INVESTIGATING FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANXIETY AND LEARNER BELIEFS IN SPOKEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK WITH A FOCUS ON LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY[*]

Vasfiye GEÇKİN[1]

ABSTRACT

Research on the role of language proficiency on foreign language anxiety and learner corrective feedback beliefs in oral practice has not reached conclusive results. This study investigates whether level of proficiency affects foreign language anxiety and learner beliefs about spoken corrective feedback in an EFL context. Participants were recruited through convenience sampling. A total of 204 participants, who were all tertiary level university learners of English from four different proficiency groups, responded to two scales: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986) and Corrective Feedback Belief Scale (Fukuda, 2004). A series of one-way ANOVA analyses and Bonferroni adjusted post-hoc corrections were run to test significance between and within groups. The four proficiency groups were statistically different from each other in terms of foreign language anxiety and spoken corrective feedback preferences. The findings revealed that the learners with a low proficiency level appreciated immediate feedback, but those with a higher level of language proficiency preferred delayed feedback. Clarification requests, elicitation and metalinguistic feedback were rated more positively by the beginner group than the other groups. In terms of the choice of correctors, language proficiency did not play a role; however, all the groups valued teachers as the main agents of correction. This study is one of the very few comprehensive studies (e.g., Tercan & Dikilitaş, 2016; Uyanıker, 2018) focusing on the role of language proficiency in anxiety and feedback preferences of high achiever tertiary level learners of English who will pursue their undergraduate studies in an English medium public university in Turkey.

Keywords: language anxiety, oral corrective feedback, EFL learners

YABANCI DİL KAYGISI VE ÖĞRENİCİLERİN SÖZLÜ DÜZELTİCİ GERİBİLDİRİM İNANIŞLARININ DİL YETERLİLİK DÜZEYİ ODAKLI İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Dil başarı seviyesinin, yabancı dil kaygısı ve öğrenicilerin sözlü iletişimdeki düzeltici geribildirim inanışları üzerindeki rolü hakkındaki çalışmalar kesin bir sonuca ulaşmamıştır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce'nin öğretildiği bir bağlamda, dil seviyesinin, yabancı dil kaygısı ve öğrenicilerin sözlü düzeltici geribildirim inançları üzerinde etkisi olup olmadığını araştırmaktır. Katılımcılar üniversitedeki hazırlık sınıflarından seçkisiz örneklem üzerinden seçilmiş dört faklı dil seviyesindeki gruplardan oluşmaktadır. Ölçek olarak Yabancı Dil Sınıf Kaygı Ölçeği (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986) ve Düzeltici Geribildirim İnanç Ölçeği (Fukuda, 2004) uygulanmıştır. Her iki ölçek toplamda 204 kişi tarafından cevaplanmıştır. Grup içi ve gruplar arası anlamlı farklılıkları test etmek için bir seri tek faktörlü varyans analizi ve Bonferroni düzeltmesi yapılmıştır. Dört seviye grubu yabancı dil kaygısı ve sözlü düzeltici geribildirim tercihleri açısından anlamlı bir şekilde ayrışmaktadırlar. Alt dil seviyesindeki öğreniciler, açıklama talebi isteği, söyletim ve üstdilsel geribildirimi üst dil seviyesine sahip öğrenicilerden daha olumlu değerlendirmişlerdir. Yapılan yanlışları düzelten kişiler açısından, dil seviyesinin herhangi anlamlı bir etkisi görülmemiştir, fakat tüm gruplar hata düzeltici mekanizma olarak öğretmeni ve kendilerini daha güvenilir olarak değerlendirmişlerdir. Bu çalışma eğitim öğretim dili İngilizce olan yüksek başarı gruplarından oluşan Türkiye'deki bir devlet üniversitedeki hazırlık okulu öğrenicilerinin dil yeterliliklerinin kaygı ve geribildirim tercihlerine etkisine odaklanan birkaç kapsayıcı çalışmadan (örn., Tercan & Dikilitaş, 2016; Uyanıker, 2018) biridir.

Anahtar kelimeler: dil kaygısı, sözlü düzeltici geribildirim, yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenenler

---

[*] *Part of this paper was presented at 3rd International Conference on Research in Applied Linguistics (ICRAL'19), at Konya Selçuk University, 24-26 October 2019.*

[1] *İzmir Democracy University, Faculty of Education, vgeckin@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8532-8627*

1.INTRODUCTION

Many foreign languages instructors have witnessed varying levels of anxiety experienced by tertiary level learners who have to master a second or foreign language to pursue their academic studies at an English-medium university. Foreign language anxiety is a form of situation specific anxiety associated with feelings of uneasiness and negative emotional reactions in the course of learning a second or foreign language (Horwitz, 2001). It is quite a complex phenomenon involving learner perceptions, beliefs and behaviors towards learning languages and manifests itself in shying away from any form of negative evaluation or degrading feedback in a foreign language classroom most of the time. This form of anxiety may also be related to the fear of poor performance or failure in tests. Shyness and negative self-perception contribute to the fear that foreign language learners face about losing track of communication with other speakers or losing face in class especially when their mistakes are pointed out right in front of their peers (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1991).

To decrease the level of anxiety observed in foreign language classes, teachers provide feedback in a variety of forms (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). The form of the corrective feedback provided could be either direct or indirect. More specifically, in spoken error treatment, teachers may prefer to give direct corrective feedback in the form of explicit corrections, recasts or elicitations. *Explicit feedback* is the explicit provision of the correct form. For instance, when the learner says, 'I visit my grandparents yesterday', the teacher directly corrects the part of the utterance that includes the error by saying, 'Not, VISIT, VISITED, I VISITED my grandparents yesterday'. As a second direct corrective feedback strategy, the teacher may reformulate all or part of the erroneous word or phrase to give the correct form in a *recast* without directly pointing out what the error is as in 'I visited'. In *elicitation*, the teacher tries to elicit the correct form from the learner by either pausing before the erroneous part as in 'I…?', allowing the student to fill in the blank with the correct form. Asking questions as in 'How do we say VISIT in past tense?' is one direct strategic form of feedback to elicit the correct form. Indirect forms of feedback such as metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests and repetitions are also practiced widely in foreign language classrooms. To exemplify, for the same erroneous utterance, the teacher may provide the learner with *metalinguistic feedback*, that is, with the technical linguistic information as in, 'visit is in present tense, you need past tense here'. Or else, the teacher *requests for clarification* by asking 'What? or Sorry?'. For the purposes of this study, clarification requests are not merely repetition requests, rather they can be defined as teacher-initiated repair questions and comments (Atar & Seedhouse, 2018) to signal that the learner utterance is not understood, or a reformulation is needed. In addition, these requests do not provide any linguistic information about the erroneous part(s) of the utterance (Ogino, 2012). They indicate that there is some misunderstanding of the meaning or the linguistic form which projects a responsive action from the teacher (Käänta & Kasper, 2018). Teachers may also resort to *repetition*, that is, repeating the utterance by highlighting the mistake mostly through emphatic stress as in 'I VISIT my grandparents yesterday?'.

The complex interplay between level of proficiency and foreign language anxiety may act as a guide for teachers in shaping their error treatment methods. In some studies (Abrar, 2017; Dalkılıç, 2001; Liu, 2006; Tercan & Dikilitaş, 2015; Tianjian, 2010), low level proficiency learners are reported to experience higher levels of anxiety in foreign language classes. In others (Aydemir, 2011; Batumlu & Erden, 2007; Debreli & Demirkan, 2015; Elaldı, 2016; Kitano, 2001; Saito & Samimy, 1996), advanced learners state that they suffer more from feelings of anxiety. There are also studies (Balemir, 2009; Çağatay, 2015; Luo, 2014) reporting that the level of proficiency has no significant effect on the level of language anxiety experienced by foreign language learners. The nature of the skill to be acquired by the learner also brings upon stress. While beginner level learners report higher levels of anxiety in acquiring receptive skills, advanced learners are more anxious in the process of learning productive skills (Ay, 2010).

Teachers treat speech errors committed by foreign language learners with different proficiency levels differently (Li, 2017). Learners also prefer finely tuned methods of corrective error treatment depending on their level of proficiency (Uyanıker, 2018). For instance, it has been documented that all proficiency groups prefer to be given recasts; however, teachers tend to avoid recasts as the learners become more proficient in the foreign language (Ahangari & Amirzadeh, 2011). Turkish learners studying English as a foreign language expect to receive frequent corrections to their serious and frequent errors especially through direct correction, clarification requests and elicitation from the teacher, who is believed to be the main feedback providing agent (Taşdemir & Arslan, 2018). Low-level learners trust their teachers as the main feedback providers. Regardless of the proficiency level, self-correction is favored over peer correction (Genç, 2014). The timing of feedback is also a subject for further research. While low proficiency foreign language learners opt to receive immediate feedback, high proficiency groups prefer delayed correction on their conversational errors (Fidan, 2015; Smith, 2010). One common belief held by the learners with varying levels of language proficiency is that no error correction does not do them any good. Indirect methods of error correction such as repetition, clarification requests and elicitation are evaluated as the most favored error correction methods by high proficiency groups whereas low proficiency groups rate direct methods of error correction such as explicit correction as the most effective error correction method (Genç, 2014;

Lee, 2013). Beginner and advanced learners differ from intermediate level learners in terms of the benefit they derive from the use of metalinguistic feedback. Intermediate level learners believe that the benefit they gain from metalinguistic feedback is quite limited when compared to the other proficiency groups (Ferreira, Moore & Mellish, 2007). On the other hand, while beginner learners are reported to value metalinguistic feedback more, advanced groups favor elicitation more (Kaivanpanah, Alavi & Sepehrinia, 2015). One other study (Hashemian & Mostaghasi, 2015) concludes that advanced level learners manifest a neutral attitude towards any kind of error correction method. All these findings in the field suggest that there is definitely a need for further research in different foreign languages contexts.

1.1. The aim of the study

The aim of this study is to explore the effect of proficiency on (i) foreign language anxiety and (ii) beliefs tertiary level foreign language learners of English hold about corrective feedback in oral communication. The research questions addressed in this paper are outlined below:

1- Do tertiary level English learners from different levels of foreign language proficiency suffer from different levels of foreign language anxiety in oral communication?
2- Does the level of foreign language proficiency determine the beliefs tertiary level English learners hold about corrective feedback in oral communication?

1.2. The importance of the study

The contribution of this study to the already existing literature is first, through offering findings to the ongoing inconclusive debate on the role of language proficiency on anxiety and oral corrective feedback preferences of tertiary level English learners. Second, this study presents suggestions to foreign language instructors in shaping their feedback strategies by taking the language anxiety of their learners into consideration.

2. METHOD

The participants were recruited through convenience sampling. After obtaining ethics clearance from Boğaziçi University Ethics Board, and the written consent of the participants, two structured surveys were given to the learners from four levels of proficiency. The participants did not require more than 25 minutes to complete the surveys which were given in English. The study was conducted on the 15th week of the second semester, in class, with the help of some English instructors who were given a short training on how to conduct the survey. Data were collected in the last week of the 2019 spring term, that is the last week of school, making sure that each learner had the chance to make their individual presentations and was exposed to a full repertoire of oral corrective feedback by their teachers. Descriptive and inferential statistics are reported in the results section.

2.1. Participants

The study adopted a convenience sampling approach. The data were obtained from 204 Turkish learners of English (95 females, 109 males) who volunteered to take part in the study. The participants completed two semesters of instruction at the School of Foreign languages of a public university, where they improved their academic listening, reading, writing and speaking skills in English as a foreign language. The participants were given an institutional placement test at the beginning of the academic year and they were put into classes of four levels of proficiency: (i) beginner (ii) pre-intermediate, (iii) intermediate and (iv) advanced (see Table 1.). After demonstrating their proficiency in English, either by passing Boğaziçi University Test of Proficiency (BUEPT) or by receiving an equivalent score on TOEFL or IELTS, the participants are expected to take up their undergraduate courses in natural and applied sciences at the Faculty of Education (*n*=54), Engineering (*n*= 44), Arts and Sciences (*n*=65), Economics and Administrative Sciences (*n*=27) and the School of Applied Disciplines (*n*=14).

Table 1.
Demographic Information about the Participants

Level	*n*	Age $\overline{x}$	*sd*	First Exposure to English $\overline{x}$	*sd*
Beginner	51	19.18	.77	9.76	1.81
Pre-intermediate	51	19.02	1.14	9.31	1.78
Intermediate	51	18.84	.86	8.20	2.51
Advanced	51	18.78	.76	7.94	2.45
TOTAL	204				

As given in Table 1, the advanced group was the youngest and the beginner group was the oldest. This difference between the groups was not statistically significant (F (3) =2.02, *p*=.12). However, a statistically significant

difference across groups existed in terms of their first exposure to English (F (3) =8.33, p<.001). The high proficiency groups were exposed to English earlier than the low proficiency groups. Bonferroni adjusted post-hoc test analyses show that the beginner group was exposed to English significantly later than the intermediate (p =.002) and the advanced group (p <.001). And the pre-intermediate group was nearing a difference with the intermediate group (p =.06) and they were definitely older than the advanced group when they were first exposed to English (p =.010). The lower proficiency groups, namely the pre-intermediate and the beginner groups, did not statistically differ in terms of the age that they were first exposed to English.

2.2. Procedure and Instrument

To test foreign language anxiety, several scales have been used in the literature including English Use Anxiety (Clement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977) and English Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (Kondo & Young, 2003). The Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (FLCAS, Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986) used in this study is more comprehensive and had higher reliability and validity than the other studies. Kaivanpanah, Alavi and Sepehrinia (2015) developed a scale of teacher and learner preferences of oral corrective feedback. Yet, this scale is too broad in scope so for the purposes of the present study, The Corrective Feedback Belief Scale (CFBS, Fukuda, 2004) is used to investigate learner preferences solely.

First, the participants were given a mini demographic questionnaire, followed by a survey consisting of two scales: Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) and The Corrective Feedback Belief Scale (CFBS). FLCAS has 33 items and assesses the degree of anxiety experienced by foreign language learners of English on four dimensions: (i) fear of negative evaluation, (ii) communication apprehension, (iii) test anxiety and (iv) anxiety in class. The scores learners can obtain from FLCAS range from 33 to 165. A higher score on the FLCAS is associated with higher levels of foreign language anxiety. CFBS, on the other hand, is a 21-item questionnaire investigating learner beliefs on (i) necessity, (ii) frequency, (iii) timing, (iv) methods of corrective feedback, (v) the type of error and (vi) the choice of correctors in oral practice (Fukuda, 2004). The scores learners can obtain from CFBS range from 21 to 105. The responses to both scales are designed on a five- point Likert Scale, ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 refers to strongly disagree/never/very ineffective, 2- disagree/occasionally/ineffective, 3- neither agree nor disagree/sometimes/neutral, 4- agree/usually/effective, and 5- strongly agree/always/very effective. Both FLCAS and CFBS have been successfully used in the Turkish context with alpha reliabilities of more than .90 in different learner environments (e.g., Aydın, 2001; Çetinkaya & Hamzadayı, 2015). Alpha reliabilities for the FLCAS and CBFS in the present study were .80 and .70, respectively, indicating acceptable internal consistency for the instrument.

2.3. Data Analysis

The scales are collected and numbered for the sake of anonymity. Data are analyzed on the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 25). The results of a series of one-way ANOVA tests with Bonferroni post hoc corrections are reported in the next section.

2.4. Ethics Committee Permit Information

Ethical evaluation committee name= Boğaziçi University, Human Research Ethics Committee in Social Sciences.

Date of ethical assessment decision= 05.04.2019

Ethical assessment document number= 2019/04

3. FINDINGS

3.1. Language proficiency and Foreign Language Anxiety

Groups with higher levels of proficiency, namely the advanced and the intermediate groups, experienced lower levels of foreign language anxiety as shown in Table 2 (F (3) =5.68, p=.001). Out of a total score of 165 on FLCAS, the pre-intermediate group scored a mean of 97.73 (sd=13.98) showing the highest levels of anxiety and the advanced group scored a mean of 86.76 (sd=15.50), reporting the lowest levels of anxiety in communicating in a foreign language.

Table 2.
Language Anxiety Experienced across Levels

Level	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p
Beginner	95.90	15.38		
Pre-intermediate	97.73	13.98		
Intermediate	90.65	15.42		
Advanced	86.76	15.50	5.68	**.001**

Bonferroni adjusted post-hoc analyses showed that the advanced group had statistically lower levels of language anxiety than the beginner (*p*=.014) and the pre-intermediate group (*p*=.002).

Table 3 outlines a breakdown of factors leading to foreign language anxiety across groups with varying levels of proficiency in English as a foreign language. A one-way ANOVA analysis between the groups showed that the level of proficiency is a contributing factor to varying degrees of foreign language anxiety especially in terms of fear of negative evaluation, (F (3) =3.39, *p*=.019), test anxiety (F (3) =7.73, *p*<.001) and anxiety arising from in-class activities (F (3) =4.70, *p*=.003).

Table 3.
Distribution of Factors Determining Language Anxiety across Levels

Anxiety Type	Level	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p	Preferences
Negative Evaluation	Beginner	2.74	.85			Pre-intermediate > advanced
	Pre-intermediate	2.97	.76			
	Intermediate	2.59	.87			
	Advanced	2.47	.88	3.39	**.019**	
Communication Apprehension	Beginner	2.96	.40			
	Pre-intermediate	3.00	.39			
	Intermediate	2.88	.34			
	Advanced	2.81	.38	2.57	.056	
Test Anxiety	Beginner	2.98	.47			Beginner>advanced &intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	2.77	.60			
	Intermediate	2.70	.61			
	Advanced	2.46	.48	7.73	**<.001**	
In-Class Anxiety	Beginner	2.96	.46			Beginner>advanced pre-intermediate > advanced
	Pre-intermediate	3.01	.44			
	Intermediate	2.80	.51			
	Advanced	2.70	.48	4.70	**.003**	

The pre-intermediate group manifested higher levels of anxiety than the advanced group because they feared to be negatively evaluated by the others (*p*=.017). The beginner group was statically more anxious about failing in tests, than the intermediate (*p*=.056) and the advanced group (*p*<.001). The pre-intermediate group was also more anxious about failing in tests than the advanced group (*p*=.03). No difference in test anxiety existed between the beginner and the pre-intermediate groups (*p*=.33). The advanced group was more relaxed in taking part in class activities when compared to the beginner (*p*=.033) and the pre-intermediate groups (*p*=.006).

3.2. Language Proficiency and Corrective Feedback (CF)

3.2.1. Is CF a necessity?

Regardless of the level of proficiency in English, 90.7% of all the learners agreed on the necessity of error correction to their spoken errors by responding, "strongly agree" or "agree" to the relevant item on the questionnaire ($\bar{x}$ =4.44, *sd*= .72). Learner preferences for the necessity of corrective feedback does not reveal a statistically meaningful difference across levels (see Table 4.).

Table 4.
Responses to the Necessity of CF across Levels

Level	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p
Beginner	4.47	.70		
Pre-intermediate	4.27	.80		
Intermediate	4.43	.73		
Advanced	4.44	.72	1.49	.22

As given in Table 4, among all four groups, the beginner and advanced groups preferred to be corrected highly frequently.

3.2.2. How often to receive CF?

Learners were asked to rate the frequency of the feedback they would like to receive from a scale ranging from 1 to 5, where 1 refers to never (0%), 2 refers to occasionally (20%), 3 refers to sometimes (50%), 4 refers to usually (80%) and 5 refers to always (100%). As shown in Table 5, all the groups believed that their errors need to be corrected at times, but the difference between groups was not statistically significant (F (3) =1.47, p=.18).

Table 5.
Responses to the Frequency of CF across Levels

Level	x̄	sd	F	p
Beginner	3.84	.86		
Pre-intermediate	3.57	.88		
Intermediate	3.45	1.02		
Advanced	3.71	1.00	1.47	.18

Despite the lack of a meaningful difference between groups, the beginner and advanced groups wanted their errors to be corrected more often than the students at pre-intermediate and intermediate levels.

3.2.3. When to receive CF?

Table 6 summarizes the timing of feedback favored by groups of learners with different levels of proficiency. There existed a meaningful difference across groups in terms of when they wanted to be corrected. While the lower proficiency groups (beginner and pre-intermediate learners) opted to receive feedback immediately, the higher proficiency groups (intermediate and advanced learners) did not want to be interrupted in the middle of their utterances. Rather they would like to receive delayed feedback either at the end of the activity or towards the end of the class.

Table 6.
Responses to the Timing of CF across Levels

Timing of CF	Level	x̄	sd	F	p	Preferences
Immediate correction	Beginner	2.88	1.16			Pre-intermediate > beginner
	Pre-intermediate	3.61	1.09			
	Intermediate	3.02	1.01			
	Advanced	3.02	1.23	4.21	.006	
After students finish talking	Beginner	4.33	.84			Beginner>pre-intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	3.88	.89			
	Intermediate	4.00	.75			
	Advanced	3.96	.96	2.71	.046	
After the activity	Beginner	2.78	1.12			Advanced & intermediate>beginner
	Pre-intermediate	3.12	1.05			
	Intermediate	3.43	1.00			
	Advanced	3.43	1.00	4.45	.005	
At the end of class	Beginner	2.14	1.37			Intermediate>beginner
	Pre-intermediate	2.33	1.34			
	Intermediate	2.67	1.23			
	Advanced	2.65	1.21	3.35	.113	

The pre-intermediate group, for example, wanted immediate correction, which is a different preference from the beginner (p=.008), intermediate (p=.05) and the advanced groups (p=.05). The students across levels tended to ask for correction after they finished talking (F (3) =2.71, p=.046). This difference was meaningful between the beginner and the pre-intermediate group (p=.05). The finding of preference to be corrected after the activity is over is also statistically meaningful across groups (F (3) =4.45, p=.005). The advanced and the intermediate groups preferred to be corrected after the activity came to an end, a preference which was not appreciated by the beginner group (p=.012). Receiving feedback at the end of the class was not favored much by any of the groups (see Table 6.). Still, when compared with the low proficiency level learners, the high proficiency level learners had a more positive attitude towards receiving feedback at the conclusion of the class.

3.2.4. What method of CF to receive?

Desirable feedback types also differed between groups. Statistically meaningful differences between groups existed in their preferences for clarification requests (F (3) =3.13, *p*=.027), elicitation (F (3) =2.97, *p*=.033) and metalinguistic feedback (F (3) =4.78, *p*=.003) to their erroneous utterances in speech (see Table 7.). The beginner group rated elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and clarification requests as the top three mostly favored feedback types. The pre-intermediate group would like to receive elicitation, repetition and explicit feedback over the other forms of CF. The intermediate group appreciated explicit feedback, elicitation and metalinguistic feedback more than the other forms of CF. Finally, the advanced group rated metalinguistic feedback, explicit feedback and repetition more positively than the other CF methods.

Table 7.
Responses to the Timing of CF across Levels

Type of CF	Level	$\overline{x}$	*sd*	*F*	*p*	*Preferences*
Clarification Request	Beginner	3.90	.83			Beginner>advanced
	Pre-intermediate	3.45	1.08			
	Intermediate	3.54	1.29			
	Advanced	3.26	1.11	3.13	**.027**	
Repetition	Beginner	3.80	1.22			Pre-intermediate>intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	3.84	1.03			
	Intermediate	3.33	1.19			
	Advanced	3.70	1.15	2.09	.103	
Explicit Feedback	Beginner	3.43	1.37			Advanced>beginner
	Pre-intermediate	3.51	1.12			
	Intermediate	3.53	1.22			
	Advanced	3.88	1.03	1.43	.233	
Elicitation	Beginner	4.18	.93			Beginner>advanced
	Pre-intermediate	3.88	.95			
	Intermediate	3.66	1.18			
	Advanced	3.59	1.27	2.97	**.033**	
No correction	Beginner	1.37	.66			Pre-intermediate>advanced
	Pre-intermediate	2.06	1.21			
	Intermediate	1.90	.81			
	Advanced	1.75	.89	5.28	**.002**	
Metalinguistic Feedback	Beginner	4.16	.73			Beginner>pre-intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	3.51	1.05			
	Intermediate	3.57	1.06			
	Advanced	3.82	.97	4.78	**.003**	
Recasts	Beginner	3.20	1.06			Advanced>beginner=intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	3.39	1.08			
	Intermediate	3.20	.94			
	Advanced	3.53	1.06	1.20	.310	

In terms of methods of CF, as reported in Table 7, beginners differed significantly from the advanced group in their beliefs about the effectiveness of clarification requests (*p*=.019) and elicitation (*p*=.04). The beginner level learners believed in the effectiveness of clarification requests and elicitation more than the advanced group did. The pre-intermediate group was of the opinion that no CF can also help them, an opinion which the beginner (*p*=.001) and the intermediate group (*p*=.023) did not agree at all. The beginner group believed in the contribution of metalinguistic feedback to their learning process more strongly than the pre-intermediate (*p*=.005) and the intermediate group (*p*=.014). All the groups doubted that recasts would help them improve their oral communication skills (*p*=.310).

3.2.5. What type of error requires correction?

All the groups wanted their highly serious, highly frequent, individual errors to be treated. Of all the groups, the advanced learners wanted feedback on all possible kinds of speech errors that they could commit. The only difference across groups existed as to how they would like their highly frequent (F (3) =5.44, *p*=.001), infrequent (F (3) =2.97, *p*=.033) and individual errors F (3) =4.51, *p*=.004) to be treated (see Table 8.).

Table 8.
Responses to the Types of Errors to Be Corrected across Levels

Type of errors	Level	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p	Preferences
Very Serious Errors	Beginner	4.35	.84			Advanced>intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	4.39	.57			
	Intermediate	4.29	.81			
	Advanced	4.63	.63	2.09	.103	
Less Serious Errors	Beginner	3.24	.86			Advanced>pre-intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	2.94	.99			
	Intermediate	3.08	.98			
	Advanced	3.33	1.05	1.61	.188	
Highly Frequent Errors	Beginner	3.29	1.37			Advanced>beginner
	Pre-intermediate	3.80	1.12			
	Intermediate	3.60	1.22			
	Advanced	4.07	1.03	5.44	**.001**	
Infrequent Errors	Beginner	2.90	1.10			Beginner>intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	2.84	1.03			
	Intermediate	2.80	.85			
	Advanced	2.86	.92	2.97	**.033**	
Individual Errors	Beginner	4.35	.84			Advanced>intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	4.39	.57			
	Intermediate	4.29	.81			
	Advanced	4.63	.63	4.51	**.004**	

The advanced group differed from the beginner group in their belief that error correction was a necessity when they made an error frequently (*p*=.001) and when the error was peculiar to the individual (*p*=.004). Even when the error was quite an infrequent one, the beginner group appreciated correction (*p*=.033). Yet, learners regardless of their level of proficiency treated infrequent errors as the ones that require the least amount of attention.

3.2.6. Who should treat errors?

First, as presented in Table 9, learners of all proficiency levels favored the teacher as the main feedback providing agent over themselves as self-correctors and the others as peer correctors.

Table 9.
Responses to the Choice of Correctors across Levels

Agent	Level	$\bar{x}$	sd	F	p	Preferences
Peers	Beginner	2.33	1.01			Intermediate >pre-intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	2.18	1.20			
	Intermediate	2.41	.94			
	Advanced	2.39	1.02	5.29	.663	
Teachers	Beginner	4.37	.86			Advanced>intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	4.31	.99			
	Intermediate	4.22	.98			
	Advanced	4.47	1.05	1.42	.240	
Students themselves	Beginner	4.16	1.37			Advanced>pre-intermediate
	Pre-intermediate	3.96	1.12			
	Intermediate	4.18	1.22			
	Advanced	4.37	1.03	1.58	.195	

Second, all the groups especially the groups with higher levels of proficiency believed that given enough time, they could figure out the errors in speech and correct themselves. Peers were the least favored feedback providing agents among the lower proficiency groups.

4. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION and IMPLICATIONS

This paper explored the effect of language proficiency on foreign language anxiety and spoken corrective feedback preferences among tertiary level English learners doing a preparatory year at a Turkish public university where the medium of instruction is English. The main finding of this study is that the level of foreign language proficiency affects the level of foreign language anxiety and learner preferences for corrective feedback in oral communication.

Firstly, the findings presented in this paper reveal that as the level of proficiency goes up, learners are more likely to experience foreign language anxiety. Learners of lower proficiency groups, namely, the beginner and the pre-intermediate groups, suffer from higher levels of foreign language anxiety. More specifically, these groups suffer from a fear of negative evaluation and failure in tests a lot more than the advanced and intermediate level learners. This finding is in line with the other studies (e.g., Debreli & Demirkan, 2015; Elaldı, 2016). The reason behind this difference can be linked to the characteristic properties of the learners, especially to those who study at advanced classes. Advanced level classes in this institution are mostly comprised of learners who will be majoring in languages including, Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Western Languages and Literature, Linguistics and Translation and Interpreting Studies. So, it is not surprising that learners who come to the advanced level classes are those who have had the longest history of learning a foreign language and who have already acquired experiences and means to handle language anxiety or failure in tests. The beginner and pre-intermediate learners, on the other hand, fear about not being able to fulfill the requirements to take or to pass the proficiency test until September, which is the last chance to demonstrate proficiency in English to start their departmental studies in the beginning of the academic year. These groups also fear about making mistakes and losing face in class, being evaluated negatively by their peers and teachers and also not being able to express themselves well enough to the other speakers, unlike the higher level proficiency groups that have experienced such feelings before and are now probably fully equipped with the mechanisms to cope with such feelings of worry.

Secondly, in this study, learner beliefs on spoken corrective feedback are investigated in terms of (i) its necessity, (ii) frequency, (iii) timing, (iv) methods, (v) error types to be corrected and (vi) feedback providing agents as the main correctors. All the groups, regardless of their level of proficiency, believe in the necessity of corrective feedback to their errors in speech. Advanced and beginner level learners stand out as the top two groups craving for feedback. It is not surprising that the beginners believe receiving feedback is an important part of their learning process since they stay in the program the longest and receive three obligatory semesters of instruction in class. Naturally, feedback becomes one of the most important classroom rituals dictated by the instructor. Advanced learners also exhibit firm beliefs about the necessity of feedback since they might think that a critical eye on their performance in oral communication can equip them with an excellent command of the language itself before starting their majors most of which are related to language studies. Similar to the findings about the necessity of feedback, learners of all groups, regardless of their level of proficiency or foreign language anxiety report that frequent error correction helps to improve their oral communication skills. These findings are also in line with the studies (e.g., Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Lee, 2013) conducted in different EFL settings.

As for the timing of CF of all the groups, especially the intermediate and the advanced level learners favor feedback after they finish talking. They do not prefer to be interrupted in the middle of the conversation. The beginner and pre-intermediate learners favor immediate feedback whereas the intermediate and advanced learners appreciate delayed feedback. This difference can be accounted by learners' awareness of the usefulness of feedback (Ellis, 2009). That is, higher proficiency groups are well-aware of the fact that they would not be making serious errors that would impede communication. They demand to be listened to until the end of their turn in the conversation so that they could have the chance to express themselves in detail by using self-repair mechanisms. The lower proficiency groups, on the other hand, are anxious that they would make errors which would hinder the conversation or confuse the listener, so they are in constant need for an error checking mechanism. This piece of finding also coincides with the other studies (e.g., Fidan, 2015; Smith, 2010) in the literature.

One particular piece of finding this paper reports is that learners of all proficiency groups regardless of their level of anxiety and level of proficiency believe that not receiving any corrective feedback will not help their learning process even though the type of feedback they opt differs depending on their levels of proficiency. The pre-intermediate and intermediate learners believe in the effectiveness of explicit feedback and elicitation over the other forms of feedback. Interestingly, the beginner and the advanced groups share a positive attitude towards metalinguistic feedback. Elicitation was rated positively by all the groups except the advanced group. Recasts were the least favored error correction method, a finding of which is also reported in the literature (Lochtman, 2002; Surakka, 2007). Recasts are not favored by the low proficiency groups since they can be pretty difficult to notice especially in oral practice (Philp, 2003). The findings of this study also support Renko (2012) suggesting that explicit correction and metalinguistic comments can reduce anxiety to manageable levels. These two feedback forms are rated positively by the high anxiety groups, namely, the beginner and pre-intermediate learners, in this study.

Nearly learners of all proficiency groups believe that their highly serious, frequent and individual errors deserve attention and corrective treatment. Especially the advanced learners appreciate feedback to all possible error forms except for the infrequent and less serious spoken errors. A similar pattern is also observed with the beginner level learners. Learners of all proficiency groups agree that the infrequent errors can be ignored.

Regardless of their levels of proficiency, all the learners in this study express a strong belief in teacher correction. One reason why the learners view teachers as the main feedback providing agents is that teachers have the expertise and experience in coping with the difficulties that learners face and in bringing solutions to the problems they cannot overcome on their own (Fidan, 2015; Gielen, Tops, Dochy, Onhema & Smeets, 2010). The second reason could be that they view teacher feedback more reliable and complex than the other forms of feedback (Van den Boom, Paas & Van Merriënboer, 2007). The second most trusted feedback providing agent is reported to be the learners themselves and the least favored feedback providers are considered as the peers. Especially, the beginner and pre-intermediate learners do not trust their peers at all, even though the beliefs scale was given at the end of the second semester when these reportedly low proficiency groups did not in fact have low proficiency in English at that time.

As final words, foreign language anxiety may impede comprehension and production in a foreign language. In addition, it can deteriorate concentration and the retrieval of information. To overcome the negative implications of foreign language anxiety on learner performance in a foreign language, teachers need to take some suggestions into consideration as in:

- implementing their programs by taking the proficiency and anxiety level of their learners into consideration,
- assuming the role of the main feedback providing agent,
- being selective in error correction, addressing mostly frequent and serious errors,
- keeping in mind that lower and higher proficiency groups differ with respect to their preferred timing of feedback,
- being aware of the type of oral feedback learners of varying proficiency groups demand.

This study can also provide insights to language teachers about functional and dysfunctional learner beliefs on corrective feedback preferences. Still, further research in different EFL contexts is needed. For future work, the participant pool can be enlarged. The role of proficiency on foreign language anxiety and spoken corrective feedback preferences of tertiary level learners who attend either a public or a private university can be compared. Plus, interviews with teachers and learners of different levels of proficiency can be added to the survey data.

REFERENCES

Abrar, M. (2017). An investigation into Indonesian EFL university students' speaking anxiety. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, *4* (2), 221-248.

Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *International Conference on Education and Educational Psychology,* 1859-1868.

Atar, C., & Seedhouse, P. (2018). A conversation- analytic perspective on the organization of teacher-led clarification and its implications for L2 teacher training. *International Journal of Instruction, 11* (2), 1308-1470.

Ay, S. (2010). Young adolescent students' foreign language anxiety in relation to language skills at different levels. *The Journal of International Social Research, 3* (11), 83-92.

Aydemir, O. (2011). A Study on the changes in the foreign language anxiety levels experienced by the students of the preparatory school at Gazi University during an academic year. (Published master's thesis). University of Gazi, Ankara, Turkey.

Aydın, B. (2001). A study of sources of foreign language classroom anxiety in speaking and writing classes. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

Balemir, S. H. (2009). The sources of foreign language speaking anxiety and the relationship between proficiency level and the degree of foreign language speaking anxiety. (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey.

Batumlu, Z. D., & Erden, M. (2007). Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu hazırlık öğrencilerinin yabancı dil kaygıları ile İngilizce başarıları arasındaki ilişki. [The relationship between foreign language anxiety and English achievement of Yıldız Techinical University School of Foreign Languages preparatory students]. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 3* (1), 24-38.

Clement, R. Gardner, R., & Smythe, P. (1977). Motivational variables in second language acquisition: *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement, 12* (4), 293-302.

Çağatay, S. (2015). Examining EFL students' foreign language speaking anxiety: The case at a Turkish state university. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 199*, 648-656.

Çetinkaya, G., & Hamzadayı, E. (2015). Yabancı dil olarak Türkçe öğretim sürecinde sözel düzeltme geribildirimleri: öğretmen ve öğrenci yeğleyişleri [Oral corrective feedbacks in Turkish as a foreign language teaching process: teachers' and students' preferences]. *Turkish Studies- International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, *10* (3), 285-302.

Dalkılıç, N. (2001). An investigation into the role of anxiety on students' success in second language learning. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Çukurova University, Adana, Turkey.

Debreli, E., & Demirkan, S. (2015). Sources and levels of foreign language speaking anxiety of English as a foreign language university student with regard to language proficiency and gender. *International Journal of English Language Education, 4* (1), 49-62.

Elaldı, Ş. (2016). Foreign language anxiety of students studying English Language and Literature: A Sample from Turkey. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *11* (6), 219-228.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, *1* (1), 3-18.

Ferreira, A., Moore, J.D., & Mellish, C. (2007). A study of feedback strategies in foreign language classrooms and tutorials with implications for intelligent computer-assisted language learning systems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *17*, 389-422.

Fidan, D. (2015). Learners' Preferences of Oral Corrective Feedback: An Example of Turkish as a Foreign Language Learners. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *10* (9), 1311-1317.

Fukuda, Y. (2004). *Treatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes*. (Unpublished master's thesis). California State University, San Francisco, USA.

Genç, Z.S. (2014). Correcting spoken errors in English language teaching: Preferences of Turkish EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Education and Science, 39* (174)*,* 259-271.

Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onhema, P., & Smeets, S. (2010). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary writing curriculum. *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*, 143–162.

Hashemian, M. & Mostaghasi, H. (2015). Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences in Iranian L2 Learners with Different Proficiency Levels. *English Language Teaching, 2* (3), 1-19.

Horwitz, E. K. (2001). Language anxiety and achievement. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*, 112– 126.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*, 125-132.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, B. M., & Cope, J. A. (1991). Foreign language classroom anxiety. In E. K. Horwitz & D. J. Young (Eds.), *Language anxiety: From theory and research to classroom implication* (pp. 27-36). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

IBM Corp. (2017). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0. Armonk, NY: IBM Corp.

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.

Kääntä, L., & Kasper, G. (2018). Clarification requests as a method of pursuing understanding in CLIL physics lectures. *Classroom Discourse, 9* (3), 205-226.

Kitano, K. (2001). Anxiety in the college Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 85* (4), 549-566.

Kondo, S., & Young, Y-L. (2003) The English language classroom anxiety scale: Test construction reliability and validity. *JALT Journal, 25* (2), 187-196.

Lee, E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41* (2), 217-230.

Li, S. (2017). Teacher and learner beliefs about corrective feedback. In H. Nassaji & E. Kartchava (Eds.), *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 143-157). NY: Routledge.

Liu, M. (2006). Anxiety in Chinese EFL students at different proficiency levels. *System, 34* (3), 301-316.

Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: how it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*, 271-283.

Luo, H. (2014). Foreign Language Speaking Anxiety: A Study of Chinese Language Learners. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages, 15*, 99-117.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *19*, 37-66.

Martin, S., & Alvarez Valdivia, I. M. (2017) Student feedback beliefs and anxiety in online foreign language oral tasks. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *14*, 1-15.

Ogino, M. (2012). Modified output, clarification requests and developmental progress of learner language: The case of negation of adjectives in L2 Japanese. *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics, 18* (1), 5-20.

Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on 'Noticing the gap': Nonnative speakers' noticing of recasts in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *25* (1), 99-126.

Renko, K. (2012). Finnish EFL Learners' perceptions on errors, corrective feedback and foreign language anxiety. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

Saito, Y., & Samimy, K. K. (1996). Foreign language anxiety and language performance: A study of learner anxiety in beginning, intermediate and advanced-level college students of Japanese. *Foreign Language Annals*, *29* (2), 239-251.

Smith, H. (2010). Correct me if I'm wrong: Investigating the preferences in error correction among adult English language students. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Central California, Florida, USA.

Surakka, K. (2007). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in an EFL classroom. (Published master's thesis). University of Jyväskylä, Finland.

Taşdemir, M. S., & Arslan, F. Y. (2018). Feedback preferences of EFL learners with respect to their learning styles. *Cogent Education, 5* (1), 11-17.

Tercan, G., & Dikilitaş, K. (2016). EFL students' speaking anxiety: a case from tertiary level students. *ELT Research Journal, 4* (1), 16-27.

Tianjian, W. (2010). Speaking anxiety: more of a function of personality than language achievement, *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics, 33* (5), 95-109.

Uyanıker, P. (2018). Turkish Teachers' and Students' Preferences of Error Correction in Different Levels of Proficiency. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *45*, 116-130.

Van den Boom, G., Paas, F., & Van Merriënboer, J. (2007). Effects of elicited reflections combined with tutor or peer feedback on self-regulated learning and learning outcomes. *Learning and Instruction*, *17*, 532-548.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

1. Giriş

Yabancı dil öğretmenlerinin pek çoğu, eğitim öğretim dili İngilizce olan bir üniversitede öğrenim görebilmek için hazırlık sınıfını başarılı bir şekilde tamamlayıp, İngilizce'de akademik yeterliliğini kanıtlamak zorunda olan üniversite hazırlık okulu öğrencilerinin yaşadığı yabancı dil kaygısına, mutlaka tanıklık etmişlerdir. Yabancı dil öğrenme kaygısı çoğu zaman öğrencinin negatif değerlendirilebileceği durumlardan kaçınması ve utanması olarak gözlemlenebilir. Bu kaygı, sınıf içi aktivitelerde öğrencinin sınıf arkadaşlarının önünde küçük düşme endişesinden ve sınavlarda başarısız olma korkusundan kaynaklanabilir (Horwitz, Horwitz ve Cope, 1991).

Bu stresli süreçte öğretmenler öğrencilere geribildirim verme yoluyla destek olurlar ki, sözlü iletişimde, yabancı dilde yapılan öğrenci hatalarına değişik şekillerde geribildirim verilebilir (Lyster ve Ranta, 1997). Düzeltici geribildirim dolaylı ya da dolaysız yollarla verilebilir. Dolaysız, direkt verilen geribildirim, doğrudan düzeltme, söyletim ve yeniden biçimlendirme olarak sınıflandırılırken, dolaylı olarak verilen geribildirim ise, açıklığa kavuşturma talebi, tekrarlama ve üstdilsel yorumlar olarak gruplandırılabilir. Örneğin, 'I visit my grandparents yesterday', cümlesindeki yanlışa öğretmen doğru zaman formunu direkt vererek *doğrudan düzeltme* yöntemi ile yaklaşabilir: 'Not "VISIT" —VISITED'. *Söyletim* yoluyla öğretmen tüm cümleyi sufle vererek öğrencinin bir yanlış yaptığının farkına varmasını sağlayabilir: 'I ...?'. Bir başka teknikle, öğretmen öğrencinin söylediği cümlenin bir kısmını ya da tamamını, yanlış kısım hariç, *yeniden biçimlendirme* ile verebilir: 'I visited'. Dolaylı verilen düzeltici sözlü geribildirimleri örneklendirirsek, öğretmen öğrenciye *açıklığa kavuşturma talebi* ile kurduğu cümleyi gözden geçirtebilir: 'Anlayamadım?'. Öğretmen, cümlenin sadece yanlış kısmını ya da tüm cümleyi tekrar ederek öğrencinin dikkatini yanlışın olduğu yere çekerek, *tekrarlama* metodunu kullanabilir: 'I VISIT?'. Ya da öğretmen konuşma yanlışı içeren cümle ile ilgili *üstdilsel bir yorum* yapabilir: 'Burada geçmiş zaman kullanman gerekir.' Tüm bu geribildirim mekanizmaları, farklı dil ve kaygı düzeyindeki öğrencilere farklı bağlamlarda, farklı biçimlerde kullanılabilir.

Yabancı dil yeterlilik düzeyinin, kaygı ve öğrenci geribildirim tercihleri üzerindeki etkisi hakkında yapılan araştırmalar çelişkili sonuçlar doğurmuştur. Bazı çalışmalar (Abrar, 2017; Dalkılıç, 2001; Liu, 2006; Tercan & Dikilitaş, 2015; Tianjian, 2010), düşük dil seviye grubundaki öğrencilerin daha fazla yabancı dil kaygısı deneyimlediklerini rapor ederken, diğerleri (Aydemir, 2011; Batumlu & Erden, 2007; Debreli & Demirkan, 2015; Elaldı, 2016; Kitano, 2001; Saito & Samimy, 1996) ileri dil seviyesindeki öğrencilerin yabancı dil kaygısından daha mustarip olduklarını bulmuşlardır. Alanyazında, yabancı dil yeterlilik düzeyinin, yabancı dil kaygı düzeyine anlamlı bir etkisi olmadığını gösteren çalışmalara (Balemir, 2009; Çağatay, 2015; Luo, 2014) da rastlanmak mümkündür. Bunlara ek olarak, başlangıç düzeyindeki öğrencilerin alımlayıcı becerileri, ileri düzey öğrencilerin ise üretken becerileri öğrenirken daha fazla kaygı deneyimledikleri gözlenmiştir (Ay, 2010).

Kaygı düzeyini hafifletmek için öğretmenler bir ya da birden çok geribildirim metoduna başvurabilirler. Öğretmenler, öğrencilerinin konuşurken yaptıkları hataları düzeltirken, dil seviyelerini göz önünde bulundurduklarını bildirmişlerdir (Li, 2017). Farklı seviye gruplarındaki öğrenciler de öğretmenlerinden geribildirim verirken dil seviyelerindeki farklılıkları göz önünde bulundurmalarını beklemektedirler (Uyanıker, 2018). Örneğin, öğrenciler, düzeyleri ne olursa olsun, yeniden biçimlendirme metoduyla geribildirim almayı tercih ederlerken, öğretmenler, öğrencinin yabancı dil seviyesi yükseldikçe, bu metottan uzaklaşmaktadırlar (Ahangari & Amirzadeh, 2011). Yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen Türk öğrenciler, sıkça yaptıkları ciddi hatalara, öğretmenin vereceği, doğrudan düzeltme, açıklığa kavuşturma talebi ve söyletim gibi metotlarla geribildirim almayı tercih etmektedirler (Taşdemir & Arslan, 2018). Daha düşük dil seviyesindeki öğrenci grupları, geribildirim konusunda özellikle öğretmenlerine güvenmektedirler. Dil seviyesi ne olursa olsun, yabancı dil öğrenen öğrenciler, akran geribildiriminden çok kendi hatalarını kendileri düzeltmeyi yeğlemektedirler (Genç, 2014). Geribildirimin verileceği zaman da değişiklik göstermektedir. Düşük yabancı dil seviyesindeki öğrenciler, anında geribildirim almayı tercih ederlerken, daha yüksek düzeydeki öğrenciler konuşurken yaptıkları hatalara geciktirilmiş geribildirim almak istemektedirler (Fidan, 2015). Farklı dil seviyelerindeki öğrenciler, düzeltici geri bildirimin olmamasının dil gelişimlerine katkısı olmayacağı konusunda hemfikirdirler. Tekrarlama, söyletim, açıklığa kavuşturma talebi gibi dolaylı hata düzeltme metotları yüksek dil düzeyindeki öğrencilerin geribildirim tercihleri olurken, doğrudan düzeltme gibi direkt hata düzeltme metotları alt düzey grupları tarafından daha çok yeğlenmektedir (Genç, 2014; Lee, 2013). Başlangıç ve ileri düzey gruplarındaki öğrenciler üstdilsel geribildirimden diğer gruplara göre daha fazla faydalandıklarını belirtmişlerdir (Ferreira, Moore & Mellish, 2007). Öte yandan, ileri düzey öğrencilerin söyletim metoduna, başlangıç düzeyindekilerin ise üstdilsel geribildirime daha fazla değer verdikleri de alanda rastlanan bulgular arasındadır (Kaivanpanah, Alavi & Sepehrinia, 2015). İlginç olan bulgulardan bir diğeri ise hata düzeltme metodu ne olursa olsun ileri düzey yabancı dil öğrencilerinin bu metoda karşı nötr bir tutum içinde olduklarıdır (Hashemian & Mostaghasi, 2015).

Bu çalışmanın amacı, öğrenici kaygı düzeyi ve sözlü düzeltici geribildirim inanışlarının dil yeterlilik düzeyiyle etkileşimi üzerine alanda süregelen tartışmaya katkıda bulunmaktır. Ele alınan araştırma soruları (i) başlangıç, ön orta, orta ve ileri düzeyde yabancı dil olarak İngilizce öğrenen üniversite hazırlık okulu öğrenicilerinin yabancı dil seviyelerine göre deneyimledikleri dil kaygısında farklılık olup olmadığı ve (ii) bu dört farklı dil düzeyindeki öğrenicilerin yabancı dil konuşurken aldıkları sözlü düzeltici geri bildirim hakkındaki inanışlarının birbirinden farklı olup olmadığıdır.

2. Yöntem

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Etik Komisyonundan gerekli izinler alındıktan sonra, veri yapılandırılmış anket yaklaşımı ile elde edilmiştir. Bu çalışmada kolaylıkla bulunabilen örnekleme yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmaya katılımda gönüllülük esastır. Anketten önce, her bir katılımcının yazılı onamı alınmıştır. Önce öğrenici demografik verisi alınmış daha sonra da Yabancı Dil Sınıfı Kaygı ölçeği (FLCAS) ve Düzeltici Geribildirim İnanç ölçeği (CFBS) tek bir doküman olarak, daha önce anketi nasıl uygulamaları konusunda eğitilmiş, İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yardımıyla 2019 bahar döneminin, yani ikinci dönemin 15. haftasındaki bir ders saati içerisinde uygulanmıştır. Bir devlet üniversitesindeki hazırlık sınıfı öğrenicileri olan katılımcılar ölçeklerdeki maddeleri dikkatli bir şekilde okuyup, kendilerine en doğru gelen şıkkı işaretlemeleri yönünde yönerge almışlardır. Doğru şıkkı/rakamı seçmek her bir maddedeki cümle ile hemfikir olma derecesini göstermektedir. Başlangıç, ön orta, orta ve ileri dil düzeyindeki 204 öğreniciden alınan veri analiz edilmiştir. Katılımcılar,18-25 yaş aralığındadırlar. İleri düzey grubundaki öğreniciler, en erken yaşta İngilizce ile tanışan grup olduklarını belirtmişlerdir. Ölçekleri tamamlamaları için, her bir katılımcıya yaklaşık 25 dakika verilmiştir. Tamamlanmış olan tüm ölçekler numaralandırılmış ve veri isimsiz bir şekilde girilmiştir. FLCAS'den alınan yüksek bir skor daha yüksek yabancı dil kaygısına denk gelmektedir. Benzer bir prosedür CFBS'nin analizi için de takip edilmiştir. Dört farklı dil düzeyindeki öğreniciler arasındaki yabancı dil kaygısı ve öğrenici sözlü düzeltici geri bildirim tercihleri istatistik programı SPSS versiyon 25 üzerinden analiz edilmiştir. Tek faktörlü varyans analizleri ve Bonferroni düzeltmeleri yapılmıştır.

3. Bulgular, Tartışma ve Sonuç

Dört farklı dil düzeyindeki öğreniciler arasındaki yabancı dil kaygısı göstergeleri dört başlık altında analiz edilmiştir; (i) olumsuz değerlendirilme korkusu, (ii) iletişim kaygısı, (iii) sınav kaygısı ve (iv) sınıf içi kaygı. Öğrenici düzeltici geri bildirim tercihleri ise (i) gerekliliği, (ii) sıklığı, (iii) yanlış türü, (iv) düzeltici geri bildirim tekniği ve (v) düzeltenin kim olduğu açısından irdelenmiştir. Bu çalışmanın ana bulgusu, yabancı dil seviyesinin öğrenicinin deneyimlediği yabancı dil kaygısını ve sözlü düzeltici geribildirim tercihlerini etkilediği yönündedir.

Öncelikle, ileri seviye grubunda olan katılımcılar, başlangıç düzeyindekilerden yaş olarak daha küçüktürler, fakat bu farklılık istatistiksel olarak anlamlı değildir (F (3) =2.02, *p*=.12). Öte yandan, İngilizce'ye ilk defa maruz kalma yaşı göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, ileri düzeydeki öğreniciler alt seviye gruplarından anlamlı bir şekilde ayrışmaktadırlar (F (3) =8.33, *p*<.001).

Alandaki diğer çalışmalara (örn., Debreli & Demirkan, 2015; Elaldı, 2015) paralel olarak, bu çalışma da, dil seviyesi arttıkça yabancı dil kaygısının azaldığı yönündeki bulguları desteklemektedir. Başlangıç ve ön orta düzeydeki öğreniciler orta ve ileri dil seviyesindeki öğrenicilere nazaran olumsuz değerlendirilme ve sınavlarda başarısız olma korkusu yaşadıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bu farklılığın sebebi olarak, özellikle ileri düzey öğrenicilerin dile daha erken yaşlarda maruz kalmış olmaları ve dil öğrenimi ile ilgili pek çok deneyimleri olduğu için kaygı ile baş edebilme mekanizmalarını oldukça geliştirmiş oldukları belirtilebilir.

Sözlü geribildirim öğrenici tercihlerine gelince, dil başarı seviyesine bakmaksızın tüm gruplar, özellikle ileri ve başlangıç seviye grupları konuşmadaki hataların düzeltilmesinin gerekliliğine inanmaktadırlar. Başlangıç seviyesindeki öğreniciler, zorunlu olarak üç dönem eğitim öğretim gördükleri için, verilen geribildirimi öğretmenin öğrenicilere benimsettiği günlük bir ritüel olarak algılıyor olabilirler. İleri seviye gruplarının çoğunun başlayacakları bölümler İngilizce öğretmenliği, dilbilim, Batı dilleri ve edebiyatı, Mütercim tercümanlık gibi meslek olarak dil ile ilgili çalışacakları bölümler olduğu için, bu öğreniciler geribildirimin öneminin farkındadırlar. Bu bulgu da alandaki diğer bulgularla (örn., Martin & Alvarez Valdivia, 2017; Lee, 2013) örtüşmektedir.

Geribildirimin zamanlaması göz önünde bulundurulduğunda, özellikle ileri seviye grupları konuşmaları bittikten sonra geri bildirim almak istediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Başlangıç ve ön orta düzey grupları anında geribildirim tercih ederlerken, orta ve ileri dil seviyesindeki gruplar geciktirilmiş geribildirimden yanadırlar. Bu farklılık öğrenicilerin geribildirimin farklılığı konusundaki farkındalıklarından kaynaklanabilir (Ellis, 2009). Üst dil seviye grupları dile hakimiyetlerine güvendikleri için, konuşmalarının sonuna kadar dinlenmesini istemektedirler ki böylece yaptıkları hataları kendi kendilerine düzeltebilirler, alt dil seviye grupları ise anlaşılmalarını engelleyecek, dinleyicinin kafasının karışabileceği hatalardan arınmak için sürekli işlevde olan bir hata düzeltme mekanizmasını tercih edebilirler. Bu bulgu da alandaki diğer çalışmaları (örn., Fidan, 2015; Smith, 2010) destekler niteliktedir.

Dil seviyeleri dikkate alınmaksızın, tüm gruplar geribildirim alınmamasının dil gelişimlerine katkısı olmayacağını belirtmişlerdir. Ön orta ve orta düzeydeki öğreniciler, doğrudan geribildirimin ve söyletimin diğer geribildirim türlerine göre daha etkili olduğuna inanmaktadırlar. Başlangıç ve ileri düzeydeki öğreniciler, üstdilsel geribildirime yönelik pozitif bir bakış açısına sahiptirler. Söyletim, ileri düzey öğreniciler haricinde, tüm gruplar tarafından faydalı görülmüştür. Alandaki diğer çalışmalara (Lochtman, 2002; Surakka, 2007) paralel olarak, yeniden şekillendirme, en az tercih edilen düzeltme metodu olarak rapor edilmiştir. Yeniden şekillendirmenin diğer metotlara göre daha az tercih edilmiş olmasının sebeplerinden biri, konuşurken, geri bildirim olarak kolay anlaşılamayan bir metot olmasıdır (Philp, 2003). Bu çalışmanın bulguları Renko (2012)'nin bulguları ile de örtüşmektedir. Kaygı düzeyini azaltan iki metot olan üstdilsel geribildirim ve doğrudan geribildirim özellikle bu çalışmadaki kaygı düzeyi yüksek olan başlangıç ve ön orta düzey öğreniciler tarafından tercih edilmiştir.

Neredeyse tüm dil seviyesindeki öğreniciler, ciddi gördükleri, sık yaptıkları bireysel hatalarının düzeltilmesini istediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Verilen ölçekte, öğrenicilerden, hatanın sıklığını, bireyselliğini ve ciddiyetini 1'den 5'e kadar bir skala üzerinde derecelendirmeleri istenmiştir. Bu derecelendirmede, öğrenicilerin düzeltilme isteği aralıkları 1- asla (0%), 2- nadiren (20%), 3- bazen (50%), 4- sıklıkla (80%) ve 5- her zaman (100%) olarak verilmiştir. Bu derecelendirmeyi öğreniciler tamamen kişisel tercihlerine göre yapmışlardır. Özellikle ileri düzey öğreniciler sıklığının ve ciddiyetinin, diğer hatalarına göre daha az olduğunu düşündüğü hatalarının daha az düzeltilmesini tercih etmişlerdir. Benzer bir eğilim başlangıç düzeyindeki öğrenicilerde de gözlenmiştir. Tüm dil seviye grupları nadiren tekrarladıkları hatalarının göz ardı edilebileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Tüm gruplar, diğer arkadaşlarından farklı olan bireysel hatalarının öğretmenler tarafından takip edilip düzeltilmesini beklemektedirler.

Dil düzeyine bakılmaksızın tüm öğreniciler hatalarının öğretmenleri tarafından etkili bir şekilde düzeltilebileceğine inanmaktadırlar. Bunun bir nedeni, Gielen, Tops, Dochy, Onhema ve Smeets (2010)'in de rapor ettiği üzere, öğrenicilerin, kendi yaşadıkları zorlukları anlamak ve problemleri çözmek açısından öğretmenlerinin deneyimlerine güvenmeleridir. Bir başka gerekçe ise, Van den Boom, Paas ve Van Merriënboer (2007)'in de belirttiği gibi, öğretmenin verdiği geribildirimin daha detaylı ve güvenilir olmasıdır. Geribildirim kaynağı olarak öğreniciler ikinci sırada kendilerini ve en son sırada da akranlarını görmektedirler. Başlangıç ve ön orta düzeydeki öğreniciler akranlarına bu konuda kesinlikle güvenmemektedirler.

Son olarak, yabancı dil kaygısı ikinci bir dildeki anlama ve üretme becerilerini engelleyebilir. Kaygı, konsantrasyonu ve bilginin hatırlanmasını da zorlaştırabilir. Kaygının negatif etkilerinin üstesinden gelebilmek ve öğrenici performansına sekte vurmaması açısından, öğretmenler öğrenicilerinin dil seviyelerini de göz önünde bulundurarak, ders akışlarını şekillendirebilirler ki bunun için aşağıdaki öneriler göz önünde bulundurulabilir:

- Öğrenicilerin kaygı düzeyleri ve dil seviyeleri göz önünde bulundurularak müfredatlar/programlar hazırlanabilir.
- Öğrenici gözünde öğretmenin temel geribildirim veren kaynak olduğu unutulmamalıdır.
- Sözlü düzeltici geribildirim verilirken seçici olunabilir ve en çok sıkça tekrarlanan ciddi hatalar üzerinde durmak gerekebilir.
- Geri bildirimin zamanlamasına karar verirken sınıf dil düzeyi göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır.
- Değişik dil seviyelerindeki gruplara farklı sözlü düzeltici geribildirim verilmesi konusunda öğretmenlerin farkındalığı olmalıdır.

Bu çalışma öğrenicilerin inanışları hakkında öğretmenlere iç görü sağlamaktadır. Gelecekte farklı yabancı dil öğretilen bağlamlarda, bu tip çalışmalara ihtiyaç vardır. Gelecekteki çalışmalarda, katılımcı havuzu genişletilebilir. Özel ve devlet üniversitelerindeki öğrenicilerin yabancı dil kaygısı ve sözlü düzeltici geribildirim yeğleyişleri karşılaştırılabilir. Farklı düzey gruplarındaki öğrenicilerle ve bu gruplara giren öğretmenlerle yapılan görüşmeler de anket verisine eklenebilir.

ÇALISMANIN ETİK IZNİ

Yapılan bu çalışmada "Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Yönergesi" kapsamında uyulması belirtilen tüm kurallara uyulmuştur. Yönergenin ikinci bölümü olan "Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiğine Aykırı Eylemler" başlığı altında belirtilen eylemlerden hiçbiri gerçekleştirilmemiştir.

Etik kurul izin bilgileri

Etik değerlendirmeyi yapan kurul adi= Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, Sosyal ve Beşerî Bilimlerde İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (SBINAREK)

Etik değerlendirme kararının tarihi= 05.04.2019

Etik değerlendirme belgesi sayı numarası= 2019/04