Journal of Studies in Learning
and Teaching English
Volume. 6, Issue. 1, Ser. 11, (2017), 23-45

The Relationship between Frequency of Oral Corrective Feedback and Identity Processing Style Among Iranian EFL Teachers

Emad Omidpour*
Department of Foreign Languages
M.A. in TEFL
Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch
Shiraz, Iran

Mohammad Bavali
Assistant professor
Department of Foreign Languages
Islamic Azad University, Shiraz Branch
Shiraz, Iran

Abstract. It is believed that identity has great impact on almost every aspect of human psychological and social growth. Oral corrective feedback, on the other hand, is found to have a profound influence on learning. In this regard, this study attempted to examine any probable relationship between identity processing styles and the frequency of oral corrective feedback techniques. The participants included eight male Iranian EFL teachers. To identify participants' choice of oral corrective strategies and their frequencies, their intermediate classes were observed for four sessions. To arrive at participants' identity processing styles, Informational, Normative, and Diffuse-Avoidant, the identity style inventory (ISI-5) by Berzonsky was employed. Since all participants obtained highest score for the Informational style, they were grouped based on their second highest score. The findings underline that there is a positive relationship between Normative identity processing style and frequency of oral corrective feedback techniques used by the teachers. Normative styles were found to be more likely to use oral corrective feedback techniques more frequently. Those with higher Diffuse-Avoidant style score

Received: December 2016; Accepted: February 2017
*Corresponding author

seemed to use a limited number and fewer types of oral corrective feedback techniques. With respect to the results, this study offers the use of identity surveys in EFL educational systems in order to help language institutions approach problems regarding teachers' performance in the field of oral corrective feedback in a more precise and personalized way which matches each teacher's needs.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, identity processing style, foreign language learning, feedbacks frequency

1. Introduction

Most of the definitions of corrective feedback revolve around the fact that feedback refers to informing learners about their work in progress. To be more precise, this kind of interaction shows learners their errors and helps them correct their work (Ur, 1996; Lewis, 2002). According to Boud (2002), "A good feedback is given without personal judgment or opinion, given based on the facts, always neutral and objective, constructive and focus on the future" (p. 7). Therefore, feedback should be considered as a constructive approach on improving students' performance. Based on Ellis (2009) feedback can be both positive or negative. He describes that positive feedback affirms that a learner response to an activity is correct. It may signal the veracity of the content of a learner utterance or the linguistic correctness of the utterance. In pedagogical theory, positive feedback is viewed as important because it provides affective support to the learner and fosters motivation to continue learning. Ellis (2009) believes that positive feedback (as opposed to negative feedback) has received little attention, in part because discourse analytical studies of classroom interaction have shown that the teacher's positive feedback move is frequently ambiguous (e.g., "Good" or "Yes" do not always signal the learner is correct, for they may merely preface a subsequent correction or modification of the student's utterance). On the other end of the continuum negative feedback signals, in one way or another, that the learner's utterance lacks veracity or is linguistically deviant. In other words, it is corrective in intent.

The controversy concerning corrective feedback has some different dimensions, knowing which helps us orient ourselves in this broad field. The

controversy regarding CF centers on a number of issues: (1) whether CF contributes to L2 acquisition, (2) which errors to correct, (3) who should do the correcting (the teacher or the learner him/herself), (4) which type of CF is the most effective, and (5) what is the best timing for CF (immediate or delayed). In order to approach the controversies above we need to be certain if there is emphasis on accuracy or fluency. Harmer (1983) argued that when students are engaged in communicative activity, the teacher should not intervene by "telling students that they are making mistakes, insisting on accuracy and asking for repetition" (p. 44). This is a view that is reflected in teachers' own opinions about CF (see, for example, Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis, 2004). Harmer's advice has the value of recognizing that CF needs to be viewed as a contextual rather than as a monolithic phenomenon. However SLA researchers-especially those working within an interactionist framework (see, for example, the collection of papers in Mackey, 2007)-take a different view, arguing that CF works best when it occurs in context at the time the learner makes the error. It seems apparent that the more accuracy is emphasized, the more attention has to be paid to form.

Despite all the controversies, every expert agrees that the decision behind the choice of the corrective feedbacks and even whether to correct learners at all or not made by the teacher could make great impact on each participant of any language class. That's why there's still the need to scrutinize corrective feedback, its roots and roles. One of the underlying factors that influences all our decisions is identity. The origin of studies on identity formation goes back to those of Erikson, the father of psychosocial development. The work of Erikson (1959; 1980) outlined eight stages of psychological development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Erikson's stages are generally related to age and proceed from basic trust and autonomy issues in early childhood to generativity and integrity in later life. At its most basic level, identity is how people make sense of their experience and how they communicate their meaning systems to others (Josselson, 1987). The central questions of identity are:

What matters to you?

What goals do you pursue?

How do you want others to think of you?

What do you believe in?

What guides your actions?

Whom do you love?

What values do you hold dear?

Where do you expend your passion?

What causes you pain? (Josselson, 1996,P. 29)

Erikson's studies pointed to the fact that the development of a stable and coherent identity is considered a central developmental task during adolescence. Erikson considers identity as an evolving configuration (Erikson, 1982) whereas Marcia looks at it as a dynamic self-structure (Marcia, 1980). On the other hand, Erikson defines identity as "terms that seem inevitably to spin in elliptical orbits around any attempt to conceptualize human beings" (Erikson, 1982, p. 9). The fact is that identity is a powerful construct which guides life paths and decisions (Kroger, 2007). A more theoretical and current explanation is presented by Schwartz.,Luycks., & Vignoles. (2011) who believe that the term "identity" has been employed to refer to numerous concepts which are as diverse as people's internal meaning systems (Marcia, 1966; Schwartz, 2001), characteristics and attachments discussed through group memberships (Brown, 2000; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), nationalism (Schildkraut, 2007), positions taken in conversations (Bamberg, 2006), and social-historical currents in belief systems (Burkitt, 2004). Although these definitions have put their fingers on different ideas, they all highlight the importance of achieving a solid sense of identity as a product which requires a dynamic self-driven process.

Years later and in an attempt to capture the social-cognitive processes underlying identity exploration, Berzonsky (1990) proposed three identity processing styles.Taken from identity studies by Erikson, research on identity has shifted focus to the processes of identity (e.g., identity style) or its content (e.g., goals and values). As the name suggests identity processing styles, in both Marcia's paradigm and Berzon-

sky's model, has been concentrating on the different processes involved in identity construction which mainly center around two main concepts, exploration and commitment. Other variables, such as gender and race, add even greater complexity to the identity formation process. Instances include higher identity exploration among ethnic minority young adults compared to that among white American young adults (Phinney & Alipuria, 1990).

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Corrective feedback

Experts have always discussed when, which, and how errors should be corrected and some have claimed whether learners' errors should be corrected at all. In other words, a big question mark is whether to provide learners with only positive evidence as nativists and rationalists believe or to expose them to negative evidence as well. Eventually Long in 1991 improved the field and provided a rationale for "focus-on-form" (FonF) approach that can promise acquisition of linguistics elements. Focus on form is grounded on a cognitive psychological theory proposed by Schmidt (1990, 1995) which suggests that noticing is necessary for input to become intake. Not only does focus on form provide learners with opportunity to notice linguistic items, but it may also help them to "notice the gap" (Schmidt and Frota, 1986) between models of the target language and their own language production. Focus on form enables learners to take time out from a focus on meaning and notice linguistic items in input, thereby overcoming a potential obstacle of purely meaning-focused lessons in which linguistic forms may go unnoticed (Loewen, 2003).

Ellis (2001) categorized focus on form into planned (i.e., the teacher decides in advance what forms should be focused on), and incidental (i.e., the forms are focused on in the process of communication, peripherally, and then the focus returns to communicative activity again) focus on form. Incidental focus on form episodes are of two kinds; preemptive (PFFEs) and reactive (RFFEs) episodes (Ellis et al. 2001b). According to Ellis, Basturkmen and Loewen (2001a), preemptive focus on form occurs when teacher or learner initiates attention to form "even though no

actual problem in production has arisen". In reactive focus on form, the teacher perceives the learners' utterance as inaccurate or inappropriate and draws their attention to the problematic feature through negative feedback. So, reactive focus on form is known as error correction, corrective feedback, or negative evidence/feedback in different studies (Long, 1996). Negative feedback refers to immediate oral feedback which aims at mistake correction (Lyste & Ranta, 1997). Within this category, several researchers have identified variations. For example, a form of negative feedback is corrective feedback which can be further categorized into recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic cues, clarification requests and repetitions (Lyster, 1998; Diane, 1998; Panova & Lyster, 2006).

It is also possible to put feedbacks in groups based on their functions. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) focus on the "evaluative feedback" used by the teacher in classroom discourse, which usually consists of the acts of accepting, evaluating and commenting. Richards and Lockhart's (1994) classification includes saying that something is correct or incorrect, praising, modifying a students answer, repeating, summarizing and criticizing. Although there are various types of feedback available to help facilitate student learning, the main point lies in the selection of appropriate type based on students' needs and the instructional activities (Konold, Miller & Konold, 2004).

A vital subject that has always been discussed and argued is the quality of feedback given to students. MacDonald (1991, p. 1) illustrates that teachers' feedback "often lacks thought or depth; students often misunderstand their teachers' feedbacks". This argument is maintained by Weeden and Winter (1999) who discovered that most forms of feedback were not understood by primary school students. Sadler (1998) mentions teachers would often provide comments or feedbacks on students' effort rather than concepts and facts. He cited teachers' lack of content knowledge as being a major influential factor. Hatie & Timperly (2007) similarly discovered that providing more (quantity) feedback can be disadvantageous for students' learning.

2.2. Identity

Identity formation is found as a continuing interaction between self-

awareness and contextual variables which is mainly evident in adolescence and might continue to midlife and is considered as one of the most important developmental challenges that adolescents and young adults must cope with (Erikson, 1968).

Erikson's (1963) theory is one of the key sources for identity development studies. Erikson assumed that a person's identity developed over time through many stages (Erikson, 1950). These stages develop one after another (Erikson, 1963). The number of these interrelated stages proposed by Erikson is eight, and they occur through the entire life, from infanthood through old age. But studying identity and its roles takes more than abstract and complex definitions. This idea of identity posed by Erikson paved the way for other psychologists to postulate a more practical view towards identity.

James Marcia broadened Erikson's model. Marcia categorized identity into four statuses: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement. In order to understand these four statuses named above we need to be familiar with two ideas: commitment and exploration. When Marcia first considered identity development, he knew that some commitment to an identity would be of importance. He also realized that many people with a stable identity had completed some exploration before committing to that identity (Marcia, 2007). Marcia believed it was important that a person engage in exploration of different alternative options in a given domain before making a choice, or a commitment, in that domain, and thus achieving an identity.

Rather than increasing the definitions of exploration and commitment to reach a broader, iterative process of identity formation and evaluation Berzonsky (1989) proposed that the cognitive processing style chosen by an individual would impact his or her manner of understanding and making use of identity-relevant information. From this social cognitive perspective, both assimilation and accommodation are employed based on internal style and external pressures, which is reflective of the psychosocial theory of identity development proposed by Erikson (Berzonsky, 1990). The processing orientation, or style, impacts the way an individual deals with or avoids making identity related decisions.

There are three primary identity processing styles suggested by Berzon-

sky (1988, 1990). Those with an information oriented processing style tend to actively seek out information, apply an active problem solving approach through evaluation of identity-relevant material, and attempt to learn new things about themselves (Berzonsky, 1988; Berzonsky & Luyckx, 2008). The normative oriented processing style is considered by a tendency to conform to norms dictated by society and significant others, such as parents (Berzonsky, 1989). The third orientation is the diffuse/avoidant processing style, which is a processing style characterized by a tendency to avoid and procrastinate decision making as long as possible (Berzonsky, 1989).

Psychological factors have also been of interest among researchers of English language teaching and learning. Joan H. Cohen and Edmund J. Amidon in a study (2010) tried to predict teaching style based on history of punishment and reward of the participants. 172 Undergraduate preservice teachers in an introductory core course in education at Temple University served as voluntary participants. The results indicated that disciplinary experiences in their families while growing up were indicative of the verbal interaction patterns or teaching style that they selected for classroom practice. Specifically, there were significant relationships between preservice teachers' perceptions of reward and perceptions of indirect teaching style. Rewarded participants were more likely to select an indirect teaching style than were those who perceived themselves as not rewarded.

Corrective feedback as another side of this study has also been studied from different angles. The most frequent factor that has been studied against corrective feedback is the perception of teachers and students. Horwitz (1988) held that teachers need to know learners' beliefs about language learning in order to help language learners adopt more effective learning strategies. Second, language scholars have explored teachers' and students' perceptions of error correction and found mismatches between them. For instance, Schulz's (1996, 2001) investigation revealed that students' perspectives toward grammar instruction and error correction were more favorable than their teachers' attitudes; that is, language learners would welcome more error correction. Consequently, when their instructional expectations are not satisfied, their

motivation can be negatively influenced, and they may shed doubt on the credibility of the teacher. In a similar vein, Schulz (1996) advanced the argument that "such lack of pedagogical face validity could affect learners' motivation" (p.349). The discrepancies between students' and teachers' expectations can have an undesirable impact on L2 students' satisfaction with the language class and can potentially cause the discontinuation of L2 study. Hence, language teachers need to explore their students' perceptions and expectations to close the gap and maximize the effects of teaching. Ancker's (2000) action research examined teachers' and students' expectations toward error correction by conducting a survey of teachers and students in 15 countries. The survey asked whether teachers should correct every error students make when using English. It was revealed that a huge gap existed between the teachers and the students. For example, when the students and teachers were asked whether teachers should correct every error students make when using English, only 25% of teachers answered "yes" while 76% of students answered "yes". The most frequent reason underlying not wanting correction was the negative effect of correction on learners' confidence and motivation. By contrast, the most frequent reason provided for wanting correction was the importance they attach to correction for learning to speak English correctly. Ancker indicated that to bridge the gap between teachers' and learners' expectations, teachers should set clear objectives in lesson plans, discuss the learning process with students, and employ alternative types of corrective feedback which could be effective and encouraging to language learners.

2.3 Objective of the study

The present study aims to investigate the relationship between teachers' identity processing styles and the frequency of corrective feedback techniques provided in the classroom interactions and the kind of influence the former might exercise on the other. This relationship is of importance since it can help us find more suitable teachers, those who are more willing to provide their students with oral corrective feedback techniques regarding affective and academic aspects.

3. Research Question

Q: Is there any significant relationship between teachers' identity processing style and a tendency to use more oral corrective feedback strategies?

4. Method

Participants and their sampling:
For the purpose of the current study 10 Iranian English teachers teaching intermediate levels at the Navid English institute in Shiraz were chosen through cluster random sampling. Most of the participants were M.A. graduates of English teaching as a second or foreign language. It should be noted that the teachers' mother tongue was Persian. They were all males. They took part in the research and filled out the questionnaires. Based on the results of the questionnaires they were categorized into two groups, one being Informational, Normative, Diffuse-avoidant identity style and the other being Informational, Diffuse-avoidant, Normative identity style. Since six of the participants had higher Normative identity style score two of the participants were omitted randomly to have equal number of participants in both groups. Then one of their intermediate classes were observed four times.

5. Instruments

For the purpose of data collection in this study the Revised Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5) by Berzonsky (with reliability index of 0.89) (Berzonsky, 2013) was used. The questionnaire consisted of 36 items demonstrating three types of identity, Informational Style (9 items). Normative Style (9 items). Diffuse-Avoidant Style (9 items). Items 4 + 8 + 12 + 16 + 20 + 24 + 28 + 32 + 36 are related to Informational, 2 + 6 + 10 + 14 + 18 + 22 + 26 + 30 + 34to Normative, and 3 + 7 + 11 + 15 + 19 + 23 + 27 + 31 + 35 to Diffuse-Avoidant. Likert scale, 1 (not at all like me) to 5 (very much like me), had teachers rate 36 statements to describe their identity status. Due to the fact that the study was carried out according to Berzonsky's framework in which commitment style had

no place, nine items of the commitment style were excluded from the analysis.

5.1. Data collection procedure

Prior to conducting the research project, permission was attained from both Navid English Institute and the teachers who were intended to be observed. The consent allowed the researchers to enter the respective classrooms, observe the teachers teaching in an authentic classroom situation for four sessions and record classroom interactions using an MP3 player. The duration of each session was approximately one hour and forty-five minutes. In the next step these recorded interactions involving 40 sessions were investigated closely and those parts related to oral corrective feedback strategies provided by teachers in reaction to learners' errors were transcribed. In order to have a framework regarding identification of oral corrective feedback strategies, the corrective feedback model in Ellis (2009) was used but during observation it was found out that the model could not account for the variety of observed corrective strategies. Therefore a few strategies were added to the existing oral corrective feedback model (based on Bavali, 2015) (Table 1).

Table 1: Corrective feedback types based on reformulation of Ellis's model (Bavali, 2015)

Corrective Feedback Technique	Definition	Example
1- Recast	The corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes and corrects utterance in some way (e.g., phonological, syntactic, morphological or lexical).	L: I went there two times. T: You've been. You've been there twice as a group?
2- Repetition	The corrector respites the learner utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress, and intonation.	L: I will showed you. T: I will SHOWED you? L: I'll show you.

3- Non-Prompt Clarification Request	The corrector indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said and ask clarification without providing any linguistic clues or a chance of choice.	L: What do you spend with your wife? T: What?
4- Prompt Clarification Request	The corrector indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said and ask clarification with providing any linguistic clues or a chance of choice.	L: I am heavy weight. T: I am heavy weight or overweight?
5- Non-Prompt Elicitation	It's a kind of elicitation technique where the corrector tries to elicit the correct form from target learner or the piers without contributing linguistic clue.	L: I don't feel like to watch T.V. T: Do you agree? (asking the whole class).
6- Prompt Elicitation	The corrector respites part of the learner utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it.	L: I'll come if it will not rain. T: I'll come if it ……?
7- Explicit Correction	The corrector indicates and error has been committed, identifies the error and provides the correction.	L: On May. T: Not on May, In May. We say, "It will start in May."
8- Meta Linguistic Explanation	At times when the corrector's attempts as to making to learner self correct or making the piers provide the correct form fail, he/she might decide to reinstruct the linguistic point or review it in detail, this is the technique of Meta linguistic explanation	L: It is fantasticing . T: Fantastic is an adjective not a verb. You can't change it to a participle adjective. It's not a verb. Participle adjectives come from verbs.
9- Paralinguistic Signal	The corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error.	L: Yesterday I go cinema. T: (gestures with right forefinger over left shoulder to indicate past)
10- Metalinguistic Clue	Relying on the students' shared meta linguistic knowledge' the corrector makes use of meta linguistic terms to make learners think about the erroneous form' recall the rule and probably providing the correct form	L: My mom give me money. T: Third person is something you always forget

5.2. Data analysis

In order to analyze the obtained data, quite a few statistical procedures were utilized. To find any probable relationship between the identity processing styles and oral corrective feedback techniques, descriptive statistics (e.g. mean, standard deviation, maximum and minimum); t-tests, as well as non-parametric tests such as Chi-square and Mann-Whitney Utest were applied.

6. Results and Discussion

As can be seen from Table 2, the mean and standard deviation of the participants' Identity score in Informational were 4.0 and 0.57 respectively, Normative were 2.5 and 0.58 and Diffuse-Avoidant were 2.25 and 0.72.

As the sample size was too small (n=8) to investigate all the possible variants of relationship, it was decided that they be categorized in terms of order of identity scales score. Since all participants were Informational (as their first identity processing style), the secondary identity processing style determined the style of individual preferences. The identity scales level for those men in an Informational, Normative and Diffuse-Avoidant mode was grouped as (1) and that of those in an Informational, Diffuse-Avoidant and Normative mode was grouped as (2).

Table 2: Profile of identity scale

Statistics	Identity characteristics		
	Informational	Normative	Diffuse-avoidant
Mean	4.0030	2.5070	2.2510
Std. Deviation	0.57190	.58224	0.72247
Skewness	-1.402	-0.188	0.792
Kurtosis	3.201	-1.666	1.229
Minimum	2.66	1.66	1.33
Maximum	4.80	3.22	3.77

In terms of distribution between groups (1) and (2), four teachers (50% of participants) were in group (1) and four of them were assigned in group (2) (50%). The results of the participants' identity scales in group (1) are displayed in Table 3.

As can be seen from Table 3, the mean and standard deviation of the participants' Identity score of group (1) in Informational were 4.0 and 0.73 respectively, Normative were 2.66 and 0.58 and Diffuse-avoidant were 1.84 and 0.43. The results of the participant's identity scales in group (2) are displayed in Table 4.

As can be seen from the Table 4, the mean and standard deviation of the participants' Identity score of group (2) in Informational were 3.9 and 0.29 respectively, Normative were 2.27 and 0.57 and Diffuse-Avoidant were 2.85 and 0.66.

Following this, it was decided to assess significant differences between those participants who were in group (1) as opposed to those who were in group (2) in terms of the frequency of the observed corrective feedback types (Recast, Repetition, Non-prompt clarification request, Explicit correction, Prompt elicitation, Non-prompt elicitation, Paralinguistic signal, Meta-linguistic explanation, Prompt clarification request, Meta-linguistic clue).

Table 3: Profile of identity scale in group (1)

Statistics	Identity characteristics		
	Informational	Normative	Diffuse-avoidant
Mean	4.0267	2.6617	1.8483
Std. Deviation	0.73132	0.58060	0.43162
Skewness	-1.569	-1.174	-.418
Kurtosis	3.194	0.888	-1.857
Minimum	2.66	1.66	1.33
Maximum	4.80	3.22	2.33

Table 4: No text of specified style in document..Profile of identity scale in group (2)

statistics	Identity characteristics		
	Informational	**Normative**	**Diffuse-avoidant**
Mean	3.9675	2.2750	2.8550
Std. Deviation	0.29500	0.57928	0.66686
Skewness	-.119	1.524	1.083
Kurtosis	-5.317	2.859	1.201
Minimum	3.66	1.77	2.22
Maximum	4.22	3.11	3.77

To investigate whether there is a significant difference between identity groups (1 vs. 2) in the frequency of the use of corrective feedback techniques, chi-square was run. Results are displayed in Table 5 and 6.

Table 5: Profile of corrective feedback in groups

Groups	Observed N	Expected N	Residual
1.00	323	261.0	62.0
2.00	199	261.0	-62.0
Total	522		

Table 6: Profile of Chi-square of corrective feedback in groups

Statistics	Group
Chi-Square	29.456
Df	1
Asymp. Sig.	0.001

As can be seen from the Table 6, 2 cells (100.0%) have expected frequencies less than 5. The minimum expected cell frequency is 261.0, and thus the null hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between teachers' identity groups (1 vs. 2) in the frequency of total observed corrective feedback techniques ($p < 0.001$). Thus chi-square indicates significant differences in the observed total feedback styles among men who are in group (1) as opposed to those who are in group (2) and teachers with Informational, Normative and Diffuse-avoidant identity had more observed total feedback techniques as opposite to teachers with Informational, Diffuse-avoidant and Normative identity. In other words, it could be implied that on the whole there is a relationship between identity processing style and use of corrective feedback techniques, totally.

7. Discussion

The results show that all of the participants' highest score was Informational style. According to the descriptive statistics, mean score of the identity style subscale reveals that the participants of this study tended to incline more towards the Informational style of identity processing which is possibly due to self-flattery syndrome on their part. As table 4.4 represents, 100% of the participants scored higher on the Informational scale which might be due to effect of self-flattery syndrome in the participants who tried to represent themselves as better decision makers and problem solvers. According to Berzonsky (2011) Individuals with an

Informational identity style are self-disciplined with a clear sense of commitment and direction. They are self-reflective, skeptical, and interested in learning new things about themselves; they intentionally seek out, evaluate, and utilize self-relevant information, and they are willing to accommodate self-views in light of dissonant feedback. This style is associated with cognitive complexity, problem-focused coping, vigilant decision making, open mindedness, personal effectiveness, and an achieved or moratorium identity status. The fact that the Informational style score of all the participants outweighs the score of other styles could also be partly due to the fact that teaching another language requires learning for many years and people who seek to be a professional language teacher are more likely to be interested in learning new things. Language teachers have to be meticulous about errors and mistakes produced by students, so it seems quite reasonable that English teachers are those who have vigilant decision making and problem-focused coping abilities. Since all participants were Informational as their primary scale of identity processing, the second identity processing style determined the style of individual preferences. The identity scales level for those men in an Informational, Normative and Diffuse-Avoidant mode was grouped as (1) and that of those in an Informational, Diffuse-Avoidant and Normative mode was grouped as (2). As a result, it was found that teachers with Informational, Normative and Diffuse-avoidant identity style applied Non-prompt clarification request, Explicit correction, Prompt elicitation, Paralinguistic signal and Meta-linguistic clue more frequently than teachers with Informational, Diffuse-Avoidant and Normative identity style ($P < .05$).

Regarding the first research question, the results showed that teachers with higher Normative score tended to use corrective feedback strategies more often ($P < .001$). This would seem to suggest that identity processing style appeared to be positively associated with the use of oral corrective feedback. This finding is in line with the literature on identity processing inventory in which individuals scoring higher on the Normative style scale have had a limited tolerance for uncertainty and a strong need for structure and closure and possess a strong sense of commitment and purpose (Berzonsky, 2004; Soenens, Duriez, & Goossens, 2005). The

positive association of higher Normative style score and using some oral corrective feedback techniques might be due to traits and strategies that underpin the Normative style. The fact that people with higher Normative score have a strong need for closure seems to play a crucial role in the higher frequency of corrective feedback techniques, in that teachers who have the tendency for closure tend to bring any mistake and error to end and deal with them completely by providing more oral corrective feedback techniques. There are a few other features among people with higher Normative style score which can justify the higher frequency of oral corrective use. People with Normative identity style are conscientious, self-disciplined and possess a strong sense of commitment and purpose, they tend to internalize and adhere to the goals, expectations, and standards of significant others (Berzonsky, 2004; Soenens, Duriez, & Goossens, 2005). Providing insightful oral corrective feedback strategies after learners' errors and mistakes seems to be one of the most crucial expectations of language institutes from their teachers. Therefore it could be inferred that there is a positive relationship between Normative style and use of oral corrective feedback. According to (Berzonsky, 2004; Soenens, Duriez, & Goossens, 2005) people with higher Normative style score tend to adhere to expectations of significant ones. On the other side of the continuum, participants with higher Diffuse-Avoidant style used no oral corrective feedback more frequently than the other group. This finding is also in line with the literature on identity processing inventory in which individuals with higher Diffuse-Avoidant score procrastinate and try to avoid dealing with identity conflicts and decisions as long as possible (Berzonsky, 2011; Berzonsky & Ferrari, 2009).

The main conclusion that can be drawn from this studyon the relationship between types of oral corrective feedback and identity processing style is that a relationship exists between styles of identity processing and a tendency to use more oral corrective feedback techniques

8. Conclusion

According to the results of the present study it is concluded that a relationship exists between styles of identity processing style and a tendency to use more oral corrective feedback techniques. As mentioned

in the literature, people with Normative style are conscientious, self-disciplined and possess a strong sense of commitment and purpose, they tend to internalize and adhere to the goals, expectations, and standards of significant others or referent groups in a relatively more automatic manner. These individuals have a rather low tolerance of ambiguity and a high need to maintain structure and cognitive closure (Berzonsky, 1990). Based on the findings teachers with higher Normative scores appear to be more likely to use oral corrective feedback techniques.

9. Pedagogical Implications

The results of this study can be used by EFL educational systems and institutions to identify the identity processing styles and their effect on quantity and quality of oral corrective feedback techniques implemented by teachers in Iranian EFL context. This will in turn lead to identifying teachers who might be more willing to apply various oral corrective feedback techniques in their classes. Such information can help all educational institutions dealing with teaching and learning English as a second or foreign language to have insights into the probable performance of their teachers regarding corrective feedback techniques. Knowing the identity processing style of teachers, language institutions can plan more precise and personalized programs and workshops to enhance their instructors' knowledge about their own identity traits and to enable them make use of more effective corrective feedback techniques in their classes.

References

Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum, 38*(4), 20-24.

Bamberg, M. (2006). Stories, big or small: Why do we care? *Narrative Inquiry, 16,* 139-147.

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated belief about incidental focus on form andtheir classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics, 25,* 243-272.

Bavali, M. (in press). *Towards a working framework for L2 class corrective feedbacks.*

Berzonsky, M. (1988). Self-theorists, identity status, and social cognition. *In D.K. Lapsley & F.C. Power (Eds.), Self, Ego, and Identity: Integrative Approaches(pp. 243-262).* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Berzonsky, M. D. (1989). Identity style: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 4,* 267-281.

Berzonsky, M. D. (1990). Self-construction over the life span: A process perspective on identity formation. In Neimeyer, G. J. and Neimeyer, R. A. (Eds.), *Advances in Personal Construct Psychology (Vol. 1, pp. 156-186).* Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Berzonsky, M. D. (2004). Identity processing style, self-construction, and personal epistemic assumptions: a social-cognitive perspective. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 1,* 303-315.

Berzonsky, M. & Luyckx, K. (2008). Identity styles, self-reflective cognition, and identity processes: A study of adaptive and maladaptive dimensions of self-analysis. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 8,* 205-219.

Boud, D. (2002). Sustainable assessment: Rethinking assessment for the learning society. *Studies in ContinuingEducation, 22*(2), 7.

Brown, R. (2000). Social identity theory: Past achievements, current problems, and future Challenges. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30,* 745-778.

Burkitt, I. (2004). The time and space of everyday life. *Cultural Studies, 18*(2-3), 211-227.

Chickering, A. W. , & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity.* 2^{nd}*Ed.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Diane, J. T. (1998). The Bridge: From research to practice: Research on error correction and implications for classroom teaching. *ACIE Newsletter, 1*(3), 12-14.

Ellis, R. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning, 51,* 1-46.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *English Language Teaching Journal, 63,* 97-107.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal, 1,* 3-18.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001a). Preemptive focus on form in the ESL classroom. *TESOLQuarterly, 35*(3), 407-432.

Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001b). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning, 51,* 281-318.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society.* New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and Society.* ($2^{nd}ed.$) [Revised and Enlarged]. New York: W.W. Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1982). *The life cycle completed: a review.* New York: Norton.

Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching.* London: Longman.

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

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal, 72,* 283-294.

Josselson, R. (1987). Identity diffusion: A long term follow Up. *Adolescent Psychiatry,* Vol. XIV. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Konold, K. E., Miller, S. P., & Konold, K. B. (2004). Using teacher feedback to engance student learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 36*(6), 64-69.

Kroger, J. (2007). *Identity development: Adolescence through adulthood* ($2^{nd}Ed.$). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lewis, M. (2002). *Giving Feedback in Language Classes.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Center.

Loewen, S. (2003). Variation in the frequency and characteristics of incidental focus on form. *Language Teaching Research, 7,* 315-345.

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & B. K. Bahtia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 413-468).* New York: Academic Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20,* 51-81.

Lyster, R., & L. Ranta. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19,* 37-66.

MacDonald, R. (1991). Developmental students processing of teacher feedback in composition nstruction. *Review of Research in Developmental Education, 8*(5), 1-4.

Marcia, J. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3,* 551-558.

Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology, (pp. 159-187).* New York: Wiley.

Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake. *TESOL Quarterly, 36*(4), 573-595.

Phinney, J. S., & Alipuria, L. L. (1990). Ethnic identity in college students from four ethnic groups. *Journal of Adolescence, 13,* 171-183.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge: CambridgeUniversity Press.

Schildkraut, D. J. (2007). Defining American identity in the twenty-first century: How much? there? is there? *The Journal of Politics, 69,* 597-615.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning (pp. 1-63).* Honolulu: University of Hawai?i Press.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a secondlanguage: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese.In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn:Conversation in second language acquisition,* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(3), 343-364.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85,* 244-258.

Schwartz, S. J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. Identity:*An International Journal of Theory and Research, 1,* 7-58.

Schwartz, S. J., Luycks K., & Vignoles, V. (2011). *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research.* New York: Springer Publishing.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse: the english used by teachers and pupils.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Soenens, B., Berzonsky, M. D., Vansteenkiste, M., Beyers, W., & Goossens, L. (2005). Identity styles and causality orientations: In search of the motivational underpinnings of the identity exploration process. *European Journal of Personality, 19,* 427-442.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.),*The psychology of intergroup behavior.* (pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching. Cambridge:* CUP.

Weeden, P., & Winter, J. (1999). *The learn project: Learners' expectations of assessment for learning nationally.* (Online) Retrieve 6 April 2010 from http://www.qca.org.uk/ca/5-14/afl/learners.pdf.