



A Comparative Analysis of Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback on Language Performance

Fatma Suer Albay¹

¹ Early Childhood Education Program, Algonquin College, Ottawa, Canada
E-mail: suer0003@algonquinlive.com

DOI: 10.53103/cjlls.v3i5.126

Abstract

The path to linguistic competence in the area of language acquisition is one of discovery, with one's capacity for clear and correct communication always evolving. The key function of corrective feedback, which acts as a compass to direct students toward the shores of linguistic clarity, is at the center of this trip. Corrective feedback is the helpful advice given to students in response to their grammatical mistakes, a lighthouse illuminating the way to skilled language usage. This article begins an investigation into the complex interactions between the explicit and implicit modes of corrective feedback. These modes navigate the complex seas of language improvement with the help of their distinctive methods to mistake repair. We learn more about the various impacts of different feedback techniques on language performance by exploring their subtleties. This essay aims to unravel the effects of explicit and implicit corrective feedback, providing light on their capacity to influence language acquisition through an analysis of theoretical underpinnings, empirical research, and pedagogical issues.

Keywords: Explicit Corrective Feedback, Implicit corrective Feedback, Language Acquisition

Introduction

The process of learning a new language is complicated and multidimensional, which makes it stand apart. It involves the complex interaction of several language components, including as syntax, lexicon, pronunciation, and cultural quirks. The feedback loop that learners participate in is a crucial part of this journey since it allows for the correction of mistakes made while using the language in order to promote ongoing growth (Willing, 1988). In the context of language learning, this corrective feedback—delivered via both explicit and implicit channels—holds a key place.

Explicit corrective feedback entails the precise identification of faults, as well as thorough justifications of their causes and the necessary fixes. This technique offers insights into the proper use of language structures as well as explicit recommendations on how to fix learners' faults (Lightbown & Spada, 1995). Contrarily, implicit corrective feedback takes a more covert approach, frequently relying on strategies like recasts,

clarification requests, or leading questions that encourage reflection to encourage students to self-identify problems.

The goal of this article is to compare these two different feedback techniques—explicit and implicit—in order to determine which is more helpful in improving language ability. We may understand the psychological and cognitive processes by exploring a variety of theoretical stances, such as constructivism, behaviorism, and interactionism. This analysis gains a great deal from empirical investigations that have examined the results of explicit and implicit corrective feedback. Findings from studies may demonstrate the immediate effects of explicit feedback on error correction while also showing the possibility of implicit feedback to promote critical thinking and metalinguistic awareness. This article aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the temporal and long-lasting impacts of these feedback systems by carefully analyzing these findings.

The efficacy of explicit vs implicit feedback frequently depends on variables including learners' competence levels, the complexity of the language structures being addressed, and the learning setting, considering the pedagogical consequences. Language teachers can modify their teaching tactics to meet the needs of students by acknowledging the possible advantages and restrictions of each strategy. This article aims to give a thorough examination of the dynamic landscape of explicit and implicit corrective feedback in language acquisition in its conclusion. It seeks to clarify the many facets of these feedback systems by moving through theoretical frameworks, empirical data, and practical consequences. Through this investigation, academics, researchers, and students may all get a clearer understanding of the crucial roles that both explicit and implicit corrective feedback play in raising language performance.

Literature Review

Understanding the function of corrective feedback in language acquisition requires investigating several theoretical stances. The functioning of feedback is clarified by three main frameworks: behaviorism, constructivism, and interactionist approaches. Constructivism underlines how students actively create their knowledge, behaviorism places a strong emphasis on reinforcement and repetition, and interactionist approaches prioritize dialogue and meaning making. Every framework offers different perspectives on how students experience and gain from corrective feedback.

A psychological theory called behaviorism places a strong emphasis on how environmental cues and reactions influence behavior. According to this view, language is learned through reinforcement and repetition in the setting of language acquisition. Behaviorism is more in line with explicit feedback when it comes to remedial input. When mistakes made by students are openly identified and addressed, they are given explicit instructions on the proper forms and structures. The repeating of this procedure discourages the repetition of mistakes and reinforces proper usage. Explicit feedback supports

behaviorist concepts in this way by giving students rapid reinforcement through punishment.

Contrarily, constructivism emphasizes how students actively construct knowledge via their own experiences and relationships. It implies that interaction with the learning environment helps students develop their comprehension. Constructivism emphasizes that learners gain through independently identifying and comprehending their faults in the context of remedial feedback. This viewpoint is well-aligned with implicit feedback because it helps students learn from their errors and motivates them to independently assess the right forms. Learners build their knowledge and grasp of language norms by noticing their mistakes and making the appropriate corrections. Therefore, implicit feedback is consistent with the constructivist idea of students as active knowledge makers.

The significance of social contact and communication in language acquisition is emphasized by interactionist pedagogies (Mart, 2020). These methods emphasize the value of collaborative learning and meaning negotiation. In these encounters, corrective feedback is seen as a crucial component since it helps to clarify and improve communication (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013; Mart, 2019). Interactionist approaches emphasize feedback's function in encouraging good communication, regardless of whether it is explicit or implicit. Correcting inaccuracies allows students to negotiate and have dialogues to reach a common understanding. This supports the notion that communication, whether feedback is expressly supplied, is language's main objective.

Theoretical systems like behaviorism, constructivism, and interactionism all provide unique perspectives through which we might comprehend the workings of corrective feedback. Behaviorism links with explicit feedback by putting a strong emphasis on repetition and reinforcement. Constructivism connects with implicit feedback and contends that learners gain through self-discovery. Regardless of its level of explicitness, interactionist approaches emphasize the importance of feedback in communication and the negotiation of meaning. Collectively, these theoretical stances advance our comprehension of how corrective feedback functions and how various feedback formats relate to various facets of learning.

Explicit Corrective Feedback

With explicit corrective feedback, learners' mistakes are pointed out and fixed in a straightforward manner, coupled with explanations of the proper forms or structures. This method informs students in a clear and precise manner about the errors they have made and the necessary remedies. It seeks to remove ambiguity and direct students toward precise language usage.

Particularly for novices and when working with complex linguistic systems, explicit feedback is helpful. Beginners frequently need clear instructions to understand their mistakes and know how to fix them. Complex language patterns can be intimidating

as well, but explicit feedback supports learners in overcoming these obstacles by providing clear explanations. In both situations, explicit feedback reduces misunderstanding, allowing students to more clearly understand the proper usage (Ellis, 2007; Takimoto, 2006).

Explicit feedback's ability for quick mistake correction is one of its main benefits. When teachers give students honest feedback about their mistakes, they may make the required changes right away. This instantaneous correction helps to increase accuracy, which helps learners effectively hone their language abilities. According to research, explicit feedback, which is distinguished by its directness and clarity, has proven to be beneficial in producing quick gains in linguistic precision (DeKeyser, 2003, 2007). Explicit feedback quickly corrects linguistic faults by identifying them and giving thorough justifications for their remedy. With this targeted approach, students may immediately correct their errors and match their language production with the intended criteria, which leads to an increase in accuracy right away.

However, depending only on explicit remedial input may have several disadvantages. It's possible for students to grow excessively reliant on instructor direction and start anticipating corrections for every error. Their capacity to critically evaluate and self-correct their language usage might be hampered by this over-reliance. A high emphasis on explicit feedback may also restrict learners' prospects for independent linguistic exploration and creativity. Language learning is an iterative process where learners try out various language tenses to hone their abilities. However, if instructors regularly offer fast feedback, students may rely too heavily on outside direction. This dependence may prevent the growth of the independent problem-solving abilities needed for independently navigating language difficulties.

Specific corrective feedback provides a straightforward way to address mistakes and explain justifications for repair. Due to its capability to lessen ambiguity, it is suitable for novices and when working with complicated language structures. The increases in accuracy and fast error correction are notable advantages. The possible drawbacks, such as encouraging an excessive reliance on teacher direction and impeding independent language development, must be taken into consideration by educators. To achieve a balance, combining chances for self-correction and autonomous inquiry with explicit feedback can result in a more thorough and long-lasting method of language acquisition.

Implicit Corrective Feedback

A more subtle method known as implicit corrective feedback seeks to assist students in recognizing and fixing problems without directly correcting them. This approach encourages students to examine their language use and identify flaws on their own, as opposed to being told specifically where they are wrong. Implicit feedback works through several strategies that encourage learners to make corrections on their own

(McDonough & Mackey, 2006). Recasts, clarification requests, and prompts are just a few of the approaches that are thoughtfully used to help students find and fix faults on their own. Recasts entail the speaker accurately and discreetly rephrasing the learner's incorrect remark to encourage comparison and recognition (Ammar & Spada, 2006; Ortega & Long, 1997). On the other side, clarification requests submit questions requesting explanation for ambiguous or inaccurate remarks, thereby highlighting prospective issues. Finally, prompts give subtle prods or partial corrections, prompting students to go back and make the required changes to their expression (Lyster & Izquierdo, 2009). Together, these strategies encourage an active approach to error repair, empowering students to engage in a process of self-discovery and critical examination of their language usage and fostering metalinguistic awareness and autonomy in language acquisition.

While using recasts, a teacher or interlocutor rewords a student's incorrect assertion into a true one without explicitly pointing out the inaccuracy. Recasts are subtle changes that discreetly modify learners' incorrect assertions. As an example of how to use the language properly, this encourages students to contrast their original phrase with the improved one. This comparison helps students see the mistake and understand the solution, which makes it easier for them to internalize the right language structure.

Learners must exercise cognitive processing and metalinguistic awareness in order to get implicit feedback. Learners are forced to examine their language use and critically assess their output when they come across implicit corrections. They get a higher degree of knowledge and better comprehension of language rules thanks to this reflective process. Learners gain metalinguistic awareness—the capacity to consider and alter language structures—by spotting faults without immediately correcting them.

Implicit feedback fits with a learning strategy called discovery-oriented learning, in which students actively investigate and identify linguistic patterns through conversation and self-analysis. Implicit feedback encourages independent problem-solving since it allows students to recognize and fix mistakes without direct instruction. This strategy gives them the ability to actively interact with linguistic features and choose the proper application. By examining patterns and making wise modifications, learners develop their knowledge of language rules through this process. As a result, learners get a sense of agency and ownership over their language learning process, motivating them to take charge of developing their language abilities.

Implicit feedback is not without risk, though. The indications for correction may not always be seen by or correctly interpreted by learners due to their subtlety. Although implicit feedback promotes students' autonomous error identification, there is a chance that overlooked errors might eventually become entrenched. Teachers must exercise caution and occasionally offer specific comments in order to lessen this. This maintains a balanced approach that tackles both seen and unnoticed faults, ensuring that students receive the essential corrections for flaws they may individually ignore.

Implicit corrective feedback uses cunning strategies to motivate students to identify and fix mistakes on their own. It encourages metalinguistic awareness, cognitive involvement, and a learning style that is focused on exploration. While giving students more liberty and developing their critical thinking abilities, educators must be wary of the possibility that mistakes can go unnoticed or be misinterpreted. Combining implicit feedback with sporadic verbal coaching can result in a well-rounded strategy that promotes both independent learning and precise language acquisition.

The usefulness of explicit and implicit corrective feedback in diverse linguistic circumstances has been the subject of several research. Explicit feedback, in particular about morphosyntactic correctness, resulted in quick improvements, according to research by Lyster and Ranta (1997). However, Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996) contends that language development is significantly influenced by the negotiation of meaning, which may entail implicit feedback. Implicit feedback improved learners' acceptance of mistakes and encouraged self-correction over time, according to a Mackey and Philp (1998) research.

Comparing these results, it appears that explicit feedback results in rapid language progress but may not have long-term effects. Implicit feedback encourages learner engagement and metalinguistic awareness, which may lead to better long-lasting language growth, even if it initially produces accuracy improvements more slowly. Based on the competence levels of the learners, their preferred learning methods, and the linguistic aspects being addressed, language instructors must carefully weigh the pros and drawbacks of providing both explicit and implicit corrective feedback. Explicit feedback could be more suitable for novices or for addressing certain mistakes. Implicit feedback in communicative activities, however, can promote metalinguistic contemplation and self-discovery as learners grow.

Efficacious hybrid strategies that incorporate both explicit and implicit feedback are also possible. For instance, balancing accuracy and fluency goals can be accomplished by giving clear feedback, followed by chances for self-correction and meaning negotiation. Modern communicative language education techniques are compatible with the implicit feedback approach. These approaches put meaningful communication ahead of isolated linguistic constructs. The emphasis on learners' active participation, self-correction, and metalinguistic awareness in implicit feedback is consistent with the objective of encouraging practical language usage and strong communication abilities.

Conclusion

When it comes to improving language learners' accuracy and fluency, both explicit and implicit corrective feedback are essential. Implicit feedback encourages metalinguistic autonomy and awareness whereas explicit feedback provides rapid corrections and explanations. Based on the competence levels, learning preferences, and language elements

being addressed, each approach's success differs. The most effective method appears to be a well-balanced instructional approach that incorporates both explicit and implicit feedback, recognizing the advantages of quick error correction while encouraging student involvement and metacognitive growth. The complex interplay between different feedback kinds and their long-term effects on language learning might be studied further in future studies.

References

- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543–574.
- DeKeyser, R. (2003). Implicit and explicit learning. In C. Doughty & M. Long (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 313-348). Oxford: Blackwell.
- DeKeyser, R. (2007). Skill acquisition theory. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction* (pp. 97-113). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition*, edited by A. Mackey, 339-360. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1995). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46, 1-40.
- Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language Learning*, 59(2), 453-498.
- 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: Academic Press.
- Mart, Ç. T. (2019). A comparison of form-focused, content-based and mixed approaches to literature-based instruction to develop learners' speaking skills. *Cogent Education*, 6. 1660526. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2019.1660526>
- Mart, Ç. T. (2020). Integrating listening and speaking skills to promote speech production and language development. *MEXTESOL Journal*, 44(2), 1–7
- McDonough, K., & Mackey, A. (2006). Responses to recasts: Repetitions, primed production, and linguistic development. *Language Learning*, 56, 693-720.
- Ortega, L., & Long, M. (1997). The effects of models and recasts on object topicalization and adverb placement in L2 Spanish. *Spanish Applied Linguistics*, 1, 65-86.
- Takimoto, M. (2006). The effects of explicit feedback on the development of pragmatic proficiency. *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 393-417.
- Willing, K. (1988). *Learning strategies in adult migrant education*. Adelaide, Australia: National Curriculum Resource Centre.