

Received: June 2017	Accepted: July 2017	Published: October 2017
Article DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.24903/sj.v2i2.107		

Students' Attitudes Toward Teachers' Corrective Feedback

Rinda Fitriana

Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda University

rindming@gmail.com

Abstract: Students' attitudes influence their decision to whether or not accept the teachers' feedback. This study focused on students' attitudes toward the correctors, the frequency of errors corrected, the types of errors corrected, and teacher's personality and way of teaching. Therefore, questionnaire was administered to one hundred and ninety-six twelfth grade of vocational high school students, wherein, ten of them were involved in interview, to figure out their perspective concerning to the teachers' correction on their oral production. From both instruments, it is found that students have positive attitudes toward the correctors, particularly to the teachers. However, they did not mind for peer correction. Regarding to their attitude toward the frequency of correction, they expected the teachers to give correction at every time they did error and for all types of errors they did. In addition, students agreed that teachers' personality and their way of teaching influenced their willingness to accept the corrective feedback.

Keywords: attitudes, corrective feedback

INTRODUCTION

Feedback, as a way to inform students about their performance (Ur, 1996) and to assess their progress (Harmer, 2001), is crucial for students so that they will be able to improve and develop their ability in the target language as well as other subject matter knowledge (Chaudron, 1988). (Brown & Douglas, 2000) also emphasized two importance of feedback. First, by giving appropriate portion on affective and cognitive feedback, positively or negatively, it will reinforce students to continue the communication in the target language and internalize particular speech patterns. Second, basically, students expect to receive feedback and be corrected on their errors. Therefore, by giving feedback, teacher has fulfilled their expectation.

Hence, treating students' oral errors is not just a piece of cake, especially when teacher decides to use corrective feedback. Some teachers might feel doubt to correct a student's errors immediately because the student is in his or her first stage of learning how to speak in English. Some teachers might ignore students' errors because they are afraid the students will stop learning when they correct their errors. Therefore, it needs some considerations before a teacher decided to treat his or her students' error, such as, when to treat the errors (i.e.: immediately, in the middle of conversation, at the end of lesson), what treatments should be done and who will do the treatment (i.e.: teacher, peer, or students themselves). Improper considerations on these aspects lead to students' unexpected attitude toward the feedback, such as refusing or ignoring teacher's correction. Since, as (Warga, 1983) stated that attitudes deal with emotional element (i.e.: feeling), they may have negative feeling toward correction (i.e.: refusing or ignoring the correction) or positive feeling (i.e.: accepting the correction) as provoked action that tell a person or people to move either toward an object or away from it. It means that when a student is being corrected by teacher, student's attitude will lead her/him to decide whether or not to accept the correction and/or change the error into the correct form. The last characteristic is attitudes are remarkably permanent. He also explained that when someone had learned an attitude about something, s/he is inclined to stick with it that makes attitudes hardly to change. What is more, attitude refers to student's manner toward an object which is consistent (Triandis & Malpass, 1971) It also refers to student's feelings, self, relationship in community, and emotional involvement (Brown & Douglas, 2000) and student's evaluative reaction toward an object, which influenced by individual's beliefs or opinion about that object (Gardner, 1985).

Regarding on how many errors that learners expect to be corrected, some researcher found that (Odalejo, 1993) (Katayama, 2007) (Al-Magid & Abdul, 2006) (Lee, 2008) students expected to be corrected on errors that impeded communication. However, level of proficiency and language exposure may influence students preference on the quantity of errors should be corrected. (Lee, 2008) found that low proficiency students may not interest in error feedback. Moreover, students' attitudes to the corrector may vary. Based on (Amador, 2008) finding, almost all of students preferred to be corrected by teachers, since they are more knowledgeable rather than peers. In addition, (Amador, 2008) also found that some students preferred to be corrected by peers since it makes them comfortable. However, in particular culture, such as Chinese people, they do not feel comfortable when corrected by their own friend, in the name of harmonious relationship (Carson and Nelson, 1996 in Naomi et al. no date). They are afraid to insult their friend's feeling. Although, (Katayama, 2007) found that Japanese EFL students do not mind to have peer correction. Teacher's behavior also can influence students' attitude toward correction. As (Lee, 2008) noted that students respond to feedback may be influenced by the teacher who gives the feedback. Perhaps, when the teacher has warm personality, the students will accept the feedback as something that will improve their performance. Meanwhile, when the teacher is cold or irresistible, students may perceive the teacher's feedback as punishment. This assumption needed to be proved; hence, investigation on students' attitudes toward corrective feedback as the second focus of this study is necessary to carry out. In addition, students' attitude on timing of corrective feedback will depend on the purpose of the lesson and student's anxiety. (Rahimi & Dastjerdi, 2012) found that immediate correction increased student's anxiety. Therefore, it is important for teachers to decide the best time to treat their students' errors.

Considering its significant roles, the researcher formulate the research question below;

- 1) How were EFL students' attitudes toward corrective feedback on oral production?

METHODOLOGY

This study mainly used qualitative approach that supported by questionnaire result. At first, to gather surface data, the researcher distributed questionnaires to 196 students (from 385 students) from all classes of twelfth graders of vocational high school in Samarinda. Then, to gain deeper information and confirmation, an observation on two classes (i.e.; high proficiency and low proficiency classes), and a semi-structure interview had been conducted

to ten students which taken randomly from the observed classes. It is important to note that observation was used to confirm the result of questionnaire and interview with the real condition in the class, whether the teachers could meet students' expectation. In addition, twelfth grade students were involved as the research subjects considering that they had received enough corrective feedback in the previous grade.

The questionnaire the researcher used was dichotomous since it only needed answer of "YES" or "NO". She employed this kind of questionnaire because it would not make the students puzzled by answering the questions. It was easy to do for students. The questionnaires consisted of two sections: 1) students' attitudes toward corrective feedback and 2) demographic questions. Section 1 uncovered students' attitudes toward corrective feedback. The questions revealed the quantity of errors that should be corrected, the correctors (i.e.: teacher, peer, students' own self), and the timing of correction (i.e.: immediate or delay) that students expect to have. Section 2 was used to know the background of students. It comprised seven questions. For interview, she had prepared seven questions regarding to students' attitude toward correction and the rests were demographic information questions.

For data from questionnaires, the researcher did simple calculation. It was by calculating how many students had answered "Yes" and "No" for each item of questionnaire. She used the formula below to count the percentage:

Item 1:

$$\text{YES(\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of respondents who answer YES}}{\text{Total number of respondents}} \times 100$$

$$\text{NO(\%)} = \frac{\text{Number of respondents who answer NO}}{\text{Total number of respondents}} \times 100$$

Then, the rest of items were counted in the same way. Moreover, to analyze the percentages, she used frequency distribution analysis.. Meanwhile, for result of interview, she used (Creswell, 2008) model of analyzing qualitative data.

FINDINGS

Questionnaire Result

The researcher stated twelve questions that related to students' attitudes toward the corrective feedbacks in questionnaire. These questions focused on 1) students' attitude toward the correctors (i.e.: teachers, peers, students themselves), 2) the quantity of errors that should be corrected, 3) the frequency of correction should be given, 4) students' acceptance to the corrective feedback, and 5) the relationship between teachers' personality and their acceptance to corrective feedback.

The same with students' preferences toward corrective feedbacks, the researcher also needed to provide the criteria of the result percentages of students' attitudes toward corrective feedbacks. The criteria were as followed:

1. The Most Preferred: $0SD + \text{Mean}$
2. The Average Preferred: $-1SD + \text{Mean}$
3. The Less Preferred: $-2SD + \text{Mean}$

Based on the criteria above, the researcher found the blueprints of result percentages as followed:

1. The Most Preferred: Result of Percentages $\geq 66\%$
2. The Average Preferred: 65.9% until 33.1%
3. The Less Preferred: $33\% \geq$ result of percentage

The following table would show the results of students' attitudes toward corrective feedback based on the questionnaires results.

No	Students' Attitudes	Amount	%
1	Students preferred if all errors were corrected	176	90%
2	Students preferred if only specific errors were corrected	58	30%
3	Students preferred teachers to give correction	183	93%
4	Students preferred peer correction	95	48%
5	Students preferred to self-correct the errors	169	86%
6	Students preferred to be corrected every time errors occurred	166	85%
7	Students preferred to be corrected occasionally	26	13%
8	Students preferred not to be corrected at all	1	1%
9	Students liked to be corrected	190	97%
10	Students wanted to accept correction	192	98%
11	Students mind for peer correction	131	67%

No	Students' Attitudes	Amount	%
12	Teacher personality (e.g.: friendly or unfriendly) affected students in taking teachers' correction	168	86%

Table 1 Students' Attitudes toward Corrective Feedbacks

From the table above, the researcher concluded five points. First, most of students (90%) preferred if teacher gave correction for all types of errors and less students preferred to be corrected for specific errors. Moreover, most of students (93%) preferred the teacher to give them corrective feedback. However, students (86%) mostly preferred to self-correct their errors and only some students (48%) preferred peer correction. By looking at the percentages, it showed that some students who preferred teacher as the corrector also liked the peer correction and the self-correction. Then, eighty-five percent (166) students mostly preferred to be corrected at every time they do errors rather than being corrected occasionally. Furthermore, most of students (97%) students said that they liked if their errors in learning speaking English were corrected and 98% (192) students said that they can accept the correction. In addition, 67% (131) students minded if their classmate gave correction for their errors. Next, 86% (168) students said that teachers' personality affected them in taking their corrective feedbacks.

Interview Result

Students' attitudes here referred to students' acceptance toward correction that related to 1) the correctors (i.e.: teachers and peer), 2) the frequency of corrective feedbacks were given, 3) the quantity of errors which were treated, and 4) the relationship between teachers' personality and students' willingness in accepting the corrective feedback. Therefore, the researcher asked questions about these points during interview. The following table summarized students' attitudes toward corrective feedback.

No	Students' Attitudes	Amount	%
1	Students preferred if all errors were corrected	5	50%
2	Students preferred if only specific errors were corrected	4	40%
3	Students preferred teachers to give correction	6	60%
4	Students preferred pair correction	5	50%
5	Students preferred to be corrected at every time errors occurred	9	90%
6	Students preferred to be corrected occasionally	2	20%
7	Teachers' personality (e.g.: friendly or unfriendly) and their ways of teaching affected students' willingness to repair the errors	9	90%

Table 2 Students' Attitudes toward Corrective Feedback (Data of Interview)

Students' preferences toward the corrector.

Starting from students' attitudes toward the corrector, the researcher found that six of ten interviewees preferred the teacher to give corrective feedback rather than their classmate. They assumed that teachers had more knowledge than their classmate (2 of 10) and they also were more accurate to provide the correct version (2 of 10). Moreover, teachers can tolerate students' errors (1 of 10). They also had more experiences in English speaking rather than their classmate (1 of 10). And the last, students preferred the teachers as the corrector since they were the ones who teach them every day. So, it was teachers' responsibility to give them correction.

However, there were found students (5 of 10) who preferred their classmate as the corrector. It was important to note that one of ten interviewees preferred both teacher and classmate to give correction. The researcher found four reasons why they preferred peer correction. One of ten interviewees said that she did not prefer teachers give correction since they made the student clumsy and rather scare, but it depends on the teacher. Three of ten interviewees stated that peer correction made them felt more comfortable. In addition, they felt not ashamed if their classmates gave correction (1 of 10) and it was easier to understand classmate's correction (1 of 10).

Students' preferences toward the frequency of giving corrective feedbacks

Students' preference on the corrector had been explained above. Now, the researcher would like to show students' preference on the frequency of teachers giving corrective feedback. Nine of ten interviewees said that they preferred if the teachers gave them correction at every time they did errors. However, two of ten interviewees (one of them like both every time correction and occasional correction) liked occasional correction.

There were six reasons why they preferred to be corrected at every time they did error. First, every time correction prevented students to do the same errors later on (3 of 10). It also made students clearer for knowing the location of their errors (3 of 10). Two of ten interviewees said that it was more effective to know the correct version for all errors they did if teachers corrected them all the time. The other two said that they could notice the errors if they find the same error at another occasion. Moreover, student (1 of 10) felt that it was better for teacher giving correction (i.e.: provide the correct version directly) rather than just giving explanation. Finally, the last reason was student assumed the teacher was a moody person if s/he gives correction occasionally (1 of 10).

As it said above, two of ten interviewees preferred occasional correction. They liked it because of three reasons. First, it made them feel that they always do error. Second, it made students losing motivation to learn. And the last reason was teachers would not have enough time to correct all students' errors.

Students' preferences toward the quantity of errors should be corrected

It was not just about the frequency of corrective feedbacks given. But, the researcher also concerned to the quantity of errors that students expected to be corrected. She found that five of ten interviewees preferred all types of errors were corrected, four of ten interviewees preferred only certain types of errors were corrected, and two of interviewees did not stated clearly whether they liked to be corrected for all errors or just certain errors. It was important to note that one of interviewees did not mind to be corrected for all and just certain errors.

The five interviewees stated that they liked to be corrected for all types of errors because of six reasons. First, if the teacher corrected them all, students could learn more and could get more knowledge (2 of 10). Moreover, two of interviewees said that they were afraid of doing another types of errors if the teachers only corrected certain errors. Other reasons that they stated were they felt comfortable (1 of 10), they understood English better (1 of 10), they know the location of errors (1 of 10), and they become more capable in English (1 of 10).

As it said before, four of ten interviewees preferred certain types of errors to be corrected. There were five reasons why they preferred it. First, if the teacher gave correction on all errors occurred, it made students unwilling to speak more (1 of 10). Furthermore, students preferred to be corrected on grammatical errors (1 of 10) and pronunciation error because they used to do these errors (1 of 10). One of interviewees said that teacher used to give correction mostly on grammar. Moreover, one of them said that if the time was enough for teacher to give correction, then she did not mind to be corrected for all errors. But, if the time was limited, then it would be okay if the teacher corrected for certain errors.

Relationship between teachers' personality and students' willingness in accepting the corrective feedback

(Warga, 1983) said that attitudes deal with emotional involvement that lead people to move on or not. Regarding to the focus of study, students' attitudes here referred to students' acceptance toward corrective feedback. It also involved their feeling to the corrector; it was the teacher. Therefore, in her interview, the researcher asked about how students' feeling about the teachers' personality that influenced them to take the corrective

feedback by repairing the error or to refuse the corrective feedback by ignoring it (i.e.: did not repair the errors).

Nine of ten interviewees agreed that teachers' personality influences their willingness to repair their errors and only one of them said it did not. There were about thirteen reasons why they agreed. One of interviewees said that teacher's personality affected her/his character and way of teaching. Stern teachers made students to delay to repair the errors (2 of 10), were afraid to ask something (2 of 10), did not understand the lesson (2 of 10), made the learning situation uncomfortable (2 of 10), made students lazy to learn and felt upset (1 of 10).

Another one said that if the teacher was not nice and did not explain well, it made the students hard to understand the lesson. Moreover, a strict teacher made students enthusiastic to learn (1 of 10) and repair the error immediately because they were afraid of the teacher's anger (2 of 10). Caring teachers made students want to learn more (1 of 10). Caring and friendly teachers made students feel comfortable to be corrected (2 of 10). However, friendly teachers also could make students delay to repair the errors. In addition, one of interviewees said that nice teachers usually explain the lesson well and make students easier to understand. Furthermore, if the teacher had good interaction with the students, they would be easier to accept the correction (1 of 10).

DISCUSSION

Students' attitude here referred to students' acceptance to the corrective feedback by repairing the error or ignoring the feedback. In general, students expected corrective feedbacks from the teachers. Data from interview showed that eighty percent interviewees expected corrective feedback since they wanted to know the location of their errors and it prevented students to do error in another occasion. Data from questionnaire also showed that, basically, these students can accept correction since 190 respondents (97%) said so and want to accept it, too (98%). However, the acceptance of the corrective feedbacks would be depended on how teachers delivered them. Therefore, students' attitudes toward corrective feedbacks had become important issue in this research since it determined students' response toward corrective feedback. Overall, students had positive attitudes toward corrective feedback because almost all of them expected corrective feedback for the errors they did.

The students' attitudes toward corrective feedback related to four points; 1) the correctors, 2) the frequency of corrective feedback given, 3) the quantity of errors which

should be treated, 4) the relationship between teachers' personality and students' acceptance toward corrective feedbacks.

Students' Preferences toward the Correctors

In previous finding, (Amador, 2008) found that almost all students preferred the teachers to give them correction since they were more knowledgeable rather than peers. However, she also found that some students preferred peer correction since it made them feel comfortable. The researcher also found similar finding. Ninety-three percent respondents (data from questionnaires) and sixty percent interviewees showed that students preferred the teacher as the corrector. Nevertheless, they also did not mind if their classmates gave correction fifty percent of interviewees said so. However, only forty-eight percent respondents (95) liked peer-correction and sixty-seven percent (131) respondents minded if their classmate gave correction. Teachers were preferred as the corrector since students believed that they have more knowledge, have more experience and were more accurate rather than their classmates

However, students also expected peer correction since it made them feel more comfortable, not feel ashamed when they do error and classmates' explanation was easier to understand. Consulting to the data from observation, peer correction occurred for three times during the three meetings of observation. It means, teachers dominated most of corrective feedbacks. If it related to interview data, there was mismatched expectation since fifty percent interviewees expected peer correction. They expected the teacher not to dominate for correcting their errors. However, in general, teachers met students' expectation since most of students preferred the teachers as the corrector and it was consistent with teachers' correction domination in the classroom.

Students' Preference toward the Frequency of Giving Corrective Feedbacks

Focusing to the frequency of corrective feedbacks that should be given, data from questionnaires showed that most of students (85%) expected teacher to give corrective feedback at every time the errors occurred. Data from interview also supported this finding. Since, ninety percent interviewees said the same. Checking with data from observation, if she compared the amount of errors teachers treated and not treated (see Table 4.3), it was clearly seen that students' expectation to be corrected all the time did not match with what teachers did in real class. From the total of errors that Mr. Y's students' did (i.e.: 151 errors), Mr. Y only treated sixty-three errors (42%). Likewise, Mrs. E only treated fifty students' errors (32%) from the total of errors (i.e.: 154 errors). Students expected the teachers gave them

correction all the time because they were afraid of doing other errors later on and prevented them to do the same error at another occasion. On the other hand, teachers preferred to give corrective feedback occasionally. So, there found another mismatch expectation in the frequency of corrective feedback that students expected.

Students' Preference toward the Quantity of Errors that should be Corrected

(Odalejo, 1993) had found that most of students preferred to have comprehensive correction rather than selective correction. It means that students like if teachers give correction for errors they did. The researcher's finding was consistent with his finding. Based on data from questionnaire, she found that students expected the teachers to give correction on all types of errors that they did (90%). Likewise, fifty percent interviewees expected teachers to give correction on all types of errors, because they were afraid of doing other errors if teacher just correct certain errors. When teachers corrected all types of errors, students learnt more and got more knowledge. In other words, they became more capable in English since it made them know the location of their error. As the result, they would understand English better. In addition, they felt more comfortable when teachers gave correction for all types of errors.

However, forty percent of interviewees preferred if the teachers only corrected certain errors. Since, if teachers always give corrective feedback for all errors occurred, it made students unwilling to speak more. Nonetheless, it was okay for teachers to correct all errors if the time was enough. Moreover, students preferred if teachers only correct their grammatical errors and pronunciation errors.

During observation, Mrs. E mostly treated students' errors that teacher's norm was the referent of the correct version, although, these errors were actually not deviant linguistic form. From fifty-one students' errors that were treated, twenty-six errors were teacher's norm errors. It also happened to Mr. Y's class. But, it was not as many as Mrs. E's treated. There were twenty-three errors of sixty-three treated students' errors belonged to teacher's norm. This data showed that both teachers gave correction only for certain errors. If the researcher compared data of interview and data of observation, there would be a matching expectation about how many errors that should be corrected. Since, only fifty percent interviewees preferred all errors were corrected and teachers did not give correction for all types of errors. However, if she compared data of questionnaire with data of observation, there would be a mismatch expectation since almost all respondents (90%) expected teachers to give correction on all types of errors.

Relationship between Teachers' Personalities and Students' Acceptance to Corrective Feedback

Based data of questionnaires, one hundred and sixty-eight respondents (86%) agreed that teachers' personalities related to their acceptance to corrective feedback. Likewise, data of interview revealed the same. Most of students believed that teachers' personalities affected them to repair or not to repair the errors. Since, teachers' personalities affected their character and way of teaching. Moreover, stern teachers made students afraid to ask something, difficult to understand the lesson, feel uncomfortable, and did not want to learn. As the result, students delayed to repair the errors at the time the teachers gave correction. In other words, they ignored teachers' corrective feedback. In addition, correction that given with anger only made students' heart hurt. Moreover, teachers' way of explaining lesson which was not good made students hard to understand the lesson, included teachers' explanation in giving the correct version of the errors and how to repair them. Otherwise, one of the interviewee felt that friendly teacher made her delay the correction. She preferred strict teacher to give correction because it made her scare of teachers' anger and repair the errors immediately because of that.

However, the researcher found teachers' personalities that made students accept the correction and repair the errors. Student believed that caring teacher made her wanted to learn more caring and friendly personality were good combination that students expected from the teachers because it made them feel comfortable when the teachers gave correction. Another student added that teachers who have good interaction with their students also made students easier to accept their corrective feedback.

Consulting to observation data, Mr. Y and Mrs. E were nice teachers. Just, they had different way of teaching. Based on data of interviewees' demographic information, two of five respondents from Mr. Y's class liked him and the rests were complained about his way of teaching and his temper. However, he was fun teacher. The video transcripts (see appendix 8) showed that students laughed a lot during learning process. Comparing to Mrs. E, all of respondents from her class did not like her because of her confusing way of teaching and unclear English speaking. So, students' predilection toward teachers (i.e.: included their personalities and their way of teaching) influenced students' acceptance toward the corrective feedbacks they gave. The amount of students ignored teachers' corrective feedback (i.e.: students did not repair the errors) could prove it. During three meetings of observation, Mrs. E's students had ignored her correction for 21% or 11 of 51 responses and Mr. Y's students'

did not repair the errors for about 23.8% or 15 responses, added one students who ignored Mr. Y's CF. Interruption because she was disappointed for not giving her chance to repair. In Mrs. E's case, the students really did not repair the errors although the teacher had given them chance. Meanwhile, for Mr. Y's case, students did not repair because he did not give them chance to repair. So, it looked like just an explanation.

To sum up, students preferred the teachers to give them corrective feedback since they were more knowledgeable, but they also did not mind for peer correction. Moreover, students preferred if teachers gave correction at every time the errors occurred, but some of them preferred occasional correction. However, in real condition, teachers gave corrective feedback occasionally. They also expected the teachers to give corrective errors for all types of errors they did. In addition, teachers' personality and their way of teaching influenced students to decide whether to repair or not to repair the errors and to understand the teachers' explanation on how to repair the errors.

CONCLUSION

Students preferred the teachers as their corrector since they were more knowledgeable and had more experiences. However, they also did not mind for peer correction. In real condition, teachers dominated the corrective feedbacks. It means there was a mismatch expectation in term of peer correction. Since, students still expected peer correction and teacher did not give enough chance for it to happen.

In addition, students expected the teachers always to give them correction and to correct all errors they did. Since, it prevented them to do the same errors in another occasion. Moreover, students can get more knowledge if the teachers gave correction all the time for all errors they did. Nevertheless, in real condition, the teachers gave correction occasionally and they only corrected certain errors. Hence, there was a mismatch expectation in terms of the frequency and the quantity of errors that teachers should correct. What is more, students believed that teachers' personality influenced their decision whether or not to repair the error after taking teachers' corrective feedback. If the teachers were nice, they would feel comfortable and directly repair the error. But, if the teachers were stern and/or annoying, they preferred to delay repairing their errors. Besides, it did not just deal with their personality, but also their way of teaching. Teachers' confusing way of teaching as well as confusing way of delivering corrective feedbacks made students confused to repair the error, worse; they delayed it or they did not repair it at all.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Magid, & Abdul, M. A.-M. (2006). *The Effect of Teachers' Attitudes on the Effective Implementation of the Communicative approach in ESL Classroom (Master 'sthesis.* University of South Africa. Retrieved from [Http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/1747/dissertation.p4on](http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/1747/dissertation.p4on)
- Amador, Y. (2008). Learner Attitudes toward Error Correction in a Beginner English Class., *17*(1), 18–28. Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/pdf/166/16617103.pdf>
- Brown, H., & Douglas. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* New York: Longman.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational Research. Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research* (Third Edit). USA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology*, 2.
- Harmer, J. (2001). *How to Teach English.* Longman.
- Katayama, A. (2007). EFL Students' Preferences toward Correction of Classroom Oral Errors. In *Asian EFL Journal* (Vol. 9, pp. 298–305).
- Lee, I. (2008). Student Reactions to Teacher Feedback in Two Hongkong Secondary Classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 144–164. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com>
- Odalejo, J. (1993). Correction in ESL: Learners' Preferences. *TESL. Journal/Revues TESL Du Canada*, *10*(2), 71–87. Retrieved from <http://journals.sfu.ca/tesl/index.php/tesl/article/viewFile/619/450>
- Rahimi, A., & Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Impact of Immediate and Delayed Error Correction on EFL Learners' Oral Production. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *3*(1), 45–54.
- Triandis, H. C., & Malpass, R. S. (1971). *Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *7*, 1–84. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2949227> Page Count: 84
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching.* Cambridge University Press. London.
- Warga, R. Q. (1983). *Personal Awareness: A Psychology of Adjustment* (Third Edit). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.