



Customized Oral Corrective Feedback: Learners' Preferences and Personality Traits

Nooshin Nateghian

English Language and Literature Department, University of Urmia, Urmia, Iran

nooshin6913@gmail.com

Zhila Mohammadnia (Corresponding Author)

English Language and Literature Department, University of Urmia, Urmia, Iran

Z.mohammadnia@urmia.ac.ir

ARTICLE INFO:

Received date:

2021.12.20

Accepted date:

2022.01.31

Print ISSN: 2251-7995

Online ISSN: 2676-6876

Keywords:

Extroversion, Introversion, Individual Differences, Error Correction.

Abstract

This study aims at investigating second language learners' preferences for receiving oral corrective feedback on lexical and grammatical errors in relation to their personality traits. Given the established benefits of providing corrective feedback, the question remains how to customize corrective feedback in order to be effective and appropriate to the individual's personality. For this purpose, 324 language learners in a language institution were asked to complete Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and feedback preference questionnaires. T-test showed that more extroverted learners prefer explicit and immediate feedback while more introverted ones prefer implicit and non-immediate feedback. Moreover, introverts preferred recasts for lexical and grammatical errors while extroverts preferred explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback the most. A follow-up content analysis of interview data revealed learners' reasons regarding their preferences for receiving corrective feedback. Interviewed extroverts mentioned that explicit correction eliminated ambiguities of peer correction and metalinguistic feedback helped to feel independent. However, recasts were disliked by extroverts because they could not notice the correction, whereas welcomed by introverts due to their least obtrusive nature.

DOI: 10.22034/ELT.2021.49503.2471

Citation: Nateghian, N., Mohammadnia, Z. (2022). Customized Oral Corrective Feedback: Learners' Preferences and Personality Traits. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 14(29), 155-170. Doi: 10.22034/ELT.2021.49503.2471

1. Introduction

Dealing with learners' errors is a complex and important phenomenon with ripple effects on a variety of individual and contextual factors. The role of individual differences (ID) has received considerable attention in the past few decades, especially in the area of corrective feedback (Mackey & Sachs, 2012; Yang, 2016; Bao, 2019; Kim & Nassaji, 2017). ID is defined as individuals' tendency that distinguishes people from one another in a consistent and stable manner (Dornyei, 2005). Exploring individual differences has much to contribute to our understanding of variation in successful language learning. Skehan (1989) provided an inventory of various individual factors affecting the how and why of language learning, such as intelligence, motivation, personalities of learners, age and other factors. Among these factors, extroversion and introversion as a personality trait is a widely acknowledged concept.

Personality refers to individuals' features that "account for consistent patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving" (Pervin & John, 2001, p.1). Two outstanding features of personality traits are that first, they are stable over time and different situations. Second, they can change individuals' behavior (Mathews, Deary, & Whiteman, 2003). The Big Five model of personality plays a crucial role in current academic circles (Dornyei, 2005), providing a powerful tool in researching the role of personality in the field of cognitive psychology (Mathews et al., 2003). The "Big Five" factors of personality traits include Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability (or Neuroticism), and Autonomy (or Culture, Intellect, Openness to Experience (De Raad, 1998). Extraversion as a psychological trait is defined by the following adjectives: "sociable, gregarious, active, assertive, passionate, and talkative" and introversion as the "passive, quiet, reserved, withdrawn, sober, aloof, and restrained" (Dornyei, 2005, p. 15). However, these concepts are not in binary opposition and absolutely rigid, rather they are relatively assumed (Sakan, 1990). According to previous studies, some outstanding characteristics of extroverts in instructional settings are using social strategies such as asking for clarification and seeking practice opportunities. In contrast, introverts prefer learning alone and are not so much talkative (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990).

A considerable amount of attention has been given to the importance of learner personality differences and its impact on language-learning process (Mackey, Adams, Stafford, & Winke, 2010, Sidek, 2012, Gan, 2011). Extroversion and introversion as personality types have been identified as significant factors in different areas of language learning such as language learning strategies (kayaoglu, 2013), speech production (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000), and second language oral performance (Gan, 2011).

2. Literature Review

2.1. Types of CF and L2 Learning

A great deal of research has been conducted to investigate the effectiveness of different types of oral and written corrective feedback (CF). In order to compare and evaluate learner uptake and repair, most of these studies (Han & Yung, 2007; Kang, 2008; Sheen, 2006; Lee, 2013; Panove & Lyster, 2002) have used classification of oral corrective feedback (OCF) developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997). The model of corrective feedback classification includes six types of OCF: explicit correction, elicitation, recasts, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request and repetition. Definitions in this study follow the ones in Lyster and Ranta's (1997), Sheen's

(2004), and Panove and Lyster's (2002). Moreover, the examples are extracted from our second language learning classroom recordings, as indicated in Table 1:

Table1. Oral CF Types

CF types	Definition	Example
1. Explicit correction	Explicitly indicates that an error has been committed, and provides the reformulation	S: In Saturday T: Not in Saturday, on Saturday We say, "he goes to school on Saturday".
2. Elicitation	Prompt the learner to self- correct by pausing so that the learner fill the gap with the correct form	S: This book is good than another. T: This book is? S: Better
3. Recast	Provides reformulation of all or part of the non-target utterance	S: We will found a book. T: Will find a book.
4. Meta-linguistic feedback	Provides explicit explanation of technical linguistic information	S: The boy tall is here. T: Boy is a noun and tall is an adjective.
5. Clarification request	Asks the learner to reformulate the utterance by indicating that the sentence was not understood	S: How do you drive of your license? T: What? (Or, Sorry?)
6. Repetition	Repeats error and uses intonation or emphatic stress to highlight the error	S: I will told you T: I will TOLD you? S: I will tell you

2.2. Effect of Different Factors on CF Effectiveness

Both descriptive (Chaudron, 1997; Pica, 1987, Gass & Varinis, 1994) and experimental studies have investigated feedback effectiveness in laboratory and classroom contexts. While some experimental research has been carried out to discover the link between second language learning and corrective feedback (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Ishida, 2004; Ammar & Spada, 2006) and key mechanisms that may influence feedback's potential effectiveness (Nassaji, 2015, 2016), descriptive studies have mostly reported episodes of corrective feedback in communicative interaction. Based on previous studies, it can be concluded that one of the key variables known to have a well-known impact on CF effectiveness is context. Previous research (Spada, 1997; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Nicholas, Lightbown, & Spada, 2001) has shown that classroom and laboratory setting act as a notable variable in altering the effectiveness of CF.

Another crucial variable known to have a considerable impact on CF effectiveness is age factor (Oliver, 2000; Mackey & Oliver, 2002). Oliver (2000) showed that teachers use different mechanisms when treating adult and child language deficiencies as they hold different beliefs

and expectations from different age ranges. Mackey and Oliver (2002) investigated children and adults' reaction to different kinds of feedback and showed that children benefited more from recasts and implicit feedback than adults.

In addition, several researchers highlighted the importance of proficiency in shaping different beliefs of both teachers and students about oral corrective feedback (Mackey & Philip, 1998; Han & Yung, 2007; Suzuki, 2004; Kaivanpanah, Alavi, & Sepehrinia, 2015). For example, Han and Yung (2007) demonstrated that teachers used different kinds of feedback with different frequencies for different proficiency levels. Teachers tended to use corrective feedback more frequently in elementary classes than intermediate ones. Moreover, they preferred recasts over other kinds of feedback in the intermediate level classes. On the other hand, they used immediate explicit correction in elementary classes especially in the formation of past tense of verbs.

Several studies investigated the effect of different kinds of feedback such as recasts or clarification requests. Some of these studies stated that metalinguistic feedback as a kind of explicit feedback resulted in profoundly better achievement of learners in comparison to those who received recasts as implicit feedback (Sheen, 2006; Ellis, 2009). Nobuyoshi and Ellis (1993) found that clarification requests as a kind of implicit feedback were beneficial for improving learners' accuracy. Rassaei and Moinzadeh (2011) noted that recasts and metalinguistic feedback were more effective on the acquisition of Wh-question forms in comparison to clarification requests. Despite a great deal of effort on differentiating the effects of different kinds of feedback on learners, the results have remained inconclusive.

2.3. Extroversion/Introversion and L2 Research

Personality traits and particularly extraversion have received only sporadic attention in studies of corrective feedback preferences. Previous research showed that personality can almost touch every single aspect of language learning such as fluency (Dewaele & Furnham, 2000), resistance to stress (Matthews & Dorn, 1995), social anxiety (Cheek & Buss, 1981), attention selectivity and capacity (Eysenck, 1979), verbal processing (Matthews & Deary, 1998), short term memory (M. W. Eysenck, 1981) and individual preference of learning (Kamal & Radhakrishnan, 2019). For example, Dewaele and Furnham (2000) found that extroverts were more fluent than introverts and used more short high-frequency words in formal occasions while introverts used long low-frequency words in formal circumstances. In another study, Van Daele, Housen, Pierrard, and Debruyne (2006) revealed that degree of extroversion only showed significant results in terms of lexical complexity but not fluency and accuracy.

According to Matthews, Deary and Whiteman (2009), extroverts' and introverts' performance depends on a whole range of task and contextual variables. For example, Eysenck (1981) showed that extroverts were better performers on tasks which require resistance to interference and divided attention. In case of attention, one study by Furnham and Strbac (2002) has shown that introverts were more easily distracted than extroverts by attentionally demanding music. Moreover, Mangan and Hookway (1988) showed that extroverts were better at immediate recall tasks and as a result have a better short-term memory than introverts. On the other hand, introverts were better at visual vigilance (Harkins & Geen, 1975), long term memory (Howarth & Eysenck, 1968), and problem-solving (Kumar & Kapila, 1987). Kamal

and Radhakrishnan (2019) found that extraverts preferred active learning while introverts welcomed reflexive learning styles in the context of internet web-based learning.

Lee (2013) found that learners appreciated to receive explicit and immediate corrections during their conversations and teacher-student interactions. Further research by Yang (2015) showed that learners opted for receiving metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction and recasts on all error types. With the exception of few studies, substantial research has focused on teachers' beliefs on CF and there is little information of this kind which focuses on personality trait of learners when investigating their CF preferences. Based on the personality of learners' teachers can make instruction more effective if personality traits can predict individuals' tendency and beliefs toward receiving CF. With this aim, this study will take a step further to investigate extroverted and introverted learners' preferences for receiving oral corrective feedback and their beliefs and reasons regarding the efficacy of different kinds of feedback.

In order to address these under-researched issues in second language learning, the following research questions are formulated:

- 1) What general oral corrective feedback preferences do EFL adult learners (extroverts vs. introverts) hold in Iranian EFL classes?
- 2) What is EFL adult learners (extroverts vs. introverts) preference among six types of corrective feedback?
- 3) What are the underlying reasons regarding learners' preference for receiving a special type of oral corrective feedback?

3. Method

3.1. Participants

The participants were 324 adult advanced L2 learners enrolled in an EFL spoken program at a private language institute in Urmia, Iran. From 324 students, 114 extroverted and 106 introverted students were chosen after administering Neuroticism-Extraversion-Openness (NEO) Personality questionnaire (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Forty-nine percent Female and 51 percent male native speakers of Turkish, Persian, and Kurdish who had no experience of residence in English speaking countries participated in this study. Their ages ranged from 20 to 30. They were already placed in advanced level by the placement test of the institution and in-house achievement test. Their course covered speaking sessions and Speak Now 4 as their course-book which develops students' communication skills both in and out of the classroom. From 31 students agreeing to be interviewed on their questionnaire response, 23 were chosen based on their personality taxonomy. Having obtained information with regard to their personality and corrective feedback preferences, the researchers analyzed the interviewed introverted and extroverted participants' preferences and reasons.

3.2. Materials and Instruments

The data were collected by means of three questionnaires and a semi-structured interview in order to find common rationale of learners behind their choices with regard to receiving CF. The first questionnaire explored learners' personality types and the second examined learners'

preferred way of receiving corrective feedback and the third explored learners' preference for receiving six types of CF.

3.2.1 NEO Personality Inventory

The first one included 12 declarative statements taken from Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) (Costa & McCrae, 1992). NEO inventory examines a person's Big Five personality traits (openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism). This questionnaire also reports on subcategories of each personality trait called facets. In this study, researchers used the extroversion facet of the inventory. The response to each question is made on a 5-point Likert type scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly agree". The questionnaire has been found valid and used extensively by researchers.

3.2.2 Learners' general preference questionnaire

The second questionnaire adopted from Han and Jung (2007) included a set of items which reflected learners' general preference of receiving corrective feedback.

3.2.3 Learners' specific corrective feedback preference questionnaire

Third researcher made questionnaire explored students' preferences of six corrective feedback types. A comprehensive framework developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997) was used as a baseline of types of corrective feedback in the questionnaire. There are 6 types of corrective feedback including *explicit correction*, *recast*, *clarification request*, *meta-linguistic feedback*, *elicitation*, and *repetition*. To this end, we prepared and administered our adapted questionnaire that included corrective feedback types, their simple definitions and two classroom-based instances or extracts focusing on vocabulary or grammar from the literature. After consulting two experts, it was found to be valid for our research purpose. Cronbach's alpha of the instrument is 0.78, indicating an acceptable reliability of the questionnaire.

3.2.4 Interview

The stimulated recall interviews were conducted to shed further light on learners' preferences of a special type of feedback that they ranked it highest, and to ask why they did not show tendency toward a feedback that they ranked it lowest. Moreover, the researchers gathered qualitative data of the interview and learners' extra ideas that emerged from the discussion in order to buttress and complement the quantitative data of the questionnaires.

3.3. Procedure

In order to collect data, the researchers assigned a personality trait questionnaire, the object of which was to distinguish the learners who were more dominant in the extrovert or introvert sides of the continuum in their personality trait. The researchers excluded 104 out of 324 respondents because according to the questionnaire template, score range of 24 to 48 was neither extrovert nor introvert. The score range of 12 to 24 was considered as introvert and 48 to 60 as extrovert. Next, we administered a questionnaire to elicit preferences of students in terms of how they liked to be given corrective feedback or reactive focus on form following the possible non-target structures they would produce in their meaning oriented classes. Later, another survey was carried out to elicit learners' preferences for receiving six types of corrective feedback including explicit correction, recasts, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition for grammar and vocabulary errors. At the end, the

researchers analyzed whether extroverts' and introverts' preferences were significantly different and further complemented the results with follow-up interviews.

3.4. Data Analysis

To examine introverts' and extroverts' general preferences for corrective feedback, all ten of the declarative statements in the first questionnaire were used. An independent-samples t-test was conducted via SPSS to compare the ten items' scores of questionnaire results obtained from extroverts and introverts. In order to assess the reliability of the adopted questionnaire for our sample, researchers made use of Cronbach's alpha test. The output was 0.783, implying that the expected level of internal consistency existed between the samples. Furthermore, interviews were analyzed and the most common responses were taken as the reason of learners' CF preferences.

4. Results

4.1. CF General Preferences

The first research question aimed at finding the oral corrective feedback preferences of adult EFL learners (extroverts vs. introverts) in Iranian EFL classes. In order to determine extroverts' and introverts' preferences for receiving corrective feedback, ten declarative statements were analyzed and the ratings were compared between two different personalities. The statements taken from Han and Yung (2007, p. 259) are:

1. I want my teacher to correct all of my errors when I speak English.
2. I think I learn more when my teacher corrects my speech.
3. I feel embarrassed when the teacher corrects me in front of other classmates.
4. I would like my teacher to correct the errors I make most often when I am speaking English.
5. I like to practice speaking English freely. I do not want my teacher to correct my errors when I am speaking.
6. When my teacher corrects me, I want him/her to tell me what I got wrong and provide the correct form immediately.
7. When my teacher corrects me, I want him/her to point out what I got wrong, but not give me the correct form so that I can figure it out myself.
8. I prefer my teacher to use nonverbal cues such as head shaking or snapping to signal my errors.
9. I try to correct and practice my errors after the teacher corrects me repeating after him/her.
10. I remember the errors I make and the correction my teacher gives me for a long time.

Table 2. *Introverts' and Extroverts' Preferences for Corrective Feedback.*

	Extroverts' mean	Introverts' mean	Standard error	Sig. (2-tailed)	t
Item1	3.63	3.43	0.13	0.15	1.43
Item2	3.97	4.12	0.11	0.20	-1.27
Item3	2.70	2.50	0.13	0.15	1.44
Item4	3.92	3.68	0.13	0.06	1.83
Item5	2.42	2.42	0.12	0.97	-0.02
Item6	4.15	2.54	0.10	0.00	15.80**

Item7	2.36	3.41	0.13	0.00	-7.86**
Item8	2.21	4.35	0.10	0.00	-19.84**
Item9	3.65	3.54	0.15	0.47	0.71
Item10	3.87	4.03	0.13	0.23	-1.18

$P < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.05$.

As shown in Table 2, extroverts' and introverts' answers on the three items (6, 7, and 8) of the questionnaire differed significantly. Extroverts strongly preferred explicit and immediate corrective feedback (item 6, $t=15.80$). However, introverts disagreed that the teacher should correct their errors immediately and explicitly. Introverts preferred implicit corrective feedback. In other words, they did not want the teacher to correct the error, so that they could figure it out themselves (item7, $t=7.86$). In terms of using non-verbal cues such as head shaking or snapping, the two personality groups differed significantly (item8, $t=19.84$). Introverts strongly wanted their teacher to use non-verbal cues, while extroverts disagreed on this point.

Both introverts and extroverts preferred that their teachers correct all of their errors (item1, $t=1.43$), and they also indicated that they learn more when their teachers correct their speech (item2, $t=-1.27$). With respect to their most frequent errors, they agreed that their teacher correct them while they were speaking English (item4, $t=1.83$). Both introverts and extroverts strongly disagreed that they felt embarrassed if the teacher corrected their error or gave feedback in front of other classmates (item3, $t=1.44$, $M=2.6$). In other words, introverts like extroverts did not consider corrective feedback as a destructive factor which causes embarrassment. Regarding rehearsals after corrective feedback, both groups claimed that they try to repeat after the teacher in order to correct their error. (item9, $t=71$). Similarly, with respect to item 10, there was no significant difference between introverts and extroverts. They asserted that they remember the errors they make and the corrections they receive for a long time.

4.2. Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences

For the second research question, it was intended to rank six types of corrective feedback among learners (extroverts vs. introverts). Figures 1 and 2 provide a full picture of learners' preferred type of corrective feedback. Among the six types of feedback included in the questionnaire, introverts mostly preferred recasts and clarification request. Additionally, whereas recasts ranked among the most preferred types of CF for introverts, they were among the extroverts' least preferred ones. On the other hand, extroverts preferred explicit correction the most, whereas it was among the least preferred one by introverts. In order to explore the variation in responses, the researchers analyzed interview transcriptions on why introverts preferred recasts and why extroverts preferred explicit correction for both lexical and grammatical errors. Interview results revealed more insights concerning students' preferences and their rankings.

Participants manifested their preferences by checking on a scale of one to four in the second questionnaire, with 2.5 being as cut-off point indicating preferred and less preferred type of corrective feedback. Moreover, the qualitative interview analysis identified some common reasons relating to introverts' and extroverts' most and least preferred corrective feedback types.




Figure1. Extroverts vs. Introverts CF Preferences for Grammatical Errors




Figure2. Extroverts' vs. Introverts' CF Preferences for Lexical Errors

4.3. Underlying Reasons

The third research question aimed at uncovering the underlying reasons regarding learners' preferences for receiving a special type of oral corrective feedback. The qualitative data of interview were categorized and the most common answers generated the rationale for choosing metalinguistic feedback.

Extroverts indicated that when their teacher gives linguistic information about the error without providing the correct answer, they were allowed to find the correct answer themselves and consequently it helped them to feel independent.

I prefer metalinguistic feedback because it indicates an error in my utterance without providing the correct form. This allows me to think about the error and to find the correct form myself. In this way, I feel I am able to convey my message myself without teacher's correction out of classroom. (Ali's interview, 2020).

Moreover, the interviewed introverts' clarifications for why metalinguistic feedback was among their least preferred types of CF were scrutinized. They disliked the intrusive and obtrusive nature of this kind of feedback.

I dislike metalinguistic feedback because most of the time the fluid of speech is disrupted by metalinguistic feedback. As a result, it negatively affects the communicative nature of the class and interruption occurs. (Reza's interview, 2020).

Extroverts mentioned that explicit correction eliminates ambiguities of peers' feedback. For this reason, unclear comments and incorrect forms by peers are eliminated. As a result, it saves time and reduces conflicts.

When our teacher uses explicit correction, some of the vague and unclear explanations of the classmates about the incorrect form become clear. When the teacher provides the correct form, she eliminates ambiguities and further confusion. Next time, we can use the form confidently without any hesitation or reformulation. (Zahra's interview, 2020).

Introverts disliked explicit correction because they thought that when they are told both the error and its correction, they are not stimulated to think. They also told that they may lose confidence when they were without teacher in other circumstances.

When teacher both spots and corrects the error, this does not give us some time to think about it and correct the error. Because it is the teacher that corrects the error we may not be able to do so outside of classroom setting. (Elham's interview, 2020).

Furthermore, extroverts almost disagreed to receive recasts since they thought they could not notice that error occurred or not and that the teacher actually corrected them.

I dislike recasts because it does not inform students that they made a mistake, on the grounds that teachers sometimes repeat learners' correct utterances too. So, I continue my speech without noticing any error. I might never realize that the teacher repeated my sentence to signal an error. (Amir's interview, 2020).

Conversely, introverts favored recasts the most. They liked recasts' least obtrusive nature.

I prefer this kind of feedback because I can continue my speech without interruption and later can focus on my error during other practicing opportunities (Sara's interview, 2020).

Both introverts' and extroverts' preferences for other kinds of corrective feedback were respectively elicitation, and repetition. Learners disliked repetition as they did not prefer the teacher to use emphatic stress in the classroom in front of other students. They linked it with feelings of anxiety and stress. They mentioned that they may fail to see what the error in their utterance was.

I dislike using emphatic stress to inform the errors as I feel a kind of anxious of doing something like a sin. I prefer to get a simple explanation instead of teacher's raising intonation that accompanies extra loudness that I think hinders further communication as it gives a negative feeling to me.

5. Discussion

This discussion addresses our research questions, which asked what preferences and beliefs extroverted and introverted learners hold about receiving oral corrective feedback. Whether they prefer to be corrected or not and how they like to be corrected were all scrutinized. As this study has shown, there are some significant differences between extroverts' and introverts' oral CF preferences. Following questionnaire results, in-depth interviews further unveiled a variety of social, cognitive, affective and pragmatic reasons regarding learners' preferences. The first issue addressed was the implicit vs. explicit and immediate vs. non-immediate corrective feedback preferences. Overall, more extroverted learners preferred immediate and explicit feedback while more introverted learners preferred implicit and non-immediate CF. Extroverts' preference for immediate feedback may be explained by the type of different short-term and long-term memory performances of extroverts versus introverts. Numerous psychological studies (M. W. Eysenck, 1981; Dewaele & Furnham, 2000) have revealed extroverts' superior short-term memory. It can be suggested that this superiority helps them to handle new information or feedback in short-term memory and to continue flow of conversation when they get immediate CF. Moreover, it takes longer for introverts than extroverts to retrieve information from long-term memory (M. W. Eysenck, 1981). As a result, extroverts' preference to get immediate feedback in the middle of a conversation can be explained by their faster retrieval of information from long-term memory while analyzing immediate feedback. Conversely, introverts may need more time to analyze and subsume new information under the existing concepts that are already in the long-term memory. Another rationale behind welcoming non-immediate feedback by introverts can be explained by introverts' vs. extroverts' information processing types. Concerning this, Nideffer (1976) found that introverts were more likely than extroverts to become confused when analyzing conflicting information. In a similar vein, Dewaele and Furnham (2000) provided evidence that introverts face a challenge when processing several different pieces of information. On the other hand, extroverts were found to process many types of information simultaneously. As a result, it can be concluded that immediate feedback is not a hindrance for extroverts in the middle of a conversation as they were reported to handle many types of information simultaneously.

This study further showed that introverts tend to receive implicit corrective feedback and recasts without interruption. A reason for this may be attributable to introverts' being more typically reserved with strangers or other acquaintances (Cheek & Buss, 1981) and they may find it discouraging if they are interrupted during classroom conversations. Consequently, recasts which are least-obtrusive in nature enable teachers to avoid interruption (Yoshida, 2008) and are preferred most by more introverted learners.

Moreover, this study found explicit correction was preferred most among more extroverted learners and was least preferred by more introverted ones. At this point, the interviewed extroverts highlighted that explicit correction eliminates the potential ambiguities that may cause by peer or self-correction. Consequently, they preferred teacher to correct their error as the most trustworthy and knowledgeable source for giving direct and explicit correction.

In contrast, more extroverted learners endorsed metalinguistic feedback for grammatical and lexical errors. Metalinguistic feedback falls at the explicit end of the corrective feedback

spectrum by Lyster and Ranta (1997). This can support the idea that extroverts prefer explicit CF. The qualitative examination of data showed that interviewed extroverts preferred metalinguistic feedback because it gives them a chance of self-repair and a sense of independency. This nature of metalinguistic feedback is in line with Lyster (2007) who pointed out that metalinguistic feedback can foster self-repair among learners. However, introverts disliked it and asserted that they do not favor the interruption caused by metalinguistic feedback in the flow of communication. The obtrusive and disruptive nature of metalinguistic feedback is also considered a caveat for this kind of CF by Lyster (2002).

Clarification requests were endorsed for grammatical and lexical errors by more introverted learners, while viewed as ineffective by more extroverted ones. Extroverts' rationale for not welcoming clarification requests was that they were ambiguous and mostly gave them a vague impression of what their teacher aimed. This reason of learners is in line with (Lee, 2013) and Katayama (2006) who found that learners' preference was due to their failure to understand and respond to clarification requests. In this respect, Yang (2016) mentioned that learners' disinclination to receive clarification request could be related to affective factors as some learners pointed out their anxiety and frustration when receiving clarification requests. Similarly, in this study, some extroverted learners pointed to the issue of anxiety when receiving clarification request. It is important to mention that there was no comment regarding becoming anxious or frustrated on the part of the introverted learners. This can suggest that extroverted and introverted learners' preferences are influenced by affective and emotional factors.

Another important aspect of this study is that it demonstrates what might be considered a caveat for a special type of feedback by extroverts can be ignored by introverts. Based on the finding of this study, corrective feedback which is a frequent practice during language learning process would be more useful if customized according to different individuals' preferences. The findings are important as they provide an awareness of providing customized corrective feedback that is giving a kind of feedback which best suits learners with different personalities in this case extroversion. Customized corrective feedback can be provided by scrutinizing learners' preferences during the process of placement in an institution or other educational organizations.

This study highlights the way of stepping in to help guide different individuals with different personalities during the critical process of learning and teaching. It is important for a teacher to take into account some subtle and essential considerations when correcting learners' errors and may tailor CF as much as they can from one individual to another. Different types of corrective feedback such as direct or indirect, implicit or explicit, oral or written, immediate or non-immediate can be either motivating or demoralizing. Thus, it is advisable that teachers tread carefully when giving feedback for different individuals so as to foster development process. Teachers have to make decisions about what, when, who, and how to give CF for different personalities through various error correction techniques.

6. Conclusion

In this study, different learners' corrective feedback preferences and their reasons for their beliefs were explored. In addition to investigating different personalities (introverts' vs.

extroverts') preferences for receiving CF, the study identified learners' common ideas through in-depth interviews about the how and what of corrective feedback.

The study found that more extroverted learners preferred immediate, and explicit feedback, while more introverted learners preferred non-immediate and implicit CF. These findings suggest that learners with varying degrees of extroversion may respond differently to various types of CF. Thus, teachers are suggested to give more attention to different learners' personality traits and delve into the nature of corrective feedback when treating errors. For example, more introverted learners favored recasts and clarification requests the most among the six types of corrective feedback. This does not necessarily indicate that more introverted learners benefit more from receiving recasts in comparison to other types of corrective feedback, as no experimental study was done to explore the possible effects of recasts on more introverted versus more extroverted learners. Other studies in various contexts with different proficiency levels may provide further information on how to give corrective feedback for different personalities. This is due to the multi-dimensional and inherently cultural nature of language learning behaviors that makes it practically impossible to prescribe a special type of CF to extroverted or introverted learners across all contexts (Lyster & Mori 2006).

The present study has the following limitations. First, the results are based on merely survey results of learners' ideas and the qualitative interview. Future exploration is needed in experimental setting to provide further evidence as to which CF types are beneficial for different personalities' language development. Secondly, learners' preference may change according to their cultural background. Other studies in other contexts would provide some new insights for giving corrective feedback. Lastly, the present study focused on adult learners' beliefs and ideas about receiving CF whose age ranged from 20 to 30 and did not cover children and other age ranges, which can be the reason why the overall results and preferences observed in the present study might not be generalized. Moreover, it is a fact that some students are neither extrovert nor introvert and their preferences should also be taken into account. Future studies that overcome these limitations might shed more light on how to intervene in learning process of individuals to promote second language development.

References

- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543–574.
- Bao, R. (2019). Oral corrective feedback in L2 Chinese classes: Teachers' beliefs versus their practices. *System*, 82, 140–150. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.004>
- Chaudron, C. (1997). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. *Language learning*, 27, 29–46.
- Cheek, J. M., & Buss, A. H. (1981). Shyness and sociability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41(2), 330–339.
- Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1989). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Costa, P. T., Jr. McCrae, R. R. (1992). NEO-PI-R Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: Psychology Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Dewaele, J. M., & Furnham, A. (2000). Personality and speech production: A pilot study of second language learners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(2), 355–365
- Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. New Jersey: Mahwah.
- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114–138). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. The Cambridge Applied Linguistics Series. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The modern language journal*, 74(3), 311–327.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Implicit and explicit learning, knowledge and instruction. In Ellis et al, (Eds.), *Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Second Language Learning, Testing and Teaching* (pp. 31–64). Bristol: Short Run Press Ltd.
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Re-examining the role of recasts in L2 acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 575–600.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1979). Anxiety, learning and memory: a reconceptualisation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 13, 363–385.
- Eysenck, M. W. (1981). Learning, memory and personality. In H. J. Eysenck, *A model for personality* (pp. 169–209). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Furnham, A. & Strbac, L. (2002). Music is as distracting as noise: the differential distraction of background music and noise on the cognitive test performance of introverts and extraverts. *Ergonomics*, 45, 203–17.
- Gan, Z. (2011). An investigation of personality and L2 oral performance. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(6), 1259–1267.
- Gass, S. & Varonis, E. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 283–302.
- Han, J., Jung, J., (2007). Patterns and preferences of corrective feedback and learner repair. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 243–260.
- Harkins, S. G., & Geen, R. G. (1975). Discriminability and criterion differences between extraverts and introverts during vigilance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 9, 335–40.

- Howarth, E., & Eysenck, H. J. (1968). Extraversion, arousal, and paired-associate recall. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality* 3, 114–16.
- Ishida, M. (2004). Effects of recasts on the acquisition of the aspectual form -tei-(ru) by learners of Japanese as a foreign language. *Language Learning*, 54, 311–394.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford.
- Kamal, A., & Radhakrishnan, S. (2019). Individual learning preferences based on personality traits in an E-learning scenario. *Education and Information Technologies*, 24(1), 407–435.
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2015). Preferences for interactional feedback: Differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal*, 43(1), 74–93.
- Katayama, A. (2006). Perceptions of JFL students toward correction of oral errors. In K. Bradford-Watts. In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.), *JALT2005 conference proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.
- Kim, J., & Nassaji, N. (2017). Incidental focus on form and the role of learner extraversion. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(6), 698–718.
- Kumar, D., & Kapila, A. (1987). Problem solving as a function of extraversion and masculinity. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 8, 129–32.
- Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2).
- Li, S. (2009). The differential effects of implicit and explicit feedback on second language (L2) learners at different proficiency levels. *Applied Language Learning*, 19(1), 53–79.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(2), 269–300.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing, and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 27, 405–30.
- Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2002). Interactional feedback and children's L2 development. *System*, 30, 459–477.
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338–356.
- Mackey, A., & Sachs, R. (2012). Older learners in SLA research: A first look at working memory, feedback, and L2 development. *Language Learning*, 62, 704–740.
- Mackey, A., Adams, R., Stafford, C., & Winke, P. (2010). Exploring the relationship between modified output and working memory capacity. *Language Learning*, 60(3), 501–533. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00565.x>
- Mangan, G. L., Hookway, D. (1988). Perception and recall of aversive material as a function of personality type. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 289–95.
- Matthews, G., Deary, I.J., & Whiteman, M.C. (2003). *Personality traits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, G., & Deary, I. (1998). *Personality traits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, G., Deary, I. and Whiteman, M. (2009). *Personality Traits*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matthews, G., & Dorn, L. (1995). Cognitive and attentional processes in personality and intelligence. In D. H. Saklofske, & M. Zeidner, *International handbook of personality and intelligence* (pp. 367–396). New York: Plenum Press.

- Nassaji, H. (2015). *Interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing
- Nassaji, H. (2016). Anniversary article: Interactional feedback in second language teaching and learning: A synthesis and analysis of current research. *Language Teaching Research*, 20, 535–562.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51, 719–758.
- Nideffer, R. M. (1976). Test of attentional and interpersonal style. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 394–404.
- Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal*, 47, 203–210.
- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pair work. *Language Learning*, 50, 119–151.
- Panove, I., Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36, 573-593.
- Pervin, L.A., & John, O.P. (2001). *Personality: Theory and research*. 8th edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pica, T. (1987). Second-language acquisition, social interaction, and the classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 8, 3–21.
- Rassaei, E., & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). Effects of recasts and metalinguistic corrective feedback on the acquisition of implicit and explicit L2 knowledge. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 2 (1), 144–156.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8, 263–300.
- Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. *Language Teaching Research*, 10, 361–392.
- Skehan, P. (1989). *Individual Differences in Second Language Learning*. New York: Edward Arnold.
- Sidek, H. M. (2012). EFL language learning personality traits and instruction. *The International Journal of Learning*, 18, 255–272.
- Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching*, 29, 73–87.
- Suzuki, M. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics 4, 1–21.
- Van Daele, S., Housen, A., Pierrard, M., & Debruyen, L. (2006). The effect of extroversion on oral L2 proficiency. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 6, 213–236.
- Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level and types of error. *System*, 61, 75–86.