

Iranian EFL Teachers' and Learners' Perspectives of Oral Error Correction: Does the Timeline of Correction Matter?

Las perspectivas de corrección de errores oral de profesores y alumnos del inglés iraníes: ¿importa la línea de tiempo de la corrección?

Ali Akbar FARAHANI

University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
farahani@ut.ac.ir

Soory SALAJEGHEH

University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran
s.khezrlou@gmail.com

Abstract

Although the provision of error correction is common in education, there are controversies regarding 'when' correction is most effective and why it is effective. This study investigated the differences between Iranian English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers and learners regarding their perspectives towards the timeline of error correction in the speaking skill. Two main categories of immediate and delayed feedback types were determined, with the immediate category specifically referring to 'very soon' and 'after speaking' and the delayed one relating to 'after activities' and 'end of class' sub-categories. To empirically test the hypothesis behind the study, a total of 460 teachers and learners were invited to complete Fukuda's questionnaire. The data obtained were analysed through multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), the results of which showed teachers' preferences for immediate correction while the learners' inclined towards delayed correction. Based on these results, specific properties and circumstances in relation to the timing of feedback are proposed to enhance its efficiency in language classrooms.

Keywords: Error correction; timeline of correction; immediate correction; delayed correction.

Resumen

Aunque la prestación de corrección de errores es común en la educación, existen controversias en cuanto a 'cuándo' la corrección es más eficaz y por qué es eficaz. Este estudio investigó las diferencias entre profesores y alumnos del inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL) iraníes con respecto a sus perspectivas hacia la línea de tiempo de la corrección de errores en la habilidad de hablar. Se determinaron 2 categorías principales de tipos de retroalimentación, inmediatos y retardados, con la categoría inmediata refiriéndose específicamente a 'muy pronto' y 'después de hablar' y la retardada en relación con las sub-categorías 'después de las actividades' y 'al final de la clase'. Para probar empíricamente la hipótesis detrás del estudio, se invitaron a un total de 460 profesores y alumnos para completar el cuestionario de Fukuda. Los datos obtenidos fueron analizados mediante un análisis multivariado de varianza (MANOVA), cuyos resultados mostraron las preferencias de los profesores para la corrección inmediata, mientras que los estudiantes se inclinan hacia la corrección retardada. Con base en estos resultados, se proponen las propiedades y las circunstancias específicas en relación con el momento de la retroalimentación para mejorar su eficiencia en las aulas de idiomas.

Palabras clave: corrección de errores; línea de tiempo de la corrección; corrección inmediata; corrección retardada.

Received: 2015-02-13 / Sent for peer review: 2015-02-13 / Accepted by peers: 2015-06-12 / Approved: 2015-06-13

To reference this article / Para citar este artículo

Farahani, A. A. & Salajegheh, S. (2015). Iranian EFL teachers' and learners' perspectives of oral error correction: Does the timeline of correction matter? *Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated Learning*, 8(2), 184-211. doi:10.5294/lacil.2015.8.2.6

INTRODUCTION

According to Chaudron (1977), error correction (EC) is a reaction of teachers that demands progress in the students' communicative competences. Student errors should be considered and handled in the class because of their great importance. Linguistic correction includes correction of pronunciation and grammar; sociolinguistic correction includes body language and tone of voice; it is more important than linguistic correction (Mendelson, 1990). The issue of EC is complicated. Sometimes the students do not use problematic structures because they are trying to avoid making errors (Brown, 2000); this is called the avoidance strategy. However, students need to know that EC can benefit their abilities to notice grammatical structures and the gap between what they want to say and what they can say (Kim, 2004; Swain, 1995).

In the process of language learning, and especially in the process of EC, learners are especially important; however, their importance was seldom considered until after the 1960s. Today, it is widely believed that teachers should adopt a teaching methodology that accepts the central role of learners and, as a result, they should become more familiar with their students' learning styles and attitudes as the appropriateness of EC would depend largely on these (Ellis, 2007; Firwana, 2001). Research points to the fact that students have a strong preference for EC and welcome its practice in the classroom (Katayama, 2007; Timson, Grow, & Matsuoka, 1999).

Nevertheless, recognizing the differences between teacher and student opinions on EC is a controversial issue in the teaching and learning process. Students' attitudes toward the type and success of EC can affect their progress (Schulz, 2001). If students' and teachers' expectations about EC can converge, then teachers would have a better chance to guide their students to successful language learning; otherwise, the mismatches can provide dissatisfaction (Brown, 2009; MacIntyre & Gardner, 1994).

TIMELINE OF ERROR CORRECTION

One of the most critical aspects of feedback provision, which has often led to differing opinions between teachers and learners, is the time at which it is provided—in other words, how long after an error is committed the learner is corrected. The literature on this issue broadly classifies time of feedback into two classifications: 1) *immediate* or *instant feedback*, where the student is corrected as soon as he/she commits an error, and 2) *delayed feedback*, where the feedback is postponed to a later time, so as to allow the student to finish his or her message first. Numerous psychologists have long supported immediate feedback. Skinner (1954, as cited in Richards & Rodgers, 1986) can be considered as one of the pioneers in this regard. Skinner is considered the founder of behavioral psychology, which in turn formed the basis of audio-lingual method (ALM) of language learning. The theory of learning underlying ALM, an anti-mentalist view, was that learners could learn a language more effectively if they acquired good habits by giving correct responses rather than by making mistakes. By memorizing dialogues and performing pattern drills, the chance of producing mistakes could be minimized (Richards & Rodgers, 1986). Based on the ALM theory of learning, language is habit formation; thus, errors must be prevented and corrected by the teacher at all costs to avoid formation of bad habits. Based on this theory, then, Skinner argued that immediate feedback could act as a reinforcer for correct responses. Since then, many other researchers have likewise valued the positive effects associated with immediate feedback as a reinforcer.

Yet although (as discussed above) there seem to be some advantages associated with immediate feedback, other researchers have argued that delayed feedback can be more helpful than the immediate feedback type (e.g., Nakata, 2014; Rolin-Ianziti, 2010). Delayed feedback supporters believe that its efficiency results from the *delayed retention effect*, according to which learners who are given feedback after a delay retain and recall more than those who are given immediate feedback (Kulhavy, Yekovich,

& Dyer, 1977; Schroth & Lund, 1993). According to these proponents, the delayed retention effect takes place because:

An original incorrect response acts to block or interfere with a learner's ability to grasp the correct answer when corrective feedback is presented. If the learner is first given the opportunity to forget those initial incorrect responses, however, it becomes more certain that the learner will be able to substitute the correct response for the original incorrect one. (Lemley, 2005, p. 15)

However, as stated previously, opinions and experiences differ. For example, Allan (1991) argues that if the appropriate time for EC is missed, the correction can be harmful; on the other hand, Hendrickson (1978) contends that nobody can say what time is the best time for EC, while Lyster and Ranta (1997) emphasize that *initiated repairs* are important for students when they commit errors. Initiated repairs can help students consolidate knowledge and guide them to revise their hypotheses.

Although views differ regarding the time of error correction, the basic belief accepted by all is that correction that breaks the stream of speech should be avoided. In other words, learners should be given the opportunity to continue their communication even if some errors emerge. However, errors that do not damage the flow of conversation can be corrected, or the teacher (or any other source of correction) can implicitly direct the student's attention toward errors so as to avoid possible fossilization.

In line with the abovementioned arguments, the assumption in this study is that the timeline for error correction constitutes a fairly significant issue and needs to be addressed closely in the foreign language teaching/learning context. This concern becomes more complicated and fundamental when the differing opinions and preferences of teachers and learners come into play. Therefore, the present study examined Iranian EFL learners' and teachers' beliefs about the time of correction. The two broad categories of immediate

and delayed error correction were examined with the immediate one being divided into 'very soon' and 'after speaking' and the delayed one divided into 'after activities' and 'end of class'.

Therefore, in the present study, the following research question and sub-questions were posed:

- Are there any significant differences between Iranian male and female teachers and adult EFL learners' preferences for times of corrective feedback in Kerman Jahad Daneshgahi Institute?
 - Are there any significant differences between Iranian male and female teachers and adult EFL learners' preferences for immediate corrective feedback in Kerman Jahad Daneshgahi Institute?
 - Are there any significant differences between Iranian male and female teachers and adult EFL learners' preferences for delayed corrective feedback after in Kerman Jahad Daneshgahi Institute?

METHOD

Participants

The participants of this study were both Iranian foreign language teachers and Iranian adult EFL learners at the Jahad Daneshgahi Institute in Kerman, Iran. The total number of the participants was 460. The research setting included five English language institutes (I) and a French language institute. Participating in the were 101 (23.5%) learners in I1, 24 (5.6%) learners in I2, 143 (33.3%) learners in I3, 103 (24.0%) learners in I4, 26 (6.1%) learners in I5 and 32 (7.5%) learners in I6.

Learners

There were a total of 429 learners (see Table 1), both male and female. Their ages ranged from 18 to 60 years old, with 65.7% of them being adolescents and 34.3% adults. There were 161 (37.5%) males and 268 (62.5%) females, dividing them according to gender. Their native

language was uniformly Persian, and the foreign language being learned was either English (92.5%) or French (7.5%). Learners' learning experience varied from 1 year (38.2%), to 2-5 years (38%), to 6-9 years (13.8%), to more than 10 years (10%); levels of proficiency also varied: beginners (17%), lower-intermediate (17%), intermediate (45.7%), upper-intermediate (12.6%) and advanced (7.7%).

Teachers

A total of 31 teachers participated in the present study (see Table 2). Classified according to gender, 12 (38.7%) were males and 19 (61.3%) were females. Their ages ranged between 25 to 40 years old, with 34.5% adolescent and 65.5% adult teachers. Their teaching experience ranged from 1 year (6.5%), to 2-5 years (54.8%), to 6-9 years (29%), to more than 10 years (9.7%). More specifically, with regard to oral skill teaching experience, this ranged from 1 year (9.7%), to 2-5 years (61.3%), to 6-9 years (22.6%), to more than 10 years (6.4%).

All the teachers should have passed several examinations in language skills to become teachers in the JD language institutes. They should have had at least a TOEFL, IELTS, or TESOL certificate, and should have been instructed in the teacher-training course (T.T.C.).

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)	Beginners (17)
Adults (34.3)	Males (37.5)	French (7.5)	2-5 years (38)	Lower-intermediate (17)
			6-9 years (13.8)	Intermediate (45.7%)
			More than 10 years (10)	Upper-intermediate (12.6) Advanced (7.7)

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of teacher participants.

Age (%)	Gender (%)	Years of teaching (%)	Oral skill teaching 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)	6-9 years (22.6)
		More than 10 years (9.7)	More than 10 years (6.4)

Instrument

The present study employed Fukuda's (2004) preferences for error correction questionnaire, with one variant developed for the teachers (N of Items= 25) (see Appendix A: Questionnaire form for teachers) and another for the learners (N of Items = 26) (see Appendix B: Translated students' questionnaire form). Both questionnaires had seven sections, with the last of these obtaining demographic information about the participants. The sixth section consisted of 22 items that were aimed at exploring the teachers'/students' judgments about the giving and receiving of spoken error correction, frequency of giving and receiving spoken error correction, time of spoken error correction, types of errors that should be corrected, types of spoken error correction, and sources for providing spoken error correction. In the present study, only the sections concerning the time of spoken error correction was considered. Each of questionnaire item was to be scored according to a 5-point Likert-scale, with the rankings 'strongly agree', 'agree', 'neutral', 'disagree', 'strongly disagree'; or 'always', 'usually', 'sometimes', 'occasionally', 'never'; or 'very effective', 'effective', 'neutral', 'ineffective', 'very ineffective'.

RESULTS

This study used survey-based research. Questionnaires were administered to the participants during their classroom time. The data gath-

ered were then analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. A significance level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) was set. For the research questions, descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) were carried out.

The MANOVA was used to provide an answer to the research question, which was concerned with the times of error correction and any possible differences between the teachers' and learners' preferences in this regard. The results are shown in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics results for preferred correction time

	participants	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
very soon (item 3)	students	2.67	1.209	428
	teachers	3.39	1.022	31
	Total	2.72	1.210	459
after speaking (item 4)	students	2.28	1.066	428
	teachers	2.10	.908	31
	Total	2.27	1.056	459
after activities (item 5)	students	3.02	1.089	428
	teachers	2.42	.992	31
	Total	2.98	1.093	459
end of class (item 6)	students	3.59	1.136	428
	teachers	3.68	.945	31
	Total	3.60	1.124	459

The results of the descriptive statistics show that while the learners preferred the spoken error correction 'after activities', their teachers believed that the corrections should be provided 'very soon'.

The results of MANOVA showed that there were significant differences between the teachers' and learners' preferences only in the 'very soon' ($F = 10.34, p < 0.001$) and 'after activities' ($F = 8.91, p < 0.003$) items, with the teachers' preferences for 'very soon' but their learners' preferred 'after activities' as the best times for providing spoken error correction.

Table 4. MANOVA results for the correction time

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	very soon	14.841 a	1	14.841	10.341	.001	.022
	after speaking	.999b	1	.999	.896	.344	.002
	after activities	10.464c	1	10.464	8.916	.003	.019
	end of class	.215d	1	.215	.170	.680	.000
Intercept	very soon	1060.724	1	1060.724	739.057	.000	.618
	after speaking	554.420	1	554.420	497.290	.000	.521
	after activities	855.562	1	855.562	728.974	.000	.615
	end of class	1527.170	1	1527.170	1.207E3	.000	.725
participants	very soon	14.841	1	14.841	10.341	.001	.022
	after speaking	.999	1	.999	.896	.344	.002
	after activities	10.464	1	10.464	8.916	.003	.019
	end of class	.215	1	.215	.170	.680	.000
Error	very soon	655.904	457	1.435			
	after speaking	509.502	457	1.115			
	after activities	536.359	457	1.174			
	end of class	578.220	457	1.265			
Total	very soon	4064.000	459				
	after speaking	2876.000	459				
	after activities	4624.000	459				
	end of class	6517.000	459				
Corrected Total	very soon	670.745	458				
	after speaking	510.501	458				
	after activities	546.824	458				
	end of class	578.436	458				

Notes:

- a. R Squared = 0.022 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.020).
- b. R Squared = 0.002 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.000).
- c. R Squared = 0.019 (Adjusted R Squared = 0.017).
- d. R Squared = 0.000 (Adjusted R Squared = -0.002).

DISCUSSION

The results from performing MANOVA analysis of data indicated significant differences between teachers and learners: while learners preferred EC be done at the end of the activities, teachers were proponents of immediate correction. This finding is also consistent with the results of other studies, showing that learners wish to save face during the conversation, while teachers try to provide solutions through immediate correction (Mendez, 2010).

Errors can work like signals that show language learning is taking place (Hendrickson, 1978; Ziahosseiny, 2005). Errors show which parts of lesson have been understood and what parts need to be revised (Hedge, 2000). Most errors are developmental errors (Dulay & Burt, 1974), reflecting signs of learning. To put it another way, errors are necessary, since they illuminate students' testing of hypotheses (Corder, 1981). Errors are, therefore, important and should be taken into consideration by classroom teachers (Brown, 2000). When teachers provide EC to students, and the students answer immediately, this is representative of uptake; it may be necessary to repair the uptake again, or it may be in the correct form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Certain factors, such as teaching context and types of correction, affect the production of uptake (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Lowen, 2001). Through systematic observation, a number of common patterns can be found for giving correction and observing an appropriate uptake (Chaudron, 1977). Elicitation, repetition, metalinguistic, and clarification requests have been observed in correlation with appropriate uptake (Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000).

Several studies have been conducted to examine the effect of timing on EC, especially the immediate correction done by the teachers, which can predict uptake (Loewen, 2004). In repetitions, clarification, elicitation and metalinguistic requests, the focus is exclusively on form and immediate correction by peer and self-repair (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Rolin-Ianziti, 2006). Intention can be significantly enhanced

by immediate correction (Brosvic, Epstein, Cook, & Dihoff, 2005). Immediate repair can also be advantageous for phonological errors when students follow repetitions and recasts (Lyster, 1998). Many teachers and their students who follow the audio-lingual method still prefer immediate correction (Bartram & Walton, 1991). In the audio-lingual method, immediate correction is provided because it is based on the idea of habit formation (Larsen-Freeman, 2014). However, not all errors should necessarily be corrected immediately (Nunan & Lamb, 1996). Research has shown that immediate correction is preferred by 30% of students (Lewis, 2005); however, depending on the type of skill and the time of communication, immediate correction can be either helpful or harmful. For instance, it has been found that immediate correction can interrupt communication and inhibit the willingness of students to speak (Hendrickson, 1978). Thus, it may be better to postpone correction to, instead of during conversation, to the end of a class.

With delayed correction, teachers can review errors before giving students the opportunity to respond to correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Delayed correction provides an opportunity for teachers and students to complete the negotiation of meaning before engaging in the negotiation of form (Rolin-Lanziti, 2006). In laboratory settings, delayed correction has been shown to be more beneficial (Brosvic, Epstein, Cook, & Dihoff, 2005). Destroying communication to correct errors would not be logical. EC should be postponed until the end of the interaction (Ellis, 2005) since, when the purpose is communication, EC should be delayed (Kelly, 2006). Prior research has also shown the helpfulness of delayed correction in certain cases by showing that students prefer delayed correction as a way of protecting their confidence (Lenon, 1991; Lewis, 2005; Salikin, 2001).

Implications

The outcomes of the present study should be beneficial for the teachers since, much of the time, teachers are unfamiliar with students' wants,

or their own coworkers' preferences, and perform based on their suppositions. In such cases, in spite of teachers' best efforts, their students may not be satisfied with the results, which may be less than delightful for either themselves or their teachers. Teachers should be aware of their students' and other teachers' opinions, investigate the similarities and dissimilarities, and take these preferences into consideration so as to act in a way that results in more satisfaction and success.

The results of the present study should also be beneficial for learners. Most of the time, students do not know how to act effectively in the language classroom—especially in group conversation activities, because they do not recognize their teachers' specificities or other students' beliefs. Yet by recognizing their teachers' estimations, students can learn to respect their teachers' intentions. By being more aware of others' opinions in their learning spaces (as well as attending class diligently, participating attentively in learning exercises, listening more seriously), they can gain better results.

REFERENCES

- Allan, D. (1991). Tape journal: Bridging the gap between communication and correction. *English Teaching Journal*, 45, 56–72.
- Bartram, M. & Walton, R. (1991). *Correction*. New York, NY: Language Teaching Publications.
- Brosvic, G. M., Epstein, M. L., Cook, M. J. & Dihoff, R. E. (2005). Efficacy of error for the correction of initially incorrect assumptions and of feedback for the affirmation of correct responding. *The Psychological Record*, 55(3), 401–418.
- Brown, A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46–60.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principle of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

- Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29–46.
- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 8, 129–136.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2007, May). Corrective feedback in theory, research and practice. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on ELT in China & The 1st Congress of Chinese Applied Linguistics, Beijing Foreign Language Studies University, Beijing, China. Retrieved from <http://www.celea.org.cn/2007/keynote/ppt/Ellis.pdf>
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H. & Lowen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281–318.
- Firwana, S. S. (2011). *A comparison between Palestinian EFL teachers' and students' attitudes toward oral error and their correction*. *The Journal of the Islamic University of Gaza (Humanities Research Series)*, 19(2), 1527–1558. Retrieved from <http://resportal.iugaza.edu.ps/articles/%D8%B5%D8%A7%D8%AF%D9%82%D9%81%D8%B1%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%86%D8%A9.pdf>
- Fukuda, Y. (2004). *Treatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes* (Unpublished Master's thesis). California State University, San Francisco, CA.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62, 387–398.
- Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction. In K. Bradford- Watts (Ed.), *JALT 2006 Conference Proceedings* (pp. 34–42). Tokyo, Japan: JALT.

- Kelly, S. (2006). Error correction. *English Language Centre*, 17, 68–107.
- Kim, J. H. (2004). Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 1–24.
- Kulhavy, R. W., Yekovich, F. R. & Dyer, J. W. (1977). Feedback and response confidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68(5), 522–528.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2014). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton, & M.A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.) (pp. 256–270). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning/Cengage Learning.
- Lemley, D. C. (2005). *Delayed versus immediate feedback in an independent study high school setting* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.
- Lennon, P. (1991). Error: Some problems of definition, identification and distinction. *Applied Linguistics*, 12, 33–62.
- Lewis, M. (2005). Role of self-correction in learning ESP. *ESP World*, 20(3), 72–84.
- Loewen, S. (2004). Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 54(1), 153–188.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning Journal*, 42(2), 183–218.
- Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22(4), 471–497.
- MacIntyre, P., & Gardner, R. (1994). The subtle effects of induced anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44, 283–305.

- Mendelson, D. (1990). How to correct errors in the communicative language talking class. *Prospect*, 5(1), 67–83.
- Mendez, E. H. (2010). Oral corrective feedback: Some ways to go about it. *FEL*, 2(1), 25–38.
- Nakata, T. (2014). Effects of feedback timing on second language vocabulary learning: Does delaying feedback increase learning? *Language Teaching Research*, 7, 23–42.
- Nunan, D. & Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. C. (2006). *Teacher corrective practices in the foreign language classroom: The effect of timing*. In C. Hopkinson & C. Hall, *Social change in the 21st Century 2006 Conference Proceedings, Queensland University of Technology, Carseldine Campus, Brisbane, Australia, 27 October, 2006* (pp. 1-14). Brisbane, Australia: Centre for Social Change Research, Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/6898/1/6898.pdf>
- Rolin-Ianziti, J. (2010). The organization of delayed second language correction. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(2), 183–206.
- Salikin, H. (2001). Learner's perception of oral error correction: An interpretive study. *JIBS (Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra)*, 1(2), 103–129.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244–258.

- Schroth, M. L., & Lund, E. (1993). Role of delay of feedback on subsequent pattern recognition transfer tasks. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 18*, 15–22.
- Swain, M. (1995). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing are not enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50*, 158–164.
- Timson, S., Grow, A., & Matsuoka, M. (1999). Error correction preferences of second language learners: A Japanese perspective. *The Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET) Bulletin, 30*, 135–147.
- Ziahosseiny, S. M. (2005). *A contrastive analysis of Persian and English & error analysis*. Tehran, Iran: Nashr-e Vira.

APPENDICES

Appendix A Teacher Questionnaire

Questionnaire Form for Teacher

Data collected from this anonymous survey will be used for completion of a master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers Of Other Languages at Sacramento State University. The information gathered will be used for research on corrective feedback in language classrooms. The purpose of this study is to investigate the opinions of teachers and students about error correction. There are no risks or benefits to you from participating in this research.

Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

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

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 (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
---------------	---------------	-----------------	--------------------	------------

❖ Students' spoken errors should be treated at the following time.

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
----------------	-------	---------	----------	-------------------

❖ **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 (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

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

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

9. Frequent spoken errors.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

10. Infrequent spoken errors.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

11. Individual errors made by only one student.

Always (100%)	Usually (80%)	Sometimes (50%)	Occasionally (20%)	Never (0%)
------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------

❖ 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.

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

Student Questionnaire

Translated Students' Questionnaire Form

Data collected from this anonymous survey will be used for completion of a master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers Of Other Languages at Sacramento State University. The information gathered will be used for research on corrective feedback in language classrooms. The purpose of this study is to investigate the opinions of teachers and students about error correction. You could feel uncomfortable with some of the questions, but you may skip any question you prefer not to answer. There are no benefits to you from participating in this research.

Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

لطفا اسم خود را روی این پرسشنامه ننویسید

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

❖ لطفا 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.

۱. من می خواهم جواب درست را دریافت کنم (یک اشاره به من بشود تا خودم اشتباهم را تصحیح کنم. به من بگویند که اشتباه کرده ام. یا اشتباه مرا تصحیح کنند.) وقتی که من اشتباهاتی مرتکب می شوم.

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?

۲. چند وقت به چند وقت شما می خواهید که معلمان روی اشتباهات شفاهی شما جواب درست را بدهد؟

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

❖ When do you want your spoken errors to be treated?

❖ چه وقت شما می خواهید اشتباهات شفاهی تان برطرف شود؟

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

۳. 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.

۴. 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.

۵. بعد از فعالیتها.

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

6. At the end of class.

۶. 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.

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

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

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

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

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

9. Frequent spoken errors.

۹. اشتباهات شفاهی که فراوان اتفاق می افتند.

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

10. Infrequent spoken errors.

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

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

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

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

Always همیشه (100%)	Usually معمولا (80%)	Sometimes بعضی وقتها (50%)	Occasionally گاهی اوقات (20%)	Never هرگز (0%)
---------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------

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

❖ چگونه شما هر کدام از تصحیح اشتباهات شفاهی ذیل را ارزیابی می نمایید؟

Teacher: Where did you go yesterday? دیروز شما کجا رفتید؟ Student: I go to the park. من به پارک می روم.

12. Could you say that again?

۱۲. می توانید دوباره آن را بگویید؟

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

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

۱۳. من می روم؟ (تکرار: معلم به وسیله آهنگ جمله اشتباهات گرامری دانش آموزان را برجسته می کند.)

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	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.)

۱۴. من دیروز آنجا رفتم همچنین. (جواب دادن به صورت ضمنی: معلم به صورت مستقیم به اشتباه دانش آموز اشاره نمی کند بلکه به صورت غیرمستقیم آنرا تصحیح می نماید.)

Very Effective خیلی موثر	Effective موثر	Neutral خنثی	Ineffective بی اثر	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.)

۱۵. "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	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
خیلی موثر	موثر	خنثی	بی اثر	خیلی بی اثر

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

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

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
خیلی موثر	موثر	خنثی	بی اثر	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.)

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

Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
خیلی موثر	موثر	خنثی	بی اثر	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.)

۱۸. 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	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
خیلی موثر	موثر	خنثی	بی اثر	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.)

۱۹. 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	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
خیلی موثر	موثر	خنثی	بی اثر	خیلی بی اثر

❖ The following person should treat students' errors.

❖ موافقم که فرد ذیل اشتباهات را تصحیح کند.

20. Classmates

۲۰. همکلاسی ها.

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

21. Teachers

۲۱. معلمها.

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

22. Myself

۲۲. خودم.

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

❖ Demographics

❖ جمعیت شناختی

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

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

23. Gender

۲۳. جنسیت.

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

24. Your first language

۲۴. زبان اول شما.

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

25. How long have you been studying English?

۲۵. 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?

۲۶. 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
----------------------	----------------------------------------	------------------------	----------------------------------------	---------------------