

## Stimulating Outcomes of CF: A Multipurpose Plan for Iranian ELT Learners' Attitude

**Mustapha Hajebi \***

Department of Education, Bandar Abbas, Iran

**Seddiq Taheri**

MA in TEFL, Yazd University, Yazd, Iran

### Abstract

The purpose of this paper is at determining of the high school students' perceptions, teachers' perceptions and attitudes about corrective feedback. This study was the relationship between corrective feedback and ELT students' attitude. The study utilized both a quantitative and qualitative research. The author find that the study indicates the students have positive attitudes about using corrective feedback and the use of corrective feedback is more effective in improving students' learning and their attitude. Practically, the authors make suggestions for the design and delivery of a course that the findings of this research would provide the reason why the corrective feedback should not be neglected when teaching a foreign language rather it should be looked upon as a resource for foreign language learning EFL students. This study takes into account teachers' perspectives and learners' perceptions. It may inform both sides regarding corrective feedback. More specifically, based on this study, teachers and learners could gain a better understanding of their perceptions of different types of corrective feedback. Also, teachers would find out their weaknesses in providing appropriate kinds of corrective feedback.

**Keywords:** attitude, corrective feedback, ELT, proficiency

### INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has greatly contributed to investigating the process of developing a second or foreign language in natural environments or via second language (L2) instruction (Ellis, 2005). In SLA field, attitude is one of the most extensively explored individual variables. L2 learning attitude is defined as a learner's intrinsic desire to devote time and effort in initiating and sustaining the process of language learning (Ortega, 2009).

Second or foreign language learning attitude has been widely acknowledged as one of the most influential individual factors which might determine success or failure in effectively acquiring an L2 (Dörnyei, 2005; Guilloteaux & Dörnyei, 2008). In fact,

Guilloteaux and Dörnyei (2008) state that even learners with the most outstanding language abilities will not be able to sustain the long process of learning a second or foreign language without genuine intrinsic attitude. Several research studies have shown that there is a notorious gap between teacher and learner beliefs about corrective feedback, not only about its best type according to each context, but also about frequency (Jean & Simard, 2011; Lee, 2013; Schulz, 2001; Yoshida, 2008; 2010). The main issue with this situation is that such disparities between teacher and learner perspectives “can have negative effects on instructional outcomes” due to the fact that students might start questioning the credibility of the instructional setting where corrective feedback is not consistent (Schulz, 2001, p. 349).

Furthermore, this lack of consistency may have a detrimental effect on learners’ attitude, which consequently affects the time and effort spent in L2 learning (Jean & Simard, 2011; Schulz, 1996; 2001). Accordingly, Kaivanpanah et al. (2012) advise language teachers to ask learners about their beliefs since “there is likely to be a relationship between learners’ preferences in the classroom and the effectiveness of learning” (p. 17). Therefore, if L2 teachers acknowledge that learner beliefs influence attitude or the desire to continue learning, then educators should also pay attention to what students have to say in order to find orientation, consistency and awareness (Schulz, 2001). In addition, several researchers have acknowledged that corrective feedback and attitude are interrelated as they interact at different stages of the learning process, hopefully facilitating the acquisition of the target language (DeKeyser, 1993; Dörnyei, 2005; Jean & Simard, 2011; Schulz, 1996; Vásquez & Harvey, 2010).

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

The design of this study is both quantitative and qualitative. Data are collected and analyzed based on qualitative and quantitative method.

### **Participants**

A total of 120 students at high school were chosen as participants. They are 15 to 20 years old. These students are chosen as they have minimal English exposure outside of English classes and may not communicate in English language.

### **Instruments**

The instruments of this research are questionnaire and interview. An informed consent form was attached to the beginning of the survey, aimed to make the participants become fully aware of the nature of the study and its purpose along with the participants’ rights. The participants were informed that their participation in this study is strictly voluntary and any information obtained in connection with this study would remain confidential and would be disclosed only with their permission. It was also made clear that there were no known physical, psychological, social, or legal risks in this study beyond those of ordinary life. Then, the participants were asked to complete the

actual survey questionnaires, which took them approximately 5-10 minutes. (Appendix A) In addition to the questionnaires, ten participants from students and three teachers were asked to participate in the semi-structured interviews. All interviews recorded in order to gather accurate data. The description of this research procedure discussed in terms of bounding or scope of this study.

Respondents given Fukuda's (2004) questionnaire which consisted of a form for teachers (N of Items= 25, Appendix A) and another form for learners (N of Items = 26, Appendix B) was employed in the present study. Each form of the questionnaire has seven sections, with one section devoted to the demographic information about the participants. From the first to the end of the sixth category in each form, there were 22 items which were aimed at the exploration of the teachers' and 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 which need to be corrected, types of spoken error correction (i.e., from item 12 to 19) in both the teacher and student forms were utilized. The questionnaire had a Likert-scale type format with answers ranging from "strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree" or "always, usually, sometimes, occasionally, never" to "very effective, effective, neutral, ineffective, very ineffective".

In this regard, significance level of 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) was set. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for personal computers (SPSS Inc. 2012) was used to carry out descriptive statistics and the related inferential statistics. To analyze the obtained data, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used for the research question and its subcategories. Then the semi-structured interviews with ten students and three teachers were used to describe their preferences of using corrective feedback in English classes. The interviews each took 15-20 minutes and were all carried out in English and Persian to prevent ambiguity of questions and statements. This decision was made in an attempt to make the participants more relaxed and free-spoken. In our experience, talking in another language than what you usually did could mean that some things were never said. This could be because one feels uncomfortable in the situation or not proficient enough to express what one really feels. At last, the transcribed parts of Persian had to be translated into English before putting them in this essay. The translations were done by the researchers.

## RESULTS

The findings of questionnaire in this study were based on Fukuda's (2004) questionnaire which consisted of a form for teachers (N of Items= 25, Appendix A) and another form for learners (N of Items = 26, Appendix B) was employed in the present study. Each form of the questionnaire has seven sections, with one section devoted to the demographic information about the participants. From the first to the end of the sixth category in each form, there were 22 items which were aimed at the exploration of the teachers' and 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 which need to be corrected, types of spoken error

correction in both the teacher and student forms were utilized. The questionnaire had a Likert-scale type format with answers ranging from "strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree" or "always, usually, sometimes, occasionally, never" to "very effective, effective, neutral, ineffective, very ineffective".

Prior to the main study (i.e., in the pilot study), the reliability analysis of the questionnaire was computed using Cronbach's alpha method. The results of the whole questionnaire reliability turned out to be 0.60 which is considered to be an acceptable level. In addition, since only one part of the questionnaire was used in the present study, the reliability index of this section was estimated to be 0.67. In order to provide an answer to the research question of the study, the MANOVA was run.

## Results of Interview

Although the results revealed that all interviewed teachers agreed on CF as a vital part of L2 writing, they used different approaches and reasoned about this in different ways. The research aims to answer follows:

1. What types of feedback do you usually provide for your students? Why?
2. Do you provide corrective feedback (CF) by pointing out errors? If so, do you use oral or written CF or a combination of both?
3. What type of errors (language issues or contextual errors) do you usually point out?
4. Do you believe CF to be good or bad for your young students (grade 3-5) when they write speak in their L2? In what way does it show that it is good or bad?
5. Can you tell any differences in the effectiveness depending on the type of CF given (oral, written or a combination of both)?
6. Can you see that your students act upon the CF? If so, what is the evidence?
7. In your experience, do you need to point out the same type of error repeatedly before your students learn?
8. Do you provide high- and low-achieving students with different types, or amounts, of CF? Why or why not?
9. Are there any other types of feedback that you use in combination with CF? If so, which are these and why do you use them?
10. What would you say is good, respectively bad, about providing CF to EFL students?
11. What are your thoughts concerning CF for EFL students being a controversial topic?

As indicated by all members, some portion of the CF to the beneficiary means giving distinctive measures of mistake amendment to high-and low-accomplishing understudies. In a roundabout way this implies the low-accomplishing understudies gets concentrated CF (the instructor amends one or a couple kind of mistakes at once)

while the high-accomplishing understudies are given unfocused CF (remedy of a wide range of blunders in the meantime). Will this have any kind of effect in what they realize and how they see the CF they get? As indicated by Farrokhi (2012) this is the situation. Farrokhi found that, despite the fact that both sorts of WCF turned out to be superior to none, the understudies given concentrated CF performed superior to the ones given unfocused CF (2012). So what does this mean for the L2 understudy who is given unfocused CF since he/she is high-accomplishing and can by and by handle that each blunder is redressed and not feel miserable or get low self-regard? Does it negatively affect the dialect advancement over the long haul?

As indicated by Chandler (2003), singular adjustments might just be finished. Chandler expressed that understudies sufficiently capable to deal with it might just be given backhanded CF (underlining), while understudies that aren't yet that capable might be given direct CF (underlining + revise shape). This is likewise how we decipher the Swedish educational modules (2011) when it says that the educator ought to "consider every individual's needs, conditions, encounter and considering" (p. 16). What we have been instructed amid our time in educator preparing school matches what they talked with instructors guaranteed to do and furthermore what various scientists, similar to Chandler (2003), Guénette (2007), Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) and the educational modules (2011) said; that educating and input ought to be adjusted to the individual understudy. The consequences of measurable and clear examination indicated noteworthy contrasts for the "verifiable" and "express" classes. As it were, educators favored unequivocal blunder rectification while learners were more for understood amendment. This finding is in accordance with the past research discoveries which demonstrated that a large portion of the understudies favored their mistakes to be adjusted certainly by the educators since they feared losing face amid discussion (Matsuura, Chiba & Hilderbrandt 2001).

As understudies need to convey what needs be in the learning procedure, furnishing them with powerful criticism cultivates their learning as well as improves their semantic capacities and is utilized as a method for inspiration and advancement for their certainty. R. Ellis (2009) said the significance of positive criticism in educational hypothesis as a result of its "full of feeling backing to the learner" (26). He trusted that it "encourages inspiration to keep learning" (26). At the point when dialect learners are considered as "entire people", they are seen as individuals who sincerely and mentally are impacted by many included calculates the learning procedure, a standout amongst the most imperative of which is the mistake redress systems utilized by the dialect educators.

The system picked by the educator to change learners' mix-ups can astoundingly help learners, induce them, prepare them, or on the other hand, may rehearse them, obstruct and debilitate them. Hattie and Timperley (2007) underlined the proficient effect of input on learning and achievement; be that as it may, this impact could be sure or negative. The previously mentioned thoughts are firmly identified with the discoveries of the present review. As a rule, there were inclination clashes amongst instructors and

learners. Learners longed for more circuitous, verifiable and deferred amendments, while educators had confidence in immediate, express and prompt rectifications. The utilization of a mix of redress sources would be more wise (Zhang 2012) and the aftereffects of this review highlight they indicate that for EC be more productive, instructors ought to regard learners' convictions. This implies wherever the rectification is a bit much, they can give it after the movement in a more circuitous manner. They ought not to turn unequivocal and quick adjustment at all circumstances. In any case, it ought to likewise be noticed that at whatever point certain blunders in the discussion create the impression that can thwart the stream of discussion, instructors

## CONCLUSION

There are in any case not very many reviews in the FL setting which have endeavored to look at the arrangement of CF as indicated by learners' ZPD in oral interactional circumstances happening in the classroom. At the end of the day, the investigations of CF gave in unconstrained talks between the instructor and learners are extremely uncommon. The present review was subsequently completed to research the adequacy of various sorts of mistake revision techniques in best framework and propelling the learners' stream of correspondence by asking their suppositions and observations.

The consequences of factual investigation demonstrated noteworthy contrasts for the "verifiable" and "express" classes. As it were, educators favored unequivocal blunder rectification though learners were more for understood adjustment. This finding is in accordance with the past research discoveries which demonstrated that the majority of the understudies favored their mistakes to be amended verifiably by the educators since they feared losing face amid discussion (Matsuura, Chiba & Hilderbrandt 2001).

As understudies need to convey what needs be in the learning procedure, furnishing them with successful input encourages their learning as well as improves their phonetic abilities and is utilized as a method for inspiration and advancement for their certainty. R. Ellis (2009) said the significance of positive input in educational hypothesis in view of its "full of feeling backing to the learner" (26). He trusted that it "encourages inspiration to keep learning" (26). At the point when dialect learners are considered as "entire people", they are seen as individuals who candidly and mentally are impacted by many included figures the learning procedure, a standout amongst the most critical of which is the blunder amendment techniques utilized by the dialect educators. The structure picked by the teacher to change learners' errors can extraordinarily help learners, induce and prepare them, or of course, may hone them, prevent and demoralize them. Hattie and Timperley (2007) underlined the competent effect of input on learning and achievement in any case, this impact could be sure or negative.

The previously mentioned thoughts are firmly identified with the discoveries of the present review. As a rule, there were inclination clashes amongst educators and learners. Learners longed for more backhanded, understood and postponed amendments, though educators put stock in immediate, express and quick remedies. The utilization of a mix of adjustment sources would be more wise (Zhang 2012) and

the aftereffects of this review highlight indicate that for EC be more effective, instructors ought to regard learners' convictions. This implies wherever the adjustment is a bit much, they can give it after the action in a more backhanded manner.

## IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

For mistake redress, understudies ought to realize that EC by the instructors are gone for the changes of their dialect capacity and the debilitating of their face. Subsequently, they ought to be more open to the adjustment and welcome the rectifications at the perfect time in the class. They ought to likewise figure out how to help their associates about their tricky regions and figure out how to support and platform each other's learning keeping in mind the end goal to accomplish better and long haul comes about. It is imperative for an instructor to know his/her understudies well, since this is the best way to in certainty have the capacity to decide of the amount CF to furnish every person with. Oral CF is favored by lower teachers and is by all accounts a decent decision for youthful learners, while if utilizing composed CF it ought to be of the immediate kind. The instructor could likewise change amongst oral-and composed CF to adjust his/her decision to every person.

## REFERENCE

- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001a). *Teaching and researching motivation*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2001b). *Motivation strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36, 353-371.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575-600.
- Farrokhi, F. (2012). The effects of direct written corrective feedback on improvement of grammatical accuracy of high-proficient L2 learners. *World Journal of Education*, 2(2), 49-57.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hu, R. J. S. (2011). The relationship between de motivation and EFL learners' English language proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 88-96.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22, 1-16.
- Lee, L. (2008). Focus-on-form through collaborative scaffolding in expert-to-novice online interaction. *Language Learning and Technology*, 12(3), 53-72.

- Zhang, Q. (2007). Teacher misbehaviors as learning de motivators in college classrooms: A cross-cultural investigation in China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Education*, 56(2), 209-227.
- Zhang, S. (2012). Promoting noticing in EFL classroom. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(3), 579.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Questionnaire Form for Teacher

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      Usually      Sometimes      Occasionally      Never
- 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      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
9. Infrequent spoken errors.  
Always      Usually      Sometimes      Occasionally      Never
10. Individual errors made by only one student. How do you rate each type of spoken error correction below?  
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? (Meta linguistic 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.) The following person should treat students' errors.  
 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
- Demographics
- Strongly Agree      Agree      Neutral      Disagree      Strongly Disagree
- 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: Students' Questionnaire Form

Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

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

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.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
2. How often do you want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your spoken errors				
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
When do you want your spoken errors to be treated?				
3-As soon as errors are made even if it interrupts my conversation.				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4. After I finish 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 want each of the following types of errors to receive corrective feedback?				
7. Serious spoken errors that may cause problems in a listener's understanding.				
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
8. Less serious spoken errors that do not affect a listener's understanding.				
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
9. Frequent spoken errors.				
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
10. Infrequent spoken errors.				
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
11. My individual errors (i.e., errors that other students may not make).				
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
How would you rate each type of spoken error correction below?				
12. Could you say that again?				
Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
13. I go? (Repetition: The teacher highlights the student's grammatical error by using intonation).				
Very Effective	Effective	Neutral	Ineffective	Very Ineffective
14. I went there yesterday, too. (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? (Meta linguistic 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. Myself

Strongly Agree                      Agree                      Neutral                      Disagree                      Strongly Disagree

### **Appendix C: Interview guide for semi-structured interviews (adapted from Kvale (2009, p. 27):**

1. What types of feedback do you usually provide for your students? Why?
2. Do you provide corrective feedback (CF) by pointing out errors? If so, do you use oral or written CF or a combination of both?
3. What type of errors (language issues or contextual errors) do you usually point out?
4. Do you believe CF to be good or bad for your young students (grade 3-5) when they write speak in their L2? In what way does it show that it is good or bad?
5. Can you tell any differences in the effectiveness depending on the type of CF given (oral, written or a combination of both)?
6. Can you see that your students act upon the CF? If so, what is the evidence?
7. In your experience, do you need to point out the same type of error repeatedly before your students learn?
8. Do you provide high- and low-achieving students with different types, or amounts, of CF? Why or why not?
9. Are there any other types of feedback that you use in combination with CF? If so, which are these and why do you use them?
10. What would you say is good, respectively bad, about providing CF to EFL students?
11. What are your thoughts concerning CF for EFL students being a controversial topic?