knowledgeable student (s) could serve as facilitator (s) of positive and negative evaluations through speech.

On the other hand, in the structural context, the form of explicit or metalinguistic feedback, guided and controlled by the teacher, was dominant, yielding to adjacent social interactions, with interruptions and few opportunities to maintain the conversational flow. Although this type of explicit feedback was expected, given the nature of the lesson, stu-

dents had better chances of developing speaking accuracy, but not fluency or the ability to develop interactional skills, due to the more significant restrictions on their ability to initiate speaking turns and to gain control in interaction. Nevertheless, since the structural contexts provide greater opportunities to invite students to notice the form and to repair their utterances, it can be suggested that one use both explicit and implicit strategies in a balanced way to promote the development of speaking accuracy, fluency, and interaction. To achieve this goal, teachers must ensure that the opportunities to provide assertive CF strategies are not missed or neglected.

Regarding the procedural section, a few CF strategies were identified as elicitations, followed by clarification requests and paralinguistic signals. This suggests that because of teachers' long conversational turns, students have almost no opportunities to practice their speaking skills. Hence, it is recommended that teachers be aware of the limitations that procedural contexts may pose for developing speaking skills. Likewise, in this setting, alongside the structural context, several examples of code alternation from English to Spanish were observed as models of meaning negotiation and the establishment of a positive atmosphere in class. This brings to mind the idea that teachers must take advantage of situations in which students' need for clarification is evident, so perhaps maintaining the interaction in students' native language is not the best option, even when the purpose is to help students feel confident asking questions.

Furthermore, it was perceived that in all three classroom interaction contexts, the opportunities for democratic, creative, spontaneous, or self-initiated interaction on the part of students were poor due to the social and institutional nature that prevails in the classroom, where the teacher is the one who has the power and the right to direct and assign speaking turns. Based on these conclusions, it is relevant to invite current and future teachers to reflect on the importance of generating and modeling activities that foster cooperative and social interaction among students in teaching contexts. This can be achieved by providing greater opportunities in class to initiate and maintain speaking turns reciprocally between students. It also intervenes in the processes of CF and error repair through the employment of linguistic strategies for the negotiation of meaning that could be used by teachers and among students to notice form and maintain interaction. Some of these strategies are recasts, repetitions, clarification requests, elicitations, and paralinguistic signals. Also, it recommended betting on alternative pedagogical contexts, such as task-based, that were not identified in the study. The latter is because, according to Gass and Selinker (2001), task- or problem-solving activities are believed to make students more likely to make adjustments in their speech through self-correction or repair conversational moves (Gass & Selinker, 2001). In other words, task-based contexts offer better opportunities for students to equally use CF strategies in discourse through interaction, socialization, and cooperation. Hence, through the implementation of an instructional design where opportunities for conversational flow are promoted, teachers will be able to increase opportunities for students' social interaction in the classroom, which can positively impact both language

and speaking development, especially in the development of social interaction skills to promote inclusion, cooperation, and linguistic reciprocity.

7. References

Barraja-Rohan, A. M. (2011). Using conversation analysis in the second language classroom to teach interactional competence. *Language Teaching Research*, 15 (4), 479–507. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811412878

Chehr Azad, M. H., Farrokhi, F., & Zohrabi, M. (2017). The effects of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' speaking accuracy and fluency breakdown. *Journal of Language Horizons, Alzabra University*, 1 (2), 107–129.

Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. (4th ed.)*. Boston, MA. Pearson.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds.) (1992). *Talk at Work: interaction in institutional settings.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 journal*, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.5070/12.v1i1.9054

Ellis, R. (2016). Focus on form: A critical review. *Language Teaching Research*, 20 (3), 405–428. https:// doi.org/10.1177/1362168816628627

Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course*. London: Mahwah.

Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. (2nd ed.). Arnold Publishers.

Hartono, D., Basthomi, Y., Widiastuti, O., & Prastiyowati, S. (2022). The Impacts of Teacher's Oral Corrective Feedback to Students' Psychological Domain: A Study on EFL Speech Production. *Cogent Education*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619

Ha, X. V., & Nguyen, L.T. (2021). Target and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as foreign language classrooms: Are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? Frontiers in psychology, 12, 697160

Hall, J., Hellermann, J., & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2011). *L2 Interactional Competence and Development*. Alemania, Multilingual Matters.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. (1991). *An introduction to second language research.* London: Longman.

Li, H., & Iwashita, N. (2019). The role of recast and negotiated prompts in an EFL learning context in China with non-English major university students. *Language Teaching Research*, 25 (2), 209–233. http://doi.org/10.117/1362168819839727

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp.413–468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Nassaji, H. (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of interactional feedback for L2 acquisition: Issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 53 (1), 3–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444819000375

Nurjanah, L., Rahmaningtyas, H., & Yaniafari, R.P. (2024). Examining students´ oral corrective feedback preferences for improving speaking proficiency. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics*, 11(1), 23–38. http://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v11i1.29020

Richards, J. & Renandya. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching. An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T. (2003). A*pproaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). *Sequence organization in interaction: A prime in conversation analysis.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 11, 17–46. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129

Schkinder, K. (2024). The crucial role of English language in intercultural communication within global healthcare. *International Science Journal of Education & Linguistics,* 3 (1), 63–68. http://doi.org/10.46299/j.isjel.20240301.07

Seedhouse. P. (2004). *The interactional architecture of the language classroom. A conversation analysis perspective.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social interactions and L2 discourse*. Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

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

VanPatten, B. (2003). *From input to output: A teacher´s guide to second language acquisition*. Mahwah, MJ: Erlbaum.

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1982). *The comprehensibility of non-native speech. Studies in second language acquisition*. 4,114-136. https://doi.org/10.1017/S027226310000437X

Vázquez Carranza, A. (2022). El análisis conversacional y la enseñanza de lenguas. In Vázquez Carranza, A. (Ed.). *Sociolingüística para la enseñanza de lenguas*. Guadalajara, Universidad de Guadalajara, pp. 337–386.

Vázquez Carranza, A. & Villalobos González, L. Ma. (forthcoming). La literacidad interaccional del docente: un estudio analítico-interaccional de la impartición de instrucciones en el salón de clase de inglés como lengua extranjera.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1979). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Walper, K. (2022). Reparación en el aula de lengua extranjera: Perspectivas desde el Análisis Conversacional Multimodal. In Vázquez-Carranza, A. (Ed.). *Sociolingüística para la Enseñanza de Lenguas*. Guadalajara, Universidad de Guadalajara. 385–435.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation Analysis & Discourse: A comparative and critical introduction.* Sage Publications. https://www.cur.ac.rw/mis/main/library/documents/book_file/digital-65ca29d-5cbc795.39104640.pdf

Appendix A
Orthographic Conventions for Conversation Analysis

Symbol	*Indicates*
01, 02, 03	Number of lines and shifts
=>	Particular part talked about in the text
[ ]	Overlap
=	Connected lines or continuous speaking turns stuck together without pauses
(.)	Micro pause
(1)	Number in parentheses indicates the duration of a pause in seconds.
↑↓	Raise or lower intonation respectively
:	The longer the previous sound, the more points the longer the sound.
"word"	Speech units in quotation marks are produced with an intonation that indicates that the speaker is quoting what someone else said.
. hh	Inhalation
hh.	Exhalation
Heh , hih , hah	Laughter. The more "haches" there are, the longer the laughter.
£	smiling voice
~	shy voice
#	broken voice
(h) word (h)	Word(s) between "haches " indicate that laughter is infiltrated into speech
Pal-	Word or utterance is cut off
WORD	Capital letters indicate an increase in volume
(calculation)	Words in parentheses indicate an estimate of what the speaker says
( )	Empty parentheses indicate that something was said but was not heard or understood.
((word))	Words in double parentheses contain descriptions of events or use of gestures

º wordº	Words between degree signs indicate that the speech is soft or very quiet
Word?	Question mark indicates question intonation
…	Indicates that there is a conversation omitted from the transcript
><	Indicates conversational comments that come from the context
*	Linguistic errors (syntax, semantics, morphology, phonetics, etc.)

Taken and adapted from Jefferson in Wooffitt, 2005, in Conversational analysis & Discourse Analysis: A comparative and critical introduction.

Appendix B
Taxonomy of Corrective Feedback Strategies

CF strategy	*Coding*	*Definition*	*Example*
Recast	RC	The corrector employs content words of the preceding utterance to signal the correct way in terms of grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, etc.	S: She has 26 years old T:She **is** 26 years old?
Repetition	RP	By means of emphatic stress, the corrector repeats the utterance to point out the error	S: She has 26 years old T:She **IS** 26 years old
Clarification Request	CR	The corrector indicates that the speaker´s linguistic realization was not understood	S: She has 26 years old T: Can you say that again?
Explicit Correction	EC	The error is overtly indicated by the corrector. In this case the correction is provided.	T: We don´t say "she has 26 years". We say, "She is 26 years old"
Elicitation	E	The corrector uses rising intonation to invite the speaker to complete and correct the erroneous utterance	S: She has 26 years old T: She……. ?
Paralinguistic Signal	PS	The corrector employs extra linguistic features to indicate error	T: uses eye contact or gestures to signal error

Taken and adapted from Ellis (2009 in Corrective feedback and teacher development