

ERROR CORRECTION IN THE SPEAKING CLASS: TEACHERS' AND LEARNERS' PSYCHOLOGICAL ATTITUDES TOWARDS SOURCES OF CORRECTION

by Ali Akbar Farahani
and Soory Salajegheh

There has been a shift away from strict teacher-oriented methods of correction to self-correction and peer correction in foreign language teaching (FLT) in the past decades, as also reflected in the increased attention to learner centered curricula. The present study compares the foreign language learners' and teachers' perceptions of sources of spoken error correction including teacher correction, peer correction, and self-correction. 429 learners and 31 teachers in a tertiary institution participated in the study. Learners' and teachers' attitudes towards the sources of correction were evaluated by applying Fukuda's (2004) preferences for error correction questionnaire. The statistical analyses showed that there were significant differences between teachers' and learners' preferences for providers of corrective feedback. On the whole, peer correction was welcomed more than the other types by the learners. Overall, our study highlights the potential pedagogical benefits of learner-centered methods of correction based on theories in the field.

1. Introduction

In foreign language learning environments, the development of oral skills among foreign language learners can be a challenging task. In the classroom, learners can have distinct speaking skills since the degree of exposure and communication in the target language can vary from extensive to scant interaction. Learners can also vary in terms of their different learning purposes and needs that can be highly influential with regard to their willingness to take part in oral activities. More-

over, speaking is a skill that consists of showing one's capabilities in the classroom, and stress has been found to be more connected with speaking, as compared to other skills (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). Specially, the correction of speaking problems can place extra anxiety on learners' motivation to participate in discussions.

The role of corrective feedback in second/foreign language acquisition has been proved to be beneficial (Kim, 2004; Tatawy, 2006). In recent years, the issue that is mostly emphasized is how to concentrate on the individual differences and English language proficiency levels of the learners when providing them with corrective feedback on their linguistic errors. According to the socio-cultural theory of the Russian psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1978), learning best occurs in social interaction. He contends that this kind of learning leads to development. In this perspective, the best type of feedback to the learners' errors is the one provided through social interaction. Through this kind of interaction, the learner is not provided with explicit or implicit corrective feedback, but with step-by-step and contingent feedback negotiation through which the learner moves from the most implicit to the most explicit corrective feedback; that is, the learner receives the corrective feedback based on his/her zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978; Aljaffreh & Lantolf, 1994; Nassajli & Swain, 2010). According to Vygotsky, the ZPD represents the distance between what the learner is able to do independently and what s/he will be able to do with the help of more capable others; in other words, the distance between the learner's actual and potential ability levels. In this process of feedback negotiation, the learner is not provided with a correct response, but s/he is located in a problem-solving process in which s/he moves from other-regulation to self-regulation (Aljaffreh & Lantolf, 1994). Moving through this continuum makes the learner more confident, and the corrections are internalized in his/her linguistic repertoire, resulting in cognitive development. Thus, corrective feedback (CF) is more effective when integrated with interaction, as based on the theories of Vygotsky (1978) and others, such as Long (1983) and Schmidt (1990).

2. Sources of feedback

There are different approaches to error correction with the goal of encouraging learners to take part more actively in classroom speaking activities. Feedback can be helpful only if it reaches its determined audience. Here, the source of the feedback is directly relevant, since feedback is best addressed to individuals when they can make sense of the response. Brookhart (2008) also suggested practicing and assigning feedback to students in groups in order to save time and involve all the students. In this way, the teacher can ensure if the students have mastered the problematic structure or still need further practice. A good choice for audience involvement is the use of a group approach to solve the students' problems if a majority suffers from the same problem. An inappropriate choice is for the teacher to use group work to solve a problem that only a few students have serious difficulty with. In fact, teachers can be creative by adopting different strategies when correcting the learners' errors in the classroom. In conclusion, Brookhart argued that these strategies should be taken into serious consideration when the teacher wants to provide a response that results in long term recall and retention on the part of the students. These strategies equip the teacher with a tool box from which they can choose the right tool for a specific student or learning target.

Peer correction has also been introduced as a response to the problematic situation of learners' participation in classroom oral activities. Peer correction is a process wherein a group of individuals evaluate their peers; the students can be either involved in the development of assessment criteria or not (Falchikov, 1995). It is often used to promote student-centered learning, to increase insight into the learning process, to encourage active learning, to save the teacher correction time, and to support students in dealing with often very individual weaknesses (Dlaska & Krekeler, 2008). Dochy, Segers, and Sluijsmans (1999) emphasized the idea of using correction as a learning device in a way that allows one to switch from a teacher-centered classroom to a

learner-centered classroom. In this context, teachers not only monitor learning, but also improve it. This is especially relevant in the context of language learning in Iran, where most teachers hold the floor in the classroom; they not only do the job of teaching the language, but also correct learners' errors – a circumstance which may lead to learner anxiety and distress. Examining the alternatives of correction such as peer correction can be a necessary information source for language educators. It would be ideal if the findings of all the empirical studies on the effectiveness of peer correction were consistent; however, they have produced varying results, which have made educators and teachers skeptical about peer correction in the evaluation of second language ability (Matsuno, 2009; Patri, 2002; Ross, 2006). Ahangari (2014) compared the effects of self-correction, peer-correction, and teacher correction on Iranian EFL learners' pronunciation improvement in oral communications. Statistical analysis of 45 learners indicated that the self-correction group outperformed the other groups, with the peer-correction group achieving a higher score on the post-test compared to the teacher correction group.

Another type of self-reflective activity, self-correction, is commonly used by learners to rate their own performance according to clearly identified activity requirements and correction principles that are sometimes extracted from the learners' input. It is thought that self-correction instills in the learner the beliefs of self-efficacy and success and gives them a chance to take more active roles in the classroom (Rana & Perveen, 2013). Self-correction is conducive to learner independence and motivation, since transferring some of the learning responsibilities from the teacher to the learner enhances learner motivation (e.g., Noels, Pelletier, Clément & Vallerand, 2000). Self-correction can be seen as a means by which such transfer can occur in the area of feedback, since it presents a chance for learners to practice self-regulation. In this process of feedback negotiation, the learner is not provided with the solution, but s/he learns to move from other-regulation to self-regulation (Aljaffreh & Lantolf, 1994). Moving through the continuum makes the learner

more confident; also, the corrections are being internalized in his/her linguistic repertoire, resulting in cognitive development.

The success and efficiency of each type of error correction (EC) depend on different factors such as the domain of correction, the learners' individual characteristics, their level of proficiency, and their attitudes towards the correction (Bachman & Palmer, 1989; Blanche & Merino, 1989; Butler & Lee, 2006). Consequently, the teachers were to consider the students' attitudes, in order to foster language learning (Horwitz, 1988). The students' point of view is important, because over-correction of the errors can discourage them to participate in the class activities and hinder the interaction (Cohen, 1975). According to Matsuura et al. (2001), most of the students preferred their errors to be corrected by the teachers, but they were also afraid of losing face during conversation. Salikin (2001) argued that the students believed that the teachers should not be the sole correctors of their errors. Liao and Wang (2008) believe, on the other hand, that the students had a positive attitude to grammatical EC and welcomed teachers' error correction, but regarded peer correction as unreliable. These conflicting results might be due to a number of reasons, including the learners' purpose in learning English, their learning styles, and personal characteristics.

In addition, it is essential for teachers to see if their perceptions of error sources are consistent with those of their learners. A study by Yang (2010) attempted to stimulate learners' appearance on both self-correction (one's own critical thinking process in writing) and peer review (peers' critical thinking process in writing) to enhance their writings in an online framework. 95 college level learners were asked to write a reflective journal to analyze their reflection on self-correction with peer-review in writing. The findings when processed by content analysis, uncovered that thinking about the contrasts between self-correction and peer-review empowered learners to screen, assess, and conform their written work forms in their quest for text improvement. In their reflective journals, learner reported that self-correction helped them recognize linguistic errors, whereas peer review permitted them to view

their own writings from others' viewpoints.

On account of the inconsistent findings of previous research and the necessity of investigating the issue of language correction, the present study intended to examine the effectiveness of peer correction, teacher correction, and self-correction from the perspective of Iranian EFL language learners and teachers at the Jihad Daneshgahi Center in Kerman, Iran. Therefore, regarding the prominent role of classroom participants including teachers and learners and their more important role compared to others in the classroom, the study tries to fill the existent gap in the Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' attitudes towards different sources of error correction. The present study thus aims at investigating the following research question:

Are there any significant differences between Iranian EFL teachers and learners' preferences for source of corrective feedback?

3. Method

2.1. Participants

The participants of the present investigation consisted of both learners (N = 429) and teachers (N = 31). The teachers were told not to provide instruction to the learner participants of the study. The age of the learners was from 18 up to 60 years; that of the teachers between 25 to 40 years. Of the learner participants, 161 were males; 268 were females. Their levels of proficiency included 73 at the beginning level, 73 at the lower-intermediate level, 196 at the intermediate level, 54 at the upper-intermediate level, and 33 at the advanced level. The research context included five English centers and one French center. The details of the participants are reported in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1*Demographic Characteristics of Student Participants*

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

Table 2*Demographic Characteristics of Teacher Participants*

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

2.2. Questionnaire

Fukuda's (2004) questionnaire on preferences for error correction, which was obtained by permission from the author, was used in the present study as the main instrument (see Appendix A). The reason for selecting this instrument was its comprehensiveness: all aspects of

correction are included in it. Moreover, since the purpose of the present study was to conduct a study with a large number of participants, the questionnaire was assumed to be more suitable on account of its ease of administration within a limited range of time to a large number of participants. The questionnaire in total includes 25 items for teachers and 26 items for learners. The type of response format for all of the items was a Likert-type scale. Each of the items in the questionnaire had been designed based on a 5-point Likertscale of either "strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree", or "always, usually, sometimes, occasionally, never", or "very effective, effective, neutral, ineffective, very ineffective". The questionnaire consisted of the following constructs: giving and receiving of spoken error correction, frequency of giving and receiving spoken error correction, time of spoken error correction, types of errors which need to be corrected, types of spoken error correction and sources for providing spoken error correction. The reliability of the scale was found to be .89 Cronbach alpha for the present study. As the purpose of the present study (itself part of a larger study) was to examine the teacher and learners' attitudes towards the sources of error correction, only the data related to the last part of the questionnaire (items 20-22) have been utilized.

2.3. Pilot Study

The pilot study was done to determine if the questionnaires were precise, reliable, and standard. The students' questionnaire was translated to avoid any comprehension problems. In order to make sure about the reliability coefficients, in the first pilot study 15 students and 3 teachers were asked to answer the questions; three English classes, at the basic, pre-intermediate, and advanced levels, were included. The participants in each class were selected randomly after their classroom hours. The second pilot study was done on the same day, with the same procedures as the first pilot and at the same levels, but in other classes with

different participants, and the researcher being present. The questions appeared to be clear, which allowed the researchers to proceed with the confidence that the inquiry's results would be accurate. The reliability of the instrument was found to be 0.61 and 0.70 Cronbach alpha for the learners' and teachers' questionnaires respectively.

2.4. Main Study

The questionnaires (See Appendix A) were administered to the participants in their class time; completion took 30 minutes. Since the aim of this research was to evaluate the participants' attitudes towards the sources of error correction, only the last part of the questionnaire was used in the data analysis. This last part asked the participants which was the best source of correction from their perspective: classmates, teachers, or the students themselves. Thus, the effectiveness of peer correction, teacher correction, and self-correction was evaluated from the perspective of both teachers and learners; both were informed about the purpose of the study and were asked to provide information in this regard. Moreover, the learners were informed that the answer to the questions did not have any effect on their course grades. In addition, the participants' demographic information was collected. Afterwards, the data were imported to the SPSS software for analysis.

3. Results

In order to analyze the data to test the research question, the statistical procedures have been carried out using a statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS, version 21).

Firstly, the scores of the teacher and learners questionnaires were analyzed to ensure the assumptions of normality. The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests are presented below.

Table 3

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Results

	Nullhypothesis	test	Sig.	Decision
1	The categories of teacher scores occur with equal probabilities.	One-sample Square Test	Chi- .18	Retain the nullhypothesis
2	The categories of learner scores occur with equal probabilities	One-sample Square Test	Chi- .20	Retain the nullhypothesis

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests show that both the teachers' ($p = 0.18$) and the learners' ($p = 0.20$) responses to the questionnaire are distributed normally.

In order to investigate the research question of the study which is concerned with the teachers' and learner's preferences (the dependent variables) for sources of corrective feedback (the independent variables), a MANOVA was employed. First, the variance-covariance matrices were tested using Box's M test of equality of covariance. Based on the significance level ($p = 0.06$), the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables were found to be equal across the groups.

The results of the descriptive statistics are given in table 4.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics Results for the Correction Source

	participants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
classmates (item 20)	students	3.14	1.210	429
	teachers	2.29	1.006	31
	Total	3.09	1.216	460
teachers (item 21)	students	1.73	.790	429
	teachers	1.71	.643	31
	Total	1.73	.780	460
Students themselves (item 22)	students	1.77	.802	429
	teachers	1.81	.873	31
	Total	1.77	.806	460

As table 4 shows, the preferences of students and their teachers differ in considering the 'classmates' as the best source for providing the spoken correct form: in contrast to teachers, students prefer their classmates to provide the corrections. By contrast, the mean differences were very similar for the 'teachers' and 'students themselves' as sources of correction. The results of Table 5 show equal variances of the dependent variable across groups.

Table 5*Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrix*

Box's M	12.312
F	1.977
df1	6
df2	1.490E4
Sig.	.065
Tests the null hypothesis that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are equal across groups. Design: Intercept + participants	

In addition, the results of Table 6 revealed the significant effect of independent variables on the dependent variable.

Table 6*Multivariate Test Results*

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesized f	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.77	5.28	3.000	456.000	.000	.77
	Wilks' Lambda	.22	5.28	3.000	456.000	.000	.77
	Hotelling's Trace	3.47	5.28	3.000	456.000	.000	.77
	Roy's Largest Root	3.47	5.28	3.000	456.000	.000	.77
participants	Pillai's Trace	.03	4.89	3.000	456.000	.002	.03
	Wilks' Lambda	.96	4.89	3.000	456.000	.002	.03
	Hotelling's Trace	.03	4.89	3.000	456.000	.002	.03
	Roy's Largest Root	.032	4.89	3.000	456.000	.002	.03

Table 7 shows that error variances of the speaking performance are significant with regard to peer-correction, but insignificant regarding self-correction and teacher correction.

Table 7

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Classmates	4.474	1	458	.035
Teachers	.504	1	458	.478
Feedback	.062	1	458	.803

In addition, the MANOVA results show that there are significant differences between the teachers and learners' preferences only in the 'classmates' ($F = 14.69$, $p = 0.000$) as the best source for giving correct forms in speaking, with the students having a higher preference for 'classmates' compared to their teachers' preferences. In contrast to the 'classmates' category, no significant differences were found between teachers and students in terms of their preferences for 'teachers' ($F = 0.01$, $p = 0.90$) and 'students themselves' ($F = 0.05$, $p = 0.81$) as sources of correction. These results are in line with those of the descriptive statistics, showing a greater mean difference for 'classmates' sources (teachers ($M = 2.29$, $SD = 1.00$), students ($M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.21$)) than for 'teachers' (teachers ($M = 1.71$, $SD = 0.64$), students ($M = 1.73$, $SD = 0.79$)) and 'students themselves' (teachers ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 0.87$), students ($M = 1.77$, $SD = 0.80$)) sources. We conclude that teachers and students see no differences between teacher correction and self-correction, whereas the students prefer to be corrected mostly by their peers.

4. *Conclusion*

The analyses showed significant differences between teachers and learners; the majority of students preferred peer-correction, presumably because peer-correction allows for face-to-face interaction. Consequently, teachers should give the students the option to have either self- or peer-correction (Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Mendez, 2010).

The findings of the present research agree with those of some previous studies. Hagège (1999) contended that correction is effective when it is accomplished with the assistance of the individual's classmates. A study by Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that peer repair and correction is more likely to result in better performance of the individuals. They argued that active involvement occurs when the negotiation of form is encouraged, with a focus on form. Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1990) integrates the two very essential cognitive notions of attention and awareness. According to this hypothesis, "what learners notice in input is what becomes intake for learning" (Schmidt, 1995: 20) Schmidt also states that a) whether a learner deliberately attends to a linguistic form in the input or it is noticed purely unintentionally, it becomes intake; and b) that noticing is a necessary condition for L2 acquisition.

The findings of the present study fit within the abovementioned assumptions, since peer correction can be considered as a less-threatening type of feedback that explicitly focuses learners' attention on the erroneous parts. This is especially important if one considers the negative impact of teacher correction (lowering learners' confidence in front of their friends) and the negative aspect of self-correction (taking a longer time to be fully developed in learners). Self-correction does also require an advanced level of proficiency, since learners need to have the prerequisite skills of self-evaluation and monitoring. Therefore, peer-correction provides a balance between these two corrective modes and is thus seen to be mostly preferred by the student participants of the present study. Learners' responses in the present study clearly indicate that they prefer to be scaffolded by their friends and peers who can

draw their attention to errors in a way that might not be detrimental to self-esteem and self-confidence. This scaffolding can range as a direct application of Vygotsky's (1978) concept of teaching in the zone of proximal development (ZPD) (Wells, 1999), given that the notion of scaffolding only partially reflects the richness of Vygotsky's concept (e.g., Daniels, 2001). According to Ellis (2005), the interactions that most help the learners in their learning process are those in which the learners scaffold the new tasks.

According to Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994), the mechanisms of assistance graduation and contingency likewise shed light on the potential developmental level of the learner and provide the learner with the most appropriate help, which is a dialogic activity that unfolds during the expert-to-novice interaction.

In conclusion, it is observed that by motivating learners to give error feedback to their friends and classmates, teachers help them to think about the language as they use it, and to form and construct new knowledge. Consequently, our study has pedagogical implications in the speaking classrooms as it encourages teachers to employ the peer-correction techniques in the classroom to help learners improve their linguistic and communicative competence. Further research could examine the methods to draw learners' limited and selective attention (Schmidt, 2001) to language use patterns and structures. Moreover, it seems worthwhile to investigate how longer peer interaction, more peer correction sessions, and more practice of oral language use sessions may lead to the learners' reduction of errors in their language use.

*Ali Akbar Farahani,
and Soory Salajegbeh,
University of Tehran
salajegbeh123@yahoo.com*

Acknowledgements

The second author would like to thank the support of Academic Center of Education Culture and Research (ACECR) for their assistance and cooperation during this research.

References

- Ahangari, Saeideh. 2014. The Effect of Self, Peer and Teacher Correction on the Pronunciation Improvement of Iranian EFL Learners. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 5(1). 76-99.
- Aljaafreh, Adam & James Peter Lantolf. 1994. Negative Feedback as Regulation and Second Language Learning in the Zone of Proximal Development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4). 465-483.
- Allwright, Dick & Kathleen Bailey. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Blanche, Patrick & Barbara J. Merino. 1989. Self-assessment of Foreign-language Skills: Implications for Teacher and Researchers. *Language Learning* 39(3). 313-340.
- Butler, Yuko Goto & Jim Lee. 2006. On-task versus Off-task self-assessment among Korean Elementary School Students Studying English. *The Modern Language Journal* 90(4). 506-518.
- Cohen, Andrew D. 1975. Error Correction and the Training of Language Teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59(8). 414-422.
- Daniels, Harry. 2001. *Vygotsky and Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge/Falmer.
- Blaska, Andrea & Christian Krekeler. 2008. Self-assessment of Pronunciation. *System*, 36(4). 506-16.
- Dochy, Filip, Mien M. Segers & David Sluijsmans. 1999. The Use of Self-, Peer and Co-assessment in Higher Education: A Review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(3). 331-350.
- Ellis, Rod. 2005. *Instructed Second Language Acquisition: A Literature Review*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Ministry of Education.
- Falchikov, Nilson. 1995. Peer Feedback Marking – developing Peer Assessment. *Innovations in Education & Training International*, 32(2, May). 175-187.

- Fukuda, Yuan. 2004. Treatment of Spoken Errors in Japanese High School Oral Communication Classes. Unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco.
- Hagège, Claude. 1996. *L'enfant Aux Deux Langues* (The child between two languages). Greek translation, Polis editions, Athens (Original publication: Paris: Editions Odile Jacob).
- Horwitz, Elaine K. 1988. The Beliefs about Language Learning of Beginning Foreign Language Students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72(3). 283-294.
- Horwitz, Elaine K., Michael B. Horwitz & Joann Cope. 1986. Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70. 125-132.
- Kim, Ji Hyun. 2004. Issues of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition. *Teachers College Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics* 4(2). 1-24.
- Liao, Michael & Huang Wang. 2008. Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions of Grammar Instruction and Error Correction. 25th International Conference of English Teaching and Learning.
- Long, Michael. 1983. Does Second Language Instruction Make a Difference? A Review of the Research. *TESOL Quarterly* 17. 359-382.
- Lyster, Roy & Leila Ranta. 1997. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19. 37-66.
- Matsuno Si. 2009. Self-, Peer-, and Teacher Assessments in Japanese University EFL Writing Classrooms. *Language Testing*, 26(1). 75-100.
- Matsuura, Hiroko, Reiko Chiba & Paul Hilderbrandt. 2001. Beliefs about Learning and Teaching Communicative English in Japan. *JALT Journal*, 23 (1). 67-82
- Mendez, Edith. 2010. Oral Corrective Feedback: Some Ways to Go about it. *FEL*, 2(1). 25-38.
- Nassaji, Hossein & Michael Swain. 2000. A Vygotskian Perspective on Corrective Feedback in L2: The Effect of Random versus Negotiated Help on the Learning of English Articles. *Language Awareness*, 9(1). 34-51
- Noels, Kimberly A., Luc G. Pelletier, Richard Clément & Robert J. Vallerand. 2000. Why Are You Learning a Second Language? Orientations and Self-Determination Theory. *Language Learning*, 50. 57-85.
- Patri, Michael. 2002. The Influence of Peer Feedback on Self- and Peer-assessment of Oral Skills. *Language Testing*, 19(2). 109-131.
- Rana, Alina & Urin Perveen. 2013. Motivating Students through Self Cor-

- rection. *Educational Research International*, 2(2). 192-196.
- Ross, John. 2006. The Reliability, Validity, and Utility of Self-assessment. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 11(10). 1-13.
- Salikin, Hira. 2001. Correcting Errors in the Communicative Speaking class. *JIBS (Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra)*, 1(1). 67-88.
- Schmidt, Richard. 1990. The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics* 11. 129-158.
- Schmidt, Richard. 1995. Consciousness and Foreign Language Learning: A Tutorial on the Role of Attention and Awareness. In R. Schmidt (ed.). *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning* (Technical Report No. 9). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Manoa. 1-64.
- Schmidt, Richard. 2001. Attention. In P. Robinson (ed.). *Cognition and Second Language Instruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3-32.
- Tatawy, Mounira E. 2002. Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition. *Teachers College Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, 2(2). 1-19.
- Vygotsky, Lev. 1978. *Mind in Society: Interaction between Learning and Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Wells, Gordon. 1999. *Dialogic Inquiry: Towards a Sociocultural Practice and Theory of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yang, Yi. 2010. Students' Reflection on Online Self-correction and Peer Review to Improve Writing. *Computers and Education*, 55(3). 1202-1210.

Appendix A

Questionnaire Form for Teacher

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

1. Students' spoken errors should be treated.

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

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

Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
--------	---------	-----------	--------------	-------

※ **Students' spoken errors should be treated at the following times:**

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

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

4. After the student finishes speaking.

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

5. After the activities.

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

6. At the end of class.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never

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

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

Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
--------	---------	-----------	--------------	-------

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

Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
--------	---------	-----------	--------------	-------

9. Frequent spoken errors.

Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
--------	---------	-----------	--------------	-------

10. Infrequent spoken errors.

Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
--------	---------	-----------	--------------	-------

11. Individual errors made by only one student.

Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
--------	---------	-----------	--------------	-------

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

Teacher: Where did you go yesterday?

Student: I go to the park.

12. Could you say that again?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

※ **The following person should treat students' errors.**

20. Classmates

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

21. Teachers

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

22. Students themselves

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

Demographics

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

23. Gender

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

24. How long have you been teaching English?

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

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

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

Appendix B

Students' Questionnaire Form (Translated)

Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

لطفاً اسم خود را روی این پرسشنامه ننویسید.

Please circle the information that applies to you.

Make sure to mark only one.

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

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

1. من می‌خواهم جواب درست را دریافت کنم (یک اشاره به من بشود تا خودم اشتباهم را تصحیح کنم. به من بگویند که اشتباه کرده‌ام. یا اشتباه مرا تصحیح کنند.) وقتی که من اشتباهاتی مرتکب می‌شوم.

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

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

2. چند وقت به چند وقت شما می‌خواهید که معلمان روی اشتباهات شفاهی شما جواب درست را بدهند؟

Always همیشه	Usually معمولاً	Sometimes بعضی وقتها	Occasionally گاهی اوقات	Never هرگز
-----------------	--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

When do you want your spoken errors to be treated?

چه وقت شما می‌خواهید اشتباهات شفاهی تان برطرف شود؟

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

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

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

4. After I finish speaking.

4. بعد از اینکه صحبتتم را تمام کنم.

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

5. After the activities.

5. بعد از فعالیتهایم.

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

6. At the end of class.

6. در آخر کلاس.

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

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

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

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

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

Always همیشه	Usually معمولا	Sometimes بعضی وقتها	Occasionally گاهی اوقات	Never هرگز
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

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

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

Always همیشه	Usually معمولا	Sometimes بعضی وقتها	Occasionally گاهی اوقات	Never هرگز
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

9. Frequent spoken errors.

9. اشتباهات شفاهی که فراوان اتفاق می افتند.

Always همیشه	Usually معمولا	Sometimes بعضی وقتها	Occasionally گاهی اوقات	Never هرگز
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

10. Infrequent spoken errors.

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

Always همیشه	Usually معمولا	Sometimes بعضی وقتها	Occasionally گاهی اوقات	Never هرگز
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

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

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

Always همیشه	Usually معمولا	Sometimes بعضی وقتها	Occasionally گاهی اوقات	Never هرگز
-----------------	-------------------	-------------------------	----------------------------	---------------

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

چگونه شما هر کدام از تصحیح اشتباهات شفاهی ذیل را ارزیابی می‌نمایید؟

<p>Teacher: Where did you go yesterday?</p>	<p>دیروز شما کجا رفتید؟</p>
<p>Student: I <u>go</u> to the park.</p>	<p>من به پارک می‌روم.</p>

12. Could you say that again?

12. می‌توانید دوباره آن را بگویید؟

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

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

13. من می‌روم؟ (تکرار: معلم به وسیله آهنگ جمله اشتباهات گرامری دانش‌آموزان را برجسته می‌کند.)

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

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

14. من دیروز آنجا رفتم همچنین. (جواب دادن به صورت ضمنی: معلم به صورت مستقیم به اشتباه دانش‌آموز اشاره نمی‌کند بلکه به صورت غیرمستقیم آنرا تصحیح می‌نماید.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18. چگونه فعل عوض می شود وقتی ما در مورد گذشته صحبت می کنیم؟ (جواب مشابه: معلم اشاره می کند یا سرنخ می دهد بدون اینکه به طور مشخص و واضح به اشتباه اشاره کند.)

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

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

19. من به پارک رفتم. (تصحیح بی چون و چرا: معلم جمله دانش آموز را با فرم درست آن تکرار می کند بدون اینکه به اشتباه دانش آموز اشاره کند.)

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

The following person should treat students' errors.

موافقم که فرد ذیل اشتباهات را تصحیح کند.

20. Classmates

20. همکلاسی ها.

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

21. Teachers

21. معلمها.

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

22. Myself

22. خودم.

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

Demographics

جمعیت شناختی

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

لطفا دور اطلاعاتی که از شما خواسته شده است دایره بکشید. اطمینان حاصل کنید که فقط یک مورد را علامت یزنید.

23. Gender

23. جنسیت.

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

24. Your first language

24. زبان اول شما.

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

25. How long have you been learning English?

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

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

26. What is your speaking or listening class level?

26. سطح کلاس مکالمه یا شنیداری شما چیست؟

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