The Effect of Implicit versus Explicit Corrective Feedback on Intermediate EFL Learners' Speaking Self-efficacy Beliefs

Hajar Shamiri
Department of English Language Teaching, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran;
Department of English Language Teaching, Khouzestan Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

Mohammad Taghi Farvardin
Department of English Language Teaching, Ahvaz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz, Iran

Abstract—**Although a majority of previous studies have investigated the efficacy of corrective feedback (CF) and a number of them have compared implicit and explicit CF types, there are still many variables, one of which is speaking self-efficacy, that have not been investigated along with CF. Therefore, this study aimed to compare implicit versus explicit CF to see if they affect EFL learners' speaking self-efficacy beliefs differently. To this aim, 44 intermediate EFL learners were randomly assigned to two implicit (n=22) and explicit groups (n=22). All participants were female students whose age ranged from 14 to 35. In the first session, speaking self-efficacy questionnaire (Hairuzila et al., 2011) including 23 items with choices on a 5-point Likert scale was administered to the participants. After 18 sessions of receiving two different types of CF, the same questionnaire with some changes in the order of the items was given to the participants. The results revealed that there were no significant differences between the implicit and explicit groups regarding their speaking self-efficacy beliefs. Moreover, a follow-up interview was held with 12 participants two weeks after the end of the treatment. The results of the interview showed that the participants in the implicit group had more positive beliefs towards speaking self-efficacy than the explicit group. The results have some implications for EFL learners, EFL teachers, curriculum designers and teacher trainers.**

Index Terms—**implicit corrective feedback, explicit corrective feedback, speaking self-efficacy beliefs**

I. INTRODUCTION

Corrective feedback (henceforth CF) is considered as one of the various aspects of the teacher's language to help foreign or second language (L2) learners to learn more efficiently during their participation in class activities or in the process of learning a language (Ellis, 2012). CF is defined as "the feedback that learners receive on the linguistic errors they make in their oral or written production in a second language" (Sheen & Ellis, 2011, p. 593). Sheen (2011) further points out that teachers can use CF even in those situations that they comprehend each other in a way that form and meaning are both negotiated.

Many researchers have attempted to categorize and classify CF since it was proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). Depending on whether CF is written or oral, it has different typologies. Written CF (WCF) is categorized as focused vs. unfocused WCF, direct vs. indirect WCF, and explicit vs. implicit WCF (Ferris, Liu, Sinha, & Senna, 2013). Ellis (2012) also classifies oral CF (OCF) which is the focus of this study as input-providing (i.e. the correct form is given to the student) or output-prompting (i.e. the student is prompted to self-correct), then separates implicit from explicit feedback and divides each into separate parts (Recasts, Repetition, Clarification Request, Explicit/Direct, Metalinguistic, and Elicitation). Ellis's (2012) taxonomy can be applied both for negotiation of form and negotiation of meaning. By implicit feedback the teacher tries to show that the student's utterance lacks veracity and linguistically contains an error and needs to be reformulated (the correct force of feedback is covert). In turn, by explicit feedback a formal aspect of language which contains an error is explained to the student and corrected (the correct force of feedback is overt) (Campillo, 2003).

Based on Carroll's (2001) autonomous induction theory, CF fosters acquisition if the learner recognizes the error but implicit CF does not locate the error most of the time. As Sheen (2006) indicates, recasts for instance, does not help the learner to recognize the error, depending on the type of recast (partial or full) made by the teacher. In contrast, explicit CF locates the error exactly for the learner.

Speaking has often been regarded as the most essential language skill (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Students need to speak in order to communicate in the classroom and also with the English-speaking world. Thus EFL/ESL teachers attempt to promote the development of listening, speaking and pronunciation in their students. As Goh and Burns (2012, p. 15) support this idea, "speaking can facilitate language acquisition and contribute towards the academic development of many second language learners". But because of lack of enough exposure for EFL learners, learners often do not have

the chance to improve their oral skills. So, students value and expect their teacher's feedback in their work. However, correcting students' errors in the classroom is an exasperating task for teachers because of the nature of subjectivity due to some individual variables such as background knowledge, pronunciation and spontaneity as influential parts (Hughes, 2002). Therefore, teachers should be more careful about error correction so as not to discourage the students from practicing the language.

In addition, self-efficacy as a component of the social cognitive theory plays a pivotal role in learner's performance in educational contexts (Bandura, 1997), and also affects the learners' motivation to learn (Schunk, 2003). Bandura (1997, p. 2) explains that self-efficacy "refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective situations". It is based on the theory that individuals prefer to participate in activities for which they have high self-efficacy than those activities for which they have low self-efficacy. some studies have been conducted on self-efficacy beliefs of L2 learners (e.g., Aregu, 2013; Barkely, 2006; Fahim & Nasrollahi-Muziraji, 2013; Ghonsouly, Elahi & Golparvar, 2012; Liu, 2013; Pajares, 2000; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009).

Lunenburg (2011) posits that self-efficacy affects people's capability in learning, their motivation and their performance and people usually prefer to learn and do tasks that think they can accomplish successfully. According to Brown (2007), whenever the learner feels s/he is capable of doing an activity, in other words, s/he has high level of self-efficacy, s/he attempts in achieving success. Failure in success then can be attributable to not attempting sufficiently and rarely to something such as bad luck. But those learners with low self-efficacy level attribute their failure to some external factors and lack of ability.

Statement of the Problem and Purpose

The type of strategy that the teacher selects in dealing with students' errors may hamper learning and result in students' anger, inhibition and feeling of inferiority (Truscott, 1999). Moreover, there are lots of controversies on which type of CF is more effective (Ellis, 2008). Ellis (2007) also argues that in exploring CF, researchers should consider the psychological characteristics of individual learners; however, a look at related literature reveals that there is scant research on such variables. Among all psychological variables, self-efficacy is the most consistent predicator of behavior and learners' achievement and also the most influential arbiter in human agency that has a pivotal role in decision-making (Bandura, 1997). Some studies have been conducted on self-efficacy in relation to second and foreign-language learning in general (e.g., Ayoobian & Soleimani, 2015; Fahim & Nasrollahi-Muziraji, 2013; Hairuzila, Rohani & Muhammad Ridhuan, 2011; Liu, 2013), and writing, reading and listening in particular (e.g., Rahimi & Abedini, 2009; Barkley 2006; Naderi, 2014). To the researcher's best knowledge, no studies have investigated the effect of CF on the speaking self-efficacy beliefs of learners, and little is known about it.

In order to fill in this gap in the literature, the current study aimed to shed light on this issue by investigating how implicit and explicit CF influence the intermediate EFL learners' speaking self-efficacy beliefs. The research question addressed to fulfill the objectives of the present study is as follows:

RQ: Is there any significant difference between self-efficacy beliefs of Iranian intermediate EFL learners who receive implicit CF in their speaking compared with those who receive explicit CF?

The study also offers the following null hypothesis:

H0: There is no significant difference between self-efficacy beliefs of Iranian intermediate EFL learners who receive implicit CF in their speaking compared with those who receive explicit CF.

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Theoretical Background

  1. Types of Corrective Feedback

According to Ellis (2012), strategies can be input-providing (i.e. the teacher gives the correct form to the learner) or output-providing (i.e. the teacher prompts the student to self-correct). In order to explain the varying assertiveness of CF event, Ellis separates implicit and explicit CF and then divides each into separate parts in order to describe how the correct form is provided through input-providing CF and how output-prompting demands the learners to negotiate language. In fact, Ellis's classification was the most successful one that could show CF as both a means of resolving meaning (i.e. didactic: a linguistic element is corrected) and negotiating form (i.e. communicative: a communication problem is resolved) (Table 1). Ellis's (2012) model was used as the theoretical model of the present study.

TABLE 1.
TAXONOMY OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK (ADAPTED FROM ELLIS, 2012, P.139)

	Implicit Feedback	Explicit Feedback
Input-Providing	Recasts	Explicit/Direct
Output-Providing	Repetition	Metalinguistic
	Clarification Request	Elicitation

  2. Explicit Correction

Explicit or Direct Feedback refers to a type of feedback that provides the learner with correct form while at the same time indicates that an error is made (Ellis, 2008). The correction may include phrases such as, "No, you should say …", "That's not right …", "In English we say…" (Suzuki, 2005, p. 9).

3. Recasts

Recasts, as another type of input-providing feedback, are considered by many researchers as being more implicit than explicit because the correct form is not directly given to the learner (Ellis, 2012). According to Ellis (2008), "recast is an utterance that rephrases the learner's utterance by changing one or more components (subject, verb, object) while still referring to its central meaning" (p. 227). Recasts can often be used in conversation and include phrases like, "You mean …" or "Are you trying to say…." (Suzuki, 2005). However, some recasts are more salient than others in that they may focus on one word only, whereas others incorporate the grammatical or lexical modification into a sustained piece of discourse" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The following example adapted from Ellis and Sheen (2006, p. 576) illustrates recasts:

Teacher: *When you were in school?*
Student: *Yes. I stand in the first row.* (Trigger)
Teacher: *You stood in the first row?* (Recast)
Student: *Yes, in the first row, and sit, ah, sat the first row.* (Uptake)

4. Clarification Requests

Clarification Requests refer to simple phrases that make learners to repeat their preceding utterances. They are viewed as being highly implicit since they do not directly indicate the type of error that the learner has been uttered and include phrases like "Pardon?", "Could you say that again?", "What do you mean? They can also be used to indicate that an "utterance is incoherent" or the listeners themselves have a "comprehension problem" Suzuki, (2005, p.10). Mackey (2012, p. 115) depicted clarification requests in the following example:

Teacher: *There has been a lot of talk lately about additives and preservatives in food. In what way has this changed your eating habits?*
Student: *Uh, I don't eat that many foods with preservatives, anyway even before all that talk.*
Teacher: *Pardon me?* (Clarification request)
Student: *I don't eat, uh, canned foods or foods that have preservatives.*

5. Metalinguistic Feedback

Metalinguistic Feedback refers to comments or questions posed by the teacher using linguistic terms about stress or verb tense. "This kind of CF makes the learner analyze his/her utterance linguistically, not quite in a meaning-oriented manner" (Suzuki, 2005, p. 10). Li (2014, p. 196) presents the following example for clarification requests:

Student: *I go to a movie yesterday.*
Teacher: *You need the past tense.*
Student: *I went.*

6. Elicitation

In this type of CF the teacher asks questions or pauses in order to elicit the correct form from the student directly. "Teachers can also use questions to elicit correct forms, such as, how can we say X in English?" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Elicitation is considered to be the least explicit output-providing CF form since it leads the students to self-correction. Suzuki (2005, p. 10) best illustrates elicitation by giving the following example:

Student: *Because I enjoy city life [laip]* (Error – phonological)
Teacher: *City…* (Feedback – elicitation)

7. Repetition

Repetition feedback occurs when the student's error is repeated and the intonation is adjusted by the teacher to draw attention to the mistake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Ellis (2012) views this as an implicit correction form, but output-providing since no form is supplied to the learner. Following is an example in order to understand this better (Sheen, 2004, p. 279):

Student: *Oh my God, it is too expensive, I pay only 10 dollars.*
Teacher: I pay?

8. Definition of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1997) pointed out that one way to increase students' achievement is by increasing their self-efficacy. "Self-Efficacy refers to people's judgements of their capabilities to carry out certain specific tasks and, accordingly, their sense of efficacy will determine choice of activities attempted, along with the level of aspiration, amount of effort exerted and persistence displayed" (Dörnyei & Ushioda, 2011, p. 16). In other words, people with low level of self-efficacy dwell on their deficiencies or obstacles they encounter during doing some tasks and they do not make any attempt to accomplish those tasks. Therefore, they may lose their belief in their capabilities and give up. However, those with high self-efficacy make any attempt to perform the tasks successfully; they approach threatening situations with confidence and never give up.

Dörnyei and Ushioda (2011) also noted that self-efficacy beliefs are only indirectly relevant to actual competence and abilities since these beliefs are the result of another complex product named self-persuasion that is based on

cognitive processing of various sources such as people's opinions, feedback, evaluation, encouragement; past experiencing and training; observing peers and information about appropriate task strategies.

9. Self-Efficacy and Feedback

Schunk and Zimmerman (1997) proposed that correcting students' errors by the teacher helps them to succeed in learning and success in learning strengthens their self-efficacy. Moreover, providing immediate feedback in the heat of the moment, when the students are struggling to learn something new, helps them to improve their self-efficacy.

B. Empirical Studies

1. Efficacy of Corrective Feedback in L2 Learning

There has been a growing interest in the role of CF in L2 learning for years. Many researchers have attempted to find out whether CF has any effect on learner's development with regard to L2 learning, and if it has, what type of CF may be more effective. The results of some meta-analyses (e.g., Li, 2010; Lyster & Saito, 2010; Mackey & Goo, 2007; Russel & Spada, 2006) indicated CF is very helpful in assisting learners to learn a language. Li (2010), for example, meta-analyzed 33 oral CF studies and reported that CF had a medium effect on L2 acquisition. However, Li (2010) reported that in laboratory studies, the effect of CF on acquisition was more effective than in a classroom. It may be because students pay attention to the feedback by the researcher in a laboratory better than those learners receive CF in a classroom setting. Li (2010) also proposed that in a foreign language setting, the effect of CF was greater than in second language context because foreign language learners pay much attention to the correction they receive than ESL learners do. He also reported that CF was more effective in treatments that involved discrete-item practice of grammatical structures than in communicative activities.

2. Studies on Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback

Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) compared the effects of implicit (recasts) and explicit (metalinguistic clue) CF on the acquisition of regular past –ed. The participants were 34 pre-intermediate students studying at a private school in NZ. They were divided into 2 experimental groups, one receiving implicit correction on their errors and the other received explicit correction. The control group received no feedback. The results of the delayed post-test revealed that the explicit group outperformed the other two groups. This study shows a preference and an advantage for the explicit CF (i.e. metalinguistic clue). The result may be different in a longitudinal study on students with different proficiencies or in another context because this study has been conducted in classroom context on pre-intermediate students and in a short period of time.

Loewen and Erlam (2006) also conducted a study on the relative effectiveness of recasts (as an implicit CF strategy) and metalinguistic (as an explicit one) during small group text-chat interaction to acquire the regular past –ed. The results showed no significant difference between the two CF types. Based on the analysis of the participants' pre-tests, the results could be due to their low-proficiency level with the target form.

Loewen and Nabei (2007) compared the effects of recast and two specific types of prompts (clarification request as an implicit strategy and metalinguistic feedback as a more explicit one) and concluded that there is no significant difference between the CF types. The reason for this is reported to be short period of treatment (thirty minutes).

Sauro (2009) carried out a study on the comparative effects of two types of computer-mediated CF (recasts and metalinguistic) on the development of the adults' L2 performance. The results showed no preference for either types of CF, however; metalinguistic group showed significant gains over the control group.

Ahangari and Amirzadeh (2011) also investigated the use of oral CF by teachers in Iran at three proficiency levels. The researchers used a database of 360 CF moves that two Iranian teachers used in class. They identified eight CF types provided by teachers and their distribution in relationship with the students' proficiency level. The results of the study revealed that recast was the most frequent CF type used for students with all proficiency levels.

Lee (2013) later examined the different types of CF that occur in adult ESL classrooms, especially advanced-level classrooms to supplement previous work on recasts and to determine which CF types are more effective. The results revealed that recasts were the most frequent type of CF used by teachers in advanced–level adult ESL classrooms and students preferred to receive immediate and explicit correction.

In a quasi-experimental study, Vahdani and Nemati (2014) investigated the effect of six different CF strategies on 186 Iranian English language learners' IELTS writing test. The results of the study showed that the reformulation strategy was the most effective one.

3. Speaking Self-Efficacy and Related Studies

According to Bandura (1986), speaking self-efficacy refers to the students' perceptions about their abilities to communicate in the target language. A student with low level of self-efficacy may not make any attempt to use the target language. In contrast, a high efficacious student feels competent and tries his/her best to speak in the target language.

Hairuzila and Subarna (2007) conducted a study on the self-efficacy beliefs of pre-university ESL students at University Teknologi Petronas and the results showed that the students had high levels of self-efficacy to speak in English.

Furthermore, Hairuzila, et al. (2011) studied 169 senior-year students in University Technology Petronas (UTP). The results showed they had high level of self-efficacy in their oral communication ability based on three constructs: aptitude (ability), attitude and aspiration.

Liu (2013) studied the effect of an English Bar, a place for students to improve their speaking, on Chinese college students' self-efficacy enhancement. Results indicated that students who went to the bar to speak in English showed higher level of self-efficacy than those who did not do that.

The results of studies working on the efficacy of CF types indicated different results depending on the design, type of measurement and the context of the study; some findings revealed the efficacy of implicit CF (e.g., Rassaei, 2015) and some others reported that explicit CF had a greater role (e.g., Ellis et al., 2006). The findings of the studies carried out on self-efficacy also revealed that self-efficacy is an important predicator of performance (e.g., Barkley, 2006; Hairuzila, et al., 2001). In addition, few studies have investigated the learners' differences and affective factors with regard to CF types.

III. METHOD

A. Design of the Study

To identify which type of CF is more effective in learners' speaking self-efficacy, a quasi-experimental comparison group design was adopted.

B. Participants

Initially, 70 EFL female students were selected. Some were taking conversation courses through Top Notch English language textbook at Aria Private Language Institute and some others were students of Daneshvaran Public Exemplary High School in Shoush, Iran. In order to homogenize the participants, they took Top Notch/Summit Placement Test. Finally, 44 students at the intermediate level were selected. All participants were native speakers of Persian; they have never been abroad and their age ranged from 14 to 35 and their educational level varied from high school to Master's degree. They were randomly assigned to two experimental groups, implicit group (n=22) and explicit group (n=22). Throughout the study, the implicit group used to receive implicit CF and explicit group used to receive explicit CF. We had no control group because it was difficult to justify that a group receives no feedback during instruction. The reason for selecting intermediate level students was that they were expected to be able to speak English fluently to engage in class discussions with their peers and it was assumed that they had acquired enough proficiency in oral production. The author believed that through this study, these participants could provide more justified responses to the questionnaire.

C. Instruments

1. Placement Test

To homogenize the participants based on their proficiency level, Top Notch/Summit Placement Test was administered (Saslow & Asher, 2006). The test includes four sections: 10 listening questions, 10 reading questions, 120 general English questions, and an interview in which the participants were asked to look at a picture and answer 10 questions related to it. They were interviewed in English and scored by an expert teacher. The interview took about 10 minutes for each student.

2. Speaking Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

As Best and Kahn (2006) put it, questionnaire is a useful instrument to measure opinion in different areas. To answer the research question, a 23-item survey questionnaire (Hairuzila et al., 2011) in the form of a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (1) to strongly disagree (5) was administered to the participants to assess their self-efficacy perceptions. For the sake of clarity, the questionnaire was translated into Persian by two experts in translation and the translated version of the questionnaire was shown to two other experts for revision.

The questionnaire is based on three constructs: the first construct, *aptitude*, including 14 items that mostly addresses the respondents' perceived ability to speak and discuss English to communicate with peers and also international students. The second construct, *attitude*, consists of 6 items that addresses the respondents' perceptions towards activities that require them to speak English. *Aspiration* is the third construct that contains 3 items measuring respondents' aspirations concerning speaking in English.

The questionnaire was empirically tested and used by many researchers. It was, first, a 32-item questionnaire designed and used by Bandura (1990) and later was used and modified by some other researchers such as Hairuzila and Subarna (2007) in different contexts. It was also applied to participants in some studies conducted by Liu (2013). Hairuzila et al. (2011) conducted a factor analysis in order to identify any underlying constructs measured by the variables. According to Hairuzila et al. (2011), the total alpha level for all three constructs was .94. In the present study, the questionnaire's reliability measured through Cronbach's alpha by the researcher was .84. Therefore, the scale was found to be highly reliable.

3. Follow-up Interview

In order to better understand the differences between two groups of the learners regarding the effect of implicit and explicit CF on their self-efficacy beliefs, 12 students were randomly selected and interviewed two weeks after the treatment. The interview consisted of five open–ended questions. The interviewer was an expert teacher teaching at ILI and Aria Private Language Institute in Shoush, Iran. The interview took about 10 minutes for each interviewee. The interview questions were selected by the researchers based on the CF questionnaire developed by Agudo (2013) and the

speaking self-efficacy questionnaire used in the present study. The questions were also shown to two experts to obtain suggestions for improvement.

D. Procedures

For conducting the main study, on the first day of the study, the participants took the Top Notch/Summit Placement Test to see if they enjoyed the same level of proficiency. Then, they were divided randomly into two groups of implicit (n=22) and explicit CF (n=22). The data collection began the next session in which the speaking self-efficacy questionnaire was administered to all participants to see if there were initial differences between them. It took 15 minutes to fill in the questionnaire. The researcher asked the participants to answer the questions honestly and assured them of the confidentiality of the data.

Before the start of the treatment sessions, the researcher provided some written points and some examples of different types of CF and gave them to an experienced teacher. The teacher studied and practiced CF types by himself and then a preparatory session with the participants was held in the presence of the researcher to make sure that the teacher was fully informed of the treatment.

The study lasted eighteen 90-min sessions, three sessions a week. Top Notch English language textbook 3 (Saslow & Asher, 2014) was taught. During the sessions, the participants received different types of CF, one group received implicit CF types and another group received only explicit ones based on the Ellis's (2012) taxonomy of the CF types. The medium of instruction was English; Persian was used when it was necessary to assure that the participants understood the feedback given by the teacher. All the sessions were recorded by the researcher. In the last session, the questionnaire was administered to the participants again to see the effect of the treatment. Two weeks later, 12 participants were randomly selected and were interviewed by an expert and well-experienced teacher. The participants were interviewed one by one; the order of the questions was changed for each participant and their voice was recorded by the researcher with their permission and then transcribed by the researcher. It lasted 10 minutes for each interviewee and they were assured that the data would be confidential and would be only used by the researchers.

E. Data Analysis

In order to analyze the collected data, Chi-square tests were run to find whether the frequency of strategies used by participants were statistically significant or not. For qualitative data, i.e. interview, the participants' voices were transcribed by the researcher.

IV. RESULTS

A. Results of the Questionnaire

In order to identify the effect of implicit and explicit CFs on the participants' speaking self-efficacy beliefs including three constructs of aptitude, attitude and aspiration, Chi-square tests were applied. Table 2 compares the implicit and explicit CF groups based on the three self-efficacy constructs in pre-test.

TABLE 2.
CHI-SQUARE VALUE OF SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY CONSTRUCTS IN PRE-TEST BY IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT GROUPS

	Value	df	Sig.
Aptitude Construct	13.682	4	.080
Attitude Construct	1.970	4	.741
Aspiration Construct	3.867	2	.145

The results of chi-square indicated no significant difference between the two groups regarding their speaking self-efficacy beliefs ($p>0.05$). Table 3 compares the implicit and explicit CF groups in the post-test based on the three constructs of speaking self-efficacy beliefs.

TABLE 3.
CHI-SQUARE TESTS ON SPEAKING SELF-EFFICACY CONSTRUCTS IN POST-TEST BY IMPLICIT AND EXPLICIT GROUPS

	Value	df	Sig.
Aptitude Construct	.618	4	.961
Attitude Construct	9.992	4	**.041**
Aspiration Construct	2.119	2	.347

As Table 3 depicts, it can be concluded that there was not any significant difference between participants' speaking self-efficacy beliefs based on the aptitude and aspiration constructs ($p > 0.05$), whereas the results of Chi-square test on the attitude construct revealed a significant difference between the two experimental groups (df = 4, $p = .041$). It shows that most probably the participants' attitude toward their speaking self-efficacy changed after they have been given explicit feedback. This further suggests that the more explicit the feedback given to the learners, the more likelihood of attitude change toward the participants' speaking self-efficacy.

B. Results of Follow-up Interview

In order to explore why there were no significant differences in participants' speaking self-efficacy beliefs after receiving implicit and explicit CF, the researchers analyzed the interview transcriptions. The results of the interviews revealed more details about the participants' preferences for CF types and their effects on the student's speaking self-efficacy beliefs. First of all, all of the interviewees wanted their errors to be corrected by the teacher since it improves their speaking ability and helps them not to commit that error again and become a better speaker. Here are some excerpts.

Error correction helps me improve my English; it helps me evaluate myself and I really love it (Mahsa's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

I want the teacher to correct my error(s) and it is part of his/her job. In this way, I can improve my English speaking ability and I feel good. (Shirin's interview, Aug 15, 2015)

Secondly, the following interview transcriptions showed the participants' tendency for CF types. Nine out of twelve participants pointed out that they preferred their errors to be corrected implicitly, because it helps them to recognize their errors themselves, and to learn better; it gives them a chance to think and lets them feel more confident.

I prefer the teacher to correct my errors indirectly. It makes me recognize my errors myself (Parnian's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

In my opinion, indirect correction by the teacher is more helpful; it makes me to think more and learn better (Narges's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

In my opinion correcting indirectly is better, since it's amazing for me to find my own mistakes (Zahra's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

It is better that the teacher corrects my errors indirectly. In this way I feel more confident (Simin's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

In contrast, in the following transcriptions, we see that three other participants (one from implicit group and two from explicit group) preferred their errors to be corrected explicitly because it helped them to recognize their errors more easily.

I prefer that the teacher corrects my errors directly. In this way I can learn faster and more efficiently. It helps me to remember my errors and not to commit them again. Correcting errors in an indirect way, I think, is a waste of time! (Sanaz's interview, Aug 15, 2015)

In my opinion the overt error correction is much better than the indirect one, because it helps me to recognize my errors (Niloufar's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

Error correction is better to be done directly, because it makes me notice my errors (Fatemeh's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

Most importantly, the six interviewees from the implicit group pointed out that CF did not make them upset or angry; they did not get embarrassed or lose confidence and all of them said they continue speaking with confidence. In contrast, five out of six interviewees from the explicit group reported that CF makes them feel angry, embarrassed and sad. They lose confidence and prefer not to continue talking and just one of them felt good and didn't have any problems with CF. Here's the transcriptions.

It makes me feel happy since I learn to speak without those flaws. Interrupting me by the teacher doesn't make me feel upset and I usually go ahead and try to keep talking after that.

It's the job of a teacher to correct students' errors and it doesn't make me embarrassed. I usually listen to the teacher while correcting my errors and then I continue talking. Humming during speaking is common for every student (Mahsa's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

Many students get worried when their teacher interrupt them and corrects them. They should know that it is necessary if they want to learn better. It doesn't dread me feeling the teacher is ready to correct me each time I want to talk. I like to evaluate my knowledge by someone more superior than me. I usually practice more not to commit that error again and remember it (Sanaz's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

This makes me angry and sad and I lose my confidence. Sometimes I doubt my speaking ability. But I usually continue speaking after the error correction. (Fatemeh's interview, Aug 15, 2015)

I usually get embarrassed, angry and upset when the teacher corrects me. It sometimes made me not to go on talking and sit in silence in the classroom. But most of the time I continue talking and try to talk without errors (Zeinab's interview, Aug 15, 2015).

The result of the interview showed that all participants benefited from CF and implicit CF was more favorable than explicit CF. Moreover, the participants' speaking self-efficacy in the implicit group was more positive than those in the explicit group. Therefore, there was a significant difference between implicit and explicit groups regarding their speaking self-efficacy beliefs in terms of three constructs of aptitude, attitude and aspiration.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

A. Discussion

The results showed that there was no significant difference between speaking self-efficacy beliefs of participants based on the three constructs of the questionnaire. Regarding the CF variable (implicit and explicit), the results of the current study could run counter to the methodologists' views in post-method era that CF has an affective damage on

learners (Ellis & Shintani, 2014); however, we observed that neither implicit nor explicit CF influenced the participants' affect negatively. As Ellis and Shintani (2014) proposed, teachers should tailor CF to the developmental level of participants in order to be helped to use linguistic features that are not capable of doing autonomously and no CF type is considered the best.

The findings of the study are in line with Loewen and Nabei (2007) who compared the effects of implicit and explicit CF on question formation and realized that there was no significant difference across feedback types. The results are also in line with Loewen and Erlam (2006) and Sauro (2009) that investigated the comparative effects of two types of implicit and explicit CF and found no significant difference between the two conditions.

An important point is why there were no significant differences between implicit and explicit groups regarding their speaking self-efficacy beliefs. This might support the claim by Bandura (1982) that individuals' self-efficacy beliefs can be fixed over a span of time. It does not change depending on how the belief is acquired, the strength of your belief and your experience, as well. The strength of self-efficacy depends on one's certainty about doing a specific task.

The findings of the interview in two groups of implicit and explicit CF indicated that the participants favored being corrected by their teacher. The results of interview are consistent with the results of some other studies that investigated learners' beliefs on CF (e.g., Li, 2010; Lyster & Sato, Mackey & Goo, 2007; Russel & Spada, 2006). Another finding of the interview was that most interviewees preferred their errors to be corrected implicitly. The significant gains evident for the implicit CF might be attributed to the chance given to the participants to induce their own interlanguage and find the gap autonomously and this helped them to learn more efficiently. The findings of the second part of the interview are congruent with the findings of some previous studies (e.g., Ahangary & Amirzadeh, 2011; Li, 2014; Long, 2006; Lyster, 2014). The results are not in line with the study done by Ellis et al. (2006) which showed a preference for the explicit CF (i.e. metalinguistic clue). The findings of the third part of the interview revealed that there was a significant difference between interviewee's speaking self-efficacy beliefs in the two explicit and implicit groups based on the three constructs of aptitude, attitude and aspiration. The interviewees in the implicit group felt more confident, not upset and continued speaking after being corrected by the teacher. In contrast, most interviewees in the explicit group indicated that correcting their errors made them lose their confidence, feel upset, angry and preferred to stop talking after being corrected by the teacher. Therefore, this affected their performance in participating in class oral activities. The reason is that explicit CF types influenced students' speaking self-efficacy beliefs negatively, whereas implicit CF influenced their speaking self-efficacy beliefs positively. The results of this part of the interview lends support to Ellis's (2012) findings considering implicit strategies (recasts) as the most favorable among researchers because they are less face-threatening than other strategies.

B. Pedagogical Implications of the Study

The study provides valuable findings to students in a way that they learn how to respond to teachers' CF and inform them that CF is an indispensable part of the teaching and helps them to improve their English. It also suggests that individual differences such as self-efficacy beliefs have an effect on students' willingness to uptaking of feedback and their willingness to continue speaking. It also suggests that all three constructs of self-efficacy must be taken into consideration since it may help students to increase their level of self-efficacy in order to be more active in conversation activities. Therefore, teachers could realize the most beneficial way to correct students' errors and to be acquainted with features of each CF type. The curriculum designers also take advantage of the results of this study. They could account for students' needs to accomplish their goals by designing books and other materials. Designing learner-center materials could be of help to leaners with low or high level of self-efficacy. Trainee teachers could also be informed about the appropriate CF types during communicative activities, and that when to correct their students' errors, and how to correct them in order not to disturb their sense of self-efficacy.

C. Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The present study acknowledged some limitations like any other studies. This study incorporated the two variables of implicit and explicit CF in relation to speaking self-efficacy, but the small sample size did not allow us to have a control group. Also, because of limited number of teachers, the researcher did not hold a follow-up interview with the teachers. Research can account for teachers' thorough descriptions and viewpoints about the results of the study. Moreover, in the current study, the results of the questionnaire and interview measures were contradictory. More studies are needed to arrive at a logical explanation for it.

In this study the researcher did not engage male participants. Further studies can be conducted on both males and females. Future studies can also investigate the impact of CF types on the L2 learners' speaking self-efficacy beliefs across different proficiency levels.

REFERENCES

[1] Agudo, J., (2013). An investigation into how EFL learners emotionally respond to teachers' oral corrective feedback. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 15*(2), 265-278.
[2] Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 29*, 1859-1868.

[3]   Aregu, B. B. (2013). Enhancing self-regulated learning in teaching spoken communication: Does it affect speaking efficacy and performance? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 10*(1), 96-109.

[4]   Ayoubian, H., & Soleimani, T. (2015). The relationship between self-efficacy and language proficiency: a case of Iranian medical students. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2*(4), 158-167.

[5]   Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*, 122-147

[6]   Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

[7]   Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 2*(2), 128-163.

[8]   Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy in changing societies. Cambridge University Press.

[9]   Barkley, R. A. (2006). Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder: *A handbook for diagnosis and treatment* (3rd ed.). New York: Guildford Press.

[10]   Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). Research in education (10th Ed.). USA: Pearson Education Inc.

[11]   Brown, H. D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching (5th Ed.). USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

[12]   Campillo, A. (2003). An Analysis of implicit and explicit Feedback on grammatical accuracy. *A Journal of English and American Studies, 27*, 209-228.

[13]   Carroll, S. E. (2001). Input and evidence: The raw material of second language acquisition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[14]   Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Teaching English as a second or foreign language. (3rd ed.). USA: Heinle & Heinle.

[15]   Dörnyei, Z. & Ushioda, E. (2011). Teaching and researching motivation (2nd ed.). Harlow: Longman.

[16]   Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (Ed), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 339-360). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[17]   Ellis, R. (2008). The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[18]   Ellis, R. (2012). Language teaching research and language pedagogy (2nd ed.). USA: Wiley-Blackwell, Inc.

[19]   Ellis, R., & Shintani, N., (2014). Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research. London: Routledge.

[20]   Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit negative feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*, 339-368.

[21]   Fahim, M., & Nasrollahi-Muziraji, A. (2013). The relationship between Iranian EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs and critical thinking ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(3), 538-543.

[22]   Fahim, M., & Nasrollahi-Muziraji, A. (2013). The relationship between Iranian EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs and critical thinking ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(3), 538-543.

[23]   Ferris, D., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 307-329.

[24]   Ghonsooly, B., Elahi, M., & Golparvar, S. E. (2012). General English university students' self-efficacy and their achievement. *The Iranian EFL Journal, 8*(3), 153-173.

[25]   Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). Teaching speaking: A holistic approach. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[26]   Hairuzila, I., & Subarna, S. (2007). Perceived self-efficacy of self-efficacy of ESL students with regard to their oral communication ability. Conference Proceeding. Paper Presented at International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities, Bangi, Malaysia.

[27]   Hairuzila, I., Rohani, S. & Muhammad Ridhuan, T. A. (2011). Oral communication ability in English: an essential skill for engineering graduates. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education, 26*(1), 107-123.

[28]   Hughes, R. (2002). Teaching and researching speaking. London: Pearson Education.

[29]   Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41*, 217-230.

[30]   Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*, 309-365.

[31]   Li, S. (2014). Oral Corrective Feedback. *ELT Journal, 68*(2), 196-198.

[32]   Liu. M. (2013). English bar as a venue to boost students' speaking self-efficacy at the tertiary level. *English Language Teaching, 6*(12), 27-37.

[33]   Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Corrective feedback in the chatroom: An experimental study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning 19*(1), 1-14.

[34]   Loewen, S., & Nabei, T. (2007). Measuring the effects of oral corrective feedback on L2 knowledge. In A. Mackey (Eds.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection empirical studies* (pp. 361-376). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[35]   Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Self-Efficacy in the workplace: Implications for motivation and performance. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration, 14*(1), 1-6.

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

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

[38]   Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies* (pp. 407-446). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[39]   Mackey, A. (2012). Input, interaction and corrective feedback in L2 Learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[40]   Naderi, S. (2014). The Effect of explicit and recast feedback on the intermediate EFL learners' listening self-efficacy. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 2*(1), 30-43.

[41]   Pajares, F. (2000). Self-Efficacy beliefs and current directions in self-efficacy research. In M. Maehr & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.). *Advances in motivation and achievement.* Volume 10, (pp. 1-49). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

[42] Rahimi, A., & Abedini, A. (2009). The interface between EFL learners' self- efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas Royal, 3*(1), 14-28.

[43] Rassaei, E. (2015). Oral corrective feedback, foreign language anxiety and L2 development. *System, 49*, 98-109.

[44] Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In J. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (133-164). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[45] Saslow, J., & Ascher, A., (2014). Top notch 3A. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

[46] Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning & Technology, 13*(1), 96-120.

[47] Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 19*, 159-172.

[48] Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (1997). Social origins of self-regulatory competence. *Educational psychologist, 32*(4), 195-208.

[49] Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research, 10*, 361-392.

[50] Sheen, Y. (2011). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning. New York: Springer.

[51] Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. New York: Routledge, 593–610.

[52] Suzuki, M. (2005). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 4*(2), 1–21.

[53] Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 437-456.

[54] Vahdani, R., & Nemati, M. (2014). The Effect of Six Different Corrective Feedback Strategies on Iranian English Language Learners' IELTS Writing Task 2. *SAGE Open, 4*(2), 1-9.

Hajar Shamiri holds an MA in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Khouzestan Science and Research Branch, Ahvaz, Iran. Her research areas of interest include psycholinguistics and teaching skills in a foreign language.

Mohammad Taghi Farvardin holds a Ph.D. in TEFL. He is currently an assistant professor in the Department of English Language Teaching at Islamic Azad University, Ahvaz Branch, Ahvaz, Iran. His research interests include psycholinguistics, teaching and learning skills in a foreign language, and L2 vocabulary learning.