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Abstract: In the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), classroom interaction has been widely discussed by teachers and researchers. In this field, different viewpoints on classroom interaction and discourse have been studied which have mainly concentrated on either teachers or students and their speech. When the focus sheds lights on language teaching and learning, and more specifically on learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL), the main issue is the language itself and how it is used in the interaction between students and teacher – student in the classroom. In the present study the focus was on the effect of immediate and delayed pronunciation error correction on EFL learners speaking anxiety. The participants in the study were sixty female intermediate EFL students, between 15 and 17 years old. A quasi-experimental research design was employed with a treatment lasting for a weeks on two intact groups—one experimental and one control group. They were then categorized as high and low proficient learners on the basis of the scores they gained in an OPT test. The final result has stated that more proficient learners experienced less anxiety in class and they were more relaxed to answer the questions or participate in discussions. The results of t-test indicated that there was a significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. It indicated that the high proficient learners with delayed error correction used more words per minute compared to low proficient ones. The result indicated that high proficient respondents were less likely to feel anxious about their errors in the language classroom, which means that proficiency, error making, and anxiety are interrelated.

Index Terms: Error correction, pronunciation correction, speaking anxiety.

1. INTRODUCTION

Classroom interaction has been widely studied and investigated in the field of Foreign Language Acquisition. In this regard, different viewpoints on classroom interaction and discourse have been examined which have mainly concentrated on either teachers or students and their speech. Language is in the center of attention when the focus is set on second language teaching and learning, and more specifically on English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms. One of the areas studied in this regard is corrective feedback, which occurs when a student produces an oral error or an incorrect utterance. Learners’ erroneous utterance is usually followed by the teacher's reaction in some type of corrective feedback. Furthermore, when the learner receive feedback after he may show signs of learning or understanding that implies the student’s reaction
to the teacher’s feedback.

Feedback can be defined as the information learners are availed of pertaining to some facet of task performance. As the name suggests, corrective feedback is used to give foreign language learners information on correctness of what they have linguistically produced and provide learners with the correct form of their erroneous production (Hamidi & Montazeri, 2014). Lyster and Ranta (1997) did a research which focused on error, feedback, and uptake in their observations and analysis of four French immersion classrooms. They found that the teachers used six different feedback, of which the most frequent one was recast (correction without additional information), followed by elicitation and clarification requests. The other feedback types (metalinguistic feedback, explicit correction, and repetition) were all used during less than 10% of the feedback situations. Furthermore, the results showed that recasts was the least likely feedback type, whereas elicitation was the most successful feedback type leading to learner uptake. The findings proved that recasts are not a good technique to use, if teachers wish to involve students in lessons and achieve learner uptake. Lyster (2001) examined corrective feedback and its relationship with different error types. Furthermore, he wanted to discover the immediate effects of the feedback types by examining learner repair (uptake).

Panova and Lyster (2002) conducted a similar study to that of Lyster and Ranta (1997) in which they focused on adult English as Second Language (ESL) classroom. The researchers categorized corrective feedback moves under seven different terms: recasts, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, repetition, translation, clarification request, and explicit correction. The results showed that recasts and translations were the most frequently used feedback. Panova and Lyster (2002) concluded that the low proficiency level of the students and their incapability in correcting their own errors may have been the reason why the teacher used recasts so frequently.

To facilitate successful language learning, teachers need to establish positive affect among students and also engage them in the interactive activity of error correction (Magilow, 1999). To shed more light on the issue, this study aims at the investigation of the effect of immediate and delayed pronunciation error correction on EFL Learners’ speaking anxiety in Iranian communicatively-oriented EFL classrooms. Errors are strong indication that learning is taking place. Few educators like Burt and Kiparsky (1972), Selinker (1972), Allwright (1975), Corder (1973), Hendrickson (1978), James (1998) argued significance of errors strongly; furthermore error correction has a very important role in teaching and learning of every foreign language. Since students can learn from their own errors, correction of errors plays a crucial role in their learning. Since there were numerous studies on the different corrective feedback types and learner uptake (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, 2001; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Lyster & Mori, 2006; Surakka, 2007). Many studies highlight the importance of error correction in improving EFL speaking proficiency, Selinker (1972); but studies on the effect of different methods of correcting errors is not enough. In Iran, few studies have been conducted on methods and the importance of correcting EFL learners’ pronunciation errors. More specifically, the present study tends to consider the effect of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' anxiety.

In order to investigate the immediate and delayed effects of pronunciation error correction on EFL learners' speaking anxiety, the following research questions were formulated:

RQ1. Do students who are required to correct the immediate pronunciation errors marked by the teacher, make fewer errors in their speaking?

RQ2. Do students of varied speaking proficiency (less proficient students and proficient) benefit differently from error correction?

RQ3. How do students react to the feedback provided by their teacher?

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Human learning is fundamentally a process that involves the making of mistakes (Brown, 2000). Obviously in language learning, mistakes and errors are things that learners unavoidably produce. Researchers came to realize that a learner made errors in the process of constructing a new system of language, which needs to be analyzed carefully since they pos-
ibly lead to the understanding of the process of language learning. Corder (1973) points out that learning a new language requires a trial and error approach, and errors are evidence that the learner is testing hypotheses of underlying rules, categories, and systems. In the past few decades, researchers have proposed many different ideas about and approaches to error correction, from the audio lingual method, which attempted to make errors all but impossible, to a cognitive approach, which involves more communicative activities, an approach in which errors are seen as a necessary and perhaps valuable strategy of learning (Brown, 2000). There has been a dramatic change in attitude on the part of researchers and teachers toward errors that learners make. On The other hands sources of errors that students make differs.

2.1 Errors and Mistakes

Ellis (2001) pointed out that errors may occur because the learner does not know what is correct. Errors in this sense cannot be corrected by learners themselves and they will occur consistently because of a lack of knowledge of the target language rule system. According to Brown (2000), a mistake refers to a performance error that is either a random guess or a "slip," in that it is a failure to utilize the known system correctly. Ellis (2001) states that mistakes reflect in performance; they occur because the learner is unable to perform what he or she knows. Mistakes inconsistently happen just because of slipping of the tongue. However, when teachers examine variability in learner language, it is not so easy. Learners may consistently use a feature like past tense in some contexts and consistently fail to use it in others. Ultimately a clear distinction between an error and a mistake may not be possible.

2.2 Approaches of Errors and Correction

2.2.1 Contrastive Analysis

In contrastive analysis, predicting areas of difficulty and error is possible by comparing the linguistic system of mother tongue and that of the target language. Lado's study (as cited in Ginsberg, 1997, p. 343) points out that contrastive analysis focuses on the similarities and differences between the learner's native language and the language being learned. Where the native and target languages differ, the contrastive analysis hypothesis predicts the learner will experience difficulty, and where the native and target languages are similar, the hypothesis asserts that the learner will find no difficulty. However, not all of difference between two language systems actually resulted in errors.

2.2.2 Error Analysis

Since some learners' errors cannot be explained by merely native language interference proposed by contrastive analysis, error analysis have been accounted for these errors. Richards (as cited in Ginsberg, 1997, p. 354) clarifies that many L2 errors do not arise from such interference but instead has taken its root from the nature of learning the system of the new language. He points out that, in trying to acquire the target language rule system, the learner mislearns these rules, just as a child. Researchers and teachers of second languages came to realize that the mistakes a person made in this process of constructing a new system of language needed to be analyzed carefully. According to Brown (2000), the fact that learners do make errors, and that these errors can be observed, analyzed, and classified to reveal something of the system operating within the learner, led to a study of learners' errors, called error analysis. Error analysis became distinguished from contrastive analysis by its examination of errors that can be found in all possible sources, not just those resulting from negative transfer of the native language. Error analysis easily outdate contrastive analysis with more powerful explanations. It explains that only some of the errors a learner makes are related to the mother tongue. Learners do not actually make all the errors that contrastive analysis predicted they should, and learners from different language backgrounds tend to make different errors.

2.2.4 Interlanguage
Error analysis focused on specific languages rather than viewing universal aspects of language, while in Gass’ study (as cited in Brown ,2000, p. 219) he noted that linguistic elements that are common to all languages are more in the center of researchers’ attention. Finegan (2004) explains that in the mastery of the target language learners develop a series of inter-languages in their progression. A learner has internalized and applied the inter-language grammar in their spontaneous utterances of the target language in various ways: by containing rules borrowed from the native language, by containing overgeneralizations, by lacking certain sounds of the target language, etc. A learner language can be viewed as progressing from one inter-language to another, until it becomes more closely to the target language. However, if all the students in a class are making different random mistakes and errors, then there must be something wrong with the teaching plan for the class and the materials. The teachers should compare the performance analyses of all the students in the class and then plan remedial work.

2.2.5 Fossilization

Some language learners may find that some errors are hardly change overtime. Finegan (2004) states that in fossilizing, for various reasons, often related to the kind of motivation a learner has, the language-learning process slows down or ceases at some point, and the existing inter-language become constant. When such stabilizing occurs, the inter-language may contain rules or other features that differ from those of the target language. According to Brown (2000), fossilization is a normal and natural stage for many learners, and should not be viewed as some sort of terminal illness, in spite of the forbidding metaphor that suggests an unchangeable situation etched in stone.

2.3 Sources of Errors

Brown (2000) classified sources of learners’ errors into two main areas which are inter-lingual transfer and intra-lingual transfer.

2.3.1 Inter-lingual Transfer

A significant source of error for all learners is Inter-lingual transfer. In the early stages of learning a second language before the system of the second language is known, the native language is the only previous linguistic system upon which the learner can draw.

2.3.2 Intra-lingual Transfer

Intra-lingual transfer is considered a major factor in second language learning in that researchers have found that in the early stages of language learning are characterized by a predominance of interference (interlingual transfer), but once learners have begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more intra-lingual transfer occur. As learners progress in the second language, their previous experience begins to intervene structures within the target language itself. However, the teacher or researcher cannot always be certain of the source of an superficial intra-lingual error, but repeated systematic observations of a learner’s data will often remove the ambiguity of a single observation of an error. Dulay (1982) also points out that the cause of errors results from fatigue and inattention or the lack of knowledge of the rules of the language.

Brown (2000) classified sources of learners’ errors into two main categories which are inter-lingual transfer and intra-lingual transfer. Inter-lingual transfer, which is the transfer of native language features to the newly learned language. In fact in the early stage before the system of the second language is familiar, the native language is the only previous linguistic system upon which the learner can draw. Intra-lingual transfer but once learners have begun to acquire parts of the new system, more and more intra-lingual transfer generalization within the target language is demonstrated. As learners progress in the second language, their previous experience begins to include structures within the target language itself. Some language learners may believe that some errors are strong to change over time. Finegan (2004) states that in fossilizing, often related to the kind of motivation a learner has, the language-learning process typically slows down or stops at
some point, and the existing inter-language intervene, with slight further acquisition. When such intervening occurs, the inter-language may contain rules or other features that differ from those of the target language.

According to Brown (2000), in spite of the forbidding metaphor that suggests an unchangeable situation, fossilization is a normal and natural stage for many learners. It has been accepted that errors play an important role in the learning process. To language learners, language learning is not so much a question of acquiring a set of automatic habits, but rather a process of discovering the underlying rules, categories and systems of choice in the language by some sort of processing by the learner of the data of the language presented to him by the teacher (Corder, 1973). Therefore learners have to go through several stages and processes. One of the most important factors included in almost all the stages and processes of language learning is error making. Dulay and Burt (1974) stated that error making is inevitable and that it would appear necessary and crucial to language learning. In fact, it is a clear sign to show language learner actually develop and internalize the rules of the language. While the errors a learner makes provide no direct measure of his knowledge of the language, it is probably the most important source of information about the nature of his knowledge. Teachers and students have different attitudes toward errors and error correction. Teachers, as Corder (1967) put it, are more concerned with how to deal with errors than with what causes them. Therefore, such teachers try every means to prevent their students from making errors by constant correction which they believe, would help students recognize their errors and not repeat them. On the other hand, some other teachers believe that the learning of the foreign language may be discouraged by the teacher who insists upon correction and grammatical accuracy. They also believe that continuous correction can raise learners’ level of anxiety, and that this obstructs learning (Krashen, 1982). Like teachers, it is not surprising to see that some students like to be corrected every now and then by their teachers because they believe that frequent correction would improve the language they are learning.

Cathcart and Olsen (1979) show that students want their oral errors to be corrected. In a study on EL2 student writers, Leki (1991) also finds that 100 percent of these students wanted all their written errors corrected. On the other hand, some students find continuous correction very annoying, distracting and discouraging. They do not mind being corrected if the error is really noticeable but they hate it whenever they make it. They do not like being corrected whenever they are speaking and some of them would even stop participating in the classroom interaction just because they do not want to be corrected. Due to these different attitudes, both teachers and students should adopt a reasonable approach to handle the error-correction problem effectively and appropriately in order to make their preferences balance in learning and teaching. Among different types of corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback are considered as the explicit ones while recast and clarification request are among the implicit types of corrective feedback. Recasts, metalinguistic feedback, and clarification requests are three types of feedback were chosen because they (a) occur relatively frequently during classroom interactions, (b) differ in the level of explicitness, and (c) differ in whether they allow self-repair or other-repair. Recasts are among the implicit types of corrective feedback that “formulates or expands an ill-formed or incomplete utterance in an unobtrusive way” (Brown, 2007, p.277). Thus, they are argued to be beneficial because they do not disrupt communication and are dependent on learners’ errors (Loewen and Nabei, 2007). Research has shown that recast are the most frequently used type of corrective feedback in and out of the classroom (Braid, 2002; Lyster and Ranta, 1997; Oliver, 1995; Sheen, 2004).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants

The participants of the study were 60 female, intermediate-level EFL students studying in a language institute in Shiraz, Iran. Based on a placement test, there were two intact groups (ages 15-17). Participants were randomly assigned into one experimental group and one control group. Then base on an English proficiency test they were divided into two groups of low and high proficient.
3.2 Instruments

3.2.1 Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety Questionnaire

A sample of Language Speaking Anxiety questionnaire which was designed by Horwitz & Cope (1986) will be given to all participants to measure their level of anxiety in Foreign Language speaking regarding the impact of immediate and delayed error correction.

3.2.2. Speaking proficiency: Complexity, Accuracy, Fluency (CAF)

In order to assess students' oral production of language specially their pronunciation, students will be asked to be involved in one of the previously taught free discussion they have had during 25 sessions of academic learning. Throughout their production, errors for one group (G1) will be corrected immediately and for the other group (G2) with delay, i.e. after finishing their speech. At the same time their voices will be recorded for later analysis. Which means all the recordings will then be transcribed in order to investigate the effects of each type of correction on participants' complexity, accuracy, and fluency in speaking. The rationale for choosing this way of evaluating the quality of the participants' oral production was for Ellis (2003) who defines the measures of CAF as follows (p 117):

*Fluency measures:* number of words per minute, number of syllables per minute, number of pauses of one/two second(s) or longer, number of repetitions

*Accuracy measures:* number of self-corrections, percentage of error-free clauses, target-like use of verb tenses, target-like use of articles, target-like use of vocabulary, target-like use of plurals, target-like use of negation, ratio of indefinite to definite articles.

*Complexity measures:* number of turns per minute, frequency of use of conjunctions, frequency of use of prepositions, amount of subordination, e.g. total number of clauses divided by the total number of c-units.

3.3 Procedure

Data collection and analysis included in the following procedure. After the 60 intermediate students were assigned to be the participant for the present study, they were randomly divided into two groups; experimental and control group. In the first phase of the study in order to measure participants' level of anxiety in speaking a foreign language the two groups were asked to fill in a sample form of foreign language speaking anxiety questionnaire. In the second phase the experimental group received treatment. Doing that, participants in experimental group were involved in a discussion session which the topics have had from the academic book they have had in an English institute. During their discussion those who have made errors will immediately be corrected by the researcher; of our special interest was also be their reaction toward the feedback that will receive from their teacher Throughout their production, their voices will be recorded by a set of an MP 3 player for later investigation in terms of accuracy, fluency, and complexity. As a final step both groups were asked to fill the sample of anxiety questionnaire, the rational for doing so is comparing the effect of error correction on the two groups' level of anxiety in speaking a foreign language.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For analyzing data, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. In descriptive statistics, the collected data were taken into consideration in terms of frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation. Moreover, in order to investigate the immediate and delayed effects of pronunciation error correction on EFL learners' speaking anxiety all the twenty five discussion sessions were initially transcribed and then meticulously examined by the researcher and a consultant, for any observable differences in terms of immediate and delayed error correction. Subsequent analysis was based on the observable transcripts. Appropriate inferential statistic was used to assess the generalizability of the obtained results.

Table 4.1 displays, minimum, maximum and standard deviation of the participants' scores in a sample test of OPT
(Oxford Placement Test). In the present study, those who received scores beyond 14 were considered as high proficient and those who received less than 12 were considered as low proficient learners.

Table 4.1 Maximum, minimum, mean, standard deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Std-deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first question was: Do students who are required to correct the immediate pronunciation errors marked by the teacher, make fewer errors in their speaking?

Table 4.2 Anxiety Classification of High and Low Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a quick view, Table 4.2 has stated that more proficient learners experienced less anxiety in class and they were more relaxed to answer the questions or participate in discussions whereas it was quite opposite for low proficient learners. High proficient errors were corrected immediately after they had made them and since they didn’t weren’t anxious about making errors, it didn’t affect their speech.

The second research question was: Do students of varied speaking proficiency (less proficient students and proficient) benefit differently from error correction?

Table 4.3 Fluency Measures for Groups High and Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of words per minute</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>72.20</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>-.4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>55.62</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of syllables per minute</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>72.30</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>-4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pauses of one/two second(s) or longer</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of repetitions</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Complexity Measures for High and Low Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of use of conjunctions</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of use of prepositions</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>20.21</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of subordination</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>65.70</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>60.20</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in the above Tables 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5 have indicated two main points, the first is that high proficient learners were more better in accuracy, fluency and complexity in the stream of their speech, whereas, low proficient could not use complex grammatical structures frequently. More specifically they were poor in terms of using more conjunctions and prepositions in their speech. Both groups’ errors were corrected by the researcher and were then compared. The result of t-test for number of words used by two groups indicates that the high proficient learners with delayed error correction used more words per minute compared to low proficient ones.

The third research question was: How do students react to the feedback provided by their teacher?

Based on the respondents’ reaction in the discussion session, their reactions were classified as three types of extractions by the researchers.

**First category**

Extract one: “I believe I can benefit from the errors I make when speaking English”

It was evident that they found oral errors useful. In total, 98% of all respondents agreed with the statement which was the considerable majority. Furthermore, some mentioned that they didn’t find oral errors useful by saying that the usefulness of errors is situation-dependent. Hence, others have mentioned that act the same whether they were anxious or not anxious.

More specifically, respondents explicitly stated that they learned from errors, thus didn’t not make them again. Some of the respondents mentioned that they remembered the situation where they made the error which makes it easier to remember the correct form the next time. They felt that researchers’ corrections help them to learn. One of the respondents went as far as stated that one cannot learn for example grammar without making errors. Interestingly, another pupil reported that she might in fact remember the correct form better after making an error, but she didn’t make errors, as she found them embarrassing. On the other hand, there were some who believed that, they did not think errors are useful in language learning, it seems that they had negative attitude towards errors is in fact related to the actions of her teacher rather than the errors she makes.

**Second category**

Extract two: “Errors help me learn that they didn’t matter and that I didn’t make the same error again.”

The respondent explicitly stated that it was quite okay to make errors. In fact, 38 pupils explicitly stated at some point during the questionnaire that making errors is absolutely acceptable and that they are a natural part of the language learning process. In general, the respondents seemed to have a very positive attitude towards errors in terms of their usefulness and significance for learning.

**Third category**

Extract three: “We are all humans and no one can avoid errors, not even the teacher.”

Many of the participants explained that everyone makes errors and that no one is perfect, not even the teacher. They have stated that errors cannot be avoided; in fact language learning cannot happen without making errors.

### Table 4.5 Accuracy Measures for Groups High And Low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy measures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of self-corrections</td>
<td>G. H</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. L</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of error-free clauses</td>
<td>G.H</td>
<td>50.20</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>-4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.L</td>
<td>68.63</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.L</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. CONCLUSION

Although researchers and teachers have realized that errors have benefits and play important roles in a language class, there are still different opinions that have not been made conclusive yet and are still controversial. Over the past decades, a rapidly growing interest in the area of focus on form in general and reactive focus on form in particular among scholars has been expanded. There are many factors that teachers need to carefully consider. They must make judgments in different situations and use experience to treat errors properly at the right time. However, there are more to be studied in this field since there is still limited evidence that reactive focus on form has been viewed on its different angles. Indeed, there seems to be a connection between language anxiety and corrective feedback in the sense that the anxious respondents were less in favor of corrective feedback than the not anxious respondents. This conclusion supports the views presented by both Truscott (1991) and Young (1991) who have stated that teachers’ corrective feedback may cause anxiety in learners. What should be borne in mind, however, is that a pupil is not likely to benefit from the teacher’s corrective feedback, if it causes anxiety in him/her. Thus, teachers should be more careful about choosing the suitable error correction strategies, teachers should always take into account the individual pupil’s affections and perceptions on corrective feedback. To conclude, the findings of the present study demonstrate that learners have strong positive opinions about the usefulness of teacher’s corrective feedback in the classroom. This information does provide motivation for language teachers to continue the practice of corrective feedback, as the learners clearly see it as a benefitting factor in their language learning. However, teachers should be cautious when applying the different error correction strategies, as some of them are more likely to cause anxiety in the learners. Thus, it would seem that rather than spending time on wondering whether they should correct errors, language teachers should focus on determining how to provide corrective feedback that is tailored for each pupil and takes into account his/her language skills and affections.

In the present study high proficient respondents reported that they were less likely feel anxious about their errors in the language classroom, which means that proficiency, error making and anxiety are interrelated. This provide noteworthy message to the language learners in the case that the less they practice foreign language the more they feel anxious about the language. However, one should note that, luckily, the feelings of error-related anxiety are rare for more proficient learners or occasionally for most pupils, when the interactive situation is known to them they can communicate more easily and this can greatly reduce their anxiety.

The findings of the current study include a number of implications for learning as well as EFL teaching, particularly in the case of providing feedback to the errors made by pupils with different English proficiency. It also shed light on the use of corrective feedback moves to clarify and identify problems and errors for better understanding. The results also may be useful for syllabus designers to put courses include more topics which lead to classroom interactions. Since the recordings of the lessons were conducted and mitigated with the presence of the observer, it may be assumed that the observations reflected a general and clear view of the classes’ atmospheres and learners’ and teachers’ interactional patterns in the classrooms. The importance of error correction has been established in the present study based on empirical evidence, now it is up to the teachers and curriculum designers to incorporate different types of tasks specifically pair and group work exercises and provide a table for the students to give feedback to the peers and check the types of feedback they provide for their pupils. Another implication is that paying special attention to learners’ error is really influential this can help educators decide which dimension of errors needs more serious attention and what should be included while designing EFL syllabi.

Finally, this study underlines the importance of error correction in acquiring a foreign language and thus calls for language teachers and practitioners to pay more attention to error correction and try to broaden its use in EFL classroom. When giving feedback, teachers should not simply tap for errors but to explain and elaborate the types of error students make and ask them to consider them when they encounter them in different occasion. In fact it will also be influential if teachers motivate pairs and groups to give feedback to the errors their peers make. Further pedagogical implications arising
from the finding of this research apply to EFL learners. It would desirable to communicate the finding of this study to EFL learners, so that they too, would understand the significant role of errors they make in their speech and pays more attention to them in order to make their speech more error free.

There are certain limitations that should be taken into account when considering the findings of the present study. Throughout the accomplishment of different phase, the study faced with some limitation. In the present study, only female participants took part, which limits the generalizability of results. Future studies need to be conducted with male students to get a more comprehensive view of the effect of immediate and delayed error correction and evaluation of their speaking anxiety. The second is the number of participants who took part in the study, they were 60 homogenized ones who were chosen to take part in this research study. Maybe, with larger samples the results would change. The speaking anxiety test used in this study measure solely the learners’ anxiety regarding their speech, which means their willingness for providing factual statement is not considered, therefore a format of stress in other skills should also be considered. Another point to be mentioned here is the difficulty of evaluation along with generalization of finding in human issues. Some uncontrolled variables such as fatigue, unwillingness to participate and effective mood may have affected the results. The last point was concerned with the interview. The strongest argument for using interview is that, there is no other way to access learners’ thought and perception. However, not all learners are equally able to introspect and to report their thought. They also vary in their willingness to do so. The latter problem is compounded by limited communication abilities in the L2. There is also the possible effect of the introspective procedures themselves on the learners’ cognitive processes- in this case interview. All of these factors threaten the reliability of data gathered and can be considered as the limitation of the study.
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