The Effect of Direct Oral Corrective Feedback on Motivation to Speak and Speaking Accuracy of EFL Learners

Hadi Hamidi[1], Danial Babajani Azizi[2], Mohammad Kazemian[3]

[1] *Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*
E-mail: Hamidi.tefl@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5876-4191

[2] *Khazar Institute of Higher Education, Mahmoudabad, Iran*
E-mail: danialbabajani@yahoo.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7205-4417

[3] *Guilan University of Medical Sciences, Rasht, Iran*
E-mail: m_kazemiansanati@yahoo.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-1517-1174

Abstract
Considering the significance of corrective feedback to improve language learners' speaking performance, the current study aimed to examine the impact of direct oral corrective feedback on speaking accuracy and motivation to speak of Iranian EFL learners. To this end, 46 EFL learners who were preparing themselves for the IELTS exam, both male and female, were invited to participate in this study. Having homogenized the participants through the Oxford Placement Test, the researchers divided them into one experimental and one control group. As to the pretest, a valid IELTS speaking test and a motivation to speak questionnaire were administered to both groups in order to measure the learners' speaking ability and motivation to speak level. The experimental group received direct oral corrective feedback on their speaking performance for 15 sessions. The control group did not receive any special kind of corrective feedback. A posttest, equivalent to the pretest, was administered after the end of the treatment sessions to both groups to find whether direct oral corrective feedback affected the learners' speaking accuracy and motivation to speak. The results of statistical data analysis indicated that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group on both speaking accuracy, and motivation to speak. Pedagogical implications are suggested to language teachers and teacher trainers.
Keywords: Iranian EFL learners, motivation to speak, oral corrective feedback, speaking accuracy.

Влияние прямой устной корректирующей обратной связи на мотивацию к говорению и грамотность речи студентов, изучающих английский язык как иностранный

Хади Хамиди[1], Даниал Бабаджани Азизи[2], Мохаммад Каземиан[3]

[1] *Иранский университет медицинских наук, Тегеран, Иран*
E-mail: Hamidi.tefl@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5876-4191

[2] *Хазарский институт высшего образования, Махмудабад, Иран*
E-mail: danialbabajani@yahoo.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7205-4417

[3] *Гиланский университет медицинских наук, Рашт, Иран*
E-mail: m_kazemiansanati@yahoo.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/ 0000-0002-1517-1174

Аннотация
Учитывая важность корректирующей обратной связи в речевом развитии студентов, изучающих иностранный язык, целью настоящего исследования было определить влияние прямой устной корректирующей обратной связи на грамотность речи иранских студентов, изучающих английский язык (EFL), и их мотивацию к говорению. Для участия в данном исследовании были приглашены 46 студентов, которые готовились к сдаче экзамена IELTS. По результатам теста (Oxford Placement Test) участники были разделены на две группы – экспериментальную и контрольную. На этапе предварительного тестирования участникам обеих групп было необходимо сдать устную часть теста IELTS и заполнить анкету для определения их мотивации к говорению. Студенты экспериментальной группы получали прямую устную корректирующую связь на протяжении 15 уроков – участники контрольной группы не имели такой возможности. В конце курса обучения был проведен пост-тест, чтобы определить влияние прямой устной корректирующей обратной связи на грамотность устной речи студентов и их мотивацию к говорению. Результаты статистического анализа показали, что баллы участников экспериментальной группы были выше, чем у студентов контрольной группы, как за правильность устного выступления, так и за мотивацию к говорению. По результатам исследования преподавателям английского языка и методистам предложены педагогические рекомендации.
Ключевые слова: иранские студенты, изучающие английский язык как иностранный, мотивация к говорению, устная корректирующая обратная связь, грамотность устной речи.

Introduction

Error correction is one of the key factors influencing language learners' accurate production. Corrective feedback (CF), in general, has been extensively researched and proved to be beneficial in the process of language acquisition (Ellis, 2009; Hyland, 2003; Montazeri & Salimi, 2019; Tang & Liu, 2018). According to Ellis (2016), how teachers correct second language (L2) students has attracted enormous interest from researchers and specialists. Dealing with L2 learners' errors has always been one of the major concerns of EFL and ESL practitioners (Keshavarz, 2015).

This concern has been addressed by ELT methodologists and SLA researchers alike. According to Keshavarz (2015), while it has become common for teachers to allow the students to make mistakes, knowing about a functional model of CF and its effect on the certain area of language learning seems to be necessary. In giving feedback, the teacher normally commends the learners for their correct or appropriate linguistic production (Harmer, 2001; Nunan, 1991; Ur, 2012) or directly/indirectly indicates to the learners that their utterance (oral or written) has been incorrect (Leeman, 2007; Loewen, 2012). What has come to be known as CF is, in fact, related to the latter approach.

Speaking skills cannot be overlooked due to their importance (Celce-Murcia, 2001). Language learners need to speak in order to establish communication, be it in the classroom or outside, with native English speakers. Thus, EFL/ESL teachers make an effort to develop listening, speaking, and pronunciation skills in their students. Goh and Burns (2012) supported this idea by mentioning that language acquisition can be eased up through speaking. Besides, it helps second language learners develop in academic activities. Some studies have investigated whether direct corrective feedback (DCF) has any impact on speaking and writing skills (Eslami, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Stefanou & Revesz, 2015).

In his study, Kumar (2013) emphasized the importance of teaching speaking skills in the classroom. Focusing on accuracy, he made suggestions for practical communication, preparing a framework, keeping the demand in mind, encouraging error correction to promote speaking skills among learners. The study by Askari and Langroudi (2014) framed Ur's (2009) model to investigate its impact on Iranian EFL learners' accuracy in speaking ability. The result of their study supported Ur's model which underlined that both mechanical and communicative practices would linearly improve leaners' accuracy and ease of communication. The results of the studies seem to provide a clear picture of the impact of CF types. This way, some of them were effective, but others were of no effect. While the studies undertaken in second and foreign language acquisition have mostly addressed the general construct of motivation (Alsolami, 2021; Hamidun, et. al., 2012; Zhao, 2015), they did not focus on traditional macro skills such as reading, listening, writing, and speaking. It can be expected that motivation can help master each of these skills. Drawing on the significance of speaking skills, we highlight the necessity to boost learners' motivation towards enhancing this skill.

Corrective feedback is one of the diverse aspects in teachers' language repertoire which assists students in language learning process in the classroom (Ellis, 2012). Several authors (Ansarin & Chehrazad, 2015; Hoseini Fatemi & Harati, 2014; Salimi, 2015; Sato & Lyster, 2012) have examined the effects of different CF types on EFL learners' speaking accuracy. Few other studies have been conducted to examine the effect of oral corrective feedback (OCF) on students' motivation to speak. However, to the best of our knowledge, no study has been carried out to simultaneously find the effect of OCF on the motivation to speak and speaking accuracy in IELTS preparatory classes. Therefore, considering the significance of oral feedback, the current research set out to investigate the issue.

Literature Review

Motivation and Corrective Feedback

The feedback that learners receive from their teachers and instructors can be positive or neutral (Brown, 2007), assisting them to find what was not linguistically correct (Nassaji, 2017). Sociocultural theory (SCT) provides support for CF as it helps to scaffold learning in social interaction and supports the subsequent internalization of new linguistic forms (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). According to SCT, no single preferable type of CF exists; rather, the feedback requires to be 'graduated' so that the learner could be provided with

the minimal level of aid required to correct the mistake. It was suggested that accurate speakers "do not make mistakes in grammar, vocabulary or pronunciation" (Baker & Westrup, 2003, p.7).

Lacking accuracy means using incorrect grammatical structures and unsuitable vocabulary, mispronouncing words. In particular, a correct use of grammar, proper articulation, and appropriate use of words in the right context are the main features of an accurate speaker. To put it differently, accuracy is defined as the ability to use words appropriately in terms of grammar and phonology (Celce-Murcia, 2001). It involves the production of language making no mistakes. It is also associated with precision during the speech. In accuracy, speakers have to be rigorous when they use different aspects of language, especially grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation. In short, accuracy has to do with the correct use of grammar, syntax, phonology, and semantics.

According to Oxford and Shearin (1994), motivation is a deciding factor in learners' success in developing L2 skills, and it determines their active engagement in L2 learning. From Piagetian point of view, motivation is built-in and an inner driving force which helps learners to develop their mental structures in a way that it becomes more complex and differentiated from others. Indeed, Dornyei and Ushioda (2011) lately propose that motivation cannot be studied discretely, but it is best viewed within a broader complex dynamic systems perspective on L2 learning (Dornyei, 2009; Dornyei & Ushioda, 2009; Dornyei & Ushioda, 2011).

There is a difference between orientation and motivation in the area of language learning. The former is a series of reasons to learn language and the latter is referred to as an integration of the learners' attitudes, desires, and willingness to make attempts to learn L2 (Richards & Schmidt, 2010). Motivation has consistently shown itself to be a powerful predictor of L2 learning success.

Several studies have been conducted on the effect of feedback on speaking in general and speaking accuracy in particular (e.g., Baleghizadeh & Oladrostam, 2010; Farrokhi et al., 2017; Nhac, 2021). A few of these studies examined motivation in speaking. For example, Montazeri and Salimi (2019) examined whether motivation to speak (MTS) and willingness to communicate (WTC) are affected by oral metalinguistic CF in the setting of Iranian second language learning. In their research, the control group received regular instructions, while an experimental group was given metalinguistic corrective feedback (MCF). The data were collected through two questionnaires: MTS and WTC. The results revealed that MCF significantly affected both MTS and WTC scores in the experimental group.

García and Martínez (2018) examined the profits of delayed teacher CF on students' oral production. While focusing on phonological errors, their study's purpose was to delineate if specific teacher CF strategy make the learners self-correct. The analysis revealed students' awareness regarding how they take advantage of self- and peer-correction once they are preparing for oral assignments. Rahnama et al. (2020) investigated the effect of OCF on the speaking accuracy and complexity in 66 Iranian EFL learners from a language institute in Iran. The results of their study, analyzed through a Mann-Whitney U Test, showed that the complexity and accuracy of the participants in the experimental group significantly improved.

Studying the effects of different CF conditions on Iranian EFL learners' accuracy in speaking, Farrokhi et al. (2017) selected four groups randomly as the control, delayed explicit MCF, extensive recast, and intensive recast. The groups participated in spoken reproduction tasks for six sessions and their errors were treated differently. The researchers transcribed the data and coded them for accuracy. Their findings showed that

the different CF conditions did not have significant effects on the number of error free analysis of speech units, as an index of the spoken accuracy.

Imroatus (2016) carried out a study to find the effect of CF on the speaking performance of students. The study was designed as a classroom-based observation with the sample of 30 students and one speaking lecturer at the English Department of Bantara Sukoharjo University. Data were gathered through observation and interview. The results indicated that feedback, especially recast, led to better speaking performance of the students.

In another study, Leyla (2016) aimed at finding out the impact of teachers' CF on EFL students' motivation. The research results suggested that teachers' CF positively affected EFL learners' motivation.

The literature review indicates that motivation in general is much worked on in terms of CF (e.g., Mehregan & Jafari Seresht, 2014; Zedan, 2021). Thus, MTS was selected as a unique domain in this particular study. In addition, since research, if any, has been carried out as to the effect of OCF on MTS and speaking accuracy among prospective candidates of IELTS, the present study aims to delve more deeply into the problem and find whether learners would benefit from the feedback they receive on the part of the teacher. The following research questions were, therefore, formulated for this study:

1. Does oral corrective feedback have any statistically significant effect on speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners who are preparing for the IELTS exam?

2. Does oral corrective feedback have any statistically significant effect on MTS of Iranian EFL learners who are preparing themselves for the IELTS exam?

Method

Design

The present study's design was quasi-experimental using nonrandomized control group, pretest-posttest since intact groups were employed and random assignment was not applied (Ary et al., 2014). There was one control and one experimental group; each received a pretest and a posttest for both MTS and speaking accuracy.

Participants

The students of two IELTS preparation classes, each of which consisted of 23 students, were selected as the participants of the present study. Their age ranged from 17 to 30. The students were both male and female studying English at least for five years. The participants were chosen based on simple random sampling, "in which all participants had an equal chance of being included in the population" (Ary et al., 2014, p. 163) from Poya-Simin language institute in Qa'emshahr, Mazandaran, Iran. The researchers clarified the terms of the research, and informed oral consent was obtained from the participants.

Raters

Two IELTS instructors scored the speaking accuracy of the participants. One of the raters was a Ph.D. holder majoring in TEFL, and the other one was an M.A. graduate in TEFL both of whom were certified IELTS teachers trained by International Development Program of Australian Universities and Colleges (known as IDP). In order to check the inter-rater reliability in this study, a pilot scoring session was done before the start of the current study, the aim of which was to find whether there was scoring agreement between two raters who assessed the speaking accuracy of the members. IDP certified IELTS mock test examiners only scored the speaking accuracy of the participants before the main study. The participants of this pilot scoring session, who were selected based on simple random sampling, were 20 students from among the participants of the current research.

Table 1. The Inter-Rater Reliability for the Two Raters in a Pilot Scoring Session

N of Raters	N of Participants	Inter-rater Correlation	Sig
2	20	.899	.000

The table 1 shows the result of the inter-rater reliability test between the two raters in a pilot scoring session. As it can be seen, there was a perfect agreement, based on Landis and Koch's (1977) classification, between the two raters of the research, $r = .89$, $P < .05$.

Instruments

Oxford Placement Test
The Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was primarily used in order to measure the participants' level of general English language proficiency and ensure their homogeneity. To conduct placement and student screening through tests, it is both easy and ideal to administer (Azizi, et al., 2022). The test consists of 60 items in the form of multiple-choice questions. Students were to choose the correct answers from among the alternatives. The required time to complete the test was 30 minutes. The reliability of the OPT has been reported by many ELT researchers (e.g., Hamidi, 2015). The reliability of the OPT was also checked in the present study, with the Cronbach's Alpha being .87, which demonstrates a high reliability index.

IELTS band descriptors
As the focus of the present study was the students' speaking skills, face-to-face interviews were conducted to measure the participants' speaking proficiency. In order to gather the data, some speaking topics from Cambridge English IELTS books were administered both as the pretest and posttest because the books are internationally well-known to IELTS candidates. Each participant was rated by two different raters before and after the treatment sessions. The raters used IELTS Speaking Band Descriptors (public version) during the rating process as a standard instrument.

Motivation to speak (MTS) questionnaire
Motivation to speak questionnaire was first developed by Montazeri and Salimi (2019), and was adopted for this research. The instrument was shown to have a high reliability index (r = .84), which was used to collect data on motivation to speak. It is a Likert-scale questionnaire consisting of 40 items in English language; each item has 6 ordinal options from never to always. The questionnaire takes about 20 minutes to complete.

Procedure
Based on the OPT scores, 46 out of 97 participants were selected for this study as they were matched on their English proficiency scores. This continuum of scores is operationally regarded as the advanced level of language proficiency based on the guidelines of the OPT. Finally, the participants were divided into control and experimental groups through simple random sampling.

Having obtained the language center's agreement to conduct the study, the trainer of the course was apprised of the purpose of the study and data collection procedure. Next, the researchers assessed the participants' speaking performance in face-to-face interviews at the beginning of the study before the start of the experiment. The scores were recorded as the pretest speaking scores. The participants were also given the MTS

questionnaire, adopted from Montazeri (2019), to assess their pretest MTS level. Since the items of the instrument were in English, the teacher was present while the students were filling out the questionnaire. If they had a problem or did not understand an item, they were allowed to ask their teacher for the clarification or purpose behind the item. This process continued until the teacher made sure all the respondents could answer the items without ambiguity. Then, the teacher provided the students with the direct oral corrective feedback (DOCF) in the experimental group which was held for 15 sessions with the researchers' observation.

At the beginning of each session, some of the students presented a lecture on a specific theme mostly relevant to IELTS speaking topics. Then, they reproduced a short story. The next section was dedicated to cue cards and discussion of the IELTS speaking test; the instructor asked them to respond to the items inserted in the cards. The learners were provided with DOCF by the instructor while speaking. DCF requires providing the correct form of the erroneous form (Ellis, 2008). Ferris (2006) pointed out that DCF takes various forms such as crossing out the unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing form or morpheme, and providing the correct form. Among the alternatives stated by Ferris (2006), the last one was adopted in the current study. The example is presented below (for further examples refer to Appendix A).

Student: The movie is inspired from a book.
Teacher: by a book
Student: OK. The movie is inspired by a book.

Following the corrective feedback, the participants were expected to engage in an active student response, repeating the correct sentence. This process was repeated for subsequent treatment sessions. This process was true for the control group as well, except for not delivering DOCF. Finally, the motivation questionnaire and speaking part of the IELTS exam were administered as posttests.

Results

The current study aimed at investigating the effect of DOCF on speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners and, secondly, the effect of this type of CF on the MTS of the learners.

The first research question of this study investigated whether there was any statistically significant difference in speaking accuracy between Iranian EFL learners who received DOCF and those who did not receive DOCF. Before answering the first research question, the two groups were compared on their pretest speaking accuracy scores in order to check whether there was any initial difference. The descriptive statistics of the two groups are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Speaking Accuracy Pretest of the Control and Experimental Groups

Groups	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Control group	23	5.00	6.50	5.71	.56	.31
Experimental group	23	5.00	6.50	5.54	.52	.27
Valid N (listwise)	23					

The mean and standard deviation (SD) of the control group were larger than the mean and SD of the experimental group at the beginning of the treatment. Table 3 shows whether this initial difference was statistically significant.

Table 3. The Result of the Mann-Whitney U Test for the Speaking Accuracy Pretest of the Control and the Experimental Groups

	Pretest_Accuracy
Mann-Whitney U	218.00
Wilcoxon W	494.00
Z	-1.06
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.288

As Table 3 shows, the two groups were homogeneous in terms of speaking accuracy before the treatment stage, $U = 218, P > .05$. In the next step, the posttest scores on speaking accuracy of the control and the experimental groups were compared. The descriptive statistics of the two groups are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The Descriptive Statistics for the Speaking Accuracy Posttest of the Control and the Experimental groups

Groups	*N*	*Min*	*Max*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Variance*
Control group	23	5.00	7.00	5.91	.66	.44
Experimental group	23	5.00	8.00	6.34	.69	.48
Valid N (listwise)	23					

The mean score of the control group is lower than the mean of the experimental group, and, conversely, the SD of the experimental group is larger than the SD of the control group.

Table 5. The Result of the Mann-Whitney U Test for the Comparison of the Speaking Accuracy Posttest Scores

	Posttest_Accuracy
Mann-Whitney U	176.50
Wilcoxon W	452.50
Z	-1.97
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.046

Table 5 indicates that there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups regarding the speaking accuracy, $U = 176.50, P < .05$, meaning that the experimental group outperformed the control group.

The second research question of this study investigated whether there was any statistically significant difference in MTS between Iranian EFL learners who received DOCF and those who did not.

Before answering the second research question, the two groups were compared on their pretest scores on motivation to speak in order to prove their homogeneity. The descriptive statistics of the two groups are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. *The Descriptive Statistics for the MTS Pretest of Control and Experimental Groups*

	Groups	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
Pretest_MTS	Control	23	139.04	10.18	2.12
	Experimental	23	136.09	10.32	2.15

The mean score of the control group was more than that of the experimental group in the pretest.

Table 7. *The Result of the Independent-Samples T-Test for the Motivation to Speak Pretest Comparison of the Control and the Experimental Groups*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Pretest_MTS	Equal variances assumed	.092	.763	.690	44	.494	2.08	3.02
	Equal variances not assumed			.690	43.99	.494	2.08	3.02

As Table 8 illustrates, the two groups were homogeneous in terms of motivation to speak before the treatment began, $t(44) = .690$, $P > .05$. In the next step, the posttest scores on motivation to speak of the control and the experimental groups were compared. The descriptive statistics of the two groups are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. *The Descriptive Statistics for the Motivation to Speak Posttest Scores of the Control and Experimental Groups*

Groups	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Variance
Control group	23	122	157	139.21	9.21	84.99
Experimental group	23	152	197	181.47	14.51	210.71
Valid N (listwise)	23					

The mean and SD of the experimental group were higher than the mean and SD of the control group.

Table 9. *The Result of the Mann-Whitney U Test for the Comparison of the Motivation to Speak Posttest Scores*

	Posttest_MTS
Mann-Whitney U	4.50
Wilcoxon W	280.50
Z	-5.71
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

According to the results presented in Table 9, the experimental and control groups differed significantly on the posttest of the MTS, $U = 4.50$, $P < .05$. The experimental

group was found to perform better than the control group; hence, there was a statistically significant difference in MTS between Iranian EFL learners who received DOCF and that of those who did not.

Discussion

The primary purpose of the current study was to explore the effect of DOCF on speaking accuracy and MTS of Iranian EFL learners preparing for the IELTS exam. The results showed that DOCF had a statistically significant effect on improving the speaking accuracy of the learners in the experimental group.

This finding is in line with that of Imroatus (2016), who showed that CF leads to the better speaking performance of students. The findings also support the findings in Rahnama and colleagues' (2020) study where it was found that the speaking accuracy of the learners who received OCF significantly improved. A possible justification for that would be when errors are appropriately corrected, learners show fewer erroneous forms, thereby performing more accurately, especially in the short run.

It is worth mentioning that not all learners might welcome immediate correction while trying to orally answer a question or express an opinion on a certain issue, yet the results of the present research indicated that students benefit from the oral correction. However, the findings contrast with those of Farrokhi et al. (2017) who found that speaking accuracy could not be significantly improved by receiving CF such as recast and explicit correction. This controversy could be supported by the fact that, apart from the correction itself, the role of the person who corrects the learners is of utmost significance since students might respond differently to different instructors. The result of the second question indicated that those who received DOCF were statistically more motivated to speak in classes. In line with the findings of this study, Leyla (2016) suggested that teachers' CF positively affected EFL learners' motivation in general.

The findings of the current study are in accordance with those of Montazeri and Salimi (2019) who, investigating the effect of CF in speaking classes, concluded that IELTS learners would become more motivated and willing to speak when they are corrected. In contrast to the findings of the current study, Rahimi and Dastjerdi (2012) found that immediate correction had no positive effect on speaking accuracy, but delayed correction was found to be significantly more useful. This controversy can be justified by the fact that their participants were EFL students at a language school who usually focus on the main language skills without aiming to prepare for sophisticated language exams. The participants of the current study, however, were IELTS prospective candidates in preparatory test classes. These students need to prepare for the test in a short period, justifying the reason why they welcome immediate correction.

It should be noted that improper correction type might sometimes hamper the flow of speaking and demotivate learners (Gumbaridze, 2013), causing them to be less willing to perform orally; however, timely and appropriate correction, as shown in this study, would be conducive to showing more motivation to engage in speaking. This would be supported by the idea that when accurate feedback type is selected and used by the instructor and errors are suitably corrected, learners would demonstrate fewer linguistically problematic forms, witnessing themselves make gradual progress.

Thus, when learners find themselves making fewer errors each time, they might become more willing to express themselves orally and participate in oral communication. Moreover, we should consider the fact that IELTS applicants need to prepare for the exam in a short period, and their ultimate goal is to reach a desired level of proficiency. Therefore, they respond positively to the appropriate feedback that they believe might help them in language learning. From among the different types of feedback frequently

used in language education studies, the focus of this study was on direct, immediate feedback presented orally, and the results confirm its merits. Nonetheless, care should be taken that the type of feedback and how that feedback is implemented plays a key role in increasing speaking motivation and accuracy.

Conclusions

The present study was conducted to investigate if DOCF could have any effect on MTS and speaking accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. The results of the data analysis indicated that the experimental group, which received DOCF from the teacher, significantly outperformed the control group in both speaking accuracy and MTS. Therefore, it is concluded that the implementation of DOCF in English language learning classes, if done correctly, will add to the motivation of students to express themselves and involve in speaking tasks.

It is also concluded that when receiving feedback, students might make up for their mistakes, and focusing on the production of correct grammatical structures, their speaking accuracy might improve. Thus, there seems to be a mutual effect between speaking accuracy and MTS. That is, more motivated students will produce more error-free sentences, and those students who have better accuracy, will become more willing to perform orally. This can have pedagogical implications for language teachers, especially IELTS speaking trainers, in that, by providing students with appropriate feedback as to their problems in speaking, they can expect their students to reach their desired speaking level more quickly.

Since it was hypothesized that speaking accuracy and MTS can be correlated, it is suggested that future studies be carried out investigating the relationship between these two variables. The findings of the present research have implications for teacher trainers, as well. Those who provide teacher training classes for IELTS instructors should consider that error correction, especially DOCF, is an indispensable part of the training.

Speaking skill instructors need to be trained how and when to use correction. First they should be aware of the different types of OCF such as explicit correction, metalinguistic, and recast. Second, they should be trained to use correction in a way that does not impede the flow of students' speech. The progress of speaking, in terms of both motivation and accuracy, should not be hampered by frequent correction on the part of instructors.

Considering the importance of different types of feedbacks and their possible roles in speaking motivation and accuracy, we suggest future studies be carried out comparing the effects of different feedback types and the dependent variables; different types of feedback can be implemented on the same dependent variable with the mediating role of gender and cognitive/perceptual styles. The limitations of the study are acknowledged. Initially, delayed posttest was not administered to explore the long-term effects of DOCF on speaking accuracy and MTS because of logistical constraints. Secondly, the present study utilized two intact classes of EFL learners as treatment and control conditions instead of randomly assigning the participants to the experimental and control groups.

References

Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone proximal development. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 465-483. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02064.x

Alsolami, T. (2021). The effect of oral corrective feedback (CF) on EFL learners' motivation in communicative classrooms. *Technium Social Sciences Journal, 19*, 644-653.

Ansarin, A. A., & Chehrazad, M. H. (2015). Differential effects of focused and unfocused recasts on the EFL learners' oral accuracy. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 17*(1), 86-97. http://dx.doi.org/10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2015.1.a06

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9 ed.). Hult Rinchart & Wiston.

Askari, K., & Langroudi, J. (2014). The effectiveness of Ur model in developing Iranian EFLlearners' fluency and accuracy in speaking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 1*(1), 75-86.

Azizi, D. B., Gharanjik, N., & Dehqan, M. (2022). The effects of mobile-mediated explicit and implicit feedback on EFL learners' use of English prepositions. *Theory and Practice of Second Language Acquisition, 8*(2), 1-20.

Baker, J., & Westrup, H. (2003). *Essential speaking skills: A handbook for English language teachers*. Continuum.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Oladrostam, E. (2010). The effect of mobile assisted language learning (MALL) on grammatical accuracy of EFL students. *MEXTESOL Journal, 34*(2), 77-86.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second language or foreign language*. Routledge.

Dornyei, Z. (2009). The L2 motivational self-system. In Z. Dornyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 9-11). Clevedon. Multingual Matters. http://dx.doi.org/10.21832/9781847691293

Dornyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2009). *Motivation, language identity and L2 self*. Multilngual Matters.

Dornyei, Z., & Ushioda, E. (2011). *Teaching and researching motivation* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97-107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(3), 3-18. http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054

Ellis, R. (2016). Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: What we know so far. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartcheva (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, and implications* (pp. 3-18). Routledge.

Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 445-452. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.438

Farrokhi, F., Zohrabi, M., & Chehrazad, M. (2017). The effect of the corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' speaking accuracy and breakdown fluency. *Journal of Language Horizons, 1*(2), 107-129.

Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 83-101). Cambridge University Press.

García, E. M., & Martínez, V. G. M. (2018). Students' reactions to teacher corrective feedback to oral production: A study on self-correction and autonomy in compulsory EFL University courses. *MEXTESOL Journal, 42*(1), 1-24.

Goh, C. C. M., & Burns, A. (2012). *Teaching speaking: A holistic approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Gumbaridze, J. (2013). Error correction in EFL speaking classrooms. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*, 1660-1663. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.237.

Hamidi, H. (2015). *Research in applied linguistics*. http://www.iranelt.com/index.php/introduction-to-research-methods.

Hamidun, N., Hashim, S. H. M., & Othman, N. F. (2012). Enhancing students' motivation by providing feedback on writing: The case of international students from Thailand. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity, 2*(6), 591-594. https://.org/doi:10.7763/IJSSH.2012.V2.179

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. Longman.

Hoseini Fatemi, A., & Harati, N., A. (2014). The Impact of recast versus prompts on the grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' speech. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*, 532–543. https://doi:10.4304/tpls.4.3.532-543

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. *Procedia: Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98*, 668-674. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.466

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*, 217–230. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6

Imroatus, S. (2016). Oral corrective feedback in speaking class of English department. *LINGUA Jurnal Bahasa Sastra dan Pengajarannya, 13*(1), 87-102. http://dx.doi.org/10.30957/lingua.v13i1.14

Keshavarz, M. H. (2015). *Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and interlanguage*. Rahnama.

Kumar, T. J. (2013). Teaching speaking: From fluency to accuracy. *The Journal of English Language Teaching, 55*(6), 16-21.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics, 33*, 159-174. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2529310

Leeman, L. (2007). Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. In R. M. Dekeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (pp. 111-137). Cambridge University Press.

Loewen, S. (2012). The role of feedback. In S.M. Gass & A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 24-40). Routledge. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315676968

Leyla, A. (2016). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback on motivation to improve students writing performance: The case study of third year EFL students at Biskra University* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mohammed Khieder University of Biskra.

Mehregan, M., & Jafari Seresht, D. (2014). The role of teacher feedback in enhancing learner self-efficacy and motivation in computer-assisted environments. *MEXTESOL journal, 38*(3), 1-16.

Montazeri, M., & Salimi, E. A. (2019). Assessing motivation to speak (MTS) and willingness to communicate through metalinguistic corrective feedback. *Learning and Motivation, 68*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2019.101594

Nassaji, H. (2017). The effectiveness of extensive versus intensive recasts for learning L2 grammar. *Mod. Lang. J., 101*(2), 353-368. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12387

Nhac, H. T. (2021). Effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral accuracy in English speaking lessons. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching, and Educational Research, 20*(10), 313-330. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.20.10.17

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. Prentice Hall.

Oxford, R. L., & Shearins, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal, 78*, 12-28. https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1994.tb02011.x

Rahimi, A., & Dastjerdi, H. (2012). Impact of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' oral production: CAF. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(1), 45-54. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2012.03.01.45

Rahnama, M., Ahmadi, A., Razmjoo, S., & Mazandarani, O. (2020). The Effect of Oral Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Complexity and Accuracy in Speaking. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies, 7*(1), 105-131. https://doi.org/ 10.30479/jmrels.2019.10362.1291

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th). Longman.

Salimi, A. (2015). The effect of focus on form and task complexity on L2 learners' oral task performance. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(6), 54-62.

Sato, M., & Lyster, R. (2012). Peer interaction and corrective feedback for accuracy and fluency development: monitoring, practice and proceduralization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 34*, 591-626. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263112000356

Stefanou, C., & Revez, A. (2015). Direct written corrective feedback, learner differences, and the acquisition of second language article use for generic and specific plural reference. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(2), 263-282. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/modl.12212

Tang, C., & Liu, Y. T. (2018). Effects of indirect coded corrective feedback with and without short affective teacher comments on L2 writing performance, learner uptake and motivation. *Assessing Writing, 35*, 26-40. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2017.12.002

Ur, P. (2009). *Grammar practice activities* (2nd ed.) Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (2012). *A course in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Zedan, R. (2021). Student feedback as a predictor of learning motivation, academic achievement and classroom climate. *Education and Self-Development, 16*(2), 27-46. http:// dx.doi.org/10.26907/ esd.16.2.03

Zhao, W. (2015). *Learners' preferences for oral corrective feedback and their effects on second language noticing and learning motivation* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). McGill University.

Appendix A. Sample of Errors Made by the Participants

No.	Error	Correct Form	Type
1	The movie is inspired from a book.	…by a book	preposition
2	To tell you the truth, I'd rather be independent on my parents.	…be independent of my parents.	preposition
3	I usually take a fast shower	…take a quick shower	collocation
4	When I heard that, I went into tears.	…burst into tears	collocation
5	As my 'professor suggested, I tried to deve'lop a new instrument.	Pro'fessor----de'velop	pronunciation
6	Most peoples don't care what you think.	Most people ….	Wrong plural
7	University students need to try hardly to ….	…try hard	Wrong word choice