2018 Int. J. of Pedagogies & Learning, *13*(2), 119-136.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF-CONCEPT AND ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PREFERENCES: INTERMEDIATE EFL STUDENT CASE

Mehry Haddad Narafshan
Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran
Ebrahim Honarmand
Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran

ABSTRACT

Whereas previous studies have shown that learners with various affective styles take advantages of various instructional modes in different ways, the background on corrective feedback studies has neglected the issue of matching error correction strategies to learners' affective style. To shed light on this issue, the present study was conducted to investigate the hypothesis that learners with self-concept cognitive styles are more inclined to take advantage of particular types of error correction. One-hundred Iranian EFL learners were given two questionnaires to identify both their level of self-concept and their feedback preferences. First, the participants were classified as self-concept based on their scores on Ronson's Inventory (1989). Subsequently, the oral feedback preference of the participants was determined by using Katayama's Questionnaire (2006). The study findings showed that male Iranian EFL learners in the main preferred to be corrected explicitly, compared with female Iranian EFL learners who tended to prefer to be corrected implicitly. This difference was statistically significant. Moreover, a statistically significant difference was found between students with high level of self-concept perception compared with those with low level self-concept perception to be corrected in vocabulary, expression, discourse, pronunciation, implicitness as well as explicitness.

Keywords: Cognitive learning styles, Corrective feedback, EFL and gender, EFL learning, Self-concept in language learning

INTRODUCTION

One of the primary definitions of corrective feedback is ascribed to Chaudron (1977) who defines corrective feedback as ‘‘any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner utterance" (p. 31). However, the literature also includes some highly prevalent synonymous concepts such as error correction, negative evidence and error feedback. Nonetheless, Han (2008) differentiates explaining that error correction connotes an evident and direct correction, while corrective feedback is a more widespread avenue for providing some hints to effectiveness, performing some corrections, as well as including the corrections made by language teachers. Thus, in the light of this, Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) define corrective feedback as:

> Tak[ing] the form of responses to learner utterances that contain error. The responses can consist of (a) an indication that an error has been committed, (b) provision of the correct target language form, or (c) meta-linguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these (p. 340).

Research shows that corrective feedback and its role have been investigated both theoretically and pedagogically. In spite of the fact that the body of language acquisition theories and second language methodologies stand by the effectiveness of corrective feedback (CF), others reject its benefits (Allwood, 1992; Calsiyao, 2015; Ellis et al., 2006; Genc, 2014). In addition, the value given to CF in language classrooms differs based on the tenets of various methods. For example, in audiolingualism Ur (1996, p. 243) took the view that "negative assessment is to be avoided as much as possible because it works as 'punishment' and might minimize students' learning process or make them frustrated". She goes on to argue that while in humanistic methods, assessment should be in a positive manner or non-judgmental format so as to "promote a positive self-image of the learner as a person and language learner." As Ur (1996, p. 243) reasons that "there is surely a place for correction" she also cautions not to overestimate its contribution to language learning and supports the philosophy that it is better to spend time on helping students to effectively learn and therefore avoid making errors - a position that is in line with a behaviourist perspective towards language learning. However, it needs to be noted that in the present times of the post-method era, teaching methods/EFL pedagogy is less likely to be as prescriptive as before yet various pedagogical dilemmas continue (Russell, 2009). The argument as to whether students' "accuracy" should be preferred over their "fluency" or vice-versa has continued to be discussed (Alhaysony, 2016; Negahdaripour & Amirghassemi, 2016) and CF is seen as an important contributor to the former option but not the latter. According to Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis (2004) this is a point of view that lies in teachers' minds in terms of their personal pedagogical beliefs and practices and whether they follow a traditional approach.

Nevertheless, feedback is crucial to students' learning (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) and is what guides and develops a learner's thinking and it is therefore a vital part of the learning process. Provided that feedback is constructive, it should have a positive effect on a students' learning (Irons, 2008). Inappropriate feedback, however, will not benefit the learning process. An example of inappropriate feedback is when it is given to encourage and make students feel better even though the quality of their product is poor. In the study by Colby-Kelly and Turner (2007) it is shown that this type of inappropriate feedback can be perceived as without merit and untrustworthy by adult students. It is also well recognised that the main source of variation in corrective feedback studies stems from affective variables within learners (Arnold & Brown, 1999; Rassaei, 2015). Since the EFL learner's self-concept is considered an affective variable this is relevant to research in second language education; it continues to play an important role in the search for ways of improving pedagogy and learner outcomes (Liu & Chang, 2013). Moreover, previous studies showed that affective variables can play a crucial role in the quality and preferences of error correction.

Although some studies have focused on the measurement of the relationship between motivation, attitude and corrective feedback (Sampson, 2012; Storch & Wiggleworth, 2010), there is a paucity of research into the relationship between self-concept and corrective feedback preferences, yet any illumination of this would assist EFL teachers' choice of feedback strategies. Another reason why this affective variable of self-concept has been selected for the focus of this study is that this characteristic is known to affect students' performance in oral communication. Students with level of affective variable are said to be more inclined to show a better performance in error correction. Having realized the importance of affective variables such as self-concept, as well as students' perceptions and preferences, the current study intended to investigate the effects of self-concept on EFL learners' preferences for corrective feedback. However, the quality and preferences of students with high and low self-concept is still under question, since as far as the authors are aware no one has investigated this area of research.

Thus, based on this reasoning the present study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistical significant difference between high and low self-concept EFL learners regarding their preferences for oral corrective feedback?
2. Is there a statistical significant difference between male and female EFL learners regarding preferences for oral corrective feedback?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corrective Feedback Preferences

There are different distinctive strategies ranging from those that essentially identify an absence of comprehension or that signal the occurrence of an error but make the language learners correct themselves, to providing the most thorough grammatical explanation and practice of keeping language learners informed regarding the correct forms they should use (Crookes & Chaudron, 1991). Among these items are clarification requests, confirmation checks, repetition, and reformulation, where repetition is of paramount importance; these techniques are generally coupled with some other effective technique, such as metalinguistic feedback, or elicitation alongside explicit correction. These techniques have been found to be the most common corrective strategies that practitioners usually employ (Ellis, 2008). Comprehension or signalling the occurrence of an error and getting the learner to self-correct is the most elaborate grammatical explanation and drill of correct forms in use to give learners feedback (Crookes & Chaudron, 1991).

In Loewen et al. (2009), a scientific study, the authors expressed that even though language learners may claim that correcting errors is a very vital step to be taken for language learning, there is no such consensus on how this type of correction of errors should be used. For instance, Katayama (2007) found that almost half of the students (47.3%) in her study disagreed that practitioners are the sole authority to help students to improve their speaking through helping them understand their errors, and intriguingly the majority of these students also agreed that the errors that challenge the process of interaction should be corrected. Accordingly, it becomes clear that practitioners have a very crucial role in this regard since they are the ultimate decision makers, who have authority to select the CF in relation to their pedagogical targets. Moreover, they need to be cognizant of learners' individual differences, necessities, proficiency levels and expectations. In Ellis' (2008) review of several studies, practitioners were found to implement various corrective strategies, but of note was that several other aspects of the learning environment had a profound impact on practice. These included the instructional context, the pedagogical approach and teaching style. Ellis (2008) maintains that the primary studies of CF concentrated on finding out the specific details and theoretical issues that comprehensively explain how corrective feedback should be covered by practitioners. Research then changed to investigate other domains such as how CF is accepted by language learners and how it can assist second language acquisition.

Dilek (2015, p. 5) cites Hendrickson (1978) in relation to error correction emphasising his conclusions as follows:

> a). If the learners are corrected, they become aware of their mistakes. b). Correcting all the errors is counter-productive. The important point is to make students feel they are in a supportive classroom environment, make them feel confident, and to avoid them suffering embarrassment from their errors. c). Errors that seriously impair communication, those that stigmatize a learner's or reader's understanding and those which are frequently produced by learners have higher priority than others. d). Direct types of corrective procedures are in effective. e). In addition to teacher correction of

learner errors, peer-correction and self-correction would be effective facilitators, but differences of learners and the type of the language classrooms should be considered to choose the best instructional strategy.

Most recently, according to Katayama's (2007) survey of Japanese English-Language Learners (ELLs) a strong learner preference for correction of pragmatic errors and errors that interfered with communication was found. In contrast, earlier research by Cathcart and Olsen (1976) showed over ninety percent of students in a survey preferred to be corrected all or most of the time. While different times and methodologies this does reflect the importance of gaining students' views. After having been corrected for every error during an exchange, however, the students reported that it was difficult to produce coherent L2 speech while being interrupted.

On the issue of students' potential embarrassment about making mistakes, Hendrickson (1978) found that when teachers allow some errors and correct others, students felt more comfortable speaking than if the teachers had corrected every error. While Cathcart and Olsen (1976) interpreted their findings as an underestimation on the part of the student of the number and extent of their spoken errors, or as simple overzealousness on the part of the student, Hendrickson (1978) concluded it was best to correct errors but undesirable, or at least unfeasible to correct them all. This view is practical and reflects recent research that shows the positive outcomes from corrective feedback regardless of type e.g. explicit versus implicit (Asassfeh, 2013, Polio, 2012).

Individual Differences and Corrective Feedback

The impact of video games on teaching and learning a new language is not in its infancy. Empirical studies that address individual differences (IDs) in the discipline of oral CF can be divided into two categories. The first is a series of studies investigating individuals' general preferences and attitudes toward the use of CF (e.g., Lee, 1990; Cumming, 1995; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Zacharias, 2007). The results of these types of studies illustrate that learners value practitioners' oral feedback and they are generally expected to be corrected by their teachers, so that they can convey their meaning more accurately. Such studies, nonetheless, as previously mentioned, by no means directly elaborate on the issue to be investigated in the current study, that is, how and in what ways IDs contribute to L2 learners' response to oral CF.

The second set of studies focuses on the role of learners' cognitive processes as well as their perceptions and views in receiving, taking up, and retaining CF. For example, Goldstein (2006) explored the role of contextual and individual factors in acceptance and application of oral CF. Having investigated two L2 writers, he concluded that there is sort of interface between the role that the instructional setting and students' motivation play so as to make written feedback work more efficiently. He subsequently argued that a number of factors, including attitude, motivation, socio-political forces, and enthusiasm towards the instructional setting, as well as the interaction between practitioners and language learners, play a pivotal role in how and in what ways the language learner responds to CF.

In addition, the results of Qui and Lapkin's (2001) case study, that examined the role played by 'the quality of noticing' in the uptake of different types of CF, qualitative analyses involving think aloud protocols highlighted the role of the teachers' comments as vital. The results showed that the performance of L2 learners' quality of noticing hinged very much upon the way that teachers commented on their uptake of the CF. Sachs and Polio (2007) replicated this study, but with a larger sample of students. They concluded that there seemed to be a positive relationship between noticing the feedback and the accuracy of subsequent revisions. Further to this Storch and Wiggleworth (2010) explored CF and analysed their data through a sociocultural paradigm where their findings suggested that the uptake of CF highly relied upon the depth of students' engagement with the feedback. The results also indicated that the

language factors that emerged were largely affective. They included beliefs about language use and related to how language learners perceived the prior experience of their L2 acquisition, their perspective towards the form of the feedback, and also whether CF met the purpose of enhancing their accuracy in matters of texts and degree of contribution to feedback retention. Hyland and Paltridge (2011), also, found a positive interface, between language learners' attitude as well as their motivation upon how they engaged with oral CF. The results of this study indicated that language learners' willingness to participate with form-focused feedback mainly relied upon their purpose for acquiring the language. The study also shed light upon how increasing accuracy in CF strongly relates to various motivational aspects in learning. Similar studies focusing on the role of affective variables in the effective uptake of oral CF by Swain and Lapkin (2003, as cited in Cohen, 2012) confirmed the relationship between L2 learners' goals, attitudes, and beliefs and their successful CF uptake.

Overall, although the studies reviewed have touched on the issue of IDs and written and oral CF, the results of which highlight the importance of considering students' cognitive strategies along with their attitudes as influences on their uptake of feedback. These variable types are recognised as different from language learning styles and writing motivation in that they are general broader in influence and differ in effect. Learning styles, for instance, are regarded rather as having a stable effect, thus having strong potential to contribute to CF outcomes, since they show language learners' "general approaches to and preferred ways of learning" (Cohen, 1994, p. 142). In contrast, writing motivation is regarded as a crucial aspect that is highly relevant to oral CF (Troia, Harbaugh, Shankland, Wolbers, & Lawrence, 2013).

Self-concept

Today, the significance of affective variables is no longer a myth for theoreticians and practitioners in the process of language learning. As Rodríguez, Plax, and Kearney (1996, p. 297) describe, "[a]ffect is by definition, an intrinsic motivator. Positive affect sustains involvement and deepens interest in the subject matter". It can lead to more effective learning and, in fact, may be essential for learning to occur. If we needed to find a shortcut for language learning, one of the most probable is provided by Stevick's (1980, p. 4) idea on to what extent being successful in the process of language learning hinges, noting this to be "less on materials, techniques and linguistic analysis and more on what goes on inside and between the people in the classroom". This draws attention to the importance of learning environments including communicative meaning making interactions/dialogues and the role of cognition and metacognition. According to Arnold and Brown (1999), learners may differ greatly regarding their personal learning as can the instructional strategies of teachers, such this variation/ individual differences may have a strong impact on students' and teachers' action and reactions, including learning a new language. However, also an additional prime consideration of the learner's internal factors, is the individual's image of themselves in terms of self-concept and its potential influence on language learning. As Arnold and Brown (1999) specify our assessment of ourselves in terms of self-concept reflects whether see ourselves negatively or positively, which in turn forms the extent of our self-esteem (Sahinkarakas & Inozu, 2017).

Scholars who are active in communication studies, which strongly relate to the field of language teaching, substantiates that "the overwhelming conclusion from both research and theory is that the perceptions one has of self significantly affect attitudes, behaviours, evaluations, and cognitive processes." (McCroskey 1977, p. 269). In an early approach to the topic Coopersmith (1967, 4-5) described self-concept in this way:

> By self-concept we refer to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself; it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval, and indicates the extent to which the individual believes himself to be capable,

> significant, successful, and worthy. In short, self-concept is a personal judgment of worthiness that is expressed in the attitudes the individual holds towards himself; it is a subjective experience which the individual conveys to others by verbal reports and other overt expressive behaviour.

According to Krashen (1981), besides advocating for his affective filter hypothesis, he argued that the process of language learning for those students with higher levels of affective variables are optimally facilitated. This is reinforced in recent research by Kahyalar and Ylmaz (2017, p. xi) who argue that "to create a clear ideal L2 self, learners should be trained to increase their imagery capacity and directed to have positive concepts of themselves as L2 learners". Thus, this literature review highlights the importance of individual differences in language learning and reinforces the argument to research into self-concept in relation to corrective feedback and in this research project its focus on oral corrective feedback.

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

The study design focused on quantitative research that aimed to examine the relationship of self-concept to corrective feedback preferences in EFL learning through EFL learners' responses to two established questionnaires.

Participants

A convenience sampling approach was adopted, where a total of 100 Iranian EFL learners at the intermediate level self-selected to participate in the study following invitations to the researchers' classes in a large provincial city in Iran. As adult learners, their age ranged from 18 to 32.

Table 1: Participant demographics

	Male	Female
Participants		
Frequency	78	22
Percentage	78%	22%

Instruments

The first instrument used in the first phase of the study was a self-concept scale, developed by Robson (1989). It consisted of 30 Likert-type items with ratings that ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The alpha reliability reported by Robson (1989) estimated .81, which is considered a good index of reliability.

The second instrument was used to elicit information on students' attitudes regarding error correction. This questionnaire was developed by Katayama (2006) and had been used with EFL learners. The questionnaire contained eight demographic items, twenty-seven 5-point Likert scale items and four open-ended questions. Consisting of four sections, the first included questions to elicit the demographic information, and the second section addressed research question one, asking students' general views about classroom oral error correction. This section contained four statements illustrating certain views that have been seen as controversial among language researchers and educators for decades. The third section asked about students' preferences for classroom error corrections of different aspects of the language, with the fourth

and final sections addressing students' preferences for particular types of error correction methods.

Data collection and analysis procedures

The data needed to answer the research question of the current study, was collected in two stages. In the first phase, a self-concept scale was given to the participants to determine their level of self-concept. Subsequently, Katayama (2006) attitude questionnaire was administered to elicit their perceptions and preferences for how oral corrective feedback should be provided. The participants were asked to complete both questionnaires in a single session of 60 minutes.

Data from the two questionnaires were analysed to report descriptive statistics and inferential statistics applied to investigate whether there was a statistically significant difference regarding the students' preferences for corrective feedback based on their level of self-concept – low versus high. The *t*-test for independent samples was utilized for this purpose.

RESULTS

This section presents the results of the questionnaires and the statistical tests applied to answer the research questions. In the study's quest to illuminate the relationship between Iranian EFL students' descriptive statistics are reported that compare level of self-concept with students' preferences for oral corrective feedback with regard to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and expression correction, discourse correction, and implicit and explicit error correction. Then independent sample *t*-tests were used to investigate whether the differences between students with high and low self-concept levels were statistically significant in relation to their preferences for corrective feedback types (grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, expression correction, discourse correction, implicit correction, explicit correction).

Comparison of learners' attitudes towards different features of corrective feedback - descriptive statistics

Correction of grammar

The first aspect of learners' preferences investigated in this study was learner's attitudes towards correction of their grammar errors (Table 2). As Table 2 indicates the high self-concept learners' mean score was 3.59, while the low self-concept learners' mean score was 3.12. This suggests that the high self-concept language learners preferred their English grammar to be corrected compared more so that the low self-concept language learners.

Table 2: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their grammar errors

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Grammar	High Self-concept	67	3.5970	1.11545	.13627
	Low Self-concept	33	3.1212	1.26880	.22087

Correction of vocabulary

With respect to preference for correction of vocabulary, as shown in Table 3, the learners with high level self-concepts mean score was greater at 3.05 than that of those with low level self-concepts, which was 2.81. This suggests that the language learners with high level self-concepts were somewhat more inclined to prefer to have their vocabulary corrected compared to language learners with low level self-concepts.

Table 3: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their vocabulary errors

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Vocabulary	High Self-concept	67	3.0552	.97597	.11923
	Low Self-concept	33	2.8182	1.23629	.21521

Correction of pronunciation

When learners' attitudes towards correction of their pronunciation errors was considered, Table 4 shows that learners with high level self-concepts appear to be much more likely to prefer to have corrective feedback on their pronunciation than those language learners with low self-concepts. Mean scores were 4.01 and 2.75, respectively. This suggests that the language learners with high level self-concepts are more inclined to want to have their pronunciation corrected.

Table 4: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their pronunciation errors

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pronunciation	High Self-concept	67	4.0149	.74859	.09145
	Low Self-concept	33	2.7576	1.09059	.18985

Correction of errors in expression

When correction of errors in expression are considered, according to Table 5, the learners with high level self-concepts were more favourable to having their English language expression corrected than those learners with low self-concepts since their mean scores were 4.04 and 2.75, respectively.

Table 5: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their expression errors

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Expression	High Self-concept	67	4.0448	.78688	.09613
	Low Self-concept	33	2.7576	1.11888	.19477

Correction of discourse errors

With correction of discourse errors Table 6 shows that the learners whose level of self-concept was high were more favourable towards being correct with regards to this feature than those learners with low level self-concepts, mean scores being 4.11 and 3.00 respectively. This suggests that the language learners with high level self-concepts are more inclined to prefer to have their discourse corrected compared with language learners with low level self-concepts.

Table 6: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their discourse errors

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Discourse	High Self-concept	67	4.1100	.78860	.09634
	Low Self-concept	33	3.0000	1.17260	.20412

Preference for implicit correction

The next feature of learners' correction preferences to be reported is learners' preference for corrective strategies that are implicit (Table 7). As Table 7 indicates the learners with low level self-concepts showed more preference for this form of correction than did their counterparts that had high level self-concepts, the mean scores for the two groups being 3.9 and 3.0, respectively. This suggests that the language learners with high level self-concepts are more inclined to prefer to be corrected implicitly compared with language learners who have low level self-concepts.

Table 7: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their errors implicitly

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Implicit	High Self-concept	67	3.0000	.95346	.11648
	Low Self-concept	33	3.9091	.94748	.16494

Preference for explicit correction

The final feature of language correction that was explored was learners' attitudes towards correction of errors being explicit. As Table 8 indicates the learners with high level self-concepts were found to prefer their feedback to be explicit more so than those learners with low level self-concepts, their respective mean scores being 3.9 and 2.8, respectively. This means that the language learners who have high level of self-concept are more inclined to prefer to be corrected explicitly compared with language learners whose self-concepts are low.

Table 8: High and low self-concept preferences for correcting their errors explicitly

Group Statistics					
Feature of correction	Styles	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
	High Self-concept	67	3.9403	.83268	.10173
	Low Self-concept	33	2.8182	1.13067	.19682

Comparison of Learners' Attitudes Towards Different Features of Corrective Feedback - Descriptive Statistics – Results of Independent Sample *t*-tests

As noted, independent sample *t*-tests were used to investigate whether the differences between students with high and low level self-concepts were statistically significant with regards to their preferences for the various forms of corrective feedback, that is with regards to grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, expression correction, discourse, and implicit correction and explicit correction

Correction of grammar

Regarding the two groups of EFL learner's preferences for grammar correction, the results of an independent sample *t*-test, shown in Table 9, show no statistically significant difference between those with high level self-concepts compared with those with low level self-concepts (t=1.83, p>.072; two-tailed). Therefore, it can be concluded that whether these students had low or high level self-concepts they did not impact on their preference for grammar correction.

Table 9: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding grammar correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Grammar	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.725	.397	1.916	98	.058	.47580	.24834	-.01703	.96863
Equal variances not assumed			1.833	56.996	.072	.47580	.25953	-.04389	.99550

Correction of vocabulary

Regarding these two groups learners' preferences for having their grammar corrected, the independent sample *t*-test indicated a statistically significance difference between students with high level self-concepts and students with low level of self-concepts, (t=4.62, p<000, two-tailed). This means that the language learners with high level self-concepts preferred their vocabulary to be corrected statistically significantly more so than those language learners whose self-concepts were low.

Table 10: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding vocabulary correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Vocabulary	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3.221	.076	5.006	98	.000	1.13704	.22712	.68632	1.58776
Equal variances not assumed			4.622	52.272	.000	1.13704	.24603	.64340	1.63068

Correction of pronunciation

Regarding learners' preferences for correcting their pronunciation errors the independent sample *t*-test results as shown in Table 11 indicate a statistically significance difference between the two groups of students (t=5.96, p<000, two-tailed). Specifically, the language learners with high level self-concepts preferred their pronunciation errors to be corrected statistically significantly more so than those language learners whose self-concepts were low.

Table 11: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding pronunciation correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Pronunciation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	9.204	.003	6.756	98	.000	1.25735	.18610	.88803	1.62667
Equal variances not assumed			5.967	47.339	.000	1.25735	.21073	.83350	1.68120

Correction of expression

When the two groups of learners' preferences for correction of their English language expression errors are considered, the independent sample *t*-test indicates a statistically significance difference (t=5.92, p<000, two-tailed) (see Table 12). Thus, the language learners with high level self-concepts preferred their expression to be corrected statistically significantly more so than those language learners whose self-concepts were low.

Table 12: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding expression correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Expression	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	8.147	.005	6.661	98	.000	1.28720	.19326	.90369	1.67071
Equal variances not assumed			5.926	48.106	.000	1.28720	.21720	.85051	1.72389

Correction of discourse

Regarding learners' preferences for correcting their discourse errors the independent sample *t*-test indicates a statistically significance difference between students with high and low level of self-concept, (t=4.95, p<000, two-tailed) as shown in Table 13. This means that those language learners with high level self-concepts were statistically significantly more likely to prefer to have their discourse errors corrected compared with those whose self-concepts were low.

Table 13: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding discourse correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Discourse	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	5.392	.022	5.650	98	.000	1.11940	.19811	.72625	1.51255
Equal variances not assumed			4.959	46.721	.000	1.11940	.22572	.66525	1.57356

Implicit corrective feedback

Regarding learners' preferences for correcting their errors implicitly, the independent sample *t*-test reported in Table 14 indicates a statistically significance difference between the two groups' preferences, (t=4.50, p<000). In contrast to the other features of corrective feedback in this case the low self-concept students were statistically significantly more inclined to be corrected in an implicit way compare to those students who have high level self-concepts.

Table 14: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding implicit correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Implicit	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.117	.733	-4.492	98	.000	-.90909	.20236	-1.31066	-.50752
Equal variances not assumed			-4.502	64.145	.000	-.90909	.20192	-1.31246	-.50572

Explicit corrective feedback

Table 15 shows the results of the independent sample *t*-test applied to the two groups' preference for receiving feedback on the English language use that is explicit. It was found that students with high level self-concepts' preference for explicit corrective feedback was statistically significantly greater than students with low level self-concepts (t=5.06, p<000, two-tailed). In other words, the result indicate that students low level self-concepts are less inclined to prefer being corrected explicitly compared with those who have high level self-concepts.

Table 15: Result of independent sample t-test for learners' preferences regarding explicit correction

Independent Samples *t*-test									
Explicit	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		*t*-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	4.219	.043	5.611	98	.000	1.12212	.20000	.72523	1.51901
Equal variances not assumed			5.065	49.662	.000	1.12212	.22156	.67703	1.56721

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

According to Nunan (1987, as cited in Katayama), "[o]ne of the most serious blocks to learning is the mismatch between teacher and learner expectations about what should happen in the classroom" (p.177). This criticism has also been purported by others (e.g., Green & Oxford,

1995 as cited in Katayama, 2007), who have emphasized the importance of language pedagogy ensuring a match between learners' preferences for error correction and teachers' correction strategies. The results of this present study in its investigation of the extent to which low level self-concept and high level self-concept EFL learners have similar or different preferences for different aspect of error correction illuminates the problem for teachers regarding how this match might be more effectively achieved. Since language learners with low self-concepts are typically more introverted and those with high level self-concepts more likely to be extroverted the result of this study highlight the contrast between the corrective feedback preferences of introverts compared with extroverts. These learner groups are clearly different with respect to the different features of corrective feedback.

In the following section, the answers to the research questions of the current study are provided. The first research question asked about introvert EFL learners' preferences for corrective feedback.

Based on the results of the study and the descriptive statistics shown in Tables 2 to 8, the low self-concept or introverted EFL learners showed some preference to be corrected in all the language features. However, they showed a higher preference for their teachers to correct their grammar and discourse. They also preferred to be corrected in implicit ways as opposed to strategies that were explicit. This suggests that their reticence or possible shyness and likely low risk-taking as language learners and introverts influences their behaviour to avoid overt attention to their oral performance. The second research question of the current study asked about extrovert EFL learners' preferences for corrective feedback.

When the high level self-concept language learners are considered their results suggest that their likely extrovertedness means they are not afraid of corrective feedback and may actually actively seek it. Based on the results of the study regarding the descriptive statistics presented in Tables 2 to 8, these students welcomed corrective feedback in all the language features. They show some higher preferences for being corrected in discourse, expression, vocabulary and grammar. Moreover, they prefer to be corrected explicitly rather than implicitly. This can be explained according to their likelihood of being more sociable as extroverts and more willing to take the responsibility for their own corrections i.e. be more self-monitoring. On this basis they would expected to be more communicative within the classroom context.

The third research question of the current study asked if there was any statistically significant difference between these EFL learners' preferences for corrective feedback comparing the groups based on self-concept level – low versus high on each language feature for correction. Table 9 to 15 shows the independent sample *t*-test results for comparing students with high and low level self-concepts' preferences for the various corrective feedback features. According to the results there was a statistically significant difference between students with high and low level self-concepts regarding their corrective feedback preferences for vocabulary, pronunciation, expression, discourse, and implicitness and explicitness of correction. However, with regards to grammar, the difference between EFL language learners' high and low self-concept was not statistically significant. Consequently, the null hypothesis of the current study that stated, there is no significant difference between EFL learners' high and low level of self-concept regarding their preferences for corrective feedback is rejected. This result might be explained by the fact that grammar may be the most commonly accepted language feature and therefore feedback may not be perceived as very threatening by low level self-concept, introverted learners.

Interestingly, the results of this study are in line with those of Jokar and Soyoof (2014) as well as Moslehi and Shokrpour (2013) who also found that introverted language learners preferred to be corrected implicitly compared with extrovert language learners who tended to be corrected explicitly or directly. They moreover resolved that direct corrective feedback can be more fruitful in enhancing the attainment of Iranian EFL students comparing to indirect

corrective feedback. The findings of this study are also in tandem with Busch (2010) and Erton (2010), who found that language learners prefer to be corrected based upon their personality types and related characteristics. Similarly, Shokrpour and Moslehi's (2015) research on personality types and the personality of the language learners also indicated that Iranian EFL learners tended to prefer to be corrected in accordance to their personality types. Thus, the present research provides strong evidence that language teachers need to be aware of their students in this regard so that the quality of corrective feedback can be enhanced in alignment with students' personal qualities such as level of self-concept and personality type/characteristics.

The results of this study indicated statistically significant difference between students with high and low level of self-concept regarding their preferences for different aspect of error correction. More specifically the results indicate that learners who have high self-concept are more inclined to be corrected regarding grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, expression, discourse and also they prefer to be corrected explicitly. On the other hand, students with lower level self-concepts preferred their errors to be corrected regarding grammar and discourse but they preferred to be corrected through teachers' use of implicit strategies as opposed to explicit.

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge the students who generously gave their time to be involved in the research.

Address for correspondence: Mehry Haddad Narafshan
Department of Foreign Languages, Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kerman, Iran.
Email:<*mnarafshan@yahoo.com*>

REFERENCES

Alhaysony, M. (2016). Saudi EFL preparatory year students' perception about corrective feedback in oral communication. *English Language Teaching, 9*(12), 47-61. DOI: 10.5539/elt.v9n12p47

Allwood, J. (1992). Feedback in second language acquisition. In C. Perdue (Ed.), *Adult language acquisition. Cross linguistic perspectives*, Vol. II. (pp. 196-235). Cambridge" Cambridge University Press.

Arnold, J. & Brown, H.D. (1999). A map of the terrain. In J. Arnold (Ed.), *Affect in language learning* (pp. 1-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asassfeh, S. (2013). Corrective feedback (CF) and English-major EFL learners' ability in grammatical error detection and correction. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(8), 85-94.

Basturkmen, H., Loewen, S., & Ellis, R. (2004). Teachers' stated beliefs about incidental focus on form and their classroom practices. *Applied Linguistics*, *25*(2), 243-272.

Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 318-337.

Calsiyao, I. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga-Apayao State College students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 3*(1), 394-400.

Cathcart, R. L., & Olsen, J. E. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. In J. Fanselow & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76.* (pp. 41-45). Washington, DC: TESOL.

Chaudron, C. (1977). *Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes*. Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cohen, A. D. (1987). Using verbal reports in research on language learning. In C. Faerch & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Introspection in second language research* (pp. 82-95). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Colby-Kelly, C., & Turner, C. E. (2007). AFL research in the L2 classroom and evidence of usefulness: Taking formative assessment to the next level 1. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, *64*(1), 9-37.

Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco, CA: Freeman

Course, S. (2017). Investigating the role of learners' selves in language-learner motivation. In S. Sahinkarakas, & J. Inozu (Eds.), *The role of self in language learning* (pp. 95-112). Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Crookes, G., & Chaudron, C. (1991). Guidelines for classroom language teaching. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 46-67). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Cumming, A. (1995). Fostering writing expertise in ESL composition instruction: Modeling and evaluation. *Academic writing in a second language: Essays on research and pedagogy*, 375-397.

Dilek, F. (2015). Learners' preferences of oral corrective feedback: An example of Turkish as a foreign language learners. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10*(9), 1311-1317.

Ellis, R. (2008). Principles of instructed second language acquisition. *CALDigest*, 1-5, December. *Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.* Retrieved from http://www.actiondyslexia.co.uk/downloads/Principlesofsecondlanguageacquisition.pdf

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *28*(02), 339-368.

Erton, I. (2010). Relations between personality traits, language learning styles and success in foreign language achievement. *Journal of Education*, *38*, 115-126.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*(3), 161-184.

Genc, Z. (2014). Correction spoken errors in English language: Preferences of Turkish EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Education and science, 39*(174), 259-271.

Goldstein, L. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: Helping learners become independent writers. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 185-205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Han, Z. H. (2008). On the role of meaning in focus on form. In Z. H. Zan (ed.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 45-79). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Harmer, J. (1991). The practice of English language teaching. *London/New York*.

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

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, *62*(8), 387-398.

Hyland, K. & Paltridge, B. (Eds.). (2011). *The continuum companion to discourse analysis*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Irons, W. (2008). Why people believe (what other people see as) crazy ideas. In J. Bulbulia, R. Sosis, E. Harris, G. Genet, C. Genet & K. Wyman (Ed.), *The evolution of religion: Studies, theories, and critiques* (pp. 51-57). Santa Margarita, California: Collins Foundation Press.

Jokar, M., & Soyoof, A. (2014). The influence of written corrective feedback on two Iranian learners' grammatical accuracy. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 799-805.

Kahyalar, E., & Ylmaz, F. (2017). Corrective feedback in writing classes: Individual variations. In S. Sahinkarakas, & J. Inozu (Eds.), *The role of self in language learning* (pp. 77-94). Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Katayama, A. (2006*). Perceptions of JFL students toward correction of oral errors*. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2005 conference proceedings* (pp. 1248-1264), Tokyo: JALT.

Katayama, A. (2007). Students' perceptions toward corrective feedback to oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, *9*(4), 289-305.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford University Press.

Lee, N. (1990). Notions of "error" and appropriate corrective treatment. *Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, *14*, 55-70.

Liu, H-J., & Chang, C-H. (2013). A study on language learning strategy use and its relation to academic self-concept: the case of EFL students in Taiwan. (Report). *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(2), p.260-269.

Loewen, S., Li, S., Fei, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, *93*(1), 91-104.

McCroskey, J. C. (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication & Research, 4*, 78-96.

Moslehi, S., & Shokrpour, N. (2013). A comparison of English and Persian oral and written performances in syntax. *International Journal of English and Education, 4*(4), 146-162.

Negahdaripour, S., & Amirghassemi, A. (2016). The effective od deductive grammar instruction on Iranian EFL learners' spoken accuracy and fluency. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *5*(1), 8-17. DOI: 10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.1p.8

Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*, 375-389.

Qi, D. S., & Lapkin, S. (2001). Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task. *Journal of second language writing*, *10*(4), 277-303.

Rassaei, E. (2015). The effects of foreign language anxiety on EFL learners' perceptions of oral corrective feedback. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching,* 9(2), 87-121. https://doi-org.ezproxy.usq.edu.au/10.1080/17501229.2013.837912

Robson (1989). Development of a new self-report questionnaire to measure self-esteem. *Psychological Medicine, 19*, 513-518.

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback over decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6*(1).

Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two ways types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *29*(01), 67-100.

Sahinkarakas, S., & Inozu, J. (Eds.). (2017). *The role of self in language learning*. Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Sampson, R. (2012). The language-learning self, self-enhancement activities, and self perceptual change. *Language Teaching Research, 16*(3), 317-335.

Shokrpour, N., & Moslehi, S. (2015). The Relationship between Personality Types and the Type of Correction in EFL Writing Skill. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, *23*(1).

Stevick, E. (1980). *Teaching languages: A way and ways*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010).Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(02), 303-334.

Troia, G. A., Harbaugh, A. G., Shankland, R. K., Wolbers, K. A., & Lawrence, A. M. (2013). Relationships between writing motivation, writing activity, and writing performance: Effects of grade, sex, and ability. *Reading and Writing*, *26*(1), 17-44.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *IJES, International Journal of English Studies*, *10*(2), 1-28.

Zacharia, Z. C. (2007). Comparing and combining real and virtual experimentation: an effort to enhance students' conceptual understanding of electric circuits. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, *23*(2), 120-132.