



# Modern Research Studies

Editor-in-Chief  
Gyanabati Khuraijam

**An International  
Journal of  
Humanities and Social  
Sciences**

*An Indexed & Refereed e-Journal*

[www.modernresearch.in](http://www.modernresearch.in)

**Title: The Effect of Different Feedback Types on L2  
Speaking Skill: A Comparison of Iranian EFL  
Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions**

**Author/s: ALI AKBAR KHOMELJANI FARAHANI  
SOORY SALAJEGHEH**

**Volume 2, Issue 1  
March 2015**

**pp. 25–50.**

Disclaimer: The views expressed in the articles/contributions published in the journal are solely the author's. They do not represent the views of the Editors.

## **The Effect of Different Feedback Types on L2 Speaking Skill: A Comparison of Iranian EFL Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions**

**Ali Akbar Khomeijani Farahani**

Assistant Professor  
University of Tehran, Iran

**Soory Salajegheh**

MA in TEFL  
University of Tehran, Iran

**Abstract:** The present study is an attempt to investigate the differences between Iranian teachers' and learners' perceptions of the significance of different feedback types on the improvement of the speaking skill. For this purpose, 'implicit', 'explicit', 'reiteration', 'repetition', 'elicitation', 'metalinguistic', 'recast', and 'no feedback' types of error correction were examined. A total of 460 teachers and learners participated in the study and were asked to complete Fukuda's questionnaire of correction preferences. Data were analyzed through MANOVA and revealed significant differences only between the implicit and explicit categories, with teachers more inclined towards the explicit correction and learners preferring the implicit feedback. Implications for teachers and learners, and suggestions for effective feedback strategies are further discussed.

**Keywords:** feedback types, explicit, implicit, perceptions, speaking skill

## 1. Introduction

Over the past decades, second language writing teachers and researchers have debated the value of error correction or corrective feedback in L2 speaking. There have been numerous studies conducted in this area, yet many have reported conflicting results (Russell & Spada 2006; Truscott 2007). For example, some researchers such as John Truscott (2007) have claimed that in both L1 and L2 courses grammar correction is not helpful due to two major theoretical and practical reasons: firstly, correction, according to Truscott, has a negative effect on the natural sequence of acquisition and interferes with the gradual and complex process of acquiring the forms and structures of a second language, secondly, there are certain practical problems with the ability of teachers to correct at the right time the specific type of error, and also the students' desire to receive feedback from the teacher. There are other scholars who argue against the efficiency of corrective feedback (Gulcat & Ozagac 2004; Krashen 1982; Sheppard 1992). Stephen D. Krashen, for example, believes that explicitly capturing the students' attention to the forms of language interferes with the naturalistic and implicit process of acquisition. However, a growing body of evidence suggests that corrective feedback can improve accuracy in limited contexts (Bitchener & Knoch 2009; Chandler 2003; Hartshorn et al. 2010). In 1999, Dana R. Ferris published an article against Truscott's claim by giving the research evidence that in some ways effective error correction could help L2 students and fulfill students' willingness for getting feedback (Ferris 1999). Studies investigating the general benefits of feedback consistently demonstrate a moderate-to-strong positive effect for feedback recipients when compared to those in control groups (Azevedo & Bernard 1995; Kluger & Denisi 1996). This should come as no surprise since it is difficult to identify anything that is learned without feedback. Furthermore, this should ascertain that providing feedback is based on a sound pedagogical principle that is likely to improve learning. However, it should be noted that most of these studies focus on the question of whether corrective feedback should be provided or not rather than asking how the teachers can help students learn and use the language more accurately and appropriately. Definitely, in this process, specific contextual factors facilitate or hinder these efforts. The

contextual variables justify the results of some studies that have shown no effect for corrective feedback and why some have produced conflicting results. Researchers need to identify the additional variables that can influence the teaching, learning and the research processes. Thus, to select an appropriate error correction strategy, teachers also have to consider social and situational contexts. These additional variables can be classified into three main categories of “learner variables, situational variables, and methodological variables” (Ferris 2006, 89).

The role of corrective feedback in second/ foreign language development has been proved to be beneficial (Kim 2005). According to the socio-cultural theory of the Russian psychologist, Lev Vygostky (1978), learning best occurs in social interaction. He opines that this kind of learning leads to development. Regarding this perspective, the best type of feedback to the learners' errors is the one provided through social interaction. Through this kind of interaction, the learner is not provided with explicit or implicit corrective feedback, but a step-by-step and contingent feedback negotiation through which the learner moves from the most implicit to the most explicit corrective feedback, that is, the learner receives the corrective feedback based on his/her zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Aljaffreh & Lantolf 1994; Nassaji & Swain 2010). According to Vygostky (1978), ZPD is the distance between what the learner is able to do independently and what s/he will be able to do with the help of more capable others. In other words, the distance between the learner's actual and potential ability level is called ZPD. In this process of feedback negotiation, the learner would not be provided with the correct response, but s/he is located in a problem-solving process in which s/he moves from other-regulation to self-regulation (Aljaffreh & Lantolf 1994). Moving through the continuum makes the learner more confident and the correction would be internalized in his/her linguistic repertoire, resulting in cognitive development.

## **2. Review of the Related Literature**

### ***2.1. The importance of types of error correction***

In the second language teaching/learning process, an error has always been regarded as something negative which must be avoided. As

a result, teachers have always adopted a repressive attitude towards it. On one hand, it was regarded as indication of inappropriateness of the teaching methods; and on the other hand, it was recognized as a natural outcome of the fact that, regarding inevitable nature of committing errors, the reality should be confirmed and effective techniques need to be developed in order to deal with them. Fortunately, little by little, learners' errors have been seen from a different point of view that we can learn from our mistakes. According to Lennon (1991) an error is "a linguistic form or combination of forms which in the same context and under similar conditions of production would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts" (p. 48). The term 'error' is used in a variety of ways in linguistics and language teaching theory in English language teaching (ELT) including Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL). It is noticeable in particular that the term tends to be interpreted differently when applied to Native Speakers or to Non-Native Speakers of a language.

Replacing the correct form instead of errors or mistake means correction (Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks 1977) and this correction varies according to different factors. Based on the types of the error, for example, one can choose types of EC (Panova & Lyster 2002). The teachers select types of correction according to the types of error (Chaudron 1977; Lyster 2001). Knowing about types of EC will be surely more effective in pedagogical practice (Hendrickson, 1978).

Error correction, therefore, can be of different categories for different purposes. EC can be implicit or explicit (Lightbown & Spada 1999), negative or positive (Long & Robinson 1998). Gesture and vocal emphasis can be defined as EC types (Fanselow 1977) too. Recasts, elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic, explicit and repetition types are also used widely dependent on the context and situational factors (Lyster & Ranta 1997). In sum, there are different EC types and there are wide varieties of techniques for EC (Hendrickson 1978; Yoshida 2008). There have been several studies to investigate teachers' preferences for doing EC in language classes (e.g., Panova & Lyster 2002; Philp 2003). However, there have been very few studies to explore the differences between the teachers' and students' perceptions about EC (Ancker 2000; Yoshida 2008; Brown 2009). More studies

need to be conducted to find the most appropriate type of EC to be fitted to the needs and purposes of particular classrooms (Lyster & Ranta 1997; Panova & Lyster 2002).

Thus, the central aim of this paper is to identify the differences between the teachers' and learners' perceptions of the types of corrective feedback in an attempt to provide an answer to the "how" of error correction. This study tries to examine the effects of 'implicit', 'explicit', 'reiteration', 'repetition', 'elicitation', 'metalinguistic', 'recast', and 'no feedback' types of error correction on students' oral language use and leads to the question of what kind of feedback is perceived by teachers and learners to be more effective in L2 educational system because feedback is the fundamental way of evaluating the stream of speech.

## **2.2. Research questions**

In order to fill the gaps in the literature regarding the attitudes of teachers and learners about different categories of error correction, the present study addresses the following research questions and its subcategories:

Are there any significant differences between Iranian male and female teachers' and adult EFL learners' preferences for the following types of corrective feedback in Kerman Jahad Daneshgahi Center?

- implicit
- explicit
- reiteration
- repetition
- elicitation
- metalinguistic
- recast
- no feedback

## **3. Methodology**

### **3.1. Sample/ Participants**

The participants of this study included both foreign language teachers and adult EFL students making a total of 460 participants. The study aimed at the investigation of possible differences in their EC

preferences. The research context included five English centers (C) and one French center. There were 101 (23.5%) students in C1, 24 (5.6%) students in C2, 143 (33.3%) students in C3, 103 (24.0%) students in C4, 26 (6.1%) students in C5 and 32 (7.5%) students in C6.

### 3.1.1. Students

The total number of the students was 429 males and females. Their ages were from 18 up to 60 years old. There were 161 (37.5%) males and 268 (62.5%) females. Their first language was Persian. The characteristics of the participants are summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1.  
*Demographic Characteristics of Student Participants*

Age	Gender	Target language	Years of learning	Level of proficiency
Adolescents (65.7%)	Females (62.5%)	English (92.5%)	1 year (38.2%)	Beginning (17%)
Adults (34.3%)	Males (37.5%)	French (7.5%)	2-5 years (38%)	Lower-intermediate (17%)
			6-9 years (13.8%)	Intermediate (45.7%)
			More than 10 years (10%)	Upper-intermediate (12.6%)
				Advanced (7.7%)

### 3.1.2. Teachers

A total number of 31 teachers took part in the present study. From all of them, 12 (38.7%) were males and 19 (61.3%) were females. Their ages were between 25 to 40 years old. All the instructors should have passed different examinations in written and oral to become employees in the JD language centers. They should have had at least one document in TOEFL, IELTS or TESOL, and also passed teacher training course (T.T.C.). According to the center's regulation, the teachers should have had acceptable experiences in teaching. From all the trainers, 30 were teaching English and one of them was a man who was teaching French.

They taught foreign languages in the oral classes which were dissimilar in levels of proficiency.

Table 2.

*Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants*

Age	Gender	Years of teaching	Oral skill teaching experience
Adolescents (34.5%)	Females (61.3%)	1 year (6.5%)	1 year (9.7%)
Adults (65.5%)	Males (38.7%)	2-5 years (54.8%)	2-5 years (61.3%)
		6-9 years (29%)	6-9 years (22.6%)
		More than 10 years (9.7%)	More than 10 years (6.4%)

### 3.2. Instruments

Fukuda's (2004) questionnaire which consisted of a form for teachers (N of Items= 25, Appendix A) and another form for learners (N of Items = 26, Appendix B) was employed in the present study. Each form of the questionnaire has seven sections, with one section devoted to the demographic information about the participants. From the first to the end of the sixth category in each form, there were 22 items which were aimed at the exploration of the teachers' and students' judgments about the giving and receiving of spoken error correction, frequency of giving and receiving spoken error correction, time of spoken error correction, types of errors which need to be corrected, types of spoken error correction (i.e., from item 12 to 19) in both the teacher and student forms were utilized. The questionnaire had a Likert-scale type format with answers ranging from "strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree" or "always, usually, sometimes, occasionally, never" to "very effective, effective, neutral, ineffective, very ineffective".

### 3.3. Procedure

A significance level of 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) was set. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for personal computers (SPSS Inc. 2012) was used to carry out descriptive statistics and the related inferential statistics. To analyze the obtained data, a multivariate



analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for the research question and its subcategories.

#### 4. Results and Discussion

Prior to the main study (i.e., in the pilot study), the reliability analysis of the questionnaire was computed using Cronbach's alpha method. The results of the whole questionnaire reliability turned out to be 0.60 which is considered to be an acceptable level. In addition, since only one part of the questionnaire was used in the present study, the reliability index of this section was estimated to be 0.67.

In order to provide an answer to the research question of the study, the MANOVA was run. The results of descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3 and the results of MANOVA are presented in Table 4 (Appendix C).

Table 3.  
*Descriptive Statistics Results for the Correction Types*

	participants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Reiteration (item 12)	students	2.08	0.872	429
	teachers	1.97	0.875	31
	Total	2.07	0.872	460
Repetition (item 13)	students	2.11	0.944	429
	teachers	2.00	1.095	31
	Total	2.10	0.954	460
Implicit (item 14)	students	3.15	1.209	429
	teachers	2.23	0.884	31
	Total	3.08	1.212	460
Explicit (item 15)	students	1.76	0.751	429
	teachers	2.68	1.166	31
	Total	1.83	0.817	460
Elicitation (item 16)	students	1.96	0.866	429
	teachers	2.10	1.044	31
	Total	1.97	0.879	460
No feedback (item 17)	students	3.64	1.231	429
	teachers	3.94	0.854	31
	Total	3.66	1.211	460
Metalinguistic (item 18)	students	2.34	0.974	429
	teachers	2.39	0.919	31
	Total	2.34	0.970	460
Recast (item 19)	students	3.17	1.267	429
	teachers	2.90	1.136	31
	Total	3.15	1.259	460

The results of descriptive statistics show that except for the implicit and explicit types of spoken error correction, there are very nuance differences between the teachers' and learners' preferences. Whereas the learners are more eager for the provision of implicit feedback, their teachers prefer the provision of explicit feedback.

The results of MANOVA test are provided in Table 4 (see Appendix C). The results of the MANOVA are in line with those of descriptive statistics since there are significant differences between the teachers' and learners' preferences only in the implicit ( $F = 17.30$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ) and explicit ( $F = 39.12$ ,  $p < 0.000$ ) types of spoken error correction, with the teachers' preferences for the explicit but their learners' preferences for the implicit categories.

## 5. Conclusion

Today, the role of corrective feedback (CF) in second language acquisition (SLA) and foreign language acquisition (FLA) contexts is quite evident. There have been numerous studies in this area and they have all corroborated the significant influence of corrective feedback in foreign language learning (e.g., Swain 1985; Schmidt 1990; DeKeyser 1993; Lightbown & Spada 1999; Ancker 2000; McDonough 2005; Katayama 2007). CF has been investigated from different angles and different theories. There are studies that have investigated the presentation of CF according to learners' ZPD in interactional form and have examined their previous writing pieces composed outside the classroom and provided feedback stepwise. There are also other studies (e.g., Nishimura 2000; Lynch 2001; Mendez 2010) that have examined the interaction that occurs while the learner is performing the task such that only when the learner encounters a problem the teacher interrupts and helps the learner internalize the point by negotiation of meaning. There are, however, very few studies in the FL context which have attempted to examine the provision of CF according to learners' ZPD in oral interactional situations occurring in the classroom. In other words, the studies of CF provided in spontaneous speeches between the teacher and learners are very rare. The present study was therefore carried out to investigate the effectiveness of different types of error correction methods in best scaffolding and motivating the learners' flow of communication by asking their opinions and perceptions.

The results of statistical analysis showed significant differences for the 'implicit' and 'explicit' categories. In other words, teachers favored explicit error correction whereas learners were more in favor of implicit correction. This finding is in line with the previous research findings which showed that most of the students preferred their errors to be corrected implicitly by the teachers because they were afraid of losing face during conversation (Matsuura, Chiba & Hilderbrandt 2001).

As students need to express themselves in the learning process, providing them with effective feedback not only fosters their learning but also enhances their linguistic capabilities and is used as a means of motivation and promotion for their confidence. R. Ellis (2009) mentioned the importance of positive feedback in pedagogical theory because of its "affective support to the learner" (26). He believed that it "fosters motivation to continue learning" (26). When language learners are considered as "whole persons", they are viewed as human beings who emotionally and psychologically are influenced by many involved factors in the learning process, one of the most important of which is the error correction strategies employed by the language teachers. The framework chosen by the instructor to redress learners' mistakes can exceptionally aid learners, persuade them, train them, or then again, may practice them, hinder them, and discourage them. Hattie and Timperley (2007) underlined the capable impact of feedback on learning and accomplishment; however, this effect could be positive or negative.

The abovementioned ideas are closely related to the findings of the present study. In most cases, there were preference conflicts between teachers and learners. Learners wished for more indirect, implicit and delayed corrections, whereas teachers believed in direct, explicit and immediate corrections. The use of a combination of correction sources would be more judicious (Zhang 2012) and the results of this study highlight the point that for EC to be more efficient, teachers should respect learners' beliefs. This means that wherever the correction is not necessary, they can provide it after the activity in a more indirect way. They should not resort to explicit and immediate correction at all times. But, it should also be noted that whenever certain errors in the conversation appear that can hinder the flow of conversation, teachers

can resort to immediate correction. Therefore, the categories of correction i.e. types, times, and sources are variable regarding the situations and contexts of learning and also the individual characteristics.

To select an appropriate error correction strategy, teachers also have to consider social and situational context. S/he has to regard the level, age, needs, skill, time, material and all other factors that may play some role in the teaching-learning processes.

Hattie and Timperley (2007, 75) pointed out that “the main purpose of feedback is to reduce discrepancies between current understandings and performance and a goal.” Therefore, teachers have to ensure “that feedback is targeted at students at the appropriate level, because some feedback is effective in reducing the discrepancy between current understandings and what is desired, and some is ineffective.”

### **5.1. Implications**

The findings of the present study have implications for teachers. They should be aware of their students and the other teachers' opinions, investigate the similarities and dissimilarities and take their preferences into consideration and act in the ways that result in more satisfactions and successes. Sometimes the teachers do not indicate their goals while they should reveal their aims with lesson plans for their students to improve their awareness and provide useful classes. They should also encourage their students to participate in the class activities and gain the better results from their efforts. Moreover, with respect to error correction, teachers should pay attention to the students' characteristics and the situational factors for deciding the appropriate time and method of correction so as not to discourage the learners from taking part in conversations.

For error correction, students should know that EC by the teachers are aimed at the improvement of their language ability and the threatening of their face. Consequently, they should be more open to the correction and welcome the corrections at the right time in the class. They should also learn to help their peers about their problematic areas

and learn how to support and scaffold each other's learning in order to achieve better and long term results.

## REFERENCES

- Aljaafreh, A., & J. P. Lantolf. 1994. "Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development." *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(4): 465-483.
- Ancker, W. 2000. "Errors and corrective feedback: updated theory and classroom practice." *English Teaching Forum*, 38(4): 20-24.
- Azevedo, R., & R. M. Bernard. 1995. "A meta-analysis of the effects of feedback in computer-based instruction." *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 13: 109-25.
- Bitchener, J., & U. Knoch. 2009. "The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback." *System*, 37: 322-329.
- Brown, A. 2009. "Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals." *The Modern Language Journal*, 93: 46-60.
- Chandler, J. 2003. "The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12: 267-296.
- Chaudron, C. 1977. "A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors." *Language Learning*, 27: 29-46.
- DeKeyser, R. M. 1993. "The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency." *The Modern Language Journal*, 77: 501-514.
- Ellis, R. 2009. "Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction." In *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*, edited by R. Ellis, Sh. Loewen, C.

Elder, R. Erlam, J. Philp, & H. Reinders, 3-26. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Fanselow, J. 1977. "The treatment of error in oral work." *Foreign Language Annals*, 10: 583-593.

Ferris, D.R. 1999. "The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996)." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8 (1): 1-10.

---. 2006. "Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction." In *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, edited by K. Hyland, & F. Hyland, 81–104. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fukuda, Y. 2004. "Treatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes." Unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco.

Gulcat, Z., & O. Ozagac. 2004. "Correcting and giving feedback to writing." *Bogazici University SFL*, 2: 1-5.

Hartshorn, K. J., N.W.Evans, P.F. Merrill, R.R. Sudweeks, D. Strong-Krause, & N.J. Anderson. 2010. "Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy." *TESOL Quarterly*, 44: 84–109.

Hattie, J., & H. Timperley. 2007. "The power of feedback." *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1): 81-112

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

Katayama, A. 2007. "Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction." In *JALT 2006 Conference Proceedings*, edited by K. Bradford-Watts, 34-42. Tokyo: JALT.

- Kim, J. H. 2005. "Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition." *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4/2: 1-24.
- Kluger, A.N., & A. Denisi. 1996. "The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory." *Psychology Bulletin*, 119: 254–84.
- Krashen, S.D. 1982. *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lennon, P. 1991. "Error and the very advanced learner." *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 29(1): 31-43.
- Lightbown, P., & N. Spada. 1999. "Instruction, first language influence, and developmental readiness in second language acquisition." *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(i): 1-22.
- Long, M. H., & P. Robinson. 1998. "Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice." In *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, edited by C. Doughty & J. Williams, 15-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lynch, T. 2001. "Seeing what they meant: Transcribing as a route to noticing." *ELT Journal*, 21: 12-35.
- Lyster, R. 2001. "Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms." *Language Learning*, 51(1): 265-301.
- Lyster, R., & L. Ranta. 1997. "Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19: 37-66.
- Matsuura, H., R. Chiba, & P. Hilderbrandt. 2001. "Beliefs about learning and teaching Communicative English in Japan." *JALT Journal*, 23.1: 69-89.

- McDonough, K. 2005. "Identifying the impact of negative feedback and learners' responses to ESL question development." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27: 79-103.
- Méndez, E. H. 2010. "Oral corrective feedback: some ways to go about it." *FEL*, 2(1): 25-38.
- Nassaji, H., & M. Swain. 2000. "A Vygotskian perspective on corrective feedback in L2: The effect of random versus negotiated help on the learning of English articles." *Language Awareness*, 1(1): 34-52.
- Nishimura, K. 2000. "Effective ways of communicative instruction in the Japanese EFL classroom: Balancing fluency and accuracy." *ERIC Document Reproduction Service no. ED. 437-848*.
- Panova, I., & R. Lyster. 2002. "Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom." *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(4): 573-595.
- Philp, J. 2003. "Constraints on "noticing the gap": Non-native speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25: 99-126.
- Russell, J., & N. Spada. 2006. "The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A meta-analysis of the research." In *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, edited by J.M. Norris & L. Ortega, 133–164. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A., G. Jefferson, & H. Sacks. 1977. "The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation." *Language*, 53(2): 361-382.
- Schmidt, R. 1990. "The role of consciousness in second language learning." *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2): 129-58.
- Sheppard, K. 1992. "Two feedback types: Do they make a difference?" *RELC Journal*, 23: 103–110.



- Swain, M. 1985. "Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development." In *Input in second language acquisition*, edited by S. Gass, and C. Madden, 235-256. New York: Newbury House.
- Truscott, J. 2007. "The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately." *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16: 255–72.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yoshida, R. 2008. "Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types." *Language Awareness*, 17 (1), 78-93.
- Zhang, S. 2012. "Promoting noticing in EFL classroom." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3): 579-590.

## Appendix A

### Questionnaire Form for Teacher

Please circle the information that applies to you. Make sure to mark only one.

1. Students' spoken errors should be treated.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

2. How often do you give corrective feedback on students' spoken errors?

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

Students' spoken errors should be treated at the following time.

3. As soon as errors are made even if it interrupts the student's speaking.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

4. After the student finishes speaking.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

5. After the activities.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

6. At the end of class.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

How often do you treat each of the following types of errors in oral communication classes?

7. Serious spoken errors that cause a listener to have difficulty understanding the meaning of what is being said.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

8. Less serious spoken errors that do not cause a listener to have difficulty understanding the meaning of what is being said.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

9. Frequent spoken errors.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

10. Infrequent spoken errors.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

11. Individual errors made by only one student.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

How do you rate each type of spoken error correction below?

**Teacher:** Where did you go yesterday?  
**Student:** I go to the park.

12. Could you say that again?

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

13. I go? (Repetition: The teacher emphasizes the student's grammatical error by changing his/her tone of voice.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

14. You went to the park yesterday? (Implicit feedback: The teacher does not directly point out the student's error but indirectly corrects it.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

15. "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: The teacher gives the correct form to the student with a grammatical explanation.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

16. Yesterday, I....(Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to correct and complete the sentence.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

17. Really? What did you do there? (No corrective feedback: The teacher does not give corrective feedback on the student's errors.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

18. How does the verb change when we talk about the past? (Metalinguistic feedback: The teacher gives a hint or a clue without specifically pointing out the mistake.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

19. I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance in the correct form without pointing out the student's error.)

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
----------------	-----------	---------	-------------	------------------

The following person should treat students' errors.

20. Classmates

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

21. Teachers

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

22. Students themselves

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

### Demographics

Please circle the information that applies to you. Make sure to mark only one.

23. Gender

Male	Female
------	--------

24. How long have you been teaching English?

1 year	2-5 years	6-9 years	More than 10 years
--------	-----------	-----------	--------------------

25. How long have you been teaching oral skill classes?

1 year	2-5 years	6-9 years	More than 10 years
--------	-----------	-----------	--------------------

## Appendix B

### Translated Students' Questionnaire Form

Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

لطفا اسم خود را روی این پرسشنامه ننویسید.

❖ Please circle the information that applies to you. Make sure to mark only one.

❖ لطفا دور اطلاعاتی که از شما تقاضا شده است دایره بکشید. اطمینان حاصل کنید که فقط یک مورد را علامت بزنید.

1. I want to receive corrective feedback (e.g., provide a hint for me to self-correct, tell me that I made an error, or correct my error.) when I make mistakes.

1. من می خواهم جواب درست را دریافت کنم ( یک اشاره به من بشود تا خودم اشتباهم را تصحیح کنم. به من بگویند که اشتباه کرده ام. یا اشتباه مرا تصحیح کنند.) وقتی که من اشتباهاتی مرتکب می شوم.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

2. How often do you want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your spoken errors?

2. چند وقت به چند وقت شما می خواهید که معلمان روی اشتباهات شفاهی شما جواب درست را بدهد؟

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

❖ When do you want your spoken errors to be treated?

❖ چه وقت شما می خواهید اشتباهات شفاهی تان برطرف شود؟

3. As soon as errors are made even if it interrupts my conversation.

3. به محض اینکه اشتباهاتی صورت بگیرد حتی اگر مکالمه من را قطع می کند.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

4. After I finish speaking.

4. بعد از اینکه صحبتیم را تمام کنم.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

5. After the activities.

5. بعد از فعالیتهای.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

6. At the end of class.

6. در آخر کلاس.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

❖ How often do you want each of the following types of errors to receive corrective feedback?

❖ چند وقت به چند وقت شما می خواهید هر کدام از انواع خطاهای ذیل جواب صحیح را دریافت کنند؟

7. Serious spoken errors that may cause problems in a listener's understanding.

7. خطاهای شفاهی جدی که ممکن است باعث مشکلاتی در درک شنونده شوند.

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

8. Less serious spoken errors that do not affect a listener's understanding.

8. خطاهای شفاهی که خیلی جدی نیستند و در درک شنونده اثر نمی گذارد.

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

9. Frequent spoken errors.

9. اشتباهات شفاهی که فراوان اتفاق می افتند.

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

10. Infrequent spoken errors.

10. اشتباهات شفاهی که فراوان اتفاق نمی افتند و نادر هستند.

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

11. My individual errors (i.e., errors that other students may not make).

11. اشتباهات فردی خودم (اشتباهاتی که دیگر دانش آموزان ممکن است مرتکب نشوند).

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

❖ How would you rate each type of spoken error correction below?

❖ چگونه شما هر کدام از تصحیح اشتباهات شفاهی ذیل را ارزیابی می نمایید؟

**Teacher:** Where did you go yesterday?

دیروز شما کجا رفتید؟

**Student:** I go to the park.

من به پارک می روم.

12. Could you say that again?

12. می توانید دوباره آن را بگویید؟

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

13. I go? (Repetition: The teacher highlights the student's grammatical error by using intonation).

13. من می روم؟ (تکرار: معلم به وسیله آهنگ جمله اشتباهات گرامری دانش آموزان را برجسته می کند).

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

14. I went there yesterday, too. (Implicit feedback: The teacher does not directly point out the student's error but indirectly corrects it).

14. من دیروز آنجا رفتم همچنین. (جواب دادن به صورت ضمنی: معلم به صورت مستقیم به اشتباه دانش آموز اشاره نمی کند بلکه به صورت غیرمستقیم آنرا تصحیح می نماید).

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

15. "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: The teacher gives the correct form to the student with a grammatical explanation).

15. "می روم" در زمان حال بکار می رود. شما احتیاج دارید که در اینجا گذشته ساده بکار ببرید. "رفتم." (جواب دادن به صورت واضح: معلم فرم درست را با توضیح گرامری به دانش آموز می دهد).

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

16. Yesterday, I.... (Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to correct and complete the sentence).

16. دیروز من ... (فراخواندن: معلم تقاضا می کند که دانش آموز اشتباه را تصحیح و جمله را کامل کند).

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

17. Really? What did you do there? (No corrective feedback: The teacher does not give corrective feedback on the student's errors).

17. واقعا؟ چه کاری در آنجا انجام دادی؟ (بدون تصحیح جواب: معلم روی اشتباهات دانش آموز جواب درست را نمی دهد).

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

18. How does the verb change when we talk about the past? (Metalinguistic feedback: The teacher gives a hint or a clue without specifically pointing out the mistake).  
 18. چگونه فعل عوض می شود وقتی ما در مورد گذشته صحبت می کنیم؟ (جواب مشابه: معلم اشاره می کند یا سرخ می دهد بدون اینکه به طور مشخص و واضح به اشتباه اشاره کند.)

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

19. I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance in the correct form without pointing out the student's error.)  
 19. من به پارک رفتم. (تصحیح بی چون و چرا: معلم جمله دانش آموز را با فرم درست آن تکرار می کند بدون اینکه به اشتباه دانش آموز اشاره کند.)

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	Very Ineffective خیلی بی اثر
-----------------------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------------

- ❖ The following person should treat students' errors.  
 ❖ موافقم که فرد ذیل اشتباهات را تصحیح کند.

20. Classmates  
 20. همکلاسی ها.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

21. Teachers  
 21. معلمها.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

22. Myself  
 22. خودم.

Strongly Agree به شدت موافق	Agree موافق	Neutral خنثی	Disagree مخالف	Strongly Disagree به شدت مخالف
--------------------------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------------	-----------------------------------

- ❖ Demographics  
 ❖ جمعیت شناختی

Please circle the information that applies to you. Make sure to mark only one.  
 لطفا دور اطلاعاتی که از شما خواسته شده است دایره بکشید. اطمینان حاصل کنید که فقط یک مورد را علامت بزنید.

23. Gender  
 23. جنسیت.

Male مرد	Female زن
-------------	--------------



24. Your first language

24. زبان اول شما.

Korean کره ای	Japanese ژاپنی	Chinese چینی	Spanish اسپانیایی	Other: زبان دیگر
------------------	-------------------	-----------------	----------------------	---------------------

25. How long have you been studying English?

25. چه مدت در حال مطالعه زبان انگلیسی بوده اید؟

1 year یک سال	2-5 years دو تا پنج سال	6-9 years شش تا نه سال	More than 10 years بیشتر از ده سال
------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------------------

26. What is your speaking or listening class level?

26. سطح کلاس مکالمه یا شنیداری شما چیست؟

Beginning مقدماتی	Intermediate low پایین تر از متوسطه	Intermediate متوسطه	Intermediate high بالا تر از متوسطه	Advanced پیشرفته
----------------------	--	------------------------	--	---------------------

## Appendix C

Table 4.

MANOVA Results for the Correction Types

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	reiteration	0.360 <sup>a</sup>	1	0.360	0.473	.492	.001
	repetition	0.332 <sup>b</sup>	1	0.332	0.365	.546	.001
	implicit	24.526 <sup>c</sup>	1	24.526	17.303	.000	.036
	explicit	24.091 <sup>d</sup>	1	24.091	39.128	.000	.079
	elicitation	0.556 <sup>e</sup>	1	0.556	0.720	.397	.002
	no feedback	2.507 <sup>f</sup>	1	2.507	1.712	.191	.004
	metalinguistic	0.063 <sup>g</sup>	1	0.063	0.067	.796	.000
	recast	2.096 <sup>h</sup>	1	2.096	1.322	.251	.003
Intercept	reiteration	473.507	1	473.507	622.691	.000	.576
	repetition	487.706	1	487.706	535.571	.000	.539
	implicit	834.526	1	834.526	588.774	.000	.562
	explicit	570.448	1	570.448	926.486	.000	.669
	elicitation	475.339	1	475.339	615.066	.000	.573
	no feedback	1659.585	1	1659.585	1.133E3	.000	.712
	metalinguistic	646.115	1	646.115	685.530	.000	.599
	recast	1067.227	1	1067.227	673.315	.000	.595
participants	reiteration	0.360	1	0.360	0.473	.492	.001
	repetition	0.332	1	0.332	0.365	.546	.001
	implicit	24.526	1	24.526	17.303	.000	.036
	explicit	24.091	1	24.091	39.128	.000	.079
	elicitation	0.556	1	0.556	0.720	.397	.002
	no feedback	2.507	1	2.507	1.712	.191	.004
	metalinguistic	0.063	1	0.063	0.067	.796	.000
	recast	2.096	1	2.096	1.322	.251	.003
Error	reiteration	348.273	458	0.760			
	repetition	417.068	458	0.911			
	implicit	649.168	458	1.417			
	explicit	281.996	458	0.616			
	elicitation	353.954	458	0.773			
	no feedback	670.589	458	1.464			
	metalinguistic	431.667	458	0.943			
	recast	725.945	458	1.585			

Total	reiteration	2323.000	460
	repetition	2446.000	460
	implicit	5051.000	460
	explicit	1840.000	460
	elicitation	2135.000	460
	no feedback	6838.000	460
	metalinguistic	2958.000	460
	recast	5305.000	460
Corrected Total	reiteration	348.633	459
Total	repetition	417.400	459
	implicit	673.693	459
	explicit	306.087	459
	elicitation	354.511	459
	no feedback	673.096	459
	metalinguistic	431.730	459
	recast	728.041	459

- a. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)  
 b. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)  
 c. R Squared = .036 (Adjusted R Squared = .034)  
 d. R Squared = .079 (Adjusted R Squared = .077)  
 e. R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)  
 f. R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .002)
- g. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)  
 h. R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)