

Immediate vs Delayed Correction Feedback (CF) and Accuracy of Oral Production: The Role of Anxiety

Karim Shabani

Allameh Mohaddes Nouri University, Nour, Iran

Fatemeh Safari

Allameh Mohaddes Nouri University, Nour, Iran

Abstract—The objective of this study was twofold: a) to evaluate L2 learners' perspectives on the level of anxiety caused by different corrective feedbacks (Immediate vs. Delayed) and b) to uncover students' views towards the effects of anxiety on the accuracy of their oral production. Following an OPT, 30 students were selected as the main cohort of the study and then randomly assigned to two groups of 15. To collect the data, a close-ended questionnaire proposed by Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) along with an additional open-ended questionnaire (developed by the researcher) was administered to the participants at the end of the term. Based on the results, it was noticed that although all the participants expressed some levels of anxiety when receiving error corrections, the level of their anxiety was found to be significantly different and learners of the G1 who received immediate CF experienced more anxiety than the G2. Furthermore, results revealed that level of anxiety helped students to improve their accuracy during speech. Finally, the study recommends material developers to conduct natural communicative tasks and opportunities in which learners perform them naturally and without fear of making mistakes.

Index Terms—corrective feedback, immediate CF, delayed CF, anxiety, accuracy, oral production

I. INTRODUCTION

In the field of language learning, the concept of corrective feedback during communication can facilitate students' oral production (Swain, 1985). In fact, language acquisition process cannot be accomplished without providing error correction and feedback. Doff (1995) stated that repetition of ill-formed utterances would be harmful for learners. Therefore, teachers should be conscious and provide suitable feedback to learners whenever there is a mismatch utterance otherwise they may feel resentment and anxious. Among various kinds of anxiety three of them have gained more importance by scholars (e.g. Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope 1986; Spielberger & Vagg, 1995; Ellis, 2008): 1) Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA), 2) State Anxiety, and 3) Trait Anxiety. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), defined the notion of Foreign Language Anxiety (FLA) as "a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feeling, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the (foreign) language learning process" (p.128). According to Spielberger and Vagg (1995), state anxiety occurs in some specific and temporary situations. This kind of anxiety is eliminated when the condition vanishes. Finally, trait anxiety is known as a stable individual difference (Abedi, Mahdavi, & Hassaskhah, 2016). In addition, Ellis (2008) claimed that trait anxiety is a kind of anxiety that provokes people to be more anxious in any condition. However, according to Abedi, Mahdavi, and Hassaskhah (2016), FLA anxiety is different from two other kinds of anxiety (state and trait anxiety), and it "is a situation-specific concept" (p.1).

According to Tseng (2012), though wide-spread use of English language (as a second or foreign language in all over the world) and also use of modern communicative language teaching methods and techniques in the context of language learning classrooms have facilitated the improvement of learners' communication skills, existence of some individual differences and feelings such as anxiety may hinder students to be proficient in learning the target language.

Corder (1967) claimed that committing errors is a normal activity in every language learning context. Therefore, considering the role of corrective feedback in language learning process is of crucial concern. Therefore, the main role of teachers in classrooms specially during students' oral activities is to consider individual differences of learners and provide the most effective CF types based on their specific needs. In order to accomplish learners' purposes of language learning, error correction types should match both various students' needs and their situations in specific conditions. For instance, to be fluent or accurate during speech, the timing of feedback and also learners' individual differences should be considered. In fact, a huge number of researchers have worked on the effectiveness of CF and its various types on different language skills. However, few scholars have considered some other aspects of CF such as the timing of feedback, affective factors and individual differences like learners' anxiety levels across their own' perspectives. Therefore, the main objectives of this study were to examine the learners' perceptions regarding the effects of

Immediate and Delayed CF types on learners' anxiety level and subsequently the effects of anxiety on their accuracy improvement during speaking.

Research Questions

The study sets out to answer the following research questions:

1. What are L2 learners' attitudes toward the effects of Immediate CF on their level of anxiety as compared with delayed CF?
2. What are L2 learners' attitudes toward the effects of anxiety on the accuracy of learners' oral production?

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Introduction

The purpose of this part is to discuss some important concepts which are the main focus of the present study. The first three sections will introduce errors and corrective feedback definitions, error types and corrective feedback strategies, and the role of CF in oral production (specifically in accuracy improvement). The next sections will discuss participants' individual differences including anxiety level, and the role of anxiety in accuracy of learners' oral production. Finally, at the end of this part, relevant previous studies on the effectiveness of CF and also role of anxiety concept in improvement of accuracy of students' oral production will be presented.

B. Corrective Feedback and Error Correction

Since there has been a great emphasis on the notion of CLT (Communicative Language Teaching) as a tool for learning language through interaction in the target language (Nunan, 1991), speaking skill has gained more importance by teachers, learners and researchers during recent decades. Therefore, for being able to communicate in the target language and to be proficient in oral production activities, all various factors of this skill should be investigated. One of the main aspects of speaking skill is learners' erroneous utterances and the way these errors should be treated. The other important factor is considering learners' individual differences especially their level of anxiety.

Whereas some scholars (such as Gass and Selinker 2008) believed that errors should be inhibited and eliminated, Corder (1967, cited in Ellis, 1994) mentioned the crucial role of errors in language learning contexts. According to Corder's attitudes, errors can help teachers to be aware of students' language learning process and let them to know how much learners have already learnt. In addition, it helps students to discover the rules and structures of the target language. Finally, by considering the notion of errors as an essential part of language learning, researchers notice the way languages are acquired. For the above reasons, researchers and teachers must consider the concept of corrective feedback as an essential part of language learning process.

Ellis (2006) defined the notion of corrective feedback (CF) as reactions to students' erroneous utterances. In addition, Chaudron (1988, cited in Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013) defined it as a complex phenomenon which includes several functions.

According to Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006), corrective feedback means giving corrective responses to a learner at the time when he/she makes an error. They have stated that these responses can be in the form of: (a) an indication that shows there is a mistake, (b) providing the correct form of that error, or (c) providing metalinguistic information about the essence of the error, or any conformation of these forms.

Interaction Hypothesis is one of the most important theories in the field of second language acquisition which was introduced by Long (1983 cited in Lightbown and Spada, 2006). According to this hypothesis, in order to acquire L2 students should comprehend input which is gained through modified interaction (Long, 1983 cited in Lightbown and Spada, 2006). Long claimed that since students cannot learn a second language from native speakers' speech, in order to acquire the target language and be able to communicate with other classmates; teachers should provide modified interaction situations for them. Long in his next published version of Interaction Hypothesis underlined the crucial role of teachers and also the role of corrective feedback in the field of language learning in classrooms (Long, 1983 cited in Lightbown and Spada, 2006).

C. How and When to Correct Errors

Although there are so many ways for teachers to treat an error, the way they select to correct errors may affect the learners' attitudes towards the target language. According to Akay and Akbarov (2011), there are a few important points that should be concerned in the field of error correction:

1. Considering the goals of the lesson, and the learners' levels

In learning the objectives of a lesson, CF would be more beneficial to learners when the focus of the error correction is on a particular goal. For instance, if the aim of a lesson is being able to use the irregular forms of past tense verbs in speech, then, for reinforcing that aim teachers should provide a speaking activity and, finally, correct mistakes that are related to the use of those particular verbs. In this controlled setting, learners might remember their specific mistakes and errors from one lesson to the next.

2. Encouraging self-correction

Teachers by encouraging learners to correct their own errors, helps them feel that they have sufficient freedom in the classroom and they can control their process of learning by their own hands. In this way, when students are making

errors, teachers should indicate that an error has occurred, and must wait for the learner to find out that error and correct it (the learner may do that with the help of her/his classmates). For instance, if an intermediate learner says, “He go to the store”, teacher should stop the learner by repeating what he has said. “He go?” “He go?” The aim is to inform the learner from his/her error and lead the student to re-think about what he/she has said and then correct his/her own error.

3. Being aware of when and how to correct

Teachers should pay attention to some basic mistakes, and bring them up later. They can write some sentences on the board, which includes some of the same mistakes, and ask learners to find and correct them.

4. Do not waste time correcting mistakes

In the field of second language learning, mistakes happen normally in classrooms and are inevitable. Teachers should not waste all the time just for correcting and repeating the correct form; instead they should provide a situation in which learners could learn from their own mistakes.

D. *The Timing of Feedback*

One of the fundamental aspects of CF which has been marginalized by researchers for a long time is the timing of feedback. However, this issue has a significant role on acquisition process especially during speech. It also affects learners' level of anxiety while they are participating in oral activities. For the above reasons, teachers should consider the time of providing feedback according to students' needs, purposes, and also specific classroom contexts.

Whereas some scholars and teachers believe that CF should be provided with some delay, some others argue that errors should be treated immediately. Many studies have supported the efficacy of delayed CF and implied the use of this strategy in language learning classrooms. For instance, Fanselow (1977) suggested that in order to analyze the nature and kind of that specific error and also to decide how it should be treated appropriately, teachers should provide delayed CF. In addition, Chastain (1971) recommended that common mistakes should be corrected at the end of learners' speech (after finishing their oral activities). Moreover, Long (1977, cited in Quinn, 2014) claimed that providing delayed CF helps learners to continue their flow of communication and prevent the negative effects of interrupting their speech. Thus, this type of CF might help students to be more fluent during their oral production activities. There have been both opposing and supporting ideas regarding Immediate and Delayed CF in the background studies related to this issue (Long, 1977). For example, Allwright (1975), stated that teachers must treat erroneous utterances immediately and do not postpone it to a later time. Furthermore, according to Long (1977), since by correcting ill-formed utterances immediately learners notice their learning process and might be more vigilant and conscious for being more accurate, there is a negative relationship between the efficacy of feedback on language learning improvement and providing delayed CF (cited in Quinn, 2014). The other innate factors which should be considered while examining the effectiveness of Immediate and Delayed CF during oral production are the notions of fluency and accuracy. As stated above, while some scholars believed that in order to be accurate errors should be treated immediately, others argued that for being more fluent CF should be provided with some delay. Since evaluating improvement of both these factors at the same time was not in the scope of this study, one of the main purposes of the current study was to examine the improvement of accuracy during learners' oral production.

E. *Accuracy in Oral Production*

Skehan (1996) claimed that the concept of accuracy refers to the way the target language is constructed according to its rules and structures. In addition, Skehan (1996, p. 46) defined accuracy as “a learner's capacity to handle whatever level of interlanguage complexity s/he has currently attained”. According to Skehan and Foster (1977), accuracy is the ability to prevent committing errors while performing language activities. In this definition, learners have high level of capacity for controlling their challenging situations during their speech.

For calculating accuracy scores of learners' improvement in oral production, many measures have been presented. For example, Yuan and Ellis (2003) introduced two kinds of measures: 1) error-free clauses and 2) correct verb forms. The first accuracy measure refers to the percentage of clauses which were performed accurately and were not considered as non-target-like utterances (including all lexical, morphological and syntactic errors). On the other hand, correct verb forms refer to the percentage of all verbs components which were used accurately (including subject-verb agreement, tense, and modality).

F. *Personality Factors: Anxiety*

One of the main aspects which have consequential effects on acquiring a second or foreign language is affective factors and learners' individual differences. According to Dörnyei (2005) and Jakobovits (1970), individual differences are considered as the most constant factors of second language learning improvement. Anxiety is the most important aspect of affective factors which highly affects the learners' process of language learning (especially during speaking skill) (Brown, 1999, cited in Renko, 2012). Therefore, the following section will introduce the concept of anxiety and its role in the language learning classrooms.

MacIntyre and Gardner (1994) defined the concept of Foreign language (FL) anxiety as “the feeling of tension and apprehension specifically associated with second language [L2] contexts, including speaking, listening, and learning” (p. 284). According to Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), three main components of FL anxiety are: 1) communication apprehension, 2) test anxiety, and 3) fear of negative evaluation. The first component is a kind of shyness specified by

feelings of anxiety while people are communicating. People who have difficulties during their speaking with classmates where their oral activities are monitored experience high level of FL anxiety. Secondly, test anxiety is identified as a kind of performance anxiety deriving from a fear of failure (p. 127). Learners with test anxiety are worried about their underperformance; they often expect better performance of themselves even more than their own capacities and capabilities. Finally, fear of negative evaluation means “apprehension about others’ evaluations, avoidance of evaluative situations, and the expectation that others would evaluate oneself negatively” (Watson & Friend, 1969, cited in Horwitz et al., 1986, p. 128). Students who fear negative evaluation have more shyness, experience high levels of anxiety and consequently have low level of performance during their oral production (Gregersen & Horwitz, 2002).

In the context of language learning classrooms, almost all students experience some levels of anxiety especially during performing oral activities and while they’re communicating in public. Horwitz (1995) stated that though students with low level of anxiety have better performance in different skills of language learning and since speaking in the target language in front of others stimulates anxiety levels, most of the learners experience anxious situations during their speech. In addition, according to Ely (1986), learners with high level of anxiety are less willing to participate in performing oral tasks and thus are unwilling to communicate with others. This issue is in line with the work of many scholars (such as Hilleson, 1996; Jackson, 2002; Liu, 2006; Tsui, 1996), they argued that students who experience more anxiety are less likely to speak in the target language. They prefer to remain silent and not participate in oral activities.

Although, a large number of researchers have considered the effects of anxiety on language learning and examined the existing relationship between this notion and corrective feedback, few scholars have investigated this issue regarding participants’ preferences and perceptions.

G. Previous Studies on Anxiety and Language Learning

One of the earliest studies on the concept of anxiety has been done by Horwitz, Horwitz and Cope (1986). During a clinical experience which was carried out among foreign language students in university classes (at the University of Texas), it was noticed that anxiety centers on two factors of language learning: speaking and listening skills. The students mentioned that they feel more confident and comfortable while delivering speeches they had prepared before; however they tend to become inhibited and anxious in role-play situations. Moreover, tests on anxiety and over-studying were reported as common anxiety-related phenomena. Learners’ attitudes regarding language learning were stated as contributing to their frustration and stress in the classroom in the sense that many learners believed that “nothing should be said in the foreign language until it can be said correctly and that it is not okay to guess an unknown foreign language word” (Horwitz et al. 1986: 127). Therefore, according to the scholars, these viewpoints must produce and increase level of anxiety.

In another anxiety study which was conducted by MacIntyre and Gardner (1991), 23 Scales were proposed to examine language anxiety, social evaluation anxiety. In this study, learners’ short-term memory and vocabulary production in their L1 (English) and L2 (French) were measured. The findings have revealed that language anxiety correlates significantly with both variables. Based on results, French tasks indicated to cause more levels of anxiety than English tasks. In addition, in the L1 tasks, the short term memory test was more anxiety-stimulating than the vocabulary production test.

Rahimi, and Dasjerdi (2012) have done a study on examining the efficacy of two CF types (immediate and delayed) in improvement of students’ complexity, fluency and accuracy in oral production. The other purpose of this study was to investigate the learners’ level of anxiety while the teacher treats their errors immediately or with some delay. For data collection, 20 female intermediate EFL learners aged 15 to 20 were selected from one of the English language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. The learners were assigned into 2 groups of 10. While teacher treated errors of G1 immediately, for G2 errors were corrected with some delay during 30 sessions. At the end of the term, each participant should discuss one of the topics they had covered during the term. For data analysis, their voices were recorded and transcribed. In order to investigate the results, measures of accuracy, fluency, and complexity were applied. The results indicated that delayed error correction improved fluency and accuracy performance but not complexity. Furthermore, at the end of the term an anxiety questionnaire was conducted to all the learners. Finally, based on the results the learners of G2 whose errors were treated with some delay had lower level of anxiety.

Furthermore, Mesri (2012) investigated the relationship between EFL learners’ Foreign Language Anxiety with regard to gender. The data were collected through a Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety questionnaire (Horwitz, Horwitz, & Cope, 1986). For this purpose, 52 participants (studying English) were selected from Salmas University. The results indicated a significant relationship between FLCA and females students. It was suggested that foreign language teachers should be aware of learners’ level of anxiety, its causes and results. In addition, this study recommended some context-specific pedagogical implications for Iranian EFL teachers and practitioners.

In another study, Ni (2012) under the guidance of the Affective Filter Hypothesis developed by Krashen, have done a survey study on advanced English majors. By collecting and examining research data, some useful findings and implications have been discovered. These results would be helpful in the field of language teaching. Considering affective factors as essential parts of language learning will help teachers to improve their teaching methods and strategies. It also would be helpful for learners to cultivate an all-round improvement.

Tallon (2014) in a pilot study examined three main objectives. The first aim was to observe whether heritage learners of Spanish may experience foreign language anxiety (FLA) in a Spanish class or not. In addition, this study investigated

the scores of heritage Spanish learners on the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale and its correlation with their scores on three other anxiety scales (listening, reading, and writing). Finally, it examined whether there were any differences in the quantity and quality of language output produced by anxious and nonanxious learners. For data collection, participants responded to a background questionnaire, four anxiety scales, and some open-ended questions. Results indicated that 1) heritage learners of Spanish can experience foreign language anxiety in a second-semester Spanish class, 2) students can also experience anxiety in the other language skills (listening, reading, and writing), and 3) the anxiety level can lead to a less amount of language output, both orally and in writing regarding quantity and quality of language.

Finally, in a more recent study, Abedi, Mahdavi, and Hassaskhah (2016) in a study examined Iranian EFL learners' beliefs regarding the effects of corrective feedback on their level of anxiety. For data collection, two self-reporting questionnaires were conducted to participants. To examine the results measures of chi-square was developed. Results revealed that there were significant differences between the two groups across students' attitudes about effectiveness of CF. This study implied that while teachers are treating errors, should consider EFL learners' preferences along with their anxiety levels.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Introduction

The present study employed both quantitative and qualitative approach to collect and analyze the data. A close-ended questionnaire proposed by Horwitz et al. (1986) with an additional open-ended question were applied to elicit the learners' preferences regarding the impacts of two specific CF types (Immediate and Delayed) on their level of anxiety and also evaluate students' attitudes across the effects of anxiety on accuracy of learners' oral production.

B. Participants

The participants of the current study were 100 Iranian EFL learners (female) aged 13 to 30 from an English language institute (Tak institute) in Dezful, Iran. Since participants' proficiency level varied from beginner to advanced level, for the sake of homogeneity, a placement test (OPT) was conducted to them. For data analysis of OPT, the reliable key answers and conversion chart of OPT were used. Results indicated that 44 of students were at intermediate proficiency level. As not all the intermediate learners were appropriate because of students' willingness to attend in this research project and ease of accessibility to participants by the researcher, convenience sampling (non-probability sampling) was selected and finally 30 of them were chosen as the main participants of the current study. Later, these 30 learners were assigned randomly to two groups of 15. The students' erroneous utterances of the first group were treated immediately. On the other side, teacher corrected non-target-like utterances of the second group after finishing their speech by using delayed CF.

At the time of the research project, students all had already studied English language 4 to 6 hours weekly at least for two years. The principal objective of holding those classes was to enhance learners' improvement at speaking skill. For this purpose, teacher reviewed all grammatical rules and structures they had already learnt from English Corner books during a term which contains 12 sessions. Participants represent 4 different classes taught by the same teacher in the same institute that were held in the afternoons twice a week.

C. Design

Since applying only quantitative procedures may not elicit the real attitudes of participants freely (Dörnyei 2007), to accomplish the purposes of this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. To analyze the findings of this study, data collected from the close-ended questionnaire was transformed into numeric results, tabulated, and finally analyzed through using SPSS software. In addition to examine the findings of the open-ended question, a qualitative procedure was used and data were presented descriptively.

D. Procedures

In order to assess the learners' preferences, data were collected during 6 weeks. Since researcher believed that for obtaining the true results of learners' perspectives, the objectives and also the main concepts of the research study should be explained for them clearly. Therefore, in the first session, the researcher described the concept of CF, its various types and strategies, the notion of foreign language anxiety, and finally the concept of accuracy in oral production. The next five weeks were allocated to treatments which lasted for 10 sessions. Finally, the last session was dedicated for distributing a foreign language class anxiety scale (FLCAS) questionnaire (close-ended) proposed by Horwitz et al., (1986). For the purpose of the current study, 13 specific questions were selected from this FLCAS questionnaire. In this questionnaire, learners were supposed to choose "agree" or "disagree" options based on their own views; thus they could establish straightforward answers for the researcher. In addition, as (Dörnyei, 2007; and Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2010) stated that collecting data through open-ended questions establishes wealthy information for researcher to elicit participants' viewpoints across their acquisition process, one open-ended question (developed by the researcher) was added.

E. Data Collection

For examining the findings of this study, a close-ended questionnaire proposed by Horwitz et al. (1986) with an additional open-ended question (developed by the researcher) was applied to the participants. In order to gain applicable findings, the researcher clarified the primary aims of the questionnaire to the learners and before administering the questionnaire papers, she explained the objective of each part and specific item to the learners. Moreover, for obtaining authentic results, she mentioned the significance of their attitudes for the purpose of this study. Finally, researcher specified that while answering the open-ended question, students are free to declare their perspectives because there is not any answer sheet.

F. Data Analysis

To answer the first research question, the findings of the close-ended questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively through using the SPSS 22.0. Furthermore, in order to achieve the purpose of the second research question, data collected through responses of the participants to the open-ended question was analyzed qualitatively.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

A. Introduction

In order to accomplish the objectives of this study, data was generated by responses of a close-ended questionnaire along with an additional open-ended question.

B. Close-ended Questionnaire

The following table displays the findings of learners' answers to the close-ended questionnaire (FLCAS questionnaire) reduced to statistical data.

TABLE 1
RESULTS OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

	Questions	Groups	Agree	Disagree	Total
1	I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking English in my class.	G1	73.3%	26.7%	100%
		G2	33.3%	66.7%	100%
2	I don't worry about making mistakes in the English class.	G1	40.0%	60.0%	100%
		G2	73.3%	26.7%	100%
3	I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in the English class.	G1	53.3%	46.7%	100%
		G2	20.0%	80.0%	100%
4	I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in the English class.	G1	66.7%	33.3%	100%
		G2	40.0%	60.0%	100%
5	It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my English class.	G1	73.3%	26.7%	100%
		G2	13.3%	86.7%	100%
6	I feel confident when I speak English in class.	G1	46.7%	53.3%	100%
		G2	86.7%	13.3%	100%
7	I am afraid that my English teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.	G1	80.0%	20.0%	100%
		G2	26.7%	73.3%	100%
8	I feel very self-conscious about speaking English in front of other students.	G1	33.3%	66.7%	100%
		G2	66.7%	33.3%	100%
9	I get nervous and confused when I am speaking English in class.	G1	73.3%	26.7%	100%
		G2	20.0%	80.0%	100%
10	I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules I have to learn to speak English.	G1	60.0%	40.0%	100%
		G2	26.7%	73.3%	100%
11	I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak English.	G1	66.7%	33.3%	100%
		G2	26.7%	73.3%	100%
12	I get nervous when the English teacher asks questions which I haven't prepared in advance.	G1	60.0%	40.0%	100%
		G2	20.0%	80.0%	100%
13	I get tense and nervous when I have to discuss things unfamiliar to me in English.	G1	86.7%	13.3%	100%
		G2	46.7%	53.3%	100%

The results of FLCAS questionnaire revealed that though learners of both groups experienced some levels of anxiety when their errors were corrected, the amount of anxiety and number of students that experienced feelings of resentment were totally different. For instance, a vast majority of students in G1 experienced a high level of anxiety while they have received immediate CF on their erroneous utterances during speech. They argued that they became nervous and worried for speaking English in the classroom (especially while teacher corrected their ill-formed utterances). In addition, students mentioned that when they have to discuss unfamiliar issues or answer questions without preparation, they started to panic or got tense to speak English. They also claimed that they trembled while teacher called their names to speak English because they were afraid that other classmates might laugh at them. On the other side, most learners of the second group experienced a less level of anxiety while their errors were treated after finishing their speech. According to participants' beliefs of G2, learners felt self-confident and conscious when they were speaking English in the class. Furthermore, they were not worried or embarrassed to volunteer for speaking English or answering teachers' questions in front of the other classmates.

C. Open-ended Question

In order to elicit learners' attitudes across the effects of anxiety on accuracy of their oral production, one open-ended question was added. This question is as follows:

Q1: What are your beliefs toward the effects of anxiety on accuracy of your oral production?

In responding to this open-ended question, surprisingly students of G1 argued that by providing immediate correction, they felt more anxious situations and then try not to experience that specific error again; thus, this kind of CF and this feeling of anxiety were helpful for improvement of their accuracy during speech. However, most learners of the second group who experienced less anxiety in the classroom claimed that their level of anxiety didn't have any significant effect on accuracy of their oral production.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

According to the works of many scholars, there is a significant relationship between language anxiety and error correction. In addition, teacher' corrective feedback can increase learners' level of anxiety in the context of language learning classroom (Truscott, 1991 & Young, 1991, cited in Renko, 2012). In this regard, considering learners' individual differences and their attitudes toward the effects of CF on their anxiety is of crucial concern. Therefore, the principal objective of the current study was to assess students' viewpoints across the effects of two specific CF types (Immediate and Delayed) on their level of anxiety. The other aim of this study was to investigate learners' perspectives toward the effects of anxiety on accuracy of their oral production. For this purpose, data were obtained through conducting a close-ended questionnaire along with an open-ended question (developed by the researcher). Results revealed that though there were significant differences among students regarding their various levels of anxiety, almost all of them experienced anxious situations during their oral activities in the classroom. These findings are in line with Krashen's (1981) Affective Filter hypothesis which claims that due to individual differences and affective factors, all learners don't experience anxiety in the same way. This is also in line with the work of Horowitz, Horowitz and Cope (1986) which concluded that learners experienced more anxiety during oral production than any other language skill. In addition, based on the findings, while participants of G1 experienced more anxious situations and had higher level of anxiety; learners of G2 were more comfortable and experienced less anxiety. Therefore, these results are in line with the work of Rahimi and Dastjerdi (2012) who claimed that students of G2 (who received delayed correction) expressed less amount of anxiety in their classes.

Finally, participants' attitudes in answering the open-ended question indicated that higher level of anxiety may help students to be more accurate during oral production. However, according to the most learners of the second group, anxiety didn't have any significant effect on their accuracy during performing the speaking activities. Results which revealed the significant effects of anxiety on improvement of accuracy among learners who received immediate CF indicated that through this CF type, some opportunities were established for learners to notice their non-target-like utterances, reformulate them and thus try to be more accurate during speech. Therefore, these findings provide evidence in line with Schmidt's (1995) Noticing Hypothesis and also Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis.

The present research study investigated the impacts of two CF types on learners' anxiety and also examined the impacts of students' anxiety on accuracy of their oral production. Results have revealed that in spite of the fact that almost all students had some levels of anxiety while speaking, the amount of their anxiety depended on many factors such as individual differences and affective factors.

Therefore, this study implies some support for considering learners' personality factors and individual differences as essential aspects of second language acquisition. In this regard, teachers should be conscious while providing CF types to students. They must consider learners' personality types and their specific errors, and then select the most effective CF type for their specific situations. Furthermore, since the findings of this study indicated that learners who received immediate CF experienced more anxious situations; in order to avoid interrupting students' flow of communication and reduce their anxiety, it is recommended to provide delayed type of CF. On the other hand, for being more accurate during speech, this study suggests the use of immediate CF more than the other one.

This study recommends material designers to conduct appropriate natural communicative tasks in which students do not feel anxiety and be able to communicate naturally without fear of making mistakes. Moreover, they should develop oral activities and tasks which provide opportunities to notice their own utterances and thus try to be more accurate.

The current research study was narrowed down in terms of evaluating the effects of two specific CF types (IEC and DEC) on the levels of learners' anxiety and subsequently the accuracy of oral production. Thus, further researches are needed to investigate the efficacy of other CF strategies (e.g. direct and indirect), other notions of affective factors (e.g. self-confidence and motivation), and also other aspects of oral production (e.g. fluency and complexity). In addition, as the focus of this study was evaluating the perspectives of female participants at intermediate proficiency level, future works should be conducted with considering both male and female learners at other language proficiency levels. Since the focus of the present study was on examining learners' views toward their improvement in oral production, further studies are needed on considering all other language learning skills. Finally, the findings of this study were collected through investigating the attitudes of limited number of students within a specific limited context, thus results cannot be generalized. Last but not least, the current study implies that for future studies data should be obtained through a larger number of participants from larger language learning contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abedi, D., Mahdavi, Z., & Hassaskhah, J. (2016). Iranian EFL learners' preferred oral corrective feedback: High anxious learners vs. low anxious learners. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 5 (2), 75-86.
- [2] Akay, C., & Akbarov, A. (2011). Corrective feedback on the oral production and its influence in the intercultural classes. In: 1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. *FLTAL*, 11, 5-7.
- [3] Arnold, J. (2000). *Affect in Language Learning*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- [4] Allwright, R. L. (1975). Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M. K. Burt and II. C. Dulay (Eds.), *New directions in second language learning, teaching, and bilingual education* (pp. 96-109). Washington D.C.: TESOL.
- [5] Chastain, K. (1971). *The development of modern language skills: Theory to practice*. Philadelphia. The Center for Curriculum Development, Inc.
- [6] Corder, S. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-167.
- [7] Doff, A. (1995). *Teach English: A training course for teachers*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [9] Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [10] Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- [11] Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [12] Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, 28, 18-41.
- [13] Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [14] Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.
- [15] Ely, C. M. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risk-taking, sociability, and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*, 36, 1-25.
- [16] Fanselow, J. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10, 583-593.
- [17] Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 562-570.
- [18] Gass, S. M. and Selinker, L. (2008). *Second Language Acquisition. An Introductory Course* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge.
- [19] Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious language learners' reactions to their own oral performance. *Modern Language Journal*, 86, 562-570.
- [20] Hilleson, M. (1996). "I want to talk with them, but I don't want them to hear": An introspective study of second language anxiety in an English-medium school. In K. M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 248-282). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125-132.
- [22] Jackson, J. (2002). Reticence in second language case discussions: Anxiety and aspirations. *System*, 30, 65-84.
- [23] Jakobovits, L. A. (1970). *Foreign language learning: a psycholinguistic analysis of the issues*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- [24] Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning* (1st ed.). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- [25] Lightbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (2006). *How Languages Are Learned* (3rd edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [26] Liu, M. (2006). *Reticence, anxiety and performance of Chinese university students in oral English lessons and tests*. Ann Arbor: ProQuest Information and Learning Company, University of Michigan
- [27] Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46 (1), 1-40.
- [28] MacIntyre P. D. and Gardner, R. C. (1991). Language anxiety: Its Relationship to Other Anxieties and to Processing in Native and Second Languages. *Language Learning* 41 (4), 513-534.
- [29] MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1994). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. *Language Learning*, 44, 283-305.
- [30] Mesri, F. (2012). The relationship between gender and Iranian EFL learners' foreign language classroom anxiety (FLCA). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 147-156.
- [31] Ni, H. (2012). The Effects of Affective Factors in SLA and Pedagogical Implications: Theory and Practice in Language Studies. *Academy Publisher*, 2 (7), 1508-1513. doi:10.4304/tpls.2.7.1508-1513.
- [32] Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative Tasks and the Language Curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (2), 279-295.
- [33] Quinn, P. (2014). *Delayed vs. Immediate Corrective Feedback on Orally Produced Passive Errors in English*. Master's Thesis, Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto.
- [34] Rahimi, A., & H.V. Dastjerdi. (2012). Impact of Immediate and Delayed Error Correction on EFL Learners' Oral Production: *CAF. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 3, 45-54.
- [35] Renko, K. (2012). *Finnish EFL Learners' Perceptions on Errors, Corrective Feedback and Foreign Language Anxiety*. Master's thesis. University of Jyväskylä Department of Languages English. September.
- [36] Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- [37] Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38-62.

- [38] Skehan, P. and P. Foster. (1977). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 1, 185–211.
- [39] Spielberger, C. D., & Vagg, P. (Eds.). (1995). Test anxiety: A transactional process model, test anxiety theory, assessment, and treatment. Washington, D.C.: Taylor & Francis.
- [40] Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers.
- [41] Tallon, M. (2014). The Effects of Foreign Language Anxiety on Heritage Students of Spanish: A Preliminary Investigation. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, 16 (1), 7-42.
- [42] Tseng, S. F. (2012): The factors cause language anxiety for ESL/EFL learners in learning speaking. *WHAMPOA - An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 63, 75-90.
- [43] Tsui, A. (1996). Reticence and anxiety in second language learning. In K.M. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom: Qualitative research in second language education* (pp. 145-167). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [44] Yuan, F. and R. Ellis. (2003). The effects of pre-task planning and on-line planning on fluency, complexity and accuracy in monologic L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 1-27.



Karim Shabani holds a PhD degree in TEFL from the University of Tehran, Iran and is currently an assistant professor at Allameh Mohaddes Nouri University, Nour, Mazandaran, Iran.

He has presented a number of papers in international conferences like ICELT2009 (UPM), TELLSI10, ICELET2012 (University of Tehran), etc. His areas of interest are Vygotsky's Socio-cultural Theory, (dynamic) testing/assessment and second language acquisition.

Fatemeh Safari is an MA holder of TEFL from Allameh Mohaddes Nouri University. She is interested in doing research on L2 feedback, psycholinguistics and L2 learning.