Research Paper

Journal of Language and Translation
Volume 13, Number 1, 2023, (pp.71-83)

Corrective Feedback and the Speaking Ability of Introvert and Extrovert Iranian EFL Learners

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

[1] Ph.D. Candidate in TEFL, Department of English, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

[2*] Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

[3] Assistant Professor of TEFL, Department of English, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran

Received: November 24, 2021 Accepted: January 03, 2022

Abstract

Corrective feedback has recently drawn plenty of interest in applied linguistics. It is used to provide learners of a foreign language with comments on the correctness of their linguistic output. This study investigated the probable effectiveness of full/partial recast, metalinguistic, elicitation, and clarification request corrective feedback on intermediate introvert/extrovert Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability. The participants included 120 English as Foreign Language (EFL) learners who had completed IELTS preparation classes. They were selected through convenience sampling and split into two groups which were specified by two raters having a checklist of IELTS speaking band descriptors. For this research, the experimental group participants received corrective feedback, while the control group participants received no comments. The researcher administered the posttest. The findings revealed a significant difference between the speaking ability of the experimental and control groups in the posttest. The results indicated no difference between the speaking ability of introverted and extroverted learners.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Extrovert, Introvert, Speaking

INTRODUCTION

Mackey (2006) declared that corrective feedback has intended to alert students to errors in their utterances. According to Ellis (2017), Hattie and Timperley (2007), Li (2018), Saadah, Nurkamto, and Suparno (2018), and Shaqaqi and Soleimani (2019), corrective feedback can be one of the most remarkable impacts on student language learning in general and speaking ability in particular (Chen & Liu, 2021). The efficiency of corrective feedback has been demonstrated in several investigations, which have been compiled in multiple review studies (Shute, 2008). According to Hattie and Yates (2007), feedback assists students to decrease the gap between what is evident currently and what could or should be the case; they called it the "empathy gap". The question of how teachers correct pupils has piqued the interest of both researchers and instructors (Elis, 2009). In this era in which teachers allow students to have mistakes, knowing about a functional model of corrective feedback and its effect on a particular area of language learning seems to be necessary; as a result, numerous researchers worked on the impact of corrective feedback on language (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Chandler, 2003; Mitchener, 2005; Miceli, 2006; Sheen, 2010; Ra-

*Corresponding Author's Email:
d.mashhadiheydar@toniau.ac.ir

himi & Dastjerdi, 2011; Fahim and Montazeri, 2013). However, despite the inevitability of corrective feedback provision, the issue of how to treat such errors has remained a controversial point. Some believe that if errors are not identified nor corrected by teachers, they become fossilized in learners; on the other hand, some claim that too much (negative) corrective feedback may decrease learners' level of effort (Zarei & Rahnama, 2013). What makes the matter more complicated is that even those who believe in the necessity of corrective feedback have not reached a consensus on how to correct errors, and this is why the debate about whether and how to provide corrective feedback on stoond and fforeign-languagelearners' errors is long-standing (Baker, 2009).

For almost all people, speaking a language is synonymous with understanding it, as the most fundamental communication model is speech. Human communication is impossible without speech; therefore, speaking skills are highly significant for language learners, be it English or any other language. Nonetheless, as Baily and Savage (1994) noted, communicating in a foreign/ second language is sometimes the most difficult of the four language abilities. It is considered the most demanding skill among the four skills because it requires a complicated meaning creation procedure (Celce-Murcia & Olshtain, 2000). Celce-Murica (2001) states that speaking is a completed skill and should be taught everywhere, and it is a skill that will lead to better learning in groups. The positive effect of different types of corrective feedback on EFL learners' speaking skills is among research findings reported in the extant literature (Chen & Liu, 2021; Muhsin, 2016). Moreover, there has been an increasing understanding and sensitivity in recent decades regarding the need of teachers learning more about learners' personality characteristics, which are clarified as "the relatively enduring style of thinking, feeling, and acting that characterizes an individual" (Costa, McCrae & Kay as cited in Navidnia, 2009, pp. 80-81). This knowledge is, indeed, attributable in part – if not entirely – to the influence of clinical psychology on school psychology in recent years, highlighting the unique personality traits of pupils (Na, Lin-Yao, & Ji-Wei, 2008) in a never-ending effort to keep all students happy (Senel, 2006).

In L2 research, extroversion/introversion is a personality characteristic that has gotten much attention (Dornyei, 2005). The extroverted personality is marked by friendliness, vitality, and hyperactivity, whereas the introverted personality is marked by dismissiveness and solitariness (Eysenck & Barrett, 1985). Moreover, an extrovert is identified as an individual whose "conscious interaction is more often directed towards other people and events than towards the person themselves". In contrast, an introvert is known as a person "who tends to avoid social contact with others and is often preoccupied with his/her feelings, thoughts, and experience" (Richards & Schmidt, 2010, p. 195). Despite the reality that personality types have been considered crucial variables in the success of the language acquisition process, there has not been much focus on it. There is a significant argument among researchers. Some researchers believe that introverts are better learners (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000; Sidek, 2012), while others have suggested evidence favouring extrovert learners (Gan, 2011).

In a related study by Rahmati (2014), extrovert and introvert EFL learners' attitudes were compared with a focus on errors and their preferences for the necessity, time, and correction techniques along with their preferences for the types of errors correction in speaking. They preferred all their errors corrected, but delayed correction was the most preferable, with postponed and immediate correction following it. Moreover, clarification requests were the most preferable correction techniques, with recasts, and repetition techniques coming next, respectively. They also believed that teacher correction is the most preferable, with self-correction following it closely, and peer correction was given the least preference. In their views, errors of word choice and pronunciation should be given the highest attention, while grammatical errors should not be regarded in speaking. In another related study by Rezvani and Sadeghi (2016),

the connection between foreign language anxiety and extroversion/ introversion personality types was investigated. Also, the way they conceptualized their fear of negative evaluation as a component of foreign language anxiety construct was investigated. Using Eysenck Personality Questionnaire, 50 students were chosen as introverts and extroverts. To measure their level of anxiety, Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale was applied. Findings indicated that extroverts were significantly less anxious than introverts, and they had fear of negative evaluation from both teachers and classmates. Error correction and incongruence between student's expectations and teacher's expectation regarding language performance were among the aspects of fear of negative evaluation. In a more recent study, Marashi and Naddim (2018) analyzed the impact of information gap and opinion gap tasks on introvert and extrovert EFL students' speaking skill. 138 intermediate students were selected and responded to the Eysenck questionnaire which categorized them into introverts and extroverts. Then, four subgroups were established as introverts/extroverts undergoing the opinion gap task instruction, and introverts/extroverts experiencing the information gap task treatment. Results revealed that while extrovert students benefited more from opinion gap tasks, introverts outperformed extroverts as a result of information gap tasks. Moreover, the results supported the notion of using appropriate tasks for different personalities.

Through reviewing the existing literature, the researcher found that in general, the volume of research on the different types of corrective feedback and speaking ability of learners in EFL contexts is not rich, at least in the context of Iran. In this research paucity, no study was found on the effectiveness of five types of corrective feedback on introvert and extrovert EFL learners. With a view to this gap and taking the above arguments into account, this study aimed at investigating the impact of the mentioned types of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners, taking the introversion and extroversion dichotomy into account. To achieve this aim, the following research questions were formulated:

1. What is the effect of complete recast corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?
2. What is the effect of partial recast corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?
3. What is the effect of metalinguistic corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?
4. What is the effect of corrective elicitation feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?
5. What is the effect of clarification request corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?
6. Is there any considerable difference between an introvert and extrovert intermediate Iranian EFL learners in terms of each type of corrective feedback on speaking ability?

METHODS

The study's target population included all intermediate male and female EFL learners of Iran Language Institute in Babol, a northern city of Iran. In the first step, permission was received from the students of the mentioned language institute and all were willing to participate in the present study. Regarding Dörnyei's (2007) definition, sample is a group of participants whom the researcher tests to determine the result of any particular research. Convenience sampling method was applied to select the participants of intermediate students of the language institute. Convenience sampling is a type of nonprobability sampling in which individuals are sampled simply because they are "convenient" sources of data for researchers. In fact, they were selected based on convenience sampling which means the selection of the participant that are easiest to access in given conditions. 176 learners of

the language institute participated in the study through convenience sampling from the population. Then, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was administered as a proficiency test to check the homogeneity of the participants in terms of their speaking skill. OPT is known as a standardized, reliable and valid test. The test was run at the beginning of the course and 56 students were excluded to increase the homogeneity of the sample. As a result, 120 participants from equally distributed linguistic backgrounds were recruited as the study sample. The rationale behind the selection of those students was that they had already experienced making errors and being corrected, and more importantly they were familiar with these concepts. That is, the researcher selected 120 students who received an acceptable grade in OPT to make sure their language proficiency was all at the same level and were homogenous. Their scores were ranged between 28 and 47. This continuum of scores confirmed that they were intermediate learners, even though it was a homogenous group. Their age ranged from 17 to 25 years old and all were native Persian speakers.

In the initial data collection procedure, the researcher talked to the institute manager to obtain consent and negotiate with an experienced IELTS teacher with almost ten years of teaching IELTS preparation classes. He was also a PhD holder in TEFL. Also, to meet the ethical codes, the researcher thought that the data collection procedure had to be done with the teacher's cooperation.

In the second step, the researcher administered an OPT for appointing homogenized students, and those who obtained the score of 28-47 were appointed and were taken into account as an intermediate learner. Afterwards, the participants were randomly put into two groups (i.e., experimental and control groups). It is worth noting that the teacher who instructed both groups was the same. Furthermore, all participants were informed that the tasks and exams were for research only and that the study's findings would not bear their grades.

In the third stage, all the participants were given IELTS speaking sample test as a pretest, and their speech was thoroughly recorded by their teacher for future analysis. In the next session, an Eysenck Personality Questionnaire was administered to identify and differentiate the introvert and extrovert language learners. The introversion/ extroversion questionnaire was consisted of 25 Yes/No questions. Considering specified procedures designed, the students' personality types were determined and divided into two groups as introverts and extroverts.

Reliability test is one of the technical characteristics to indicate that instruments used under the same conditions produce the same results. It should be noted that the researchers used Cronbach's alpha test to check the reliability of the questionnaire. The value of Cronbach's alpha test reported as 0.75 which is acceptable. Moreover, the validity of the instrument was checked by the researchers. That is to say, the suitability of the questionnaire was investigated and the questions were checked carefully after consulting the past studies. During all the instructional sessions (n=5), commonly-used topics of the IELTS speaking module were given as materials to both groups. The open-ended questions which were included in the IELTS speaking test were given to the participants. The questions gave the language learners more leeway to talk about their opinions. Over the treatment sessions, both the introvert and extrovert students in the experimental group received full/partial recast, metalinguistic, elicitation, and clarification request corrective feedbacks on their speaking. It is worthy to note that timing of the treatment (Talking about the mentioned questions) was same for all the students. More importantly, the frequency of receiving the correction for both types were carefully recorded by the teacher, and the results have been almost the same. That is to say, both types of the students received various kinds of feedback equally. To be more specific, a clarification request was used as a corrective feedback strategy. The teacher pretended to be perplexed to indicate to the learner that the teacher had misunderstood his or her utterance or that the utterance was problematic to some extent necessitating a repetition or reformulation. The teacher res-

tated the correct form of the speaker's incorrect sentence by full recast feedback. The following lines present an example of full recasts.

S: There would have been many problems in this regard.

T: Yes, there would have been many problems in this regard.

However, through a partial recast, the teacher did not correct the student explicitly and by repeating the incorrect word, he provided an ambiguity in the speaker's mind to reconsider the incorrect form.

By using metalinguistic feedback, the teacher either gave comments or extra information or asked the student some related questions on correcting his utterance. For example, after a student produced a grammatically incorrect utterance, the teacher mentioned to him to consider subject-verb agreement. However, he seriously avoided providing the correct form explicitly.

It is worthy of notice that only the experimental group participants received various kinds of feedback. The control group participants were instructed according to the regular classroom practices; that is, they didn't have the chance of getting engaged in dialogic interactions, hence discovering the troublesome areas of their speaking performance by receiving various types of feedback. However, they conducted similar speaking tasks and received the traditional routine of the teacher managing the speaking part of the class (commonly including students' error correction, echoing their speech, nodding, and choosing the next speaker). At the beginning of each session, some students presented a lecture around a specific topic relevant to IELTS. Then, they reproduced a short story. The teacher dedicated the following section to topic cards and the discussions of the IELTS speaking test. Responses to the items listed on the cards were required of the pupils. The instructor delivered them the aforementioned corrective feedbacks that were repeated for the subsequent treatment sessions. Ultimately, the previous IELTS speaking topics were administered as a posttest. Data analysis was conducted at descriptive and inferential levels, using descriptive statistics, Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) and two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

RESULTS

Investigating the First Research Question

Descriptive statistics and ANCOVA were run to answer the first research question, *what is the effect of complete recast corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?* The results can be seen in tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Full Recast Feedback and Speaking Ability

Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Full Recast Feedback	35.9000	7.90003	20
Control Group	25.7500	7.16626	20
Total	30.8250	9.04657	40

As indicated in Table 1, compared to the control group, the real difference in mean scores between complete recast corrective feedback and total recast corrective feedback is relatively considerable.

As Table 1 highlights, the mean score of the full recast feedback (M=35.9, SD=7.9) was remarkably different from the mean score of the control group (M=25.75, SD=7.16).

Table 2

Between-Subjects Effects of Full Recast Feedback

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2616.020[a]	2	1308.010	84.057	.000	.820
Intercept	27.994	1	27.994	1.799	.188	.046
Covariates	1585.795	1	1585.795	101.909	.000	.734
Groups	684.947	1	684.947	44.017	.000	.543
Error	575.755	37	15.561			
Total	41199.000	40				
Corrected Total	3191.775	39				

a. R Squared = .820 (Adjusted R Squared = .810)

Table 2 reveals a substantial difference in full recast feedback compared to the control group. Because the p-value (Sig) is smaller than.05, the full recast feedback group significantly performed better than the control group on the speaking ability test.

Investigating the Second Research Question

To answer the second research question, *what is the effect of partial recast corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability*? descriptive statistics and ANCOVA were implemented, leading to the results shown in tables 3 and 4.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Partial Recast Corrective and Speaking Ability

Groups (Immediate Post-Test)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Partial Recast Corrective	37.3500	6.15822	20
Control Group	25.7500	7.16626	20
Total	31.5500	8.83162	40

As revealed by Table 3, the actual difference in the mean scores between partial recast corrective comparing the control group is quite large.

That is, the mean score for the partial recast corrective feedback (M=37.35, SD=6.15) was remarkably different from that of the other group (M=25.75, SD=7.16).

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Partial Recast Corrective and Speaking Ability

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2716.226[a]	2	1358.113	154.296	.000	.893
Intercept	110.160	1	110.160	12.515	.001	.253
Covariates	1370.626	1	1370.626	155.718	.000	.808
Groups	473.114	1	473.114	53.751	.000	.592
Error	325.674	37	8.802			
Total	42858.000	40				
Corrected Total	3041.900	39				

a. R Squared = .893 (Adjusted R Squared = .887)

Table 4 reveals a significant difference in partial recast correction compared with the control group. Because the p-value is less than.05, the partial recast correction group significantly outperformed the control group on the speaking ability exam.

Investigating the Third Research Question

The results of descriptive statistics and ANOVA run to answer the third research question, *what is the effect of metalinguistic corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability?* are shown in tables 5 and 6.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback and Speaking Ability

Groups (Immediate Post-Test)	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback	39.3000	5.42023	20
Control Group	25.7500	7.16626	20
Total	32.5250	9.29568	40

Table 5 shows that compared to the control group, the actual difference in mean scores between metalinguistic corrective feedback and that of the control group is relatively considerable. As Table 5 indicates, the mean score of metalinguistic corrective feedback (M=39.3, SD=5.42) was considerably different from that of the control group (M=25.75, SD=7.16).

Table 6

Between-Subjects Effects of Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2855.966[a]	2	1427.983	102.791	.000	.847
Intercept	317.739	1	317.739	22.872	.000	.382
Covariates	1019.941	1	1019.941	73.418	.000	.665
Groups1	1313.261	1	1313.261	94.533	.000	.719
Error	514.009	37	13.892			
Total	45685.000	40				
Corrected Total	3369.975	39				

a. R Squared = .847 (Adjusted R Squared = .839)

Based on Table 6, there is a substantial difference in metalinguistic corrective feedback compared to the control group. Because the p-value (Sig) is less than.05, the metalinguistic corrective feedback group significantly performed better than the control group on the speaking ability test.

Investigating the Fourth Research Question

To find an answer to the fourth research question, *what is the effect of corrective elicitation feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability*, the results of descriptive statistics and ANCOVA was obtained, which are indicated in tables 7 and 8.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics of Elicitation Corrective Feedback and Speaking Ability

Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Elicitation Corrective Feedback	40.4000	3.58946	20
Control Group	25.7500	7.16626	20
Total	33.0750	9.29126	40

According to Table 7, compared to the control group, the difference in mean scores between corrective elicitation feedback and the control group is relatively considerable.

The mean score for the corrective elicitation feedback (M=40.4, SD=3.58) was remarkable different from that of the control group (M=25.75, SD=7.16).

Table 8
Between-Subjects Effects of Elicitation Corrective Feedback

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2955.225[a]	2	1477.612	132.843	.000	.878
Intercept	485.978	1	485.978	43.691	.000	.541
Covariates	809.000	1	809.000	72.732	.000	.663
Groups1	1624.172	1	1624.172	146.019	.000	.798
Error	411.550	37	11.123			
Total	47125.000	40				
Corrected Total	3366.775	39				

a. R Squared = .878 (Adjusted R Squared = .871)

Table 8 indicates a significant difference in partial recast correction compared with the control group. Elicitation corrective feedback outperformed the control group on speaking ability test results because the sig value is.00, which is less than.05.

Investigating the Fifth Research Question

Answering the fifth research question "*What is the effect of clarification request corrective feedback on intermediate Iranian EFL learners' speaking ability*?*"* required running another descriptive statistic and ANCOVA, whose results are shown in tables 9 and 10

Table 9
Descriptive Statistics of Clarification Request Corrective Feedback and Speaking Ability

Groups	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Clarification RequestFeedback	45.0500	3.67746	20
Control Group	25.7500	7.16626	20
Total	35.4000	11.27466	40

As demonstrated in Table 9, the actual difference in mean scores between clarification requests corrective feedback and the control group is relatively considerable. As Table 9 reveals, the mean score for the clarification request corrective feedback (M=45.05, SD=3.67) was remarkably different from that of the control group (M=25.75, SD=7.16).

Table 10
Tests of Between-Subjects Effects of Clarification Request Corrective Feedback

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	4298.382[a]	2	2149.191	120.628	.000	.867
Intercept	886.383	1	886.383	49.750	.000	.573
Covariates	573.482	1	573.482	32.188	.000	.465
Groups1	3074.677	1	3074.677	172.573	.000	.823
Error	659.218	37	17.817			
Total	55084.000	40				
Corrected Total	4957.600	39				

a. R Squared = .867 (Adjusted R Squared = .860)

Table 10 reveals a substantial difference in clarification recast correction feedback compared with the control group. Because the sig value is less than.05, the clarification requests corrective feedback group significantly outperformed the control group on the speaking ability exam.

Investigating the Sixth Research Question

Regarding the 6th question, descriptive statistics and a two-way ANOVA Test were run to examine the impact of corrective feedback and personality types on EFL students' speaking ability. Tables 11 and 12 show the results.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics

Corrective Feedback	Type	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Full Recast	Introvert	35.3000	7.42443	10
	Extrovert	36.5000	8.70823	10
	Total	35.9000	7.90003	20
Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback	Introvert	38.9000	4.58136	10
	Extrovert	39.7000	6.37791	10
	Total	39.3000	5.42023	20
Partial Recast Corrective	Introvert	36.5000	6.36396	10
	Extrovert	38.2000	6.16081	10
	Total	37.3500	6.15822	20
Elicitation Corrective Feedback	Introvert	40.1000	3.34830	10
	Extrovert	40.7000	3.97352	10
	Total	40.4000	3.58946	20
Clarification Request Corrective Feedback	Introvert	43.2000	3.85285	10
	Extrovert	46.9000	2.46982	10
	Total	45.0500	3.67746	20
Total	Introvert	38.8000	5.83795	50
	Extrovert	40.4000	6.72492	50
	Total	39.6000	6.31656	100

Table 12

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1078.800[a]	9	119.867	3.757	.000	.273
Intercept	156816.000	1	156816.000	4.916E3	.000	.982
Corrective Feedback	983.700	4	245.925	7.709	.000	.255
Personality Type	64.000	1	64.000	2.006	.160	.022
Corrective Feedback* Personality Type	31.100	4	7.775	.244	.913	.011
Error	2871.200	90	31.902			
Total	160766.000	100				
Corrected Total	3950.000	99				

a. R Squared = .273 (Adjusted R Squared = .200)

Table 12 informs us whether our independent variables (corrective feedback and personality type) and their interaction ("corrective feedback "*" personality type" row) have a statistically remarkable effect on the dependent variable, "speaking ability". It is vital, to begin with the interaction because it will impact how we perceive our outcomes. At the p =.913 level, the "Sig." column indicates no statistically remarkable interaction. Furthermore, as highlighted in the table above, there was a remarkable difference in the type of feedback (p =.00), but no statistically considerable difference between introverted and extroverted intermediate EFL learners (p=.16).

CONCLUSION

The results showed that different types of corrective feedback, including complete recast, partial recast, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and clarification request, significantly affected EFL learners' speaking ability. Moreover, it was found that different types of feedbacks did not impact introvert and extrovert learners differently.

Although corrective feedback has not been so far probed concerning extroversion and introversion dichotomy, the findings are consistent with the previous studies, including Desouky (2016), Li (2018), Nabei and Swain (2002), Rodrguez and Perdomo (2002), Saadah, Nurkamto, and Suparno (2018), and Shaqaqi and Soleimani, (2019) which proved the significant effect of corrective feedback types on oral production of learners in EFL contexts. As an argument that can justify the findings, it can be stated that corrective feedback supports metacognitive thinking among EFL learners (Desouky, 2016). Another justification is that corrective feedback may increase learners' motivation to learn the language (Kamalaian & Sayadian, 2014) and this may lead to a higher level of speaking ability among them. Furthermore, the argument according to which corrective feedback can facilitate the active process of retrieving knowledge to apply it to a novel circumstance and help students reach higher order thinking skills (Bishop & Verleger, 2013) can be referred to in justifying the findings.

From the researcher's viewpoint, another justifying point is that corrective feedback enhances collaboration, communication, and information sharing among EFL learners. Moreover, the researcher believes that corrective feedback can improve learners' self-regulation skills and this in turn, contributes to higher speaking ability among them. Furthermore, the researcher believes that another possible justification for the positive effect of corrective feedback practice on learners' speaking performance is that corrective feedback may increase learners' autonomy, which in turn leads to their significant improvement in English speaking. Radia's (2019) argument that corrective feedback may help students monitor their progress can also justify the findings of this study.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that English teachers can see improvements in students' speaking ability by applying different types of corrective feedback as an essential dimension of EFL learning. The other conclusion taken from the results is that since the effectiveness of corrective feedback has been proved in this study, teachers can encourage students so that they do not have negative perceptions of corrective feedback as a belittling strategy. In other words, since attitudes and perceptions are essential in learners' language performance, keeping positive perceptions towards corrective feedback can be helpful.

The study results can inform EFL teachers about the potential of different forms of corrective feedback in enhancing EFL learners' speaking ability and the need to use them in speaking classes. In addition, since students usually do not hold positive perceptions of corrective feedback, EFL teachers should use them in speaking classes to become motivated concerning its use. Moreover, taking the findings into account, another implication is that curriculum planners design future curricula in speaking courses so that the use of corrective feedback is more encouraged.

References

Baily, K. M. & L. Savage, eds. (1994). *New ways in teaching speaking*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than to receive: The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*(1), 30-43.

Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). *The flipped classroom: A survey of the research*. Paper presented at the 120th ASEE Annual & Exposition, Atlanta, USA.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 267–296.

Chen, W., & Liu, G. (2021). Effectiveness of corrective feedback: Teachers' perspectives. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research 9*(1), 23-42.

Desouky, A. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching, 9*(8), 106-121.

Dewaele, J.-M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28*(2), 355–365. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00106-3.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp.206–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 3-18). New York & London: Routledge.

Fahim, M., & Montazeri, M. (2013). The impact of 'metalinguistic' corrective feedback on EFL learners' levels of lexical resource and grammatical range and accuracy in their Oral proficiency. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 4*(7), 1776-1782.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161–184.

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

Kamalian, A., & Sayadian, S. (2014). The role of short text messaging in Iranian EFL vocabulary learning and motivation. *Science, 2*(4), 101-107.

Li, N., Wang, L., & Yao, J. (2008). Relations network in the interactive ESL class: Analysis of individuals, groups, and a whole classroom network. *The Asian EFL Journal,10*(3), 78-108.

Li, S. (2018). Corrective feedback in L2 speech production. In J. I. Liontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (pp. 1-9). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning, 54*, 153-188.

Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of ns-nns and nns-nns adult and child dyads. *Language Learning, 53*, 35-66.

Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 405–430.

Marashi, H., & Naddim, R. (2018). Using Information Gap and Opinion Gap Tasks to Improve Introvert and Extrovert Learners' Speaking. *Applied Research on English Language, 8* (2), pp. 187-206.

Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(1), 395-404.

Muhsin, M.A. (2016). The effectiveness of positive feedback in teaching speaking skill. *Lingua Cultura, 10*(1), 25-30.

Nabei, T., & Swain, M. (2002). Learner awareness of recasts in classroom interaction: A case study of an adult EFL student's second language learning. *Language Awareness, 11*(3), 43- 63.

Navidinia, H. (2009). Psychological characteristics of English language teachers: on the relationship among big five personality traits and teachers' efficacy beliefs. *Journal of English Language Studies, 1*(1), 79-99.

Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*, 417-528.

Radia, B. (2019). Approaching a reading course via Moodle-based blended learning: EFL learners' insights. *MJLTM, 9*(11), 700-721.

Rahimi, A., & VahidDastjerdi, H. (2011). Impact of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' oral production: CAF. *Mediterranean Center of Social and Educational Research,3*(1),45-54.

Rahmati, T. (2014). Extrovert and Introvert Learners' Attitudes and Preferences for Error Correction in Speaking. *Asian Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, 4* (9), pp. 268-286.

Rezvani, A., & Sadeghi, B. (2016). A Comparative Investigation into Speaking Anxiety of Extroverted and Introverted Iranian EFL Learners. *Journal of Teaching English Language Studies, 5* (2), pp. 7-23.

Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics (4th)*. London: Longman.

Rodríguez, M., & Perdomo, B. (2002). *Effects of implicit and explicit negative feedback on EFL students' oral performance*. Paper presented at the annual TESOL convention, VenTESOL, Nueva Esparta, Venezuela.

Saadah, L., Nurkamto, J., and Suparno, S. (2018). Oral corrective feedback: Exploring the relationship between teacher's strategy and students' willingness to communicate. *Studies in English Language and Education, 5*(2), 240-252.

Shaqaqi, M., & Soleimani, H. (2019). Effects of asynchronous and conventional paper-and-pen metalinguistic feedback on L2 learners' use of verb tense. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies 5*(3), 55-72.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effects of corrective feedback, language aptitude, and learner attitudes on the acquisition of English articles. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition* (pp. 301-322). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sidek, H. (2012). EFL textbook analysis. *Language and Literacy 14*(3), 27-45.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Varnosfadrani, A.D., & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *System, 37*(4), 82-98.

Zarei, A.A., & Rahnama, M. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback modes on EFL learners' grammatical and lexical writing accuracy: From perceptions to facts. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 1*(3), 1-14.

Biodata

Ms. Atousa Ebrahimi is a Ph.D. candidate in English Language Teaching at Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, Iran. She has been involved in Teaching English Language at Iran Language Institute, Babol Branch from 1375 to 1395; and teaching English Literature and Language at Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr Branch, since 1379. She has presented and published some papers in international conferences and journals. Her main areas of interest include Language Teaching, Teaching Literature and methods of teaching Literature.

Email: a.ebrahimi@qaemiau.ac.ir

Dr. Davood Mashhadi Heidar is an assistant professor of English Language Teaching at Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, Iran. He teaches ELT, Teaching Language Methodology, Language Assess-

ment, Critical Pedagogy Second Language acquisition and Socio-linguistics, and his main areas of interest are teacher education, Critical Pedagogy and cultural and social aspects of language. He has published some books and papers in international and national academic journals and seminars in language learning and teaching.
Email: d.mashhadiheydar@toniau.ac.ir

Dr. Mohammad Reza Khodareza is an assistant professor of English Language Teaching at Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon Branch, Iran. He teaches Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Applied Linguistics, Pragmatics, Language Testing and EFL Learners' Language Proficiency. His main area of interest is Language Testing and Applied Linguistics. He has published some books and papers in international and national seminars in language teaching and Testing.
Email: m.khodareza@toniau.ac.ir