Research paper

Iranian EFL Teachers' and Learners' Cognition on Corrective Feedback on Speaking

Azizeh Chalak[1]*, Samira Mazrouei[2]

Department of English, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Islamic Azad University, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract

The term corrective feedback is an imperative part of foreign language teaching and frequent practice in the field of learning and achievement. The present study aimed at investigating Iranian EFL teachers' and learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking skill covering the necessity, timing, agents of error correction, different types of feedback including recast, clarification request, elicitation, metalinguistic cue, direct correction, repetition, and the types of error that need to be corrected. The study was a quantitative, non-experimental descriptive design conducted at Iran-e-ma and Pendar language institutes in Isfahan, Iran during 2020. The participants were 25 non-native English-speaking female teachers and 60 EFL learners. The instruments of the study were questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, and observations. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data and come up with the findings of the study. In terms of feedback type, explicit and delayed corrective feedbacks were the most favoured error correction forms and teacher-correction, serious and frequent errors were more preferred to be corrected by the teachers. Moreover, significant differences were observed between male and female learners regarding their cognition on feedback. This study could benefit learners, teacher educators, curriculum designers, and teachers in their reflective practice.

***Corresponding Author**: Azizeh Chalak

Address: No.127, Floor 1, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Khorasgan, Isfahan, Iran

Tel: (+98) 9122795543 **E-mail:** *azichalak@gmail.com*

Introduction

Language is a system of communication and a basic component of learning process. Errors are an inseparable part of the learning process and happen when a learner does not have

sufficient knowledge of the language. One of the major roles for an EFL teacher is to increase the learners' consciousness toward the quality of their production.

Errors inevitably occur in language classes and demonstrate that language learning is in progress. In addition, corrective feedback stands for "constitutes a reaction to learners' incorrect linguistic form in order to help them notice their incorrect utterance and correct it" (Zhang & Rahimi, 2014, p. 429). There are different approaches to error correction. Teachers have different points of view on error correction, some believe that learners' errors should be ignored and some teachers believe that they should be corrected immediately while others think that errors should be corrected indirectly. Teachers use different ways of error correction to correct the learners' errors. They may provide corrective feedback explicitly or implicitly to the learners' inappropriate utterances. According to Yoshida (2010), an instructor's choice of corrective feedback type might be affected by their perception of particular learners and the error types. From the analysis of the learners' errors, teachers can infer the nature of learners' knowledge at that point in their learning and understand what they still have to learn (Abbasi & Karimnia, 2011).

The traditional view of corrective feedback in which teachers are in the center of the teaching process, has shifted to more learners' collaboration in language classes. Learners also have different ideas toward error correction. Some learners prefer to be corrected at the end of students' oral production or after the class while others prefer to be corrected immediately after errors occur even it interrupts their oral production.

Additionally, the effectiveness of corrective feedback depends upon various factors such as teachers' and learners' gender, student anxiety (Allwright and Bailey, 1991), the proficiency level of students and the degree of difference between the student's utterance and the target form (Philp, 2003), teachers' experience, and different methods of corrective feedback that teachers use to correct the errors. Teachers' and learners' cognition refer to their knowledge, belief, perception, and attitude toward the learning and teaching process. Although all the investigation examined EFL teachers' cognition, perception, and attitude toward corrective feedback in second language learning in different fields, only a few studies describe both teachers' and learners' cognition on corrective feedback in the Iranian EFL context on different fundamental aspects of corrective feedback including the necessity of corrective feedback, the timing of error correction, types of errors that need to be corrected, the agents of error correction, and different methods of corrective feedback to provide potential insights and how these are reflected in classroom practice. This was the motivation behind the present study.

Literature Review
Corrective Feedback and Language Learning

The term corrective feedback has recently been imperative part of foreign language teaching. Corrective feedback stands for "teachers' or other learners' responses to second language or foreign language learners' erroneous or inappropriate products by reformulating the forms or giving clues for corrections" (Yoshida, 2008a, p. 525). In terms of language

learning, learners are considered as human beings who have emotions, attitudes, and values. Furthermore, it is teacher who presents the learners trust and respect and preparing them to express their abilities in the classroom in order to provide best of themselves. Regarding to self-actualization, learners would come to be best functioning individuals because of their intrinsic motivation and desire they have got during classroom by the trust and respect from teacher (Alahdadi & Ghanizadeh, 2017; Hosseini, Ghonsooly, & Ghanizadeh, 2017).

Lightbown and Spada (1999) defined corrective feedback as an indication to a learner that his or her use of the target language is incorrect. It also refers to utterances that indicate to the learner implicitly or more explicitly that his or her output has an error in some way. Chaudron (1988) defined it as "any teacher behavior that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error" (p. 150). This behavior may overtly bring out a response from the learner and may result in self-correction (SC), or may correct the errors in some ways that the learner may not realize in which a response is needed. Grami (2005) defined feedback in general as "any procedures used to inform a learner whether an instructional response is right or wrong" (p. 141). Corrective feedback can be provided both orally and in written form in response to a range of learners' errors including linguistic, content, discourse, and even pragmatic errors.

Studies on Types of Feedback and Effectiveness of Oral Corrective Feedback

As input, output, and interaction are taking into account of important factors in learning a second language, the role of feedback on learners' oral performance in promoting language learning is undeniable. Therefore, much corrective feedback research has drawn on Hendrickson's (1978) questions, should learner's errors be corrected, if so, then when, which ones, how, and by whom. The how has been of particular interest, Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six types of corrective feedback including recast, direct correction, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition. They found that recasts were by far the most common form of corrective feedback.

Recast is a type of corrective feedback that the teacher reformulates all or part of learners' erroneous utterances into a correct form. They are more implicit and provide feedback without interrupting the flow of communication.

Teacher   Which countries did you visit last year?
Student   I visit Peru and Chile.
Teacher   You visited Peru and Chile? [Recast]
Student   Yes

Clarification request indicates teachers' misunderstanding of the learners' utterance. The clarification request does not provide the correct form. Instead, it provides opportunities for self-correction.

Student   What do you spend with your husband?
Teacher   I'm sorry? [Clarification requests]

Repetition is concerned with repeating the learners' erroneous utterance, highlighting the error utilizing emphatic stress. It also attempts to push the learner to self-correct.

Student   I will told you.
Teacher   I will TOLD you. [Repetition]
Student   I will tell you.

Elicitation is a feedback type that the teacher repeats part of the learners' utterance but not the erroneous part and pausing strategically in order to allow the learner to complete the utterance or by using a rising intonation to signal the learner.

Student   I will come if it will not rain.
Teacher   I will come if it …? [Elicitation]

Metalinguistic cue is a feedback type that comments metalinguistic information and questions related to the learners' utterance without providing the correct form. It can include the information about the location, tense, or indication of the nature of the error.

Student   I write to him last night.
Teacher   You need a past tense. [Metalinguistic cue]

Direct correction indicates that an error has been committed. It also informs the learner explicitly about the presence of an error. Therefore, the teacher identifies the error and corrects.

Student   My mother always wake up early in the morning.
Teacher   Not wake up, wakes up. [Direct correction]

Another study conducted by Demir and Özmen (2017) explored the CF preferences of native and non-native English teachers in Turkey. Their findings indicated that recast was more favourable than other types of CF. Similarly, Sheen (2004) argued that recasts are predominant in leading to learners' uptake. Additionally, Zhai and Gao (2018) showed other preferred types of CF. They proposed that clarification, requests, and metalinguistic feedback were the most dominant types in stimulating the learning process of different speaking task complexity.

Learners should not only be able to detect the error, they should also be able to correct it. As mentioned earlier, some corrective feedback types such as recasts and direct correction provide the learner with the correct form, while others such as elicitation try to push the learners themselves to provide the correction. Elicitation covers three activities including asking students to fill in the blank, eliciting the correct forms, and reformulating students' utterances. Although elicitation is less common than recasts, elicitation is more conducive to learning development (Kaivanpanah, Alavi, & Sepehrinia, 2012).

More explicit feedback such as direct correction and metalinguistic cue may be needed when learners are not able to understand their linguistic difficulty. Metalinguistic explanations, not only help learners to notice the errors but also provide information about how the target language system works. Recasts were found to positively influence learning in a meta-analysis of feedback studies carried out by Mackey and Goo (2007). While Mackey and Goo's meta-

analysis included studies set in both laboratories and classrooms, Lyster and Saito (2010) only included classroom studies in their meta-analysis. It appeared that although laboratory studies generally found recasts to be effective, learners in classrooms seemed to benefit more from being prompted to self-correct than from receiving the correct form from the teacher. According to Lyster (1998) it can be hard for learners to notice their corrective intent, especially in a classroom environment, rather than on one-on-one interaction with a researcher in the lab. Recasts of morphosyntactic errors are especially difficult to notice (Mackey, Gass, & McDonough, 2000). At the same time, the implicitness of recasts means their disruption of communication is minimal.

Schulz (2001) found that most students want their oral errors to be corrected whereas most teachers do not believe this is always helpful. Regarding oral corrective feedback, Mohseni and Edalat (2012) conducted a study toward Iranian EFL learners' preferences for oral corrective feedback. The findings revealed students more preferences for immediate correction of pronunciation and delayed correction of grammatical errors. Moreover, learners showed a more positive perspective toward the teacher and self-correction over peer-correction. In this study, learners favored explicit correction in which teacher provides students with the correct form. The study identified a significant difference between students' preferences and teachers' attitudes and error correction practices.

Studies on Teachers' and Learners' Cognition on Corrective Feedback
In this regard, Roothooft (2018) carried out a study to compare the beliefs of EFL teachers at private language institutes and EFL teachers at public schools. He explored their views about how and when to correct students and the types of errors correction. While secondary school teachers thought that recasts were more effective, language teachers working at private institutes preferred elicitation. The same findings are supported in other studies (e.g Boyerhassani, Chalak, & Heidari Tabrizi, 2020; Khaki & Heidari Tabrizi, 2021).

In another study, Lee (2013) investigated the teachers' and students' preferences for CF in an advanced level classroom. Lee reported that recast comprises 92 percent of the error correction. Students favored immediate and explicit feedback. Although learners preferred their teachers to correct them in the middle of their oral production, teachers strongly disagreed regarding the correction of all students' oral errors. According to the results of the interviews, learners preferred explicit correction because when teachers indicated the errors directly, they can clearly understand and correct them quickly. On the other hand, they described clarification requests as an unclear technique that results in unpleasant feelings and frustrates their desires to continue their oral production.

With regard to the timing of corrective feedback, Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) found that most of the learners preferred their errors to be corrected after the speaking task. The findings are similar to the previous findings in which students usually expected teachers to correct their errors without interrupting their conversation (Park, 2010).

Chunhong and Griffiths (2012) investigated students' preferences for CF both qualitatively and quantitatively through questionnaires and interviews. The findings showed that in the force of attesting the effectiveness of error correction on their language learning process, students preferred immediate over delayed and explicit over implicit feedback types and teacher-correction over self-correction and peer-correction.

Zarei (2011) also investigated the relationship between gender and corrective feedback. The findings showed significant differences between males and females in different aspects of error correction. According to this study, females had a higher tendency toward error correction than males. The findings also showed that males prefer a meaning-based approach to learning form while females prefer an analytic approach because according to them, a direct grammatical explanation is more helpful. In addition, in a study conducted by Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013), the findings revealed that there was no significant difference between male and female learners in delivering the agents of error correction with which nearly all learners agreed error correction by teachers. Therefore, learners valued and preferred teacher-correction and self-correction to peer-correction. The current study has addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the Iranian EFL teachers' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking?
2. What are the Iranian EFL learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking?
3. Is there any significant difference between male and female Iranian EFL learners regarding their cognition on corrective feedback?

Methodology

Design and Context of the Study

In order to achieve the objectives of the study, the present study employed a non-experimental descriptive design in a quantitative paradigm. The data for the current study were collected from Iran-e-ma Language Institute and Pendar Language Institute in Isfahan, Iran, during the second spring semester of 2020.

Participants

The population of this study was Iranian EFL learners and the target population were English teachers and learners in Isfahan. Through convenience sampling, 60 learners (30 males and 30 females) were selected out of two private language institutions in Isfahan. Learners' age was from 13 to 30, and their foreign language was English while Persian was the native language of all the participants. Moreover, 25 non-native English-speaking teachers participated in the research. They were all female teachers and their ages was from 20 to 40 years. All of them were working at private language institutions and teaching English at intermediate to advanced levels. There was an important difference in experience, ranging from two years of teaching experience to 15 years. Table 1 depicts the characteristics of the participants.

Table 1.

Demographic Background of the Participants

No. of Learners	60	No. of Teachers	25
Age	13s-30s	Age	20s-40s
Gender	Male & Female	Gender	Female
Native Language	Persian	Native Language	Persian
Foreign Language	English	Foreign Language	English
Proficiency Level	Intermediate to advanced	Teaching experience	2-15 years

Instruments

In order to have triangulation in the data collection procedure, the instruments of the study were questionnaires, interviews, and observations. To investigate EFL teachers' and learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking, two questionnaires were adapted from Fukuda (2004). The teachers' questionnaire consisted of 12 questions and the learners' one consisted of 16 questions. In addition, to increase the validity in collecting the data, observations were made as well as semi-structured interviews with volunteer teachers and learners.

Data Collection Procedure

In the first phase of data collection, the relative questionnaires were distributed to the participating EFL teachers and learners in the two language institutes. The instruction was written on the questionnaires in order to avoid any confusion for the participants.

The items of the questionnaires were divided into different categories including the necessity of error correction, the timing of error correction, different types of corrective feedback, types of errors that need to be corrected, and who should provide corrective feedback to the learners' error. The participants were requested to complete it by rating the items on a 5-point Likert scale. Then, the data were analyzed quantitatively to examine if there was a significant difference between the two groups of the participants' cognition on corrective feedback or not.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted before classroom observations to seek teachers' and learners' further insights regarding their cognition on corrective feedback on their oral production. To do so, two male and two female teachers and learners participated voluntarily. The participants were interviewed individually at the end of the classes in a quiet place; each interview lasted 15-20 minutes. Their interviewees were recorded, transcribed, and then analyzed. To explore EFL teachers' and learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking at different levels, the researchers relied on 8-hour classroom observations. Due to the Covid-19 Pandemic, the rest of the observations and classes were canceled.

Data Analysis Procedure

By the final return of all survey responses, the non-experimental descriptive data analysis procedure was started. The obtained data were analyzed via the statistical analysis software (SPSS) version 26 through descriptive analysis, and the frequency distribution table was

depicted to compare the mean scores of EFL teachers' and learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking skill. Then the inferential statistics were used to compare male and female students to find out the differences across genders. The questionnaire items were coded based on the criteria of each research question. The data were presented in tables to generate frequencies and percentages of each of the research questions of the study. The descriptive analysis of the surveyed data and the report on interviews and observations are presented in the following section.

Results

The first objective of the current study was to investigate the EFL teachers' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking skill. Table 2. demonstrates the frequencies of the teachers' responses to the questionnaire items. For each choice in this 5-point Likert type scale questionnaire was assigned a value ranging from 1 to 5 (strongly agree to strongly disagree), the mean score of each questionnaire item was compared with the average value of the choices (that is 3.00). This would mean that if the mean score of a questionnaire item was less than 3.00, the respondents tended to disagree with that statement. By contrast, a mean score greater than 3.00 indicated the respondents' inclination to agree with that given statement.

Table 2.
EFL Teachers' Cognition on CF on Speaking

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean	SD
Necessity of error correction							
1. Students' spoken errors should be corrected.	11	10	2	2	0	4.20	.91
Timing of Error correction							
2. Immediate corrective feedback (CF)	2	4	5	7	7	2.48	1.29
3. CF after students' oral production	5	14	1	5	0	3.76	1.01
4. CF after the activity	3	9	7	4	2	3.28	1.13
5. CF at the conclusion of class	2	4	6	8	5	2.60	1.22
Methods of corrective feedback							
6. Recasts	4	12	5	2	2	3.56	1.25
7. Repetition	6	11	6	2	0	3.84	.80
8. Clarification request	8	11	3	2	1	3.92	1.07
9. Elicitation	6	8	6	2	3	3.48	1.67
10. Metalinguistic cue	7	11	3	3	1	3.80	1.11
11. Direct correction	2	14	4	3	2	3.44	1.08
12. No corrective feedback	3	2	3	12	5	2.44	1.26

Table 2. illustrates the frequencies of responses as well as the mean scores for each item. Regarding the necessity of corrective feedback (item # 1), nearly all EFL teachers agreed that the students' spoken errors should be corrected. With regard to the timing of error correction, they also agreed that correction should take place after students' oral production (item # 3) or after the activity is rounded up (item # 4), rather than immediately (item # 2) or at the end of the class (item # 5). In line with the types of corrective feedback favored by teachers, clarification request, repetition, and metalinguistic cue owned the highest percentage of the most preferred type of feedback in comparison with elicitation, recast, and direct correction.

The second objective of the study was to investigate the EFL learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking skill. Table 3. demonstrates the frequencies of the learners' responses to the questionnaire items as well as a mean score for each questionnaire item.

Table 3.
EFL Learners' Cognition on CF on Speaking

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean	SD
Necessity of error correction							
1. Students' spoken errors should be corrected.	26	20	6	4	5	3.96	1.24
Timing of Error correction							
2. Immediate corrective feedback (CF)	10	10	16	14	10	2.93	1.34
3. CF after students' oral production	6	28	11	14	1	3.40	.99
Type of errors that need to be corrected							
4. Serious spoken errors	26	18	1	8	7	3.80	1.42
5. Frequent spoken errors	14	23	9	13	1	3.60	1.12
6. Individual spoken errors	9	15	23	4	9	3.18	1.20
Agents of error correction							
7. Peer-correction	6	12	16	11	15	2.71	1.34
8. Teacher-correction	15	24	9	7	5	3.61	1.22
9. Self-correction	14	22	10	11	3	3.55	1.18
Methods of corrective feedback							
10. Recasts	10	16	21	8	5	3.30	1.15
11. Repetition	10	15	10	11	14	2.93	1.43
12. Clarification request	12	14	21	6	7	3.30	1.23
13. Elicitation	5	16	15	11	13	2.81	1.28
14. Metalinguistic cue	24	21	5	7	3	3.93	1.19
15. Direct correction	13	19	18	4	6	3.48	1.20
16. No corrective feedback	5	9	19	14	13	2.65	1.21

In line with the necessity of error correction, nearly all EFL learners agreed that students' spoken errors should be corrected. With regard to the timing of error correction, they preferred corrective feedback after students' oral production, while expressing their reluctance for receiving immediate feedback. As to the type of errors that need to be corrected, the surveyed EFL learners gave priority to serious spoken errors while frequent spoken errors ranked second and individual spoken errors were the last type in this triad. More precisely, regarding the agents of error correction, peer correction was dismissed out of hand, and priority was given to teacher correction and then self-correction. With regard to the types of corrective feedback favored by learners, metalinguistic cues, direct correction, and clarification requests deserved the most attention.

The final aim of the present study was to find out any possible differences between male and female EFL learners regarding their cognition on corrective feedback during their oral production. For this purpose, first, the frequencies of responses to the different choices of each questionnaire item by male and female EFL learners were juxtaposed in the following table. Then, to find out whether the differences between these two gender groups were of statistical significance or not, their frequencies of responses were compared by running a series of chi-square for independence. The *p*-values of the chi-square analyses are shown under the Sig. column (the rightmost column). A *p*-value less than the significance level ($p < .05$) indicates a difference that reached statistical significance while a *p* value larger than .05 would mean that the difference between male and female EFL learners for that given item failed to reach statistical significance.

Table 4.
Male and Female EFL Learners' Cognition on CF on Speaking

Items	Male/Female	Strongly Agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Sig.
Necessity of error correction							
1. Students' spoken errors should be corrected.	Male	16	10	3	1	0	.10
	Female	10	10	2	3	5	
Timing of Error correction							
2. Immediate corrective feedback (CF)	Male	6	4	11	5	4	.33
	Female	4	6	5	9	6	
3. CF after students' oral production	Male	2	14	6	8	0	.72
	Female	4	14	5	6	1	
Types of errors that need to be corrected							
4. Serious spoken errors	Male	16	12	1	0	1	.00
	Female	10	6	0	8	6	
5. Frequent spoken errors	Male	7	15	7	1	0	.00
	Female	7	8	2	12	1	
6. Individual spoken errors	Male	6	10	12	0	2	.04
	Female	3	5	11	4	7	
Agents of error correction							

7. Peer-correction	Male	5	9	6	5	5	.07
	Female	1	3	10	6	10	
8. Teacher-correction	Male	6	13	7	2	2	.28
	Female	9	11	2	5	3	
9. Self-correction	Male	5	10	7	6	2	.50
	Female	9	12	3	5	1	
Methods of corrective feedback							
10. Recasts	Male	6	5	12	3	4	.31
	Female	4	11	10	4	1	
11. Repetition	Male	9	12	5	3	1	.00
	Female	1	3	5	8	13	
12. Clarification request	Male	7	5	13	3	2	.41
	Female	5	9	8	3	5	
13. Elicitation	Male	1	13	6	6	4	.03
	Female	4	3	9	5	9	
14. Metalinguistic cue	Male	12	11	5	2	0	.053
	Female	12	10	0	5	3	
15. Direct correction	Male	9	9	11	1	0	.04
	Female	4	10	7	3	6	
16. No corrective feedback	Male	5	4	11	6	4	.09
	Female	0	5	8	8	9	

Regarding the necessity of corrective feedback between male and female EFL learners, there was no difference between male and female learners ($p > .05$) as both of the gender groups realized the preponderance of correcting students' spoken errors. Besides, there was no significant difference between male and female EFL learners with regard to their opinions about timing of error correction (that is immediate vs. delayed) owing to the fact the p-value for items # 2 and 3 exceeded the significance level of .05.

However, significant differences were found between the male and female EFL learners with regard to the types of errors that need to be corrected, through item # 4 ($p < .05$), nearly all of the male learners (strongly) agreed that serious spoken errors should be corrected, but only a little less than half of the female learners disagreed with this idea. Besides, in item # 5 ($p < .05$), most male EFL learners agreed that frequent spoken errors need to be corrected while this was not the case with female EFL learners. Additionally, significantly higher numbers of male learners remarked that individual spoken errors should be corrected. All in all, it seems that male EFL learners would welcome the correction of different types of errors compared to female EFL learners.

In relation to the agents of error correction, there was no significant difference between male and female EFL learners. Teacher-correction and self-correction were both liked by male and female EFL learners.

Finally, as far as various methods of providing corrective feedback are concerned, there was no significant difference between male and female EFL learners in their cognitions about the provision of recasts, clarification requests, and metalinguistic cues. In fact, males favoured repetition, elicitation, and direct correction ($p < .05$) more than females.

Discussion

Based on the teachers' questionnaire, the findings of the present study showed that nearly all EFL teachers agreed that students' spoken errors should be corrected. In terms of the timing of error correction, teachers concurred that correction had better be delayed. Regarding the methods of corrective feedback, the findings revealed that clarification, request, repetition, and metalinguistic cues owned the highest percentage of the most preferred types of corrective feedback. The results of the study are in line with the findings of Zhai and Gao (2018) that clarification, requests, and metalinguistic feedback were the most dominant types of corrective feedback in stimulating the learning process of different speaking tasks complexity.

According to the classroom observations and semi-structured interviews, it was certainly important for the teachers to give corrective feedback to the learners' oral performance for the development of second language learning. It helps learners to concentrate on the content and how to reformulate the errors. It is most productive to students' learning when they are provided with an explanation as to what is accurate and inaccurate about their work. Feedback provides a sense of engagement and interactivity, and allows learners to take ownership of their learning.

For timing of error correction, errors were corrected immediately when they occurred at the time of students' oral performance and occasionally afterward of their oral communication in order not to disturb learners' concentration. With regard to the feedback types, teachers agreed in providing recast and elicitation in order to reformulate the learners' erroneous utterances throughout the interviews while recast, direct correction, and metalinguistic cues deserved the most attention by teachers through classroom observations. The results are in line with the findings of Demir and Özmen (2017) that recast was more favorable than other types of corrective feedback.

The findings of the learners' questionnaire showed that nearly all EFL learners agreed that their spoken errors should be corrected. In terms of the timing of error correction, they preferred delayed rather than immediate corrective feedback. These results are in line with the findings of Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) that most of the learners preferred their errors to be corrected after their speaking. Moreover, EFL learners gave priority to serious spoken errors, then frequent spoken errors, and individual ones ranked last. With respect to the methods, metalinguistic cues, direct correction, and clarification requests deserved the most attention. Furthermore, teacher correction and self-correction were both favoured by the learners.

Based on the observations and semi-structured interviews, serious spoken errors and frequent ones were given priority by the EFL learners. Recast as the best methods of error correction and teacher-correction deserved the most attention. They also preferred immediate corrective feedback and occasionally delayed it at the time of their oral production. The findings are in line with Chunhong and Griffiths (2012) that despite attesting the efficacy of error correction on students' language learning process, students preferred immediate over delayed, explicit over implicit, and teacher-correction over self or peer-correction.

Significant differences were found between male and female learners with regard to the types of errors that need to be corrected in which nearly all the males agreed that serious spoken errors should be corrected. Additionally, there were significant differences in their attitudes regarding repetition, elicitation, and direct correction.

Observations and semi-structured interviews also showed that female learners preferred immediate corrective feedback while male learners preferred delayed corrective feedback. Both male and female EFL learners agreed in providing a recast in order to correct the erroneous utterances, also female learners maintained that serious spoken errors should be corrected, while males expressed that frequent spoken errors should be corrected during their oral performance. Moreover, both gender groups believed that errors should be corrected by teachers (teacher-correction). The findings are in line with Khorshidi and Rassaei (2013) that there was no significant difference between male and female learners in delivering the agents of error correction in which nearly all learners agreed with error correction by teachers.

Conclusion

Corrective feedback (CF) refers to all comments, suggestions, and corrections from the teacher performed to correct the learners' erroneous utterances. The present study was aimed to investigate EFL teachers' and learners' cognition on corrective feedback on speaking skill. The findings of this study revealed that corrective feedback is an indispensable part of the second language learning. It also is considered beneficial by the teachers in order to improve learners' language acquisition. Evidently, expressing the error and its reformulation makes the explicit correction most favored by teachers and learners. It helps them to concentrate on the content and how to reformulate the errors.

The findings also showed that learners considered corrective feedback as an essential and beneficial part in the learning process and they made use of it in their language acquisition in order to prevent fossilization and encourage them to improve L2 acquisition. By providing explicit correction, it will be easy for learners to find out the error and how to reformulate the correct form.

Conventionally, corrective feedback from the teacher was more favorable. The authority, the expertise, and knowledge of the teachers are as primary reasons that learners deserved corrective feedback provided by the teachers. Furthermore, corrective feedback extremely provides learners' willingness to communicate. The more corrective feedback is provided, the more learners feel motivated and confident. Feedback as an evaluation approach is used to point out the effectiveness of understanding of the learners as well as teaching strategies. Corrective feedback is also used as a supportive approach that develops the second language learning process. It is essential as it helps teachers and learners to focus on frequent errors, also provides a stage through which teachers interact with learners in order to promote their language skills.

Implication and Limitations of the Study

This research generates some pedagogical implications for EFL teachers, learners, and material designers. Corrective feedback creates opportunities for interaction between students and teachers, therefore facilitating better learning. The most fundamental impact of corrective feedback is that EFL learners can correct their own oral performance by the inputs which they receive. Thus, EFL learners can improve their self-correction and decrease the reliance on their teachers. It also increases EFL teachers' and learners' knowledge and motivation toward second language learning.

The findings of the present study make researchers, teacher educators, course book and curriculum designers, and teachers on their own reflective practice. Curriculum designers should highlight the importance of corrective feedback and inform teachers with the best method of corrective feedback. They also can integrate activities and exercises in course books which require learners to improve their own self-correction.

In terms of the limitations of the study, this study is not an exception. Having a small size of the participants is one of the main problems, which requires further research for any generalizations. The number of classes of private language institutes was not sufficient enough so the number of participating EFL teachers and learners could not be satisfied.

Teachers in higher level of education were usually involved and busy with different aspects of their job, they did not accept to complete the questionnaires. Some teachers did not allow classroom observations. They also would not like to take part in interviews. The participating EFL teachers in this research study were only female, and it is recommended to examine the project with gender differences in order to obtain better result in this case.

References

Abbasi, M., & Karimnia, A. (2011). An analysis of grammatical errors among Iranian translation students: Insights from interlanguage theory. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 25*(4), 525-536.

Allwright, R., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alahdadi, S., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2017). The dynamic interplay among EFL learners' ambiguity tolerance, adaptability, cultural intelligence, learning approach, and language achievement. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 5*(1), 37-50.

Boyerhassani, J., Chalak, A. Heidari Tabrizi, H. (2020). Probing into the effect of synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated peer feedback practices on IELTS learners'/peers' provided comments. *International Journal of Future Generation Communication and Networking, 13*(4), 1234–1245.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chunhong, Z., & Griffiths, C. (2012). Quantitative and qualitative perspectives on individual differences in error correction preferences. In M. Pawlak (ed.), *New perspectives on*

individual differences in language learning and teaching (pp. 305-317). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.

Demir, Y., & Özmen, K. (2017). Exploring native and non-native EFL teachers' oral corrective feedback practices: An observational study. *Brock Education Journal*, (pp. 111-129). doi: 10.26522/brocked.v26i2.609

Fukuda, Y. (2004). *Treatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes.* Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco.

Grami, M, A. (2005). The effect of teachers' written feedback on ESL students' writing: A study on a Saudi ESL University-level context. *Language Teaching, 2,* 9-22.

Hosseini, B. A., Ghonsooly, B., & Ghanizadeh, A. (2017). Self-fulfillment in higher education: contributions from mastery goal, intrinsic motivation, and assertions. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher,*. DOI 10.1007/ s40299-017-0338-1.

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

Khaki, M. & Heidari Tabrizi, H. (2021). Assessing the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback in process-based vs product-based instruction on learners' writing. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 21*, 35-53.

Khorshidi, E., & Rassaei, E. (2013). The effects of learners' gender on their preferences for corrective feedback. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English,14*, 71-83.

Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2012). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal, 43*(1), 74-93. doi: 10.1080/09571736.2012.705571.

Lee, E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, *41*, 217–230.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned (2nd Edition).* New York: Oxford University Press.

Lyster, R. (1998). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20,* 51-81.

Lyster, R. & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition 19*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32,* 265-302.

Mohseni, A., & Edalat, P. L. (2012). Iranian EFL learners and their teachers' preferences for oral error correction. *Journal of Language and Translation, 3*(1), 9-16.

Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction and second language acquisition* (pp. 407-453). New York: Oxford University Press.

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, *22,* 471-497.

Park, H. S. (2010). Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction. [Unpublished Ph.D Thesis]. California State University.

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on 'noticing the gap': Normative speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*, 99-126.

Roothooft, H. (2018). Teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: A comparison of secondary and adult education. *Filologíay Didáctica de la Lengua*, *18*, 151-176.

Schulz, R. (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.

Sheen, Y. H. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(3), 263-300. doi: 10.1191/1362168804lrl46oa.

Yoshida, R. (2008a). Learners' perception of corrective feedback in pair work. *Foreign Language Annals, 41*(3), 525-541.

Yoshida, R. (2010). How do teachers and learners perceive corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom? T*he Modern Language Journal, 94*(2), 293-314. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4781.2010.01022.x

Zhai, K., & Gao, X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education Curriculum & Teaching Studies,* http://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2018.1485472

Zhang, L.J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective Feedback in oral communication classes. *System, 42,* 429-439.

Zarei, N. (2011). The relationship between gender and corrective feedback. *Online Journal of ICT for Language Learning, 5,* 11.