ISSN 1799-2591
Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 6, No. 9, pp. 1780-1790, September 2016
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0609.09

The Effect of Immediate vs. Delayed Oral Corrective Feedback on the Writing Accuracy of Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners

Hasti Yasaei
Islamic Azad University, Iran

***Abstract*—This research used the quasi-experimental design to investigate the effects of immediate vs. delayed oral corrective feedback (CF) on the writing accuracy of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. A Nelson English Language Test (section 200 A) was used to homogenize three classes, two of which then were randomly assigned to experimental group and one to control group. During the treatment, the experimental group 1 received immediate oral CF through a face-to-face negotiation between the teacher and each individual after an error was made by a learner. The experimental group 2 received delayed oral CF in which learners received oral CF some time after an error was made by a learner. The control group received direct correction. After a 16-session treatment, the results of the post-test indicated a significant difference between the three groups.**

***Index Terms*—corrective feedback, oral corrective feedback, immediate oral corrective feedback, delayed oral corrective feedback**

I. Introduction

Writing ability is a basic communication skill and a unique asset in the process of learning a language (Chastain, 1988). It is through writing that a person can communicate a variety of messages to a known or unknown reader or readers and at the very same time increase his knowledge of the language system (Motallebzadeh, et al., 2011).

Considering the pivotal role of writing in learning a language, it seems rational to provide practitioners with guidance for better ways to teach L2 writing. Consequently, over the past few decades, considerable attention has also been given to the treatment of errors and corrective feedback.

Since the late 1950s, there has been a great change of attitude towards the role of feedback. In the late 1950s and the 1960s, when Audio Lingual Method (ALM) was very popular in L2 classrooms, error correction was widely regarded as having a significant role in helping learners to form good habits. Therefore, error correction was in the form of providing the learners with immediate corrections. In the 1970s and the 1980s, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) equipped learners with communicative competence in terms of "function over form ". At that time, formal correction was considered as interfering with L2 acquisition rather than facilitating it.

With the dominance of CLT, the position of feedback has become the subject of heated debate between theorists and researchers. Truscott (1996) claimed that corrective feedback should be abandoned because of being ineffective and harmful. Ferris (1999) evaluated Truscott's original review article, "The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes" and refuted Truscott's argument, saying that his claim is premature and overly strong. Due to the fact that research evidence was scarce in support of corrective feedback, both Truscott and Ferris agreed that further research was needed to help us better understand the potential impacts of corrective feedback on L2 writing (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). As a result, a wealth of studies (e.g., Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Tregila, 2008; Alamis, 2010; Weaver, 2006; Lee, 2004, 2008a) have been conducted to examine the effect of different kinds of feedback on the improvement of writing ability of L2 students. Although some studies suggested that feedback has a significant role in helping L2 students develop the quality of their writing, many of them showed contradictory results.

II. Review of the Related Literature

A review of the literature indicates that the last decade has witnessed a wealth of studies conducted in the area of corrective feedback. Below is a quick review of the main studies done on oral and written corrective feedback and also the issue of feedback timing.

Truscott's (1996) claim that corrective feedback (CF) is ineffective and should therefore be abandoned has generated a considerable amount of debate among researchers and classroom practitioners about the value of providing CF on L2 writing. As a result, a great body of research has been conducted to examine the effectiveness of different types of CF. Kepner (1991) conducted a study to compare the effects of error- versus message-oriented written feedback on second language students' essays and found that students who received message-oriented comments produced writing that had better content than those who received error-oriented ones. In another study, Leki (1991) asked 100 English-as-a-

second-language college students to fill in questionnaires. She wanted to examine the effectiveness of the given feedback and also to understand how they perceived the given comments on the content and the form of their writing. Her study revealed that correcting errors in both content and form was beneficial.

Several studies have been done to find out why different kinds of written corrective feedback may not be effective. Research has shown that learners often do not understand the meaning of the written correction on their papers because it is incomprehensible to them and they even don't know what they are expected to do with the corrections. Hyland (2003), for instance, conducted a case study to investigate the effect of teacher written corrective feedback on individual writers and realized that learners experienced difficulty in understanding the written corrective feedback given to them. He understood that there was a mismatch between how learners utilized the provided corrective feedback and what teachers really intended. Therefore, he concluded that this kind of misunderstanding originated from a lack of "open teacher-student dialogue". In a similar vein, Oliver and Mackey (2003) found that feedback gained during conversational interactions in classroom had a "facilitative role". In another study, Mackey et al. (2007) examined the potential effect of getting involved in conversational interactions and stated that learners gained fluency as a result of student - student interaction. Kim (2003) also conducted a study to investigate students' perceptions of online teacher feedback to student writing, and found that "voice modality" was an effective kind of feedback because it offered both verbal and nonverbal information. He also found that students implemented the teacher's comments in their revisions only the time that they grasped and agreed with the comments. He concluded that students' participation in these talks reduced their anxiety and misunderstandings, and led to a positive attitude toward writing. Sheen (2002) phrased that ,"there is now growing evidence that oral CF, as a focus- on- form technique, facilitates inter language development, although there is less consensus about the effect of different types of oral CF" (p.256). Margolis (2007) as cited in Sheen, Younghee (2007) also stated that " good oral error feedback strategies can boost student motivation, advance language learning, and increase student perception of instructional effectiveness, but the oral error feedback literature offers a confusing picture of what is appropriate feedback"(p.7).

Another issue that has been examined by researchers is the issue of feedback timing. Thorndike's (1932) law of effect sheds light on the issue of feedback timing. He believed that behaviors which cause the feeling of being satisfied have a significant role in increasing the probability that these same behaviors would occur again under similar circumstances. Skinner (1969) modified Thornike's law of effect and fit it into a more general framework of reinforcement theory. Gagne (1988) shared the same opinion with Skinner (1969) that informational feedback could be considered to be a form of reinforcement and reinforcement works because expectancies established at the beginning of the learning loop are confirmed or disconfirmed during the feedback phase. Zahorik (1987), for instance, believed that when students are informed about the correctness of their answers, it helps them to change their studying style which then leads to improved achievement. He also mentioned that immediacy of feedback is important because it provides students with information about how well they are doing. If the behavior is incorrect, immediate corrective feedback gives the learners the opportunity to make corrective modifications and, at the same time, prevents continued practice of the incorrect behavior. On the contrary, if the behavior is correct, immediate corrective feedback gives learners motivation as well as information about the progress they make towards their goals (Borich& Tombari, 1997; Eggen & Kau Chak, 2004).

As the literature review shows, much research has been conducted in the area of corrective feedback and the issue of feedback timing. However, researchers still debate the question of which feedback type is the most effective one for learners. Ellis (2007), for example, stated that arriving at any general conclusion regarding the relative efficacy of immediate and delayed corrective feedback is impossible. Dabaghi (as cited in Ellis, 2007) also noted that no evidence is available to show that immediate corrective feedback is more effective than delayed. The present study, therefore, tries to highlight the importance of feedback timing on producing more linguistically accurate writing. The researcher hopes that the findings of this research would provide beneficial evidence to illuminate the issues at the heart of feedback timing.

III. Methodology

Participants

A. Students

The participants of this study were 45 EFL students of three intact classes at an intermediate level of proficiency and consisted of 23, 22, 25 students respectively which totaled 70. After administering the proficiency test, the researcher could only use 13 students from the first class, 17 from the second class and 15 from the third class. The rest did not qualify to participate in the research because their scores were not between one standard deviation below and above the mean. Then the classes were randomly assigned to three groups.

B. Teacher

The course instructor was a middle-aged female teacher with an M.A degree in English. She had already completed an extensive teacher training course (TTC). She had approximately 6 years of teaching experience at different levels.

C. Scorers

The scorers were three teachers with native-like command of English.

Instruments

A. Proficiency Test

The proficiency test used in this study was a sample of the *Nelson English Language Test* (section 200 A), adapted from Fowler and Coe (1976). Before conducting the main study, the Nelson English Language Test was administered to the participants to determine the learners' level of general English language proficiency and ensure the homogeneity of the participants. The Nelson test of proficiency for the intermediate group consisted of fifty multiple choice questions. The students had 50 minutes to complete the test.

Another sample of the *Nelson English Language Test* (section 200 A), adapted from Fowler and Coe (1976) was administered to participants of the pilot study to determine the learners' level of general English language proficiency and ensure the homogeneity of the participants.

B. The Pilot Study

One of the instruments used in this study was a sentence completion grammar exam. The pre-test was produced by the researcher herself because none of the ready-made tests were suitable for the object of the present study. The sentence completion test was piloted to ensure the reliability, rubrics unambiguousness and misprint of the test. The environment**,** in which the experiment was conducted, was an exam-like one.

The teacher-made pre-test was piloted among 25 individuals who enjoyed proficiencies equaling that of the research participants at the end of the treatment. The pilot study occurred in the same language school used for the experiment. No technical problems arose during the pilot study.

The criteria for scoring procedure were one mark for each instance of the correct use of conditional structures. Based on the students' scores, the item facility and item discrimination were calculated and some items were revised or omitted.

Based on the results of the item analysis, the poor items were discarded. The remaining thirty items had an acceptable item facility value of between .36 to .61 and a fairly high positive discrimination index of above .40.

The reliability of the test was calculated by using the Kudor -Richardson 21 formula. The obtained reliability coefficient was .78, which was at an acceptable level. The next step was investigating the validity coefficient of the test, which was carried out by calculating the correlation coefficient between the obtained scores of the test and the scores on the grammar part of the Nelson test as a valid measure of the students' grammar ability. The obtained validity coefficient was .83. In other words, the obtained validity and reliability coefficient suggested that the test was both reliable and valid.

The same procedure was conducted in order to obtain the validity and reliability of the post-test. The obtained reliability and validity were .83 and .80 respectively which were at an acceptable level.

C. Pre-test

The other instrument used in this study was a researcher made pre-test in the form of a sentence completion grammar exam which had an acceptable value of reliability and validity (see the pilot study) .The pre-test was administered to the subjects in three groups to make sure that they were not familiar with conditional structures. The pre-test consisted of 30 incomplete sentences, 10 for each type of conditional structure. After reading each incomplete sentence in their exam, students wrote the second part of the given sentence. The criteria for the scoring procedure were one mark for each instance of the correct use of conditional structures. Finally, the inter-rater reliability of the scores and correlation of the scores of the three raters were estimated.

D. Post-test

After a sixteen session treatment, the parallel post-test(see the pilot study) was administered to the subjects in order to investigate the effectiveness of the corrective feedback techniques regarding to the specific grammatical point being taught.

Procedure

The present research tried to investigate the effectiveness of immediate versus delayed oral feedback on the writing accuracy among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. A Nelson English Language Test (section 200 A) was used to homogenize three classes, two of which then were randomly assigned to experimental group and one to control group.

All the students in all three groups took the sentence-completion test as a pre-test to make sure that the three groups were also homogeneous regarding their familiarity with conditional structures. The tests were rated by three raters and inter-rater reliability of the scores was calculated. After making sure that the rating was consistent and therefore, there was no significant difference between the mean performance of the three groups, the researcher began the experimental phase of the study.

During the 16-session treatment, all the classes met three times a week. When conditional structures were taught to the participants, one of the experimental groups received *immediate oral corrective feedback*. It means that when one grammar point was taught, the instructor gave learners 10 incomplete sentences. And while learners were completing the 10 sentences, the instructor provided each of them with *Immediate Oral Corrective Feedback*. In Immediate Oral Corrective Feedback (CF), the instructor corrected each individual's error through a face-to-face conferencing between the learner and the instructor which might last about 5 minutes. While giving Immediate Oral CF, the instructor indicated the location of errors, asked for clarification and gave comments in the form of suggestions and questions.

The other experimental group received *Delayed Oral CF*. Here, after teaching a grammar point, the instructor gave the learners 10 incomplete sentences. When the learners finished completing the sentences, the instructor underlined

each individual's errors and asked each of them to correct their own papers at home. Learners were asked to return these self-corrections the following session. At this time the instructor provided each of them with oral CF, which is considered to be of delayed type because learners' errors were corrected some time after they were made by the learner.

The control group received neither immediate nor delayed oral CF but *traditional feedback*. It means that the subjects received *direct correction.* In direct correction the correct forms were provided above or near the incorrect ones. This kind of written feedback was used in 15 English classes that the researcher had observed.

Finally, to be sure about the effects of the treatment, two days after the study, the researcher tested all the three groups through a post - test which was the parallel form of the pre-test.

In order to answer the research question, a t-test was run to compare pre - and post - test mean scores to investigate whether such an improvement was statistically significant.

IV. Results

A. Results of the Proficiency Test

First, all the students in the three classes took a *Nelson English Language Test* (section 200 A) to ensure that they are homogenized. The obtained results are in the table below.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: PROFICIENCY TEST

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
class1 in nelson test	23	33.8261	8.37557	1.74643
class2 in nelson test	22	27.9545	7.68720	1.63892
class3 in nelson test	25	26.6400	10.95019	2.19004

TABLE 2
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: ONE-SAMPLE TEST

	Test Value = 0					
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Lower	Upper
class1 in nelson test	19.369	22	.000	33.82609	30.2042	37.4480
class2 in nelson test	17.057	21	.000	27.95455	24.5462	31.3629
class3 in nelson test	12.164	24	.000	26.64000	22.1200	31.1600

B. Results of the Pre-test

In this study the sentence-completion grammar test was administered to the participants in all three groups at the beginning of the experimental period. In table 3, the mean score, standard deviation and standard error of the mean that each group received by each rater were calculated. The results of this table were used to estimate the correlation of the scores of the three raters. In table 4, the mean score, standard deviation and standard error of the mean that all participants in three groups received by each rater were calculated. Although no significant difference was observed between the mean score of the three groups, the inter-rater reliability of the scores was assessed through Cronbach's Alpha to make sure the raters have been consistent in their ratings.

TABLE 3
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: GRAMMAR PRE-TEST

	Experimental group 1				Experimental group 2				Control group			
	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error mean	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error mean	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error mean
Rater1	13	23.3077	4.73259	1.31259	17	22.7059	4.35552	1.05637	15	22.7333	4.52717	1.16891
Rater2	13	23.000	4.49073	1.24550	17	22.9412	4.14534	1.00539	15	22.4000	4.37199	1.12884
Rater3	13	23.6154	4.40716	1.22233	17	23.000	4.04660	.98145	15	22.2667	4.18273	1.07998

TABLE 4
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: GRAMMAR PRE-TEST

	Total			
Rater	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error Mean
Rater 1	45	22.4444	4.6443	.69235
Rater 2	45	23.000	4.29058	.63960
Rater 3	45	22.9333	4.13631	.61661

C. Reliability Estimates

To assure that the participants' scores in the pre-test were a reliable estimate of their ability and to explore the consistency of the scores, the inter-rater reliability of the scores was assessed through Cronbach's Alpha and correlation of the scores of the three raters were estimated by Pearson correlation. Tables 5, 6, and 7 show the results of the Person correlation in experimental group 1, experimental group 2 and control group (respectively).

TABLE 5
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES: CORRELATIONS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP1

		rater1 in exp group 1	rater2 in exp group 1	rater3 in exp group 1
rater1 in exp group 1	Pearson Correlation	1	.937**	.941**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	13	13	13
rater2 in exp group 1	Pearson Correlation	.937**	1	.960**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	13	13	13
rater3 in exp group 1	Pearson Correlation	.941**	.960**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	13	13	13

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 6
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES: CORRELATIONS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP2

		rater1 in exp group 2	rater2 in exp group 2	rater3 in exp group 2
rater1 in exp group 2	Pearson Correlation	1	.913**	.915**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	17	17	17
rater2 in exp group 2	Pearson Correlation	.913**	1	.972**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	17	17	17
rater3 in exp group 2	Pearson Correlation	.915**	.972**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	17	17	17

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 7
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES: CORRELATIONS IN CONTROL GROUP

		rater1 in control group	rater2 in control group	rater3 in control group
rater1 in control group	Pearson Correlation	1	.963**	.937**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	15	15	15
rater2 in control group	Pearson Correlation	.963**	1	.962**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	15	15	15
rater3 in control group	Pearson Correlation	.937**	.962**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	15	15	15

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The following tables show the results of the Cronbach's Alpha for each of the groups.

TABLE 8
RELIABILITY STATISTICS FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP1

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.981	3

TABLE 9
RELIABILITY STATISTICS FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP2

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.976	3

TABLE 10
RELIABILITY STATISTICS FOR CONTROL GROUP

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.983	3

The raters' scores were significantly correlated at the 0.01 level in all the tables and the inter rater reliability assessed using Cronbach's Alpha formula, was near 1, which indicated high agreement between raters' scores.

D. Results of Post-test

In order to measure the subjects' scores in all groups after the treatment, the post-test was taken. Table 11 shows the mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean that each group received by each rater. The results of this table were used to estimate correlation of the scores of the three raters. Table 12 shows the mean, standard deviation and standard error of the mean that each rater gave to all participants in the three groups. The results of this table were used to estimate the inter-rater reliability of the scores of the raters to make sure the raters have been consistent in their ratings.

TABLE 11
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: GRAMMAR POST-TEST

	Experimental group 1				Experimental group 2				Control group			
	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error mean	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error mean	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error mean
Rater1	13	23.6923	4.21079	1.16786	17	23.7647	4.13112	1.00194	15	22.3333	4.74593	1.22539
Rater2	13	23.1538	3.71587	1.03060	17	23.8824	3.60351	.87398	15	22.5333	3.77712	.97525
Rater3	13	24.0769	3.59308	.99654	17	24.3529	3.96770	.96231	15	22.8667	3.81476	.98497

TABLE 12
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS: GRAMMAR POST-TEST

	Total			
Rater	N	Mean	Std deviation	Std.error Mean
Rater 1	45	23.2667	4.31909	.64385
Rater 2	45	23.2222	3.65494	.54485
Rater 3	45	23.7778	3.78327	.56398

E. Reliability Estimates

The post-tests were also corrected by the same raters. The following tables show the results of the Person correlations.

TABLE 13
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES: CORRELATIONS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP1

		rater1 in exp group 1	rater2 in exp group 1	rater3 in exp group 1
rater1 in exp group 1	Pearson Correlation	1	.802**	.839**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.000
	N	13	13	13
rater2 in exp group 1	Pearson Correlation	.802**	1	.948**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.000
	N	13	13	13
rater3 in exp group 1	Pearson Correlation	.839**	.948**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	13	13	13

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 14
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES: CORRELATIONS IN EXPERIMENTAL GROUP2

		rater1 in exp group 2	rater2 in exp group 2	rater3 in exp group 2
rater1 in exp group 2	Pearson Correlation	1	.888**	.867**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	17	17	17
rater2 in exp group 2	Pearson Correlation	.888**	1	.873**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	17	17	17
rater3 in exp group 2	Pearson Correlation	.867**	.873**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	17	17	17

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

TABLE 15
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES: CORRELATIONS IN CONTROL GROUP

		rater1 in control group	rater2 in control group	rater3 in control group
rater1 in control group	Pearson Correlation	1	.926**	.847**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	15	15	15
rater2 in control group	Pearson Correlation	.926**	1	.937**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	15	15	15
rater3 in control group	Pearson Correlation	.847**	.937**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	15	15	15

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The following charts show the results of the Cronbach's Alpha for each of the groups in post-test.

TABLE 16
RELIABILITY STATISTICS FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP1

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.948	3

TABLE 17
RELIABILITY STATISTICS FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP2

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.953	3

TABLE 18
RELIABILITY STATISTICS FOR CONTROL GROUP

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.958	3

The raters' scores were significantly correlated at the 0.01 level in all the tables and the inter-rater reliability assessed using Cronbach's Alpha formula, was near 1, which indicates high agreement between raters' scores.

F. Investigating the Research Question

The research question stated:

"Is there a statistically significant difference between the effects of immediate vs. delayed oral feedback on the writing accuracy of Iranian intermediate EFL learners?"

To answer the research question, a T-test was run to compare the mean scores of the three groups in three pairs. The results are shown in table 19.

TABLE 19
PAIRED SAMPLE STATISTICS

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	exp group 1 in pre test	23.3077	39	4.43167	.70963
	exp group 1 in post test	23.6410	39	3.76610	.60306
Pair 2	exp group 2 in pre test	22.8824	51	4.10194	.57439
	exp group 2 in post test	24.0000	51	3.83667	.53724
Pair 3	control group in pre test	22.2444	45	4.28611	.63894
	control group in post test	22.5778	45	4.04794	.60343

As shown in table 19 both experimental groups outperformed the control group. The experimental group 2 outperformed the experimental group1as well.

Table 20 shows the results of Pearson Correlations which indicate that the raters' scores were significantly correlated at the 0.01 level in all groups.

TABLE 20
PEARSON CORRELATION

		exp group 1 in pre test	exp group 1 in post test	exp group 2 in pre test	exp group 2 in post test	control group in pre test	control group in post test
exp group 1 in pre test	Pearson Correlation	1	.964**				
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000				
	N	39	39				
exp group 1 in post test	Pearson Correlation	.964**	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000					
	N	39	39				
exp group 2 in pre test	Pearson Correlation			1	.937**		
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.000		
	N			51	51		
exp group 2 in post test	Pearson Correlation			.937**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.000			
	N			51	51		
control group in pre test	Pearson Correlation					1	.961**
	Sig. (2-tailed)						.000
	N					45	45
control group in post test	Pearson Correlation					.961**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)					.000	
	N					45	45

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in table 19, the mean score of experimental group 2 has changed significantly from pre-test to post-test and this is also obviously visible from the Sig (2-tailed) which is less than 0.005in table 21 below. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected. According to the Sig (2-tailed) which is .113 and .000 for experimental group 1 and 2 (respectively), we can also conclude that the mean scores of both groups have changed significantly after the treatment but experimental group 2 which received delayed oral CF outperformed experimental group 1 which received immediate oral feedback.

TABLE 21
PAIRED SAMPLE T-TEST

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	exp group 1 in pre test - exp group 1 in post test	-.33333	1.28418	.20563	-.74962	.08295	-1.621	38	.113
Pair 2	exp group 2 in pre test - exp group 2 in post test	-1.11765	1.43732	.20126	-1.52190	-.71339	-5.553	50	.000
Pair 3	control group in pre test - control group in post test	-.33333	1.18705	.17696	-.68996	.02330	-1.884	44	.066

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

While some researchers such as Truscott (1996) have claimed that error correction is ineffective, others have suggested that not only do L2 students who are engaged in the skill of writing expect to receive corrective feedback but also effective error correction can and does help some student writers (Bitchener, et al.,2005). The purpose of this study was to build on existing research which suggests that corrective feedback can lead to more linguistically accurate writing.

In response to the research question, data analysis indicated that the students did improve their linguistic accuracy when the two error-correction strategies were implemented. This means that the provision of both immediate and delayed oral CF had a significant effect, enabling the learners to use the targeted function with greater accuracy. These gains are quiet pronounced between the pre-tests and post-tests taken from the beginning and end of the treatment period. The superiority of experimental groups over control group was due to the fact that students have great difficulty in interpreting and understanding written form of corrective feedback.

A point worthy to mention is that while both the immediate and delayed oral CF groups outperformed the control group, the delayed oral CF group outperformed the immediate oral CF group as well. This superiority of delayed oral given feedback over immediate feedback could be due to the fact that learners in the delayed oral CF group were pushed to correct their errors themselves which according to (Ferris, 2006) seems more facilitative in learning the TL and also more beneficial in improving learners' inter language development.

APPENDIX

A. Pre-test

A: Complete the following sentences.
1. If you stop waiting for a bus and start walking, …….....
2. If you take vitamin C, ……
3. If it doesn't rain tomorrow, ……..
4. If you 're hungry,……..
5 If the phone rings,…….
6. If I pass all my exams this semester,…….……..
7. If you have some guests tonight,……..
8. If you miss the bus ,…….
9. If you find a better job ,……..
10. He'll be late for work, ……
11. If I had a BMW,…….
12. I'd buy a villa if ……..
13. If I saw a shark, ……
14. My parents could buy a bigger house if …….
15. He could get a job in a hotel if ……..
16. If I got engaged, …….
17. If he were at work ,……
18. If I had time next week ,……
19. If I didn't have to work in Norooz , …….
20. If I were a millionaire , ……
21. If she had known he was so stingy,…….
22. If you hadn't worn the seat belt,……..
23. We would have gone to the beach if…….
24. If I hadn't gone to the party,……
25. If we had had more time,……
26. If you'd told me earlier,……
27. If you hadn't forgotten the map,……..
28. If you'd arrived two minutes earlier, …….
29. If I'd known about the party,……
30. If you hadn't helped me, ……

B. Post-test

A: Complete the following sentences.
1. If you stop waiting for a taxi and start walking, ……
2. If you drink more water, …….
3. If it doesn't rain on Friday, ……...
4. If you are thirsty, …… ……
5. If your cell phone rings, …….. ……..
6. If my sister passes all her exams this semester, ……..
7. If your mother has some guests tonight ,……
8. If you miss the taxi , ……
9. If your husband finds a better job , …….
10. He'll be late for school if ……
11. If I had a car, ……..
12. I'd buy a house if …….
13. If I saw a bear , ……
14. I could buy a bigger house if ……
15. He could get a better job if……..
16. If I got married , …….
17. If he were at home , …….
18. If I had time tomorrow , …….
19. If I didn't have to work on Friday , ……
20. If my father were a millionaire, ……..
21. If she had known she was so lazy , ……..
22. If you hadn't worn your coat , ……
23. We would have gone to the party if ……...
24. If I hadn't gone to work, …….
25. If we had had more rice, ……..
26. If you'd told me two days earlier , …….
27. If you hadn't forgotten your coat , ……
28. If you'd left two minutes earlier , ……..
29. If I'd known about the meeting , ……..
30. If you hadn't lent me the money , ……

REFERENCES

[1] Alamis, M. M. P. (2010). Evaluating students' reactions and responses to teachers' written feedbacks. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 5, 40-57.

[2] Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214.doi:10.1093/applin/amp016.

[3] Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 14 (3), 191. doi:10.1016/ j.j.slw.2005.08.001.

[4] Borich, G. D., & Toombari, M. L. (1997). Educational Psychology: Contemporary Approach (2nd ed). New York: Addison-Wisely Educational Publishers.

[5] Chastain, K (1988). Developing Second-Language Skills. Theory and Practice (3 rd ed.)

[6] Eggen, P. & Kauchak, D. (2004). Educational psychology: Windows on Classroom (6th ed). Colmbus, OH: Prentice Hall.

[7] Ellis, R. (2007). Corrective feedback, research and practice. Retrieved January 15, 2010, from http://www.celea. org. cn/2007/ keynote/ppt/ Ellis. Pdf.

[8] Feris, D.R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*., 8, 1-10.

[9] Ferris, D.R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New Evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing*: contexts and issues. (pp.81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[10] Gagne, R. M, & Driscoll, M. P. (1988). Essentials of Learning for Instruction (2nd ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[11] Hyland, K. (2003). Second language writing. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[12] Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second _ language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.

[13] Kim, L. (2003).Online technologies for teaching writing: Students react to teacher response in voice and written modalities. *Research in Teaching of English*, 38(3), 304-337.

[14] Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(4), 285-312*. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw. 2004.08.001.

[15] Lee, I. (2008a). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong Secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(3), 144-164. Doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2007.12.001.

[16] Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218. doi:10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x.

[17] Lyster, R., Panova, I., (2001). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom. *Language Learning*, 21(2), 26-33.

[18] Mackey, A., Al-Khalil, M., Atanassova, G., Hama, M., Logan-Terry, A., Nakatsukasa, K. (2007). Teachers' intentions and learners' perception about corrective feedback on the L2 classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. 1. 1. 129-152.

[19] Margolis, D. P. (2007). Impacts of oral error feedback in Korean university EFL classrooms. *Dissertation Abstract International 68 A* (11). Publication No. AAT 3288121.
[20] Motallebzadeh, Khalil, and Somaye Amirabadi. (2011). "Online Interactional Feedback in Second Language Writing: Through Peer or Tutor?" *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*.
[21] Oliver, R. & Mackay, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 519-33.
[22] Sheen, R. (2002). 'Focus on Form' and 'Focus on Forms'. *ELT Journal*, 56, 303-304.
[23] Sheen, Younghnee. (2007). "The effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aprirude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles", *TESOL Quarterly*.
[24] Skinner, B. F. (1969). Contingencies of Reinforcement: A Theoretical Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
[25] Thorndike, E. L. (1932). The Fundamental of Learning. New York: Teachers College Press.
[26] Tregila, M.O. (2008). Feedback on feedback: Exploring student responses to teachers' written commentary. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 27(1), 105-137.
[27] Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-69. doi: 10.1111/j.1467- 1770.1996.tb01238.x.
[28] Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Student perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 31(3), 379-394.* Doi: 10.1080/02602930500353061.
[29] Zahorik, J. A. (1987). Reading. In M. J. Dunkin (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education* (pp.413-423). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Hasti Yasaei was born in Iran, in 1985. She has a BA in English translation from Payam e Noor University in Iran, in 2009. She has got an MA in English teaching from Islamic Azad University in Iran, in 2012.

Now she is an English Lecturer in university of Applied Sciences in Karaj and she teaches English in private institutes at the same time. She was a supervisor in an institute in Karaj as well.