



Impact of Class Discussion Feedback on the Quality of Extrovert and Introvert Language Learners' Written performance

Sahar Farrahi Avval¹, Hassan Asadollahfam^{2*}, Bahram Behin³

¹ Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Bonab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran

^{2*} Assistant Professor, English Department, Bonab Branch, Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran

³ Associate Professor, English Department, Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran

Received: October 15, 2022

Accepted: February 21, 2023

Abstract

The present study was intended to investigate whether Iranian EFL learners with different personality types could benefit from corrective feedback (CF) or not. 317 EFL learners from 4 Institutes in Tabriz took the TOEFL test; 271 participants scored between 477 and 510; the scores of 164 of them fell between $\pm 1SD$; 34 of them agreed to participate in the study and were asked to deliver a 200-word composition. Their compositions were analyzed based on CAF (complexity, accuracy, and fluency). Afterward, they were asked to answer questions relating to the Extroversion-Introversion dimension to investigate their level of introversion. Then the participants were provided with different types of CF through 10 class discussion sessions. After passing this period, they were asked to deliver another 200-word composition. This final composition was analyzed based on CAF again. The result showed that the text quality of the introverted language learners did not differ significantly from the text quality of the extroverted language learners.

Keywords: Iranian EFL learners, personality types, CF, class discussion

INTRODUCTION

According to Han (2021), "Corrective feedback has consistently ranked among the most resilient topics in second language acquisition (SLA) research over its five decades of existence, garnering attention transcending theoretical boundaries (and research and practice divide, for that matter) (p. 23). CF is a type of information given to the L2 learner on what is not sanctioned in the target language (TL) – is part of the environmental stimulation, a form of negative reinforcement, and it allegedly helps the learner realign his or her behavior with the grammatical norms of the TL (Han, 2021). Apart from the different types and effects that CF can have on developing the language learners' macro-skills, learning requires

the participation of both learner external linguistic influence and learner-internal formation of habit, as well as CF, needs both external (e.g., the teacher's) and internal (e.g., the learner's) efforts (Han, 2021).

CF can be provided in different modes i. e. through class discussion or on writing projects delivered by language learners but the question here is whether all individuals take advantage from CF provided to them equally and beneficially. That is to say, do individuals with different personality types benefit similarly from CF provided?

In numerous studies carried out in the field of second language teaching and learning, the experts have greatly focused on the different personality types which would have any effects on second language learning achievement; research such as Blair (2022); Chen et

*Corresponding Author's Email:
asadollahfam@bonabiau.ac.ir

al. (2022); Ito (2022); Asmali (2014); Oz (2014); Sadeghi et al. (2012); Nikpour & Farsani (2010) and Sharp (2008). In all of these studies, the importance and impact of personality traits on second language learning achievement have been explored and proven.

Theoretical Framework of the Study

One of the widely-discussed subjects in the literature on L2 learning and L2 acquisition, according to Banaruee et al. (2017), is CF. In his work, Harmer (1983) reasoned that the instructor should not meddle in the L2 learners' communication when they make mistakes. This perspective is held up by experts such as Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis (2004). Although these experts support the idea of correcting mistakes made by L2 learners, there are masters rejecting this idea, those who believe that correcting the mistakes in a composition cannot lead to grammatical accuracy improvement while this interference can stop L2 learners from making the same mistakes in subsequent drafts (Truscott, 2007).

The following research question was, therefore, addressed:

***RQ:** Does class discussion feedback have a different impact on extrovert and introvert language learners' written performance?*

LITERATURE REVIEW

CF in Second Language Teaching and Learning
Brandt (2008), as cited by Seyedebrahimi et al. (2022), explained that feedback is the information given to learners dealing with some aspects of what they perform on a task. He continued to say that this information can be provided to language learners by teachers and instructors. He also declares that there should be a balance in the feedback provided to the language learners.

In earlier studies, it was asked whether CF provision would be influential on L2 learning or not (Day et al. 1984, and Chun et al. 1982). In accordance with the aforementioned question, the effectiveness of CF provision on language elements has been investigated in the work of Ruegg (2017&2018) and Banaruee & Askari (2016). They confirmed that provided

CF could be beneficial for improvement in the macro-skills development. As Sinha & Nassaji (2021) reveals, the relevance of error correction in foreign or second language learning is a controversial issue and simultaneously not a new phenomenon, but in recent years empirical studies have been carried out and found inconclusive results.

Another crucial factor affecting the type of feedback provided to the language learner, according to Esmaeeli and Sadeghi (2020), is the language learner's proficiency level. In other words, teachers should consider the type of feedback they give to the learner based on their level of mastery of the second language (Wei & Cao, 2020). Furthermore, Abalkheel and Brandenburg (2020) revealed in one of their studies that feedback provided by the teacher could affect the writing task done by the language learners beneficially. Again, Esmaeeli and Sadeghi (2020) confirm that error correction could enhance the grammatical accuracy of the learners' L2 writing performance. Although there are some scholars such as Eslami and Derakhshan (2020) support feedback provision by instructors, there are other experts who believe that feedback provision can suppress learners' emotions and stop them from continuing communication (Truscott, 1996).

It was first proved in 1994 (Aljaafreh & Lantolf) that CF had a leading role in second language learning. After that Hyland (2006), research highlighted the important role of CF provision in improving skills such as speaking and writing.

Different Types of Feedback

As cited by Lyster et al. Lyster and Ranta (1997) pinpoints six types of FB which are categorized into two major kinds, namely prompts and reformulations (2013). They define prompts as signals pushing L2 learners towards self-correction. By signals, we mean elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification request, and repetition. On the other hand, reformulations refer to recast and elicitation which gives learners "target reformulations of their non-target output" (p. 3).

Ellis & Sheen (2006) classify FB into implicit and explicit ones. The reason for this kind of classification is the correction direction made by the instructor. They call FB as an explicit correction when the correct form of learner's production is given to them by the instructor while the implicit correction is withholding the correct form like what happens in metalinguistic clues and elicitation.

Yilmaz (2016) has a similar classification of FB which focuses on the FB exposure condition. In his opinion, the learner's exposure to CB defines the feedback condition which is divided into direct or indirect. In the former, FB is given on the wrong utterance, and in the latter, FB is given on the incorrect production for other learners to listen not for the learner who makes that mistake.

Different taxonomies and classifications of CF have been presented so far. Rezaei (2011) contends that there are five corrective strategies other than recasts (i.e., explicit correction, clarification requests, metalinguistic infor-

mation, elicitation, and repetition). According to Zhao & Ellis (2020), CF strategies are distinguished into implicit and explicit types. Table 1 groups them according to Lyster and Saito (2010). Ellis (2006), like several other studies, compared the correlative effect of implicit and explicit correction such as metalinguistic clues and recasts. But, as stated by Lyster and Ranta (1997), there seems to be a problem with this comparison because each CF type can differ regarding their implicitness/explicitness. They determined three elicitation strategies:

1. elicitation completion (see example in Table 1),
2. a question (e.g. How do we say A in Italian?), and
3. asking students to reformulate their utterances (e.g. Can you say that again?).

1 and 2 clearly attract the language learner's attention to the wrong form and thus are explicit but 3 is more obscure. The most ambiguous strategy is recast.

Table 1
Explicit and implicit corrective strategies

Dimension	Corrective Strategies
Explicit	Direct correction; e.g. No, not 'goed' Explicit correction, e.g. Went not goed Elicitation; e.g. 'the man---?' Metalinguistic clue ; e.g. 'You need the correct past tense form' Metalinguistic explanation; e. g. 'Go is an irregular verb so you can't say 'goed'; you need irregular verb form 'went'
Implicit	Recast; e. g. S1: The man goed home. S2: The man went home Confirmation Check; e. g. S1: The man goed S2: The man went home? Clarification request; e. g. S1: The man goed home. . S2: Sorry? Repetition; e. g. S1: The man goed home. S2: The man goed home?

Recast is explained by Long (2007, p. 77) as a "reformulation of all or part of a learner's immediately preceding utterance in which one or more non-target-like items are replaced by the corresponding target language form(s), and where throughout the exchange, the focus of the interlocutors is on meaning, not language as an object". According to Long (2007), recast is incidental and implicit. Correspondingly, Lyster and Ranta (1997) regarded recasts as "implicit provision" (p. 46).

Metalinguistic clues, as Wiboolyasarini (2021) explains, is a brief explanation with or without examples given to the learner. According to Li & Vuno, this kind of FB was first deemed as indirect FB, but later other experts labeled them as both metalinguistic and indirect (2019). A study (Montazeri and Salimi, 2019) revealed that metalinguistic FB was positively effective on the learners' enthusiasm for speaking.

As Nateghian & Mohammadnia state, Repetition is when the error is repeated to the language

learner with an emphatic intonation and stress to attract the learner's attention to the error. Clarification request, as Nateghian & Mohammadnia (2022) explain, is when the learners are asked to change their utterance structure because the meaning is not communicated. Spada and Frohlich (1995) believe that when a message is not understood by the teacher, the teacher asks questions like "Excuse me? What did you mean by...?" Or "I did not get the message, would repeat that?" to ask the learners to give more information about their utterance or correct the erroneous utterance (p. 25). Elicitation, according to Nateghian & Mohammadnia (2022), forces the L2 learner to correct their erroneous utterance by the teacher's pausing. Lyster & Ranta (1997) define elicitation as the teacher's pause to elicit the correct form from the student. the teacher pauses for the students to fill in the blank.

Explicit correction or explicit FB is provided to the L2 learner when they produce an ill-formed structure (Samaee et al., 2021). Varnosfadrani & Basturkmen (2009), showed that L2 learners performed better in their post-test than in the pretest after receiving explicit FB. As stated by Lyster & Ranta (1997), explicit correction happens when the instructor explicitly provides the correct form after the student has given the wrong production.

Personality Traits in Second Language Teaching and Learning

According to Boroujeni et al. (2015), people's traits influence their life and anything they do in their life like learning or acquisition. This is the individual differences that create this diversity. Even in 2000, Ferguson showed that although the behavior style is relatively fixed over time in a person, people are different in their personality types. Again, Funder (2007, p. 5) contends that "an individual's characteristic patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior, together with the psychological mechanisms, hidden or not, behind those patterns". Mayer (2007, p. 14) defines this condition as "the organized, developing system within the individual that represents the collective action of that individual's major psychological subsystems". As one of the main macro-skills,

speaking is assumed to be effective in L2 learning (Cumming, 2006). According to him (2007, p. 473), speaking is a "uniquely personal form of individual expression". Therefore, the assumption that personality traits affect people's behavior can lead to the differences learners shows in studying and learning a language.

The relationship between personality type and optimal benefits from CF is a matter that has not been properly sought in the literature of the field. 16 participants were labeled as extroverts and 18 were labeled as introverts. These 34 participants were excluded from 164 EFL learners who took a TOEFL test and scored as intermediate ones.

According to Nateghian & Mohammadnia (2022), "Personality traits and particularly extraversion have received only sporadic attention in studies of corrective feedback preferences" (p. 158).

As reported by Cheraghi Shehi & Khezrab (2020), despite the influence of several factors on language learning improvement, personality factors should not be ignored as affecting elements of language learning also. Montero et al. believe that individual differences can be effective on the decrease or increase in the level of L2 learning (2014). Zafar & Meenakshi (2012) claim that language learners take their affective states to class with them, states which affect L2 achievement. They also contend that for L2 learning, just cognitive ability would not be sufficient. In addition, according to Dornyei (2005), since the arrival of psychology, this science has been trying to shed light on the picture of the mind and understanding individual differences and the relationship between these differences and learning. As Deutsch assumes, individual differences can affect human decisions thus teaching and learning, presumed to be human's decisions, cannot be untouched by these factors (2006).

As a behaviorist, Eysenck (2004), states that individual differences which are mostly inherited have an iconic role in personality. As confirmed by Ahour & Haradasht (2014), these differences can result in several kinds of feelings, intellect, and performance. Plus, character comprises personal adaptation for

living and feeling models (Cervone & Pervin, 2010). And finally, educational experts have discovered that each person learns diversely because of their personality type which determines how well that person learns something (Chen & Hung, 2012).

Introversion/ Extroversion, according to Sakano (1990), both exist in an individual. In other words, all people can have both traits to some extent in them but in a different ratio, and these qualities are not fixed. It is believed that a typical extrovert is more sociable, has many friends, and needs to talk with people while introverts are assumed to be morindoor-sor and not be interested in communicating with other people (Chen et al., 2012). Naiman et al. (1978) and Griffiths (1991) state that extroversion and introversion are major elements affecting success and failure in language learning. It is generally held that extroversion is advantageous to foreign/second language learning, while introversion is disadvantageous to foreign/second language learning (Skehan, 1989, p.101).

As Skehan (1989) shows, learning English is influenced by factors such as intelligence, language aptitude, motivation, age, and the personalities of learners. In this study, he focused on personality traits such as extroversion and introversion and investigated their effects on language learning; these aspects of personality were thought to be effective in improving communicative language ability in Japanese learners. Pornsakulvanich et al. (2012) and Pashler et al. (2008) showed that classroom tasks like writing are thought to be as solitary endeavors while tasks such as speaking are not. In their opinion, extroverts could perform better at academic levels and these learners engage in activities involving communication such as speaking and class discussions more than introverts. On the contrary, Wafiqoh (2019) and Sharp (2008) mentioned that the inner world of thought would motivate L2 learners and directs their attention inward and gets the energy from thoughts and memories. Introverted L2 learners need time and space to pull themselves together and try to grasp the world and things around them before they are ready to speak. Sadeghi et al.

(2012) and Sharp (2008) believe that introverted L2 learners understand and learn through thoughtful reflection. Their focus is on inside ideas and impressions. According to them, considering class activities, these learners prefer reading and writing which do not involve communication with others. They would rather be working independently because they depend on time for internal information processing. These learners cannot solve problems by listening to teachers who talk and teach fast because, as it was mentioned earlier, they need time to process new information. They do not feel safe when participating in class discussions and working in groups and delay speaking. Although they fall short in class discussions, they perform better than extroverts in writing, reading, and listening tasks and they avoid being forced to talk and discuss. (Molinuevo & Torrubia, 2013).

In 1979, Milton & Cranney carried out research to investigate the relationship between learning styles and personality traits. They examined introversion/extroversion in reading comprehension tasks. They witnessed a meaningful relationship between learning style and introversion. The relationship between reading comprehension among Iranian EFL learners and extroversion/introversion was investigated by Pazhuhesh et al. (2014). She found that introverted learners outperformed their extroverted counterparts. In a similar study, Badran (2001) as cited by Ahmadi et al. (2015), the researcher tried to see whether there was a relationship between extroversion/introversion and correct pronunciation or not. The results showed that extrovert learners were better at pronunciation than introvert learners.

Alibakhshi (2011) did a study to investigate the effect of personality and gender on teaching performance preferences and efficacy. This research involved 280 male and female Iranian EFL teachers. The instruments applied in this study were MBTI, the Teaching Activity Preference questionnaire, and Teaching Efficacy. No significant personality and gender effects were found in teachers' teaching efficacy but a meaningful effect was revealed for gender and personality of teachers on teaching activities preference.

Carrell (1995) and other researchers examined the influence of personality types on L2 learners' writing and studied their role in writing among raters and writers. They discovered that writers' personality types influenced their received ratings on the essays and raters' personality types influenced the process of their rating. Callahan (2000) carried out research to examine the relationship between teacher FB and student reflective writing. He used MBTI to identify the writers' types. Finally, he showed that writers went beyond their interests and appreciated the readers' comments on their writing. Layeghi (2011) examined the relationship between EFL learners' performance and their personality types by focusing on extroversion/introversion aspects. She discovered that introverted learners performed better than extroverted ones. In 2015, Salameh & Khaled revealed no significant difference between extrovert and introvert writing performance.

METHOD

Design of the Study

This study explored a quasi-experimental design to check the effect of personality types on benefiting from CF provided which would be improving the writing quality of Iranian EFL learners. For this matter, the introvert and extrovert participants were given 6 types of CF during 10 sessions of class discussion, each session lasted for 60 minutes.

Participants

Thirty-four intermediate (male and female) EFL learners comprised the candidates for this study. They were learners of 4 English language schools in Tabriz, Iran, and had been studying English for at least 5 years. Their age ranged from 16 to 22. They were selected from among a larger group to which a TOEFL test had been administered. Those who scored between 477 and 510 were included in the study.

Instruments

The tool or instruments used in this study were, first, a TOEFL to screen the participants. Second, the NEO-FFI to find out the introvert-

ed and extroverted participants, third, a pre-test writing task of 200 words. After implementing the treatments, the fourth instrument; namely, another writing task of 200 words was implemented as the post-test.

Data Collection Procedure

According to the researcher's investigations, from 4 English language institutes in Tabriz, 317 intermediate students took part in TOEFL tests. 271 of them got a score that fell between $\pm 1SD$. 34 of them agreed to be included in the rest of the study. These participants were asked to produce a 200-word composition on a given subject. Their written productions were analyzed based on complexity, accuracy, and fluency (CAF) criteria which are depicted in Table 2. Afterward, they were administered the NEO-FFI test (See Appendix) to be divided into two groups of introverted and extroverted participants. 16 participants were labeled as extroverts and 18 were labeled as introverts. The introverts formed one experimental group and the extroverts formed another experimental group. Both groups went under 10 one-hour sessions of class discussions through which they received 6 types of CF. After passing this treatment period, the participants were asked to deliver another 200-word composition on the same topic in the pre-test phase. The renderings of both pre-test and post-test were analyzed based on CAF criteria which come from Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998, p. 119) which is depicted in Table 2. To measure the grammatical complexity, the number of dependent clauses per clause was calculated, to measure accuracy, the number of error-free units per T-units was calculated and to measure fluency, the number of words per T-unit was calculated.

Data Analysis Procedure

Regarding Table 2, the participants' compositions were analyzed for measuring grammatical complexity, accuracy, and fluency.

Table 2
CAF Measures Used in the Current Study

Construct	Measure	Code
Grammatical complexity	Dependent clauses per clause	DC/C
Accuracy	Error-free T-units per T-units	Error-free
Fluency	Words per T-unit	W/T

RESULTS

The results of the pre-test and post-test are illustrated in the following Table 3 below:

Table 3
The mean and standard deviation of the variables points in the introvert and extrovert groups in pre-test and post-test

Groups	Measures	Grammatical complexity		Accuracy		Fluency	
		Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Introvert	Mean	0/22	0/3	0/23	0/3	5/51	6/42
	SD	0/01	0/04	0/02	0/03	0/24	0/27
Extrovert	Mean	0/23	0/28	0/22	0/01	5/34	6/45
	SD	0/01	0/02	0/02	0/01	0/25	0/34

DISCUSSION

In the present undertaking, the researcher tried to conduct an experimental study considering the effects different personality types would have on benefiting from CF which was provided in-class discussion sessions in an Iranian context. The results of the study showed that the two personality traits, namely introversion, and extroversion had no significant effect on the introverted and extroverted participants gaining from CF provided. Consequently, the quality of their writing projects in the pre-test was not meaningfully different from the quality of their writing in the post-test. Several reasons for this event can be assumed.

A look at the results reported in Table 3 reveals a few significant findings summarized. An improvement in the CAF of the two groups is reported while comparing the pre-test and post-test of the introverted group shows no significant difference. Similarly, there is no meaningful difference between the

pre-test and post-test of the extroverted group. Boroujeni et al. (2015) showed that although there was an assumption that extroverts could express themselves quite better in speaking skills, in writing, they were not as successful as introverts.

There can be a few arguments for these findings. First, based on the literature, the effect of providing CF on improving the quality of writing is undeniable, that is to say, the observed difference in the pre-test and post-test of the two groups was not far from believed assumptions. However, the related literature contends that personality traits would affect L2 achievement and improvement. Nonetheless, in the present study, it was not reported that introverted and extroverted language learners benefit differently from the CF provided to them through class discussion sections. In other words, the writing quality of introverted and extroverted language learners could not be affected by the way CF is given.

CONCLUSION

Correcting the written production of language learners is undoubtedly an important role of a teacher and a significant part of any writing process as well. However, how and when this correction could happen has been under exploration in the last few years and has attracted much attention from practitioners in the field of L2 teaching and learning. But whether language learners with different personality types benefit from this correction similarly or not has recently gained a great deal of attention i. e. as well as focus on the effect of personality types on L2 achievement and development, in the present undertaking, the focus has been shifted to the difference the personality types would create on profiting from CF delivered to language learners.

In a few ways, there would be some limitations to carrying out such research. It is wished that these obstacles would be removed in future undertakings. One of the constraints of this study was that the participants were mostly employed and busy doing their job, thus holding class discussion sessions when would be available to all participants was quite problematic. Another limitation was that the participants had to undergo a few evaluations such as a TOEFL test, the NEO-FFI for personality evaluation, a pre-test, a post-test, and finally 10-class sessions as treatment. Managing the time for these activities was quite problematic.

However, besides all the difficulties, a few things attracted the attention of the participants doing this research. For example, nearly all participants were eager to know whether they were introverts or extroverts. As a result, they enthusiastically took the NEO-FFI test. Another thing that made them participate in this study was that they wanted to know their proficiency level in English, so they took the TOEFL test. But the most important of all was that the participants could take part in a 10-session class discussion without any charge and this alone was enough to encourage them to cooperate with the researcher. At last, the researcher is grateful for the participant's help in this research.

References

- Abalkheel, A., & Brandenburg, T. (2020). Effects of written corrective feedback: A synthesis of 10 quasi-experimental studies. *English Language Teaching*, 13(7), 97–103.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n7p97>
- Ahmadi, A., Gowhary, H., Jamalinesari, A. & Azizifar, A. (2015). Investigating The Iranian EFL Teachers' Pronunciation Of Neutral And Non-Neutral Affixes in Derivative Words Based On Their Gender And Teaching Experience. *Procedia*, 192. pp. 748-757.
- Alibakhshi, G. (2011). On The Impacts Of Gender And Personality Types On Iranian Efl Teachers' Teaching Efficacy And Teaching Activities Preferences. *IRANIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS (IJAL)*, 1.
- Aljaafreh, A. and J. P. Lantolf (1994). "Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development." *The Modern Language Journal* 78(4): 465-483.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/328585>
- Arnold, J. & H. D. Brown. (1999). A map of the terrain. In J. Arnold (ed.) *Affect in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-24.
- Banaruee, H. et al. (2017). Corrective Feedback and Personality Type: A Case Study of Iranian L2 Learners. *Global Journal of Educational Studies*., 3(2).
- Banaruee, H. and A. Askari (2016). *Typology of corrective feedback and error analysis*, Sana Gostar Publications Isfahan.
- Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated belief about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 243-272.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.243>
- Boroujeni, A., Roohani, A. & Hasanimanesh, A. (2015). The Impact of Extroversion and Introversion Personality Types on EFL Learners' Writing Ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(1), pp. 212-218.

- Callahan, S. (2000). Responding to the invisible student. *Elsevier*, 7(1), pp. 57-77.
- Carrell, P. (1995). The effect of writers' personalities and raters' personalities on the holistic evaluation of writing. *Elsevier*, 2(2). pp. 153-190. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1075-2935\(95\)90011-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/1075-2935(95)90011-X).
- Chen, Y., Jiang, Y. & Mu, Z. (2015). A Survey Study: The Correlation between Introversion/Extroversion and Oral English Learning Outcome. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(3), pp. 581-587.
- Chen, M. (2012). Personality Type, Perceptual Style Preferences, and Strategies for Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(9), 1501-1510
- Cheraghi Shehni, M. & Khezrab, T. (2020). Review of Literature on Learners' Personality in Language Learning: Focusing on Extrovert and Introvert Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*.10(11), pp. 1478-1483.
- Chun, A. E., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., & Luppescu, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and correction: A study of native- nonnative conversations. *Tesol Quarterly*, 16(4), 537-547.
- Cumming, A. (2006). Teaching writing: Orienting activities to students' goals. In E. Uso-Juan & A. Martinez-Flor (Eds.), *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four Language Skills*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, 383-400.
- Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N. A., Chun, A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1984). Corrective feedback in native- nonnative discourse. *Language learning*, 34(2), 19-45.
- Dewaele, J. M. & A. Furnham. (1999). Extraversion: the unloved variable in applied linguistic research. *Language Learning* 49: 509-544.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Modelling learning difficulty and second language proficiency: The differential contributions of implicit and explicit knowledge. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 431-463.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Eslami, Z. R., & Derakhshan, A. (2020). Promoting advantageous ways of corrective feedback in EFL/ESL classroom. (Special Issue: In Honor of Andrew Cohen's Contributions to L2 Teaching and Learning Research). *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 19, 48-65.
- Esmaeeli M., & Sadeghi, K. (2020). The effect of direct versus indirect focused written corrective feedback on developing EFL learners' written and oral skills. *Language Related Research*, 11(5), 89-124. <https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.11.5.124>
- Funder, D. C. (2007). *The personality puzzle*. NY: Norton
- Griffiths, R. (1991). *Personality and Second-Language Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. In: Sadtono, Eugenius, Ed. *Language Acquisition and the Second/Foreign Language Classroom*. Anthology Series 28; see FL 021 883.
- Hyland, F. (2006). "Focusing on the form: Student engagement with teacher feedback." *System* 31(2): 217- 230. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00021-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6)
- Harmer, J. (1983). *The practice of English language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Kiany, G. Reza. (1998). English proficiency and academic achievement in relation to extroversion: A preliminary study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8: 113-130.
- Kubota, M. (2003). Factors affecting Japanese proficiency levels in native English speakers. *ASAA E-journal of Asian Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 5 [OL]. [Http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/languages/asaa_ejournal](http://www.arts.unsw.edu.au/languages/asaa_ejournal).
- Layeghi, F. (2011). Form and Content in the Argumentative Writing of Extroverted and Introverted Iranian EFL Learners. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 7(3). pp.166-183.

- Li, Sh. & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System* (84).
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265–302.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- Milton, R., & Cranney, A. G. (1976). Personality correlates of college reading and study skills. *Journal of Reading Behavior* 8.3, 335–336.
- Molinuevo, B. & Torrubia, R. (2013). Does personality predict medical students' attitudes to learning communication skills? *IJME*, 3(4).
<https://dx.doi.org/10.5116/ijme.51f4.f2de>.
- Moradi, A., Banitalebi, A. & Pazhuhesh, S. (2014). Predicting Computer Attitude Based on Psychological Hardiness, Self-Efficacy and Achievement Motivation. *Information and Communication Tech*
- Naiman, N., M., Frohlich, H.H. Stern, & A. Todesco. (1978). *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Nateghian, N. & Mohammadnia, Zh. (2022). Customized Oral Corrective Feedback: Learners' Preferences and Personality Traits. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 14(29). 10.22034/ELT.2022.49503.2471.
- Pornsakulvanich, V., Dumrongsiri, N. & Sajampun, P. (2012). An Analysis of Personality Traits and Learning Styles as Predictors of Academic Performance. *ABAC Journal*, 32(30).
- Rezaei, Saeed. (2011). *Corrective Feedback in Task-based Grammar Instruction: A Case of Recast vs. Metalinguistic Feedback*. MA. Thesis.
- Ruegg, R. (2017). Learner revision practices and perceptions of peer and teacher feedback. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 9(2). 214
- Ruegg, R. (2018). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on changes in EFL students' writing self-efficacy. *The Language Learning Journal*, 46(2), 87–102.
- Sadeghi, N., Zalina Mohd, K. Bee Hoon, T, & Faiz Sathi, A. (2012). Learning Styles, Personality Types and Reading Comprehension Performance. *English Language Teaching*, 5(4). pp. 116-123.
- Samaee, L., Rassaei, E. & Bavali, M. (2021). Exploring Language Learners' Perceptions of Explicit Corrections and Scaffolded Corrective Feedback in the Use of Articles in Oral Production. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 11(3). pp. 91-108.
- Sharp, A. (2008). Personality and Second Language Learning. *CCSE*, 4(11).
- Seyedebrahimi, S, Rahimi Esfahani, F & Sepehri, M. (2022). Impact of Metalinguistic vs. Clarification Request Feedback on the Speaking Anxiety of Iranian Students in IELTS Preparatory Classes. *Journal of Language and Translation*. 12(2).
https://tlt.stb.iau.ir/article_690692_04a825cd0da0c6ba43d301f192d2e1fc.pdf.
- Salameh, M. & Khaled K, O. (2015). Let Them Toil to Learn: Implicit Feedback, Selfcorrection and Performance in EFL Writing. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*; London, 5(8).
- Sinha, Sh. S. & Nassaji, S. (2021). ESL learners' perception and its relationship with the efficacy of written corrective feedback. *Wiley*. 1(16). DOI: 10.1111/ijal.12378.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning*. New York: Edward.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 205–224.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 255-272.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003>
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes.

- Language Learning, 46(2), 327–369.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14671770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Varnosfadrani, A. & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 82-98.
- Wafiqoh, H. (2019). Learning strategies based on students' personality in speaking ability at the eighth grade on MTsN 1 Karanganyar (Undergraduate degree Thesis). Retrieved February 9, 2022, from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/296480697.pdf>. (15.32.2.1.031).
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (2020). Written corrective feedback strategies employed by university English lecturers: A teacher cognition perspective. *SAGE Open*, 1(12). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020934886>.
- Wiboolyasarini, W. (2021). Written Corrective Feedback Beliefs and Practices in Thai as a Foreign Language Context: A Perspective from Experienced Teachers. *Language Related Research*. 12 (3). 81-119.
<https://doi.org/10.29252/LRR.12.3.4>
- Yilmaz, Y. (2016). The role of exposure condition in the effectiveness of explicit correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 38, 65–96
- Zhao, Y. & Ellis. R. (2020). The relative effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on the acquisition of 3rd person -s by Chinese university students: A classroom-based study. *Language Teaching Research*. 1(21). <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1362168820903343>.

Biodata

Sahar Farrahi Avval is a Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran. Her areas of interest include teaching methodology, teacher education, and teaching speaking skill.

Email: saharfa2000@gmail.com

Dr. Hassan Asadollahfam is an assistant professor of TEFL at Islamic Azad University, Bonab, Iran. His main research interests include language assessment, language test development, item analysis, and teaching methodology.

Email: asadollahfam@bonabiau.ac.ir

Dr. Bahram Behin is an associate professor at Shahid Madani University, Tabriz, Iran. His main areas of research interest include academic discourse.

Email: bahram.behin@gmail.com