Research Paper

Impact of Elicitation and Clarification Request Corrective Feedback on Intermediate Introvert/Extrovert EFL Learners' Speaking Ability

Atousa Ebrahimi[1], Davood Mashhadi Heidar[2*], Mohammad Reza Khodareza[3]

[1]Ph.D. Candidate, Department of English Language and Literature, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran
atousa.ebrahimi.ae@gmail.com

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran
davoodm_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran
mkhodareza@yahoo.com

Abstract
The present study examines the effects of two specific forms of corrective feedback, namely elicitation and explanation requests, out of a total of five types of corrective feedback, on the speaking skills of Iranian intermediate English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners who fall into the categories of either introverts or extroverts. The study consisted of 172 intermediate-level students divided into 11 groups, with 10 groups assigned to the experimental condition and 1 group assigned to the control condition. The language learners were learning English at The Iran Language Institute, which has three branches: two in Babol and one in Sari. The techniques utilised in this quasi-experimental study were the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) to establish group homogeneity, a speaking component of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) as both a pre-test and post-test, and a Learning Style Survey to assess extraversion and introversion. The data was analysed using ANCOVA and two-way ANOVA statistics. The results indicated that those with extroverted traits shown superior performance in the process of elicitation, but individuals with introverted traits exhibited greater performance in providing clarification and corrective feedback. By utilising the results of the study, educators can establish a nurturing and all-encompassing environment that motivates both introverted and extroverted students to actively take part in and involve themselves in oral exercises.
Keywords: Corrective feedback, Elicitation, Clarification, Learning styles, Introvert/Extrovert, Speaking

تأثیر درخواست بازخورد اصلاحی برانگیختن و شفاف‌سازی بر توانایی گفتاری زبان‌آموزان زبان انگلیسی زبان‌آموزان درون‌گرا/برون‌گرا متوسط

پژوهش حاضر به بررسی تأثیر دو شکل خاص بازخورد اصلاحی، یعنی درخواست‌های توجیهی و توضیحی، از مجموع پنج نوع بازخورد اصلاحی، بر مهارت‌های گفتاری زبان‌آموزان ایرانی انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجی (EFL) می‌پردازد. دسته بندی افراد درون‌گرا یا برون‌گرا. این مطالعه شامل ۱۷۲ دانش آموز سطح متوسط بود که به ۱۱ گروه تقسیم شدند که ۱۰ گروه در شرایط آزمایشی و ۱ گروه در شرایط کنترل قرار گرفتند. زبان آموزان در موسسه زبان ایران که دارای سه شعبه است، مشغول یادگیری زبان انگلیسی بودند: دو شعبه در بابل و یکی در ساری. تکنیک‌های مورد استفاده در این مطالعه نیمه تجربی، آزمون تعیین سطح آکسفورد (OPT) برای ایجاد همگنی گروهی، جزء گفتاری سیستم بین‌المللی آزمون زبان انگلیسی (IELTS) به‌عنوان پیش‌آزمون و پس‌آزمون و سبک یادگیری بود. نظرسنجی برای ارزیابی برون‌گرایی و درون‌گرایی. داده‌ها با استفاده از آمار ANCOVA و ANOVA دو طرفه مورد تجزیه و تحلیل قرار گرفت. نتایج نشان داد که افراد دارای صفات برون‌گرا در فرآیند استخراج عملکرد بهتری از خود نشان دادند، اما افراد دارای صفات درون‌گرا عملکرد بیشتری در ارائه شفاف سازی و بازخورد اصلاحی از خود نشان دادند. با استفاده از نتایج مطالعه، مربیان می توانند یک محیط پرورشی و فراگیر ایجاد کنند که هم دانش آموزان درون گرا و هم برون گرا را تشویق می کند تا فعالانه در تمرینات شفاهی شرکت کنند و خود را درگیر آن کنند.
کلیدواژه‌ها: بازخورد اصلاحی، برانگیختن، روشن‌سازی، سبک‌های یادگیری، درون‌گرا/برون‌گرا، صحبت کردن

Introduction

Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) assert that in Iran, English as a Foreign Language (EFL) training plays a vital role in the development of proficient communication abilities and accessing international prospects. Proficiency in spoken English is crucial, since it improves interpersonal communication and builds confidence in diverse contexts. Although the curriculum intends to achieve a balance in all language skills, Iranian pupils frequently have difficulties in speaking as a result of restricted opportunities for practice and classroom engagement. Engaging students in effective speaking exercises can offer significant feedback, which is crucial for enhancing their skills (Atai & Shafiee, 2017).

Corrective feedback plays a crucial role in language training by assisting learners in recognising and rectifying faults, so enhancing their accuracy and fluency. Various tactics, including recasts, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and clarification requests, address different aspects of language production and understanding (Fazilatfar et al., 2014). Providing corrective feedback helps learners develop metalinguistic awareness, enabling them to recognise and fix their mistakes, so improving their language proficiency. The efficacy of feedback hinges on the instructor's capacity to impart it seamlessly, without impeding the exchange of information and causing discomfort among pupils. Personality traits, such as introversion and extroversion, have a substantial influence on the process of acquiring linguistic skills. Introverted learners have a preference for solitary, self-directed learning, whereas extroverted learners flourish in communal, collaborative settings. It is crucial to acknowledge these distinctions in order to provide successful language teaching (Ferris et al., 2013). Customised corrective feedback tactics can improve speaking proficiency for both introverted and extroverted learners. Educators can enhance language learning environments by acknowledging and adapting to various learning preferences. This inclusivity can assist students in overcoming obstacles and enhancing their speaking abilities. Several studies (Gao & Ma, 2022; Haifaa & Emma, 2014; Iraji et al., 2014; Karim & Nassaji, 2018; Kessler, 2023; Li & Vuono, 2019; Lyster, 2023; Montazeri & Salimi, 2019) have emphasised the importance of this approach.

Language acquisition is impacted by multiple elements, wherein personality traits like introversion and extroversion have substantial influence. According to Zhu & Wang (2019), extrovert learners are individuals who thrive in contexts that involve communication, actively seeking opportunities for engagement and practice. On the other hand, introverts are described as individuals who prefer solitary and reflective learning approaches. These variations require customised teaching methods to fit the unique characteristics of different learners. According to Farrell (2017), corrective feedback plays a vital role in language learning by giving learners a deeper understanding of their linguistic mistakes and helping them improve their proficiency. Nevertheless, its efficacy is contingent upon the specific personality qualities of each individual. This study aims to fill the research vacuum on the correlation between corrective feedback and personality factors in Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. It investigates the impact of feedback on the speaking skills of introverted and extroverted learners. Comprehending the correlation between corrective feedback and personality qualities is crucial for instructors who seek to enhance language learning results. Through discerning the distinct impacts of feedback on different types of learners, educators can customise their methods to accommodate a wide range of demands. The findings of this study can provide valuable guidance for the creation of inclusive teaching methods that promote language development among individuals with diverse personalities, hence cultivating a more nurturing educational atmosphere (Feng & Liu, 2021; Gholami, 2022; Hartono et al., 2022).

This study enhances English teaching methodologies in Iran, specifically by investigating the efficacy of several forms of corrective feedback on speaking proficiency. The study explores the

intricate correlation between feedback and speaking skills, emphasising the necessity for additional research to identify the most efficient sort of feedback for improving speaking proficiency (Fazilatfar et al., 2014). Research in language teaching suggests that enhancing speaking abilities is a significant challenge for language learners. The study highlights the importance of rectifying student errors, emphasising that feedback is crucial for the advancement of language skills. The text emphasises the significance of rectifying semantic errors in verbal communication to facilitate the advancement of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners (Ferris et al., 2013; Gholami, 2023). The study also examines the use of metalinguistic corrective feedback in the Iranian EFL environment, proposing that it can improve learners' fluency and motivation. The findings have significant ramifications for learners, teachers, and material creators, particularly those who are specifically targeting IELTS preparation. According to Evans (2013), having knowledge about the influence of personality traits on language acquisition allows educators to create teaching strategies that are more inclusive and effective. This involves providing feedback that caters to the various requirements of learners, which in turn enhances their proficiency and confidence in English communication.

Research Questions
Considering the above-mentioned objectives, the following research questions were addressed:

RQ1. What is the impact of elicitation corrective feedback on the speaking ability of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

RQ2. What is the impact of clarification request corrective feedback on the speaking ability of intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

RQ3. Is there a statistically significant difference in the effectiveness of the above-mentioned corrective feedback on the speaking ability of introvert and extrovert intermediate Iranian EFL learners?

Review of Literature
The notion of verbal communication has been delineated in many manners. Gholami (2023) defines speaking as the conveyance of data, exchange of viewpoints, and articulation of emotions through spoken communication. Effective communication is a crucial ability that goes beyond simply expressing words. It encompasses the exchange of information, ideas, and emotions through sound in order to allow interaction with others. This talent is intricate and entails arranging verbal expressions to effectively communicate meaning, while also necessitating an awareness of how various circumstances and audiences impact communication. (p. 34)

Han (2017) asserts that effective speaking is influenced by various crucial elements, including vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency and accuracy, and comprehension. Proficiency in vocabulary is essential as it facilitates efficient communication. Adhering to proper grammar facilitates the accurate organisation of phrases, hence enhancing clarity. Accurate pronunciation is crucial in order to prevent misinterpretations, as words that sound alike might result in confusion. Fluency and accuracy in speech encompass the ability to communicate smoothly and continuously, without needless pauses or errors. Finally, a thorough understanding of the topic is crucial for establishing trust and ensuring clear and logical communication. Various forms of oral presentations aid in the cultivation of these abilities. The speaking activities encompass imitative speaking, which emphasises pronunciation through repetition; intensive speaking, which entails phonological and grammatical exercises; responsive speaking, which involves short conversations and basic requests; dialogic speaking, which includes exchanging specific information; and extensive monologue, which encompasses formal speeches or reports. In order to effectively teach speaking skills, it is important to have a clear understanding of students'

characteristics and to use strategies that actively engage them in communicative activities. These strategies should help students develop their ability to produce, understand, and process spoken language. Several studies (Han & Hyland, 2015; Kim et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2021; Mahalingappa et al., 2022; Nassaji, 2016; Rassaei, 2015; Sepehrinia & Mehdizadeh, 2018; Winke & Rawal, 2023) have explored this topic.

There has been an increasing recognition in recent years of the significance for teachers to comprehend the personality styles of learners, with a specific emphasis on introversion and extroversion. This perspective has been shaped by the field of clinical psychology, which emphasises the importance of individual personality qualities in guaranteeing student contentment. Kirgoz and Agcam (2015) assert that:

The concepts of extroversion and introversion have received considerable focus in language study. Extroverts are characterised as social, vivacious, and dynamic, whereas introverts are often regarded as sullen and secluded. Extroverts actively engage with others and outward stimuli, while introverts tend to shy away from social engagements and prioritise their internal thoughts and emotions. (p.62)

Physiological variables contribute to the determination of an individual's extroverted or introverted nature. According to Ha & Murray (2023), extroversion is associated with the mental consequences of physiological variations that impact degrees of arousal and conditioning in the cerebral cortex. According to Farrell (2017), extroverts are those who display characteristics such as warmth, sociability, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking, and positive emotions. Introverts, conversely, have a preference for being alone and concentrate intensely on particular topics for prolonged durations. He asserts that introverts acquire knowledge through internal processes, whereas extroverts acquire it from outward experiences. Introverts typically eschew noisy situations and group activities, instead favouring tranquil and contemplative settings.

The question of whether extroversion or introversion is more advantageous for language learning is currently a subject of continuous discussion. Although extroverts are commonly perceived to possess superior communication skills, both personality types offer distinct advantages based on the specific task at hand. Extroverts demonstrate higher levels of fluency in demanding social situations, whereas introverts exhibit exceptional skills in solitary pursuits such as reading and writing. Studies suggest that extroverts derive greater advantages from collaborative learning, while introverts exhibit superior performance in competitive environments. In general, introverts tend to derive greater advantages from both collaborative and competitive settings compared to extroverts.

According to Ha and Murray (2023), Corrective feedback has long been a fundamental aspect of language learning research, serving as a connection between speaking abilities and personality characteristics. It has been a topic of study for more than fifty years and has frequently transcended theoretical frameworks. It is believed that several ideas have successively supplanted their predecessors, indicating significant changes in comprehension. (37)

Examining the historical context can provide valuable insights into the changing opinions and methods of corrective feedback, shedding light on the many attitudes and tactics that have shaped the field throughout its history. According to the behaviourist paradigm, which was prevalent in the 1950s and 1960s, language learning was viewed as the result of forming habits through external cues and reinforcement. Corrective feedback, considered as a type of negative reinforcement, played a crucial role in assisting learners to conform their behaviour to grammatical norms. Behaviourists prioritised the teacher's responsibility in promptly and consistently correcting learners, resulting in an educational method centred around repetitive practice and the correction of all mistakes made by learners. On the other hand, the innatist perspective, which arose as a response to behaviourism, suggests that language acquisition is

primarily influenced by internal cognitive mechanisms rather than external rewards. Innatists contend that people possess an inherent capacity for acquiring language, which is shaped by Universal Grammar (UG). They minimised the importance of corrective feedback, indicating that it mostly impacts metalinguistic knowledge rather than genuine linguistic proficiency. The interactionist approach builds upon this concept by placing emphasis on conversational interaction and the process of negotiating meaning. In this approach, corrective feedback plays a crucial role in helping learners identify gaps in their knowledge and make appropriate adjustments to their language usage (Koltovskaia, 2020).

Feedback is crucial for educational and training programmes, as it facilitates the exchange of information between teachers and learners. The purpose of this is to enhance individual and organisational performance by gathering information from diverse sources, including educators, peers, and books, regarding performance. Feedback is a systematic procedure in which the results obtained are used to make modifications and enhancements (Bitchener, 2008; Lyster, 2023). Classroom instruction is crucial for assisting students in closing the knowledge gap and achieving their intended learning outcomes. This process not only minimises errors but also improves the interaction between teachers and students (Liu & Brown, 2015; Mawlawi Diab, 2015). Corrective feedback is a sort of feedback that especially focuses on identifying and addressing linguistic faults in both spoken and written language. It is analysed and understood through the lens of mental and sociocultural learning theories. Cognitively, it entails the identification and assimilation of linguistic information for effortless application (Papi et al., 2021). From a sociocultural perspective, it facilitates learning by promoting social contact and offering the minimum level of assistance required for self-correction (Akiyama, 2017). Efficient corrective feedback assists learners in recognising and rectifying non-target utterances, hence enhancing their language correctness, irrespective of the media employed (Mori, 2011). Couper (2019) asserts that Key components of effective feedback techniques encompass the time, quantity, method, and target audience. Providing feedback in a timely manner allows students to contemplate their learning objectives, but ensuring an adequate amount of feedback prevents them from feeling overwhelmed while still promoting comprehension. The feedback modality should be tailored to the specific requirements of the student, employing spoken means for enhanced comprehension or written means for more intricate tasks.

The content should prioritise the features of the task, the processes of learning, and self-regulation. It should use language that is clear, explicit, and favourably framed to drive progress. This approach is supported by Haifaa and Emma (2014) and Han (2017). Bao (2019) investigated the efficacy of oral and written corrective feedback in improving English article usage. The study highlighted that the explicitness of the feedback plays a crucial role in determining its success. Multiple studies conducted by researchers such as Akiyama (2017) and Benson and DeKeyser (2019) have examined the influence of direct and indirect feedback on enhancing the writing skills of language learners. These studies have emphasised the beneficial effects of direct feedback in boosting accuracy. In a study conducted by Couper (2019), it was found that metalinguistic feedback, such as error analysis, can significantly improve both accuracy and fluency in language learning situations. In their study, Eckstein and Bell (2023) examined the correlation between motivational factors and the oral communication methods of English language learners. They discovered that motivational elements such as a positive attitude and determination had a positive correlation with effective speaking skills, which improve learners' capacity to recognise and utilise language structures while communicating. Mandouit and Hattie (2023) emphasised the significance of feedback in directing learners towards their language learning objectives, highlighting its function in improving both fluency and accuracy. Mendez Seijas and Spino (2023) emphasised the effectiveness of both immediate and delayed remedial

feedback in enhancing pupils' precision, with direct input demonstrating enduring long-term advantages.

Corrective feedback in Iranian language instruction has received considerable attention, with a specific focus on enhancing learners' lexical and syntactic skill in oral communication. Research conducted by Atai and Shafiee (2017) and other scholars has shown that the provision of corrective feedback greatly improves learners' linguistic correctness when compared to those who do not receive feedback. Nevertheless, there is ongoing discussion regarding the efficacy of various forms of feedback in improving oral communication skills. This emphasises the necessity for additional research on metalinguistic, elicitation, and clarification request feedback techniques to enhance the speaking abilities of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. It is particularly important to consider the individual differences between introverted and extroverted learners. The latest study examines the impact of corrective feedback in language learning environments, emphasising its ability to enhance both written and oral proficiency by enhancing accuracy and fluency. Additionally, they emphasise the significance of motivation and individual learning styles in influencing the efficacy of feedback techniques.

Methodology

Design of the Study

The researcher chose to use a quasi-experimental approach in order to properly address the study questions. The selection of this design was based on its appropriateness for examining causal links between variables in cases when it is not possible to randomly allocate individuals to experimental and control groups. The researcher chose this strategy to obtain a better understanding of how certain interventions affect the desired outcomes, while also considering any potential factors that could influence the results. The researcher used a pre-test-post-test methodology within the quasi-experimental design framework to assess changes in the participants' outcomes over time. The pre-test-post-test method is very beneficial for evaluating alterations in participants' speaking skills in relation to the corrective feedback treatments. Through the assessment of speaking proficiency prior to and following the intervention, the researcher was able to determine if any enhancements identified in the post-test were a result of the intervention itself rather than unrelated factors.

Participants

The study comprised 172 students at an intermediate level. The language learners were enrolled in English courses at The Iran Language Institute, which has three branches: two branches located in Babol, namely the Central Branch and Velayat Branch, and one branch in Sari known as the 15th of Khordad Branch. The mandatory examinations and therapeutic sessions took place at the specified locations. The individuals were chosen based on their achievement on the language institutions' proficiency test scores from a total population of 302. The researcher utilised convenience sampling as the methodology for recruiting participants for the study. The participants' age range in the sample was quite limited, with an average age ranging from 17 to 25 years old. This age group corresponds to the usual age range of students who are enrolled in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) programmes, especially at the intermediate level. Furthermore, all participants were categorised as female English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students who possessed comparable educational backgrounds. The uniformity in educational background guarantees a consistent level of previous language learning experiences and academic environments among the participants. All study participants willingly and comprehensively received information regarding the research objectives and methodologies. Prior to enrolling, individuals were provided with thorough explanations of the study's objective,

their responsibilities, and any potential hazards or advantages. The participants were provided with the assurance that they had the right to discontinue their involvement in the research at any point without facing any repercussions. Additionally, their consent was sought prior to commencing the research activities.

Material

The learners were given with the contents of the Intermediate 3, Student Book (2004) of The Iran Language Institute during all 10 teaching sessions. The researcher provided the indicated remedial comments to them during this process, which was then replicated for the following therapy sessions. The control group did not get any form of feedback, although undergoing the same procedures as the experimental groups.

Instruments
Oxford Placement Test

In order to acquire a sample that accurately represents the community being studied, the researchers utilised the OPT as the benchmark for assessing the uniformity of the learners. This examination consists of two primary components: grammar and vocabulary. The grammar component is subdivided into two subcategories: 15 cloze exam items that gauge the learners' proficiency in completing the blanks with suitable words, and 10 multiple-choice answers that check their comprehension of grammar rules. The vocabulary component is divided into two subcategories: 25 multiple-choice items that assess the learners' comprehension of word definitions and usage, and 10 cloze test items that need the completion of sentences using the appropriate vocabulary. Following the administration of the OPT, the researchers identified a group of learners whose scores were within the range of 30 to 47. These learners were categorised as intermediate learners for the purposes of this study. This method of selection assured that the participants possessed a similar level of English proficiency. In order to confirm the dependability of the questionnaire employed in the research, the investigators carried out a pilot examination involving 30 students from the identical demographic. The questionnaire's reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, a statistical measure employed to examine the internal consistency of a test. The study produced a reliability value of 0.76 ($r = 0.76$), indicating a satisfactory level of reliability. This suggests that the questionnaire was a reliable tool for measuring the targeted variables.

Speaking Pre-test

The primary objective of this study was to evaluate speaking proficiency by utilising interviews as the main assessment instrument. During the pre-test phase of the study, participants were given a 5-minute time frame to discuss a topic of importance to them, specifically describing an item they own that holds significant value. The researcher selected the speaking tasks of the IELTS test for multiple reasons: its worldwide acknowledgement for being legitimate, dependable, and easy to administer, as well as the presence of professional raters for consistent scoring. The IELTS speaking module was employed as both an initial assessment and final assessment to gauge alterations in the participants' speaking proficiency prior to and during the treatment sessions. Two accredited IELTS instructors evaluated the performance of each participant both before and after the sessions using the IELTS band scores. In order to maintain uniformity and trustworthiness, the inter-rater reliability was assessed using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The analysis revealed a robust agreement ($r = 0.823$), thereby confirming the reliability of the scoring procedure.

Speaking Post-test

Following the treatment, the participants were allocated an additional 5 minutes to discuss Advertisements as a post-test. The selection of themes for the pre-test and post-test was based on the students' existing knowledge and familiarity with the subjects.

Learning Style Survey

The study utilised the Learning Style Survey (Cohen et al., 2001), a reputable questionnaire, to categorise the learners into introvert and extrovert. The Learning Style Survey is a psychological instrument used to assess an individual's personality attributes. This test comprises 12 items and assesses two personality factors: Extraversion and Introversion. The questionnaire consists of 6 items each for Extraversion and Introversion. In order to assess its dependability, the researcher conducted a preliminary test of the questionnaire using a sample of 50 students from the identical demographic. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient revealed a reliability rating of .85 (r = .85).

Procedures

The data collection technique spanned 18 months, with two sessions per week totaling fourteen 90-minute sessions. It commenced in the beginning of Spring 1400 and concluded at the conclusion of Summer 1401. The duration of each institute semester typically consisted of 21 sessions. However, for this project, the data collecting process included 14 sessions out of the total 21 sessions for each group. The data collection began with the first session and concluded with the 14th session. Out of the total of 14 sessions, 4 sessions were dedicated to the administration of OPT, the learning style survey, the pre-test, and the post-test. The remaining 10 sessions were considered treatment sessions and followed the institute's teaching methodology. Every chapter of the textbook was finished in two separate sessions. Each unit consisted of warm-up questions before the dialogue, sample questions after the dialogue, a warm-up discussion topic related to a reading passage (dialogues and reading passages were taught alternately), multiple-choice questions following the reading passage, and spoken drills that focused on grammatical points. Typically, the oral exercises required two sessions to be finished, following the teacher's lesson plan handbook. Every participant was provided with a workbook, in addition to the textbook, that primarily consisted of grammar tasks to be completed at home. These exercises were then reviewed in the classroom during the next session.

With the exception of the time allocated for participants to act out dialogues or read and explain passages (15 to 30 minutes), the remainder of the class time was dedicated to applying feedback. During the research, the researcher utilised feedback from language learners. This feedback was obtained when the learners questioned the participants questions about the subject of the dialogue they performed or specific parts of the reading passage they read and explained, in front of the class. Furthermore, the feedback was used during the preliminary discussions before instruction, as well as throughout the instruction and practice of a new dialogue or reading passage. During these exercises, the researcher posed inquiries to the participants regarding the significance of sentences, phrases, and words. They also instructed the participants to identify specific grammatical structures or to restate sentences or idioms in different language to confirm their comprehension. The input was incorporated into the substitution spoken drills, which were conducted collaboratively by the students following the researcher's presentation of each case. Typically, implementing the comments required approximately 60 to 70 minutes out of the total 90-minute session duration. The study encompassed 172 students at the intermediate level, all of

them were engaged in the process of acquiring English language skills at The Iran Language Institute, which is comprised of three branches: two located in Babol and one in Sari. All individuals at the Intermediate 3 level were invited to participate in the research and readily consented. The selection was conducted using a convenience random sample method, which is a nonprobability sampling strategy that involves choosing participants based on their availability and ease of access. This implies that the pupils were chosen based on their high level of accessibility. The sample consisted of female English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners who had similar educational backgrounds. The participants were selected based on their proficiency test scores from a total population of 302 students at the language institutes.

During the initial session of the course, the administration of the OPT was conducted to guarantee that the participants were similar in terms of their characteristics and abilities at the start of the study. In order to adhere to ethical guidelines, the researcher engaged in discussions with the institute managers to secure their approval. Additionally, the researcher negotiated with two highly experienced IELTS teachers who have nearly a decade of experience teaching IELTS preparation courses. Additionally, they possessed doctoral degrees in TEFL. The researcher gave instructions to all groups. In addition, the participants were explicitly notified that the tasks and tests were exclusively intended for research reasons and that their academic performance would not be influenced by the findings of the study. Following the process of selecting a sample, the IELTS examiners administered a pre-test to assess the speaking proficiency of the participants in the third session of the course. This pre-test required the participants to talk on a given topic. During the IELTS speaking pre-test, participants were provided with a task card focused on a certain topic. This card contained the main elements that participants were required to discuss. The pre-test prompt was to provide a description of a possession that holds significant value to you. The learners were given with the contents of the Intermediate 3 Student Book (2004) of The Iran Language Institute during all ten teaching sessions. The researcher provided the indicated remedial comments during this process, which was then replicated in the following treatment sessions. The control group did not get any form of feedback, although undergoing the same procedures as the experimental groups. The 10 treatment sessions included the following topics: Final Exams, Working Parents, Types of Families, Being a Teenager, Your Future Job, Headaches, Travelling by Plane, Phobia, Galileo, and Traffic Regulations.

Throughout the treatment sessions, participants in the experimental group, regardless of their introverted or extroverted nature, received elicitation and clarification request corrective feedback on their speech. After each course, the examiners conducted a post-test to evaluate the impact of the treatment. They requested the learners in each group to discuss Advertisements in a 5-minute session, which took place at the 14th session. During the IELTS speaking post-test, participants were provided with a task card focusing on a certain topic. This card contained the essential points that they were required to discuss.

In order to investigate each research issue, appropriate statistical techniques were selected to analyse the impact of different types of corrective feedback on the speaking abilities of intermediate Iranian EFL learners. Additionally, these approaches were used to determine if there were any statistically significant variations between introverted and extroverted learners. The data obtained from both the experimental and control groups in this quasi-experimental study were analysed using ANCOVA with SPSS software (Version 27). An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was employed to compare the average speaking ability scores of intermediate Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners who received elicitation and clarification, together with request remedial feedback, with those who did not receive these interventions. The researcher employed a two-way ANOVA to assess the differences in mean speaking ability scores between introverted and extroverted intermediate Iranian EFL learners who received different types of corrective feedback.

Data Analysis and Results

Initially, the reliability of the instruments was assessed by administering the final versions to a sample of 30 people from the same demographic. The dependability indices, computed with Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, were .76 and .85, correspondingly. In order to classify the participants into similar categories and obtain the required number of participants for the study, the OPT was employed to evaluate the students' levels of English proficiency. Individuals who obtained a score of 0-29 out of 60 on the OPT were categorised as having an elementary level of proficiency. Those who scored between 30-47 were classed as having an intermediate level, while those who scored between 48-60 were considered to have an advanced level. The findings display the means, variances, and standard deviations for elementary, intermediate, and advanced students. Specifically, for elementary students, the mean is 23.32, the variance is 7.766, and the standard deviation is 2.787. For intermediate students, the mean is 39.14, the variance is 8.799, and the standard deviation is 2.966. Lastly, for advanced students, the mean is 50.46, the variance is 2.216, and the standard deviation is 1.488. The study eliminated individuals who were at the elementary and advanced levels.

Table 1

Results of ANCOVA for Changes in Learners' Scores in Elicitation Post-test

Dependent Variable: Elicitation Post-test							
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial	Eta Squared
Group	910.450	1	910.450	29.175	.000	.493	
Corrected Total	1846.970	32					
a. R Squared = .493 (Adjusted R Squared = .459)							

A study utilising ANCOVA was conducted to investigate the impact of elicitation feedback on the speaking proficiency of intermediate students. The study employed a one-way between-groups design, where the independent variable differentiated the experimental and control groups. The variable that was influenced by other factors was the scores that the students achieved on a speaking post-test. In order to account for any initial variations, the learners' results on a speaking pre-test were incorporated as a covariate in the study. After controlling for pre-test scores, there were substantial disparities seen between the experimental and control groups in terms of post-test scores, as indicated by the statistical analysis ($F (1, 30) = 29.175$, $p < .000$). Furthermore, the effect size was found to be medium, with a partial eta squared value of .493.

In order to assess the impact of clarification corrective feedback on the speaking proficiency of intermediate Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners, the researcher employed ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariance). The descriptive data indicate that the experimental group (mean = 59.67, standard deviation = 3.994) outperformed the control group (mean = 47.94, standard deviation = 3.976) in the post-test.

Table 2

Results of ANCOVA for Changes in Learners' Scores in Clarification Post-test

Dependent Variable: Clarification Post-test						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared

Group	1093.422	1	1093.422	67.715	.000	.700
Corrected Total	1571.875	31				
a. R Squared = .702 (Adjusted R Squared = .682)						

A one-way between-groups ANCOVA was performed to examine the effect of clarification feedback on the speaking abilities of intermediate students. The independent variable was group type (experimental and control), and the dependent variable was the scores on the speaking post-test. The pre-test speaking scores were used as a covariate. After adjusting for the pre-test scores, the results showed a statistically significant difference between the groups on the post-test scores, $F (1, 30) = 67.715$, $p < .000$, with a partial eta squared of .700, indicating a large effect size.

To examine the differences in speaking abilities between introverted and extroverted intermediate Iranian EFL learners, the researcher conducted a two-way between-groups ANOVA. The findings from this analysis are shown in the tables below.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable:	Speaking Post-test			
Groups	Style	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Elicitation	Extroverts	61.25	4.655	16
	Introverts	38.82	3.321	17
Metalinguistic	Extroverts	38.75	4.282	16
	Introverts	55.94	3.750	16
Clarification	Extroverts	38.44	3.010	16
	Introverts	57.19	2.562	16
Full Recast	Extroverts	57.81	4.820	16
	Introverts	38.93	3.496	14
Partial Recast	Extroverts	59.06	4.171	16
	Introverts	38.93	4.009	14
Total	Extroverts	51.06	11.101	80
	Introverts	46.23	9.395	77
	Total	48.69	10.548	157

Table 3 shows that extroverts scored significantly higher (Mean = 61.25) than introverts (Mean = 38.82), indicating that extroverts perform better in speaking tasks under Elicitation. Introverts again outperformed extroverts with a mean score of 57.19 compared to 38.44 for extroverts in Clarification. Generally, extroverts performed better in speaking tasks with Elicitation, while introverts performed better with Clarification. The total mean score for extroverts (51.06) was slightly higher than that of introverts (46.23), indicating a general trend of higher performance among extroverts across the styles. The variation in scores, as indicated by the standard deviations, was also higher among extroverts.

Table 4

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Speaking Post-test						
Style	1017.863	1	1017.863	68.042	.000	.316
Groups	143.560	4	35.890	2.399	.053	.061
Style * Groups	14101.968	4	3525.492	235.672	.000	.865
a. R Squared = .873 (Adjusted R Squared = .866)						

The findings of the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for the dependent variable "Speaking Post-test" are displayed in Table 4. The Between-Subjects Effects tests showed that the Corrected Model, which included the main effects of Style and Groups, as well as the interaction term Style * Groups, had a significant predictive effect on Speaking Post-test scores (F (9, 147) = 112.589, p < .001, η^2 = .873). The main effect of Style F (1, 147) = 68.042, p < .001, η^2 = .316) and the interaction between Style and Groups F (4, 147) = 235.672, p < .001, η^2 = .865) both had a significant impact on the Speaking Post-test scores. The primary impact of Groups was slightly significant (F (4, 147) = 2.399, p = .053, η^2 = .061), indicating potential variations in the influence of group circumstances on Speaking Post-test results. The Intercept term had a high level of significance (F (1, 147) = 24612.773, p < .001, η^2 = .994), showing a large amount of variation in Speaking Post-test scores among the individuals.

The statistical findings offered reveal important insights into the factors that influence Speaking Post-test scores. The primary impact of Style (introverts vs. extroverts) is statistically significant (F (1, 147) = 68.042, p < .001, η^2 = .316). This indicates a significant disparity in Speaking Post-test results between individuals who are introverted and those who are extroverted. The effect size (η^2 = .316) suggests that about 31.6% of the variation in Speaking Post-test scores may be explained by Style alone. The correlation between Style and Groups is extremely significant (F (4, 147) = 235.672, p < .001, η^2 = .865). This suggests that the impact of Style on Speaking Post-test scores is contingent upon the specific feedback group, namely Elicitation, Metalinguistic, Clarification, Full Recast, and Partial Recast feedback. The substantial effect size (η^2 = .865) indicates that 86.5% of the variation in Speaking Post-test results can be attributed to the combined influence of Style and Group comments. The primary impact of Groups is slightly significant (F (4, 147) = 2.399, p = .053, η^2 = .061). This implies that there may be variations in Speaking Post-test results as a result of the various forms of feedback, although this impact is not as pronounced or definitive as the other influences. The impact size (η^2 = .061) suggests that approximately 6.1% of the variation in scores can be attributed to the variations between feedback groups. In general, the style of individuals, whether they are introverts or extroverts, significantly influences their performance on the Speaking Post-test. The correlation between Style and type of feedback is a highly reliable indicator, suggesting that the type of feedback produces distinct outcomes for individuals with introverted and extroverted personalities. The specific feedback group alone has a minimal impact on the Speaking Post-test scores.

Table 5
Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Speaking Post-test
Scheffe

(I) Groups	(J) Groups	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Elicitation	Metalinguistic*	2.35	.960	.042	.264	.735
	Clarification*	1.88	.960	.029	.116	.488
	Full Recast*	.70	.976	.037	.235	.374
	Partial Recast	.03	.976	.294	3.01	3.07
Metalinguistic	Elicitation*	-2.35	.960	.042	.264	.735
	Clarification*	-.47	.967	.041	.491	.557
	Full Recast*	-1.66	.983	.039	.172	.419
	Partial Recast*	-2.32	.983	.023	.394	.746
Clarification	Elicitation*	-1.88	.960	.029	.116	.488
	Metalinguistic*	.47	.967	.041	.491	.557
	Full Recast	-1.19	.983	.833	-4.25	1.88
	Partial Recast	-1.85	.983	.472	-4.92	1.21
Full Recast	Elicitation*	-.70	.976	.037	.235	.374
	Metalinguistic*	1.66	.983	.039	.172	.419
	Clarification	1.19	.983	.833	-1.88	4.25
	Partial Recast	-.67	.999	.978	-3.78	2.45
Partial Recast	Elicitation	-.03	.976	.294	3.01	3.07
	Metalinguistic*	2.32	.983	.023	.394	.746
	Clarification	1.85	.983	.472	-1.21	4.92
	Full Recast	.67	.999	.978	-2.45	3.78

Based on observed means.
 The error term is Mean Square (Error) = 14.959.

The findings of multiple comparisons using the Scheffe technique for the dependent variable "Speaking Post-test" across different groups are shown in Table 5. The results of the elicitation group show that there are notable disparities among the Metalinguistic (p = 0.042), Clarification (p = 0.029), and Full Recast (p = 0.037) groups. There were no notable distinctions observed in the Partial Recast group. Significant differences were observed in the Elicitation (p = 0.042), Clarification (p = 0.041), and Partial Recast (p = 0.023) groups within the Metalinguistic group. However, no significant changes were detected in the Full Recast group. The Clarification group had notable distinctions from the Elicitation (p = 0.029) and Metalinguistic (p = 0.041) groups, but did not show any differences with the Full Recast and Partial Recast groups. The Full Recast group exhibited notable disparities with the Elicitation (p = 0.037) and Metalinguistic (p = 0.039) groups, but did not display any significant distinctions with the Clarification and Partial Recast groups. There are notable disparities between the Metalinguistic group and the Partial Recast group, with a statistically significant difference identified (p = 0.023). No discernible disparity is detected among the other categories. The Scheffe technique was used to conduct multiple comparisons, which showed significant differences in mean Speaking Post-test scores between the Elicitation and Metalinguistic groups (p = 0.042), the Clarification group (p = 0.029), and the Full Recast group (p = 0.037). Significant differences were seen between the Metalinguistic and Elicitation groups (p = 0.042), the Clarification group (p = 0.041), and the Partial Recast group (p

= 0.023). Furthermore, there were notable disparities observed between the Clarification and Elicitation groups (p = 0.029). There were no notable distinctions found between the groups.

Discussion

The study investigated the response of Iranian EFL learners, who were at an intermediate level and identified as either introverts or extroverts, to the techniques of Elicitation and Clarification in relation to their speaking abilities. Statistically significant differences were seen between extroverts and introverts in various aspects, including elicitation (F = 34.563) and clarification (F = 45.454), with p-values < .000. Extroverts typically outperformed Introverts, attaining higher marks in activities that required eliciting information, showcasing their greater proficiency in interactive language tasks. On the other hand, Introverts excelled in tasks demanding clarification.

The results of this study are consistent with other research that suggests extroverted learners tend to perform well in language tasks that include active participation and interaction. The extroverts' superior performance in tasks that require elicitation provides evidence that their friendly and outgoing disposition improves their ability to excel in communicative language activities. In a study conducted by Kessler (2023), the influence of various forms of corrective feedback on speaking skills was examined. The results indicated that extroverted individuals consistently demonstrated superior performance compared to introverted individuals across multiple feedback categories, which aligns with the present findings. This implies that individuals with extroverted personalities derive greater advantages from educational settings that are characterised by constant change and active participation, allowing them to engage in conversations and receive prompt feedback to enhance their language abilities.

Furthermore, Mandouit and Hattie (2023) suggest that introverted learners have a preference for studying in isolation and tend to experience increased levels of anxiety when participating in group activities. This could elucidate why introverts exhibit worse performance in tasks that necessitate impromptu engagement and instant response, while they typically thrive in tasks that demand concentrated concentration and limited social connection. Moreover, a study conducted on primary school pupils revealed that children with extroverted traits exhibited a higher propensity to engage in classroom discussions and group activities, resulting in superior language acquisition outcomes when compared to their introverted counterparts. These findings emphasise the significance of customising language education practices to suit various personality types. Extroverted learners can benefit from including additional interactive and communicative assignments. On the other hand, incorporating a combination of individual and collaborative tasks can enhance the comfort level and improve the results of introverted language learners.

Nevertheless, several investigations, such as the one carried out by Penning de Vries et al. (2020), failed to see a noteworthy disparity in the speaking aptitudes of introverted and extroverted students. This implies that the specific circumstances and research methods employed could have an impact on the results. Another study indicated that there was no notable disparity in speaking proficiency based on personality types. This emphasises the possibility of varying outcomes depending on different educational environments and groups of learners. It is worth mentioning that introverts demonstrated superior performance in activities involving clarification. This suggests that introverts have exceptional performance in tasks that necessitate profound study, self-reflection, and meticulousness, traits commonly linked to introverted individuals. These findings emphasise the subtle distinctions in cognitive and language capabilities between individuals who are extroverted and those who are introverted. Extroverts excel in social and interactive environments, whereas introverts exhibit their strengths in contemplative and analytical activities. Gaining insight into these distinctions can aid in the development of settings

and instructional approaches that accommodate the varied requirements and capabilities of persons spanning the extroversion-introversion continuum.

Zhang and Zhang (2023) observed that individuals with extroverted personalities tend to excel in speaking activities because they are more inclined to actively participate in communication. This conclusion aligns with the results of the present study. The study on speaking skills in public situations also found that extroverts demonstrated greater performance, confirming the presence of similar patterns. The findings indicate that individuals with extroverted traits may possess a benefit in language learning settings that prioritise interactive and communicative activities. Nevertheless, the inconsistency in research findings among various studies highlights the necessity for additional exploration into the influence of diverse circumstances and methodology on the correlation between personality types and the achievement of language learning.

The results suggest a significant disparity in performance between extroverted and introverted learners across various language learning feedback categories. Extroverts routinely outperformed introverts, as evidenced by their superior performance on activities that required elicitation. This implies that those who are extroverted have a tendency to perform exceptionally well in tasks related to communication and language that necessitate active participation and contact. Prior research supports these results, emphasising the benefits that extroverts have in social situations and activities that include verbal communication.

Introverts exhibited superior performance in explanation tasks when compared to others. On the other hand, extroverts excel in tasks that require social interaction and quick verbal reactions. The findings emphasise the impact of individual characteristics on the process of acquiring language skills and employing effective communication methods. It would be advantageous for educators and language instructors to customise their feedback systems to accommodate the unique characteristics of learners, hence enhancing learning outcomes by considering their extroversion or introversion.

Conclusion

The study investigates the impact of personality qualities, specifically introversion and extroversion, on the speaking skills of intermediate Iranian EFL learners who are receiving corrective feedback. Introverted learners tend to approach language activities with more contemplation and may prefer thorough, clear feedback that helps with accuracy and understanding. On the other hand, extroverted learners tend to do well in social situations, where they favour feedback that improves their ability to speak fluently and promotes spontaneous communication. The efficacy of corrective feedback depends on various aspects, such as the nature of the feedback given. Explicit feedback and recasts are emphasised as being beneficial in enhancing speaking proficiency by providing quick clarity or subtle direction without disrupting the flow of conversation. The effectiveness of feedback is greatly influenced by the timing and frequency at which it is provided. Providing prompt feedback during or immediately after speaking exercises helps learners correct errors while the information is still fresh in their thoughts. However, delayed feedback might provide a more thorough examination. Incorporating regular feedback into classroom activities promotes improved learning outcomes.

Additionally, the study emphasises the significance of customising feedback systems to suit the unique qualities and preferences of each student. It is essential to establish a conducive learning environment that values the need for introverted learners to engage in contemplation and extroverted learners to participate in social contact in order to maximise the development of speaking skills. Additional investigation on corrective feedback among Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners highlights the impact of learner attitudes and cultural factors. The value of feedback substantially impacts learners' engagement and competency. In order to promote student engagement and involvement, it is important for feedback delivery to adhere to

cultural values of courtesy and dignity. Furthermore, consistent and prolonged practice is crucial for incorporating feedback into learners' language proficiency. Active engagement, introspection, and customised feedback methods based on individual requirements further augment efficacy. Teachers have a crucial role in creating a supportive environment that helps students acquire long-term competency.

The findings have wide-ranging ramifications and yield observable outcomes for language teaching and learning practices. Language educators should contemplate including more interactive and communicative assignments for extroverted learners. These activities encompass group conversations, role-plays, and other speaking tasks that necessitate active engagement and prompt feedback. To accommodate introverted learners, who may have heightened anxiety in group settings and prefer solitary pursuits, instructors should incorporate more personalised and less participatory assignments. This may entail written assignments, individual discussions, and tasks that provide ample time for preparation. Considering that extroverted individuals exhibited a more positive response to elicitation feedback, it is advisable to prioritise this approach while instructing extroverted students. On the other hand, introverted students may derive greater advantages from clarification queries, as these enable them to engage in more profound information processing at their own preferred speed. Curriculum developers should take into account the varied requirements of learners by incorporating a well-rounded blend of activities that accommodate both outgoing and reserved students. This strategy can facilitate the optimisation of the potential of all pupils, irrespective of their personality types. Establishing a nurturing and adaptable classroom setting that acknowledges and values diverse personality traits might improve educational achievements. For example, providing students with the option to select either group or individual work can effectively cater to their preferences and alleviate tension. The results indicate the necessity of more investigation to examine the lasting impacts of various forms of corrective feedback on speaking proficiency across individuals with diverse personality traits. This could assist in refining and optimising teaching tactics for enhanced language acquisition.

References

Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the Teachers' Use of Spoken Corrective Feedback in Teaching Iranian EFL Learners at Different Levels of Proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *29*, 1859-1868. https:// doi. org/ https ://doi .org/1 0.1016/j.sbspro.2011.11.435

Akiyama, Y. (2017). Learner beliefs and corrective feedback in telecollaboration: A longitudinal investigation. *System*, *64*, 58-73. https:// doi.org/ https://do i.org/10.1 016/j.system.2016.12.007

Atai, M. R., & Shafiee, Z. (2017). Pedagogical knowledge base underlying EFL teachers' provision of oral corrective feedback in grammar instruction. *Teacher Development*, *21*(4), 580-596. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2016.1277257

Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, *82*, 140-150. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004

Benson, S., & DeKeyser, R. (2019). Effects of written corrective feedback and language aptitude on verb tense accuracy. *Language Teaching Research*, *23*(6), 702-726. https:/ /doi.org/10.1177/1362168818770921

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 102-118.https://do i.org/https:/ /doi.org/10. 1016/j.jslw. 2007.11.004

Cohen, A., Oxford, R., & Chi, J. (2001). Learning Style Survey: Assessing Your Own Learning Styles Learning Style Survey*: Assessing Your Own Learning Styles A -Total. *Regents of the University of Minnesota*.

Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*, *84*, 41-52.https:// doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.003

Eckstein, G., & Bell, L. (2023). Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback in First-Year Composition: Accuracy and Lexical and Syntactic Complexity. *Relc Journal*, *0*(0), 00336882211061624. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882211061624

Evans, C. (2013). Making Sense of Assessment Feedback in Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(1), 70-120. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350

Farrell, M. (2017). Leadership Reflections: Extrovert and Introvert Leaders. *Journal of Library Administration*, *57*(4), 436-443. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2017.1300455

Fazilatfar, A. M., Fallah, N., Hamavandi, M., & Rostamian, M. (2014). The Effect of Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Syntactic and Lexical Complexity of L2 Writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 482-488.https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.443

Feng, H., & Liu, H. (2021). International Perspectives on Teaching the Four Skills in ELT: Listening, Speaking, Reading, Writing. *System*, *98*, 102467. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2021.102467

Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(3), 307-329.https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.009

Gao, J., & Ma, S. (2022). Instructor feedback on free writing and automated corrective feedback in drills: Intensity and efficacy. *Language Teaching Research*, *26*(5), 986-1009. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820915337

Gholami, L. (2022). Incidental corrective feedback provision for formulaic vs. Non-formulaic errors: EFL teachers' beliefs and practices. *Language Awareness*, *31*(1), 21-52. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1943421

Gholami, L. (2023). Oral corrective feedback and learner uptake in L2 classrooms: Non-formulaic vs. formulaic errors. *Language Teaching Research*, *0*(0), 13621688211021560. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211021560

Ha, X. V., & Murray, J. C. (2023). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, *27*(1), 137-167.https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897

Haifaa, F., & Emma, M. (2014). Oral Corrective Feedback and Learning of English Modals. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *136*, 322-329.https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.337

Han, Y. (2017). Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback. *System*, *69*, 133-142. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2017.07.003

Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *30*, 31-44. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.002

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), 2152619.https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152619

ILI.English.Series.Intermediate. (2004). *The ILI English Series Intermediate 3*. ILI Language Institute.

Iraji, S., Zoghi, M., & Nemat-Tabrizi, A. (2014). Corrective Feedback and Learners' Uptake Across Gender in an EFL Context. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 680-687. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.468

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2018). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, *24*(4), 519-539. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469

Kessler, M. (2023). Written corrective feedback in an online community: A typology of English language learners' requests and interlocutors' responses. *Computers and Composition*, *67*, 102752. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2023.102752

Kim, Y., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, *53*(1), 176-199.https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12443

Kirgoz, Y., & Agcam, R. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions on Corrective Feedback in Turkish Primary Schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *192*, 574-581. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096

Koltovskaia, S. (2020). Student engagement with automated written corrective feedback (AWCF) provided by Grammarly: A multiple case study. *Assessing Writing*, *44*, 100450. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2020.100450

Lee, I., Luo, N., & Mak, P. (2021). Teachers' attempts at focused written corrective feedback in situ. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *54*, 100809. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100809

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, *84*, 93-109.https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.05.006

Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *30*, 66-81. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.08.011

Lyster, R. (2023). Oral Corrective Feedback as a Pedagogical Strategy. In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 1-7). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal1028.pub3

Mahalingappa, L., Polat, N., & Wang, R. (2022). A cross-cultural comparison in pedagogical beliefs about oral corrective feedback: the case of English language teachers in China versus the U.S. *Language Awareness*, *31*(4), 410-430. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2021.1900211

Mandouit, L., & Hattie, J. (2023). Revisiting "The Power of Feedback" from the perspective of the learner. *Learning and Instruction*, *84*, 101718. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2022.101718

Mawlawi Diab, N. (2015). Effectiveness of written corrective feedback: Does type of error and type of correction matter? *Assessing Writing*, *24*, 16-34. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2015.02.001

Mendez Seijas, J., & Spino, L. (2023). Written "corrective" feedback in Spanish as a heritage language: Problematizing the construct of error. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *60*, 100989. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2023.100989

Montazeri, M., & Salimi, E. A. (2019). Assessing motivation to speak (MTS) and willingness to communicate through metalinguistic corrective feedback. *Learning and Motivation*, *68*, 101594. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2019.101594

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, *39*(4), 451-467. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.014

Nassaji, H. (2016). Researching corrective feedback in interaction and instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, *20*(4), 433-435. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168816651018

Papi, M., Wolff, D., Nakatsukasa, K., & Bellwoar, E. (2021). Motivational factors underlying learner preferences for corrective feedback: Language mindsets and achievement goals. *Language Teaching Research*, *25*(6), 858-877. https://doi.org/10.1177/13621688211018808

Penning de Vries, B. W., Cucchiarini, C., Strik, H., & van Hout, R. (2020). Spoken grammar practice in CALL: The effect of corrective feedback and education level in adult L2 learning. *Language Teaching Research*, *24*(5), 714-735. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818819027

Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System*, *49*, 98-109. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.01.002

Sepehrinia, S., & Mehdizadeh, M. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: teachers' concerns and researchers' orientation. *The Language Learning Journal*, *46*(4), 483-500https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1172328

Winke, M. P., & Rawal, H. (2023). Teaching Large, Mixed-Ability Classes. In *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1-6). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0222

Zhang, X., & Zhang, R. (2023). Feedback, Response, and Learner Development: A Sociocultural Approach to Corrective Feedback in Second Language Writing. *SAGE Open*, *13*(1), 21582440231157680. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231157680

Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*, *28*(2), 139-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755

Biodata

Atousa Ebrahimi is a Ph.D. candidate in the field of teaching English as a foreign language at Islamic Azad University - Tonekabon Branch in Iran. She has been engaged in teaching English language for 15 years at Amol, Iran. She has taught courses on general English language for different levels.
Email: *nasrin_mehrvarz@yahoo.com*

Davood Mashhadi Heidar is an assistant professor of TEFL in the Dept. of ELT at Islamic Azad University - Tonekabon Branch in Iran with 12 teaching experience. He has taught courses on discourse analysis, contrastive analysis, linguistics, and English as a foreign language in ELT. He has done studies on different topics related to his field of study such as applied linguistics, teaching English language methodologies.
Email: *davoodm_tarbiatmodares@yahoo.com*

Mohammadreza Khodareza is an assistant professor of TEFL in the Dept. of ELT at Islamic Azad University - Tonekabon Branch in Iran with 26 teaching experience. He has taught courses on English language research, teaching methods, linguistics, and English as a foreign language in ELT. He has done studies on different topics related to his field of study.
Email: *m.r.khodareza1349@gmail.com*