Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review
Vol. 5, Issue 2, 2024 (April – June)
ISSN 2707-9023 (online), ISSN 2707-9015 (Print)
ISSN 2707-9015 (ISSN-L)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.36902/rjsser-vol5-iss2-2024(112-120)

RJSSER
Research Journal of Social Sciences & Economics Review

Delayed vs Immediate Corrective Feedback: An Anxiety Measure among ESL Secondary Level Learners in Punjab

* Zobia Tariq, MPhil (Applied Linguistics)

** Dr. Muhammad Imran Shah, Lecturer (Corresponding Author)

Abstract:

The timing of corrective feedback (CF) can induce anxiety among ESL learners, the fear of making mistakes and immediate correction of error during oral interaction makes them more anxious. The correlation between CF timing (Immediate or delayed) and foreign language anxiety (FLA) is contemplated to have a momentous effect on language development, providing immediate CF may alleviate FLA and hinder language accuracy while delayed CF improves accuracy in foreign language learning. The primary aim of this study is to explore L2 learners' anxiety level induced by the provision of CF and its effect on their oral accuracy. This study involves 200 ESL secondary level learners selected by purposeful sampling technique, divided into immediate CF group (G1) and delayed CF group (G2), employing a mixed-methods approach, integrating the collection of quantitative data through a language anxiety questionnaire (FLCAS), and the qualitative data through open-ended responses. For the analysis of quantitative data SPSS, and Excel by Microsoft are employed while, qualitative data is analyzed using Grounded Theory by generating themes. The findings demonstrate that delayed CF had a significant impact in reducing anxiety levels among ESL secondary level learners, leading to improved oral accuracy and boosted self-confidence. The study acknowledges its limitations, including the limited sample size and dependence on self-reported questionnaire. Also, highlights the significance of addressing continued examination of CF's temporal factor as well as foreign language anxiety in language classrooms. The research in its final recommendations advocates that educational material developers should design natural oral production tasks and opportunities to engage learners in them without being anxious about making errors.

Keywords: Immediate Corrective Feedback, Delayed Corrective Feedback, ESL Learners, Anxiety, Accuracy

Introduction

The status of English as a "global language" makes it an essential language to be learn and acquire. Mastery of the English language fosters interaction among diverse cultures that leads to intercultural communication as well as cooperation expertise. Mastery of four basic language skills (speaking, reading, listening and writing) is thought to be essential for personal growth as well as social interaction. Speaking is a vital component of language learning, which requires a high degree of proficiency because it involves active participation, negotiation of meaning, and constant adjusting to changing contexts. Fluency and accuracy in speaking are seen as fundamental skills to be acquired and their development can be linked to a number of variables, including motivation as well as corrective feedback (Housen et al., 2012). When the teachers should speak? Is there a right time to correct errors? What happens if you correct errors immediately now rather than delaying? These questions are imperative for second language learners, teachers, and researchers (Quinn, 2014).

According to Ellis (2017), corrective feedback (CF), which is an essential part of teaching and learning in a variety of L2 classrooms, has caught the attention of both L2 teachers and scholars in the disciplines of Applied Linguistics as well as Second Language Acquisition (SLA). CF can be delivered orally, such as when teachers correct students' spoken errors, or in writing, such as when teachers provide written feedback on students' written tasks (Li & Vuono, 2019). Immediate error correction and delayed error correction are two of the most popular methods of error correction. The former is immediate feedback, always done during the learner's speech, the teacher corrects them

* Government College University Faisalabad Email: linggcuf@gmail.com
** PhD (Applied Linguistics) Universiti Utara Malaysia / Lecturer, Government College University Faisalabad Email: m.imran.shah@gcuf.edu.pk

quickly, which can be advantageous in maintaining the accuracy of oral production. The latter delayed correction approach, prefers to delay the correction after a learner has committed a mistake until the learner has completed the sentence or concept before interjecting. This is aimed frequently to prevent interfering with fluency practice.

The relationship between the provision of CF and educational outcomes depends heavily on the perceptions and emotions of students. According to Ellis (2010), how students respond to CF has a direct bearing on their level of student with learning. The presence of explicit individual variations and thoughts, like anxiety, may preclude students from being competent in language learning. Teachers understand the value of providing meaningful feedback as well as the benefits of correcting learner errors right away to help them develop their communication skills (Rahimi & Zhang, 2015). The idea of foreign language anxiety (FLA) was introduced by Horwitz et al. (1986). FLA develops when people engage in a language that is not their mother tongue. Nearly all language learners endure some extent of anxiety in language classes, particularly while speaking in front of others or taking part in oral activities.

Notably it has been observed that, students who experience greater levels of anxiety are less likely to engage in oral tasks intended for classroom activities, which may lead to difficulties in speaking in front of their peers. This is consistent with the findings of Gkonou and Miller (2019), "anxious learners are much less likely to participate in speaking". Additionally, Horwitz et al. (1986) developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), a measure consisting of 33 Likert scale questions graded from strongly agree to strongly disagree, to determine FLA that elevates when learners speak in target language. The relationship between anxiety and SLA has been studied by several studies using FLCAS or its adaption, the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS) and Foreign Language Writing Anxiety Scale (FLWAS) (Matsuda & Gobel 2004; Mamhot et al., 2013; Amiri & Ghonsooly, 2015; Anggraini & Wijaya 2018; Berowa, 2018; Teimouri et al., 2019).

This study aims to determine a possible intervention of the question, how immediate or delayed CF may trigger FLA among ESL learners and impact their performance in the classroom. Moreover, the research aims to have a deeper understanding of the intricate relationship between speaking accuracy and language anxiety as a result of provision of CF.

Research Hypotheses

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1)

It is anticipated that provision of delayed CF will lower anxiety levels while concurrently improving language accuracy, while obtaining immediate CF will raise anxiety levels. The degree of FLA that is experienced by ESL learners during oral production in classroom is significantly affected by timing (delayed or immediate) of CF.

Null Hypothesis (H_0)

The level of anxiety that ESL students experience when using a foreign language is not considerably affected by the timing of CF. In particular, neither the anxiety levels caused by immediate CF nor the degree of accuracy of language is significantly different when compared to delayed CF.

Research Questions

The subsequent research questions will be addressed in this investigation:

1. What is the attitude of L2 secondary level learners about the variations among immediate and delayed CF in the context of how much anxiety they encounter?
2. What do L2 secondary-level learners feel about how foreign language anxiety affects how well they produce oral language?
3. What is the perception of secondary-level learners about the effect of anxiety on accuracy?

Literature Review

Theoretical Approaches to CF Timing

The proposition regarding the provision of CF is that its effectiveness increases when the learner is conscious of its corrective aim which is in accordance with Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis which asserts that learners must first notice the features of L2 in order to acquire them. Theories related to CF have seen a significant progress over the years across numerous educational fields. The century-old theory of "Behaviorism" was once well-known among the behaviorists. This theory was oriented towards psychology that placed the learners as stimulus respondents. Behaviorism interprets learning as the formation of habits, emphasizing the need to promptly address mistakes to prevent

them from becoming undesirable habits. Constructing positive habits entails continual reinforcement of responses through feedback confirming their accuracy (Watson & Thorndike, 1913; as cited by Smith, 2020).

Theories supporting the provision of feedback also include Krashen's Input Hypothesis. According to Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1977, 1985) language is acquired by humans only one way by the comprehension of messages or by receiving "comprehensible input" we proceed prom from our current stage (i) to the subsequent stage (i +1), in the inherent sequence by comprehending input that includes (i+1). He proposed that feedback can elevate the "affective filter" which includes anxiety and motivation that hinders the subconscious acquisition of L2. Feedback forces students to restructure the target language (TL), input, and output necessary for communication. The process of restructuring the TL to a level above their current level of competence can provide learners with intelligible input, which can be gained (i+1) to help them acquire L2.

Schmidt (1990) put forward the argument that learners must be aware of the disparity between the information they receive as input and the output they generate. The Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1990) foundations rest on the conversion of input into intake. As per this hypothesis, constructive feedback has significant value in facilitating the process of acquisition as it serves as a guiding light for learners to recognize the gap between purposeful input and individual's inter-language structures. Noticing is crucial and "intake is what learners consciously notice" has been used to describe the effective functioning of CF in the L2 learning process (Schmidt, 1990, p. 149). Schmidt discovered that learners who receive CF are more likely to recognize their mistakes and correct them. However, the researcher also discovered that CF induces anxiety, particularly if it is given in a critical or negative manner. The arguments put forth by Schmidt have gained substantial employment in the field of L2-instructed investigations.

Research on CF Timing

The timing of CF has been an overlooked area in SLA research, and it has recently gained interest. Depending on the condition as well as on the situation in the classroom CF can be immediate or delayed. During the 1950s and 60s, theorists influenced by behaviorism urged the avoidance of errors and suggested minimal delay between learners' errors and the delivery of CF by the teacher. According to Doughty (2001) as cited by Salimi et al. (2015) the immediate provision of CF in the context of meaning-focused interaction is vital for effectiveness. Moreover, Loewen (2005) found that classroom teachers offer both immediate as well as delayed CF. Transfer Appropriate Processing (TAP), a cognitively oriented approach relating to CF timing, suggests that both immediate and delayed CF can assist in the formation of various kinds of L2 knowledge.

Rassaei (2014) suggested that there is no significant correlation between immediate and delayed recast (50%-56%). To put it another way, timing does not affect learners. When immediate and delayed feedback receive equal receive equal, delayed feedback typically outperforms (Mullet et al., 2014). This can be justified by the Interference-Perseveration Hypothesis, which suggests mistakes create less interference since they are forgotten because of the delay, and the Spacing Theory, supporting that delayed feedback creates spaced instruction. Nakata (2015) conducted research on vocabulary and determined that delayed feedback led to better performance as compared to immediate feedback. Abedi et al., (2016) investigated the perceptions of Iranian EFL students on how CF affects their anxiety levels. Two self-reporting surveys were given to participants in order to collect data. Chi-square measurements were created to analyze the results, the data revealed substantial differences between the perceptions of both groups regarding CF effectiveness. Meanwhile, it was also recommended that teachers must understand EFL learners' preferences and anxiety level for correction.

Furthermore, the results of two recent meta-analyses (Zhang, 2019; Teimouri et al., 2019) revealed a substantial negative correlation between FLA and L2 achievement. Based on the findings of Teimouri et al. (2019) and Zhang (2019), the mean impact sizes were -0.36 and -0.34, suggesting that anxiety may be responsible for up-to 12% and 9% variation in L2 accomplishment, respectively. For this reason, it is imperative that researchers and foreign language instructors focus on CF methods as well as student well-being as interrelated components of effective FL instruction and learning.

Methodology

Research Design

The current inquiry adopted a mixed-methods approach to gather and analyze data. According to Creswell (2014), a mixed methods approach is a research methodology that entails gathering both qualitative and quantitative data, integrating the two forms of information, and utilizing distinctive designs. A pragmatic philosophical stance was the decisive element in choosing mixed methods research, and the objectives of this study necessitated the use of both quantitative and qualitative measures. The FLCAS questionnaire developed by Horwitz et al. (1986) was employed to collect data closed-ended data on learners' attitudes towards the timing of CF, the anxiety it causes, and how it affects oral production. Moreover, the investigation of potential relationships between CF (immediate and delayed) and improvements in accuracy or fluency levels was conducted concurrently with the collection of qualitative data via open-ended inquiries to know learners' in-depth opinions.

Population

The participants of the present research were ESL secondary-level learners from Punjab Pakistan. According to the school education department of the government of Punjab (2023), the total number of secondary-level students enrolled in government as well as private institutions were 1.63 million. The participants of the research were 200 ESL secondary-level students, representing both genders, selected via purposeful sampling, hailing from various educational institutions of Faisalabad, including both public and private sectors. Later, these 200 participants were randomly divided into two groups (G_1 and G_2), each consisting of 100 learners. The control group (G_1) was provided immediate CF while the experimental group (G_2) was treated with delayed CF on their errors.

Data Collection

At the time of research, every student in the selected population was mandated to take English as an obligatory course in their academic program. Each English class was a of minimum 45 minutes long and was held at least between six and seven times a week. The data was collected over the course of six weeks. The researcher firmly believed that a clear elucidation of the research's objectives and key concepts was crucial in obtaining accurate insights from the learners. Thus, in the first encounter, the researcher elucidated the idea of CF, the timing of CF, its approaches, the idea of anxiety in learning a foreign language, and lastly, the notion of accuracy in oral production. The following five weeks were allocated for treatment, encompassing ten sessions each lasting for 45 minutes in total. The last session was specifically allocated for the distribution of the questionnaire to both groups (G_1, G_2) comprising of both open-ended questions and 20 close-ended questions from FLCAS using a 5-points Likert scale varying from strongly agree (SA) to strongly disagree (SD).

Data Analysis

The quantitative data gathered from the survey questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS version 23.0. The data collected from both the control group namely G_1, and experimental group G_2 were inferred by utilizing descriptive statistics that included, mean (M), standard deviation (S.D) and frequencies as well, and inferential data based on independent sample t-test. The qualitative data obtained from learners' responses to the open-ended questions was analyzed applying Grounded Theory elucidated by Titscher et al., (2000). The data was classified by common themes and the interrelation between these was established to give possible insights into how anxiety impacts on oral accuracy.

Data Analysis and Results

To analyze the responses to the research questions, statistical tool SPSS 23.0 was utilized to evaluate the quantitative and qualitative data obtained from the questionnaire.

Close-ended Items Analysis

The descriptive and inferential statistics for data analysis from closed-ended items are as following.

Table 1: Results of Descriptive and Inferential Statistics.

Sr.no	Question	Groups	M	SD	t-value	df	p-value
1	I never feel quite sure of myself when I am speaking in my foreign language class.	G_1	3.50	1.439	2.119	198	.035
		G_2	3.07	1.430		197.993	
2	I don't worry about making mistakes in language class.	G_1	3.02	1.477	1.920	198	.056
		G_2	2.62	1.469		197.994	
3	I tremble when I know that I'm going to be called on in language class.	G_1	3.29	1.217	2.036	198	.043
		G_2	2.91	1.415		193.662	

4	I start to panic when I have to speak without preparation in language class.	G_1	3.40	1.385	2.058	198	.041
		G_2	3.00	1.363		197.949	
5	Even if I am well prepared for my language class, I feel anxious about it.	G_1	3.73	1.479	1.873	198	.032
		G_2	3.35	1.441		197.837	
6	I feel confident when I speak English in my English class.	G_1	3.79	1.399	1.147	198	.044
		G_2	3.38	1.389		196.784	
7	I worry about the consequences of failing my foreign language class.	G_1	3.49	1.573	2.052	198	.041
		G_2	3.06	1.384		194.840	
8	In language class, I can get so nervous I forget things I know.	G_1	3.93	1.691	4.212	198	.011
		G_2	3.08	1.340		197.468	
9	It embarrasses me to volunteer answers in my language class.	G_1	3.46	1.359	2.151	198	.033
		G_2	3.05	1.336		197.943	
10	I get upset when I don't understand what the teacher is correcting.	G_1	3.98	1.592	4.303	198	.023
		G_2	3.21	1.275		196.912	
11	Even if I am well prepared for language class, I feel anxious about it.	G_1	3.63	1.321	2.678	198	.047
		G_2	3.45	1.329		195.347	
12	I feel confident when I speak in foreign language class.	G_1	3.56	1.242	2.872	198	.005
		G_2	3.04	1.317		197.309	
13	I am afraid that my language teacher is ready to correct every mistake I make.	G_1	3.89	1.197	4.151	198	.000
		G_2	3.11	1.449		191.185	
14	I can feel my heart pounding when I'm going to be called on in language class.	G_1	3.87	1.183	4.096	198	.038
		G_2	3.48	1.368		194.756	
15	I feel very self-conscious about speaking the foreign language in front of other students.	G_1	3.52	1.235	2.819	198	.005
		G_2	3.01	1.322		197.089	
16	I feel more tense and nervous in my language class than in my other classes.	G_1	3.97	1.121	2.811	198	.033
		G_2	3.36	1.299		194.967	
17	I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my language class.	G_1	3.58	1.312	3.443	198	.001
		G_2	2.93	1.358		197.766	
18	I feel overwhelmed by the number of rules you have to learn to speak a foreign language.	G_1	3.40	1.477	1.661	198	.098
		G_2	3.08	1.236		192.054	
19	I am afraid that the other students will laugh at me when I speak the foreign language.	G_1	3.36	1.389	2.017	198	.045
		G_2	2.97	1.344		197.787	
20	I would probably feel comfortable around native speakers of the foreign language.	G_1	3.15	1.410	-2.471	198	.014
		G_2	3.62	1.277		196.108	

$*p<0.05$

The findings of FLCAS close-ended items revealed that although learners from both groups (G_1, G_2) experienced FLA when speaking English and provided CF on their errors by teachers but, the amount of anxiety varies substantially among the learners of both groups. For example, the learners who were provided immediate CF on their errors experienced elevated levels of FLA in comparison to the learners who were treated with delayed CF on their errors. The learners of G_1 were more conscious, anxious, less self-assured, and worried compared to the learners of G_2, who reported elevated levels of self-assurance, less anxiety, and fear in speaking English in the language classrooms. The p-value of each item except two items (2 and 18) was less than the significant p-value ($p<0.05$) indicating that there is a substantial variation between the two groups.

Open-ended Items Analysis

The data from the open-ended questions related to perceptions of learners about the effect of anxiety on their learning abilities, timing for self-error correction and accuracy was analyzed using the grounded theory (Titscher et al., 2000). The table given below presents the categories of data obtained from both groups based on emerging themes.

Q: 21. What are your views about effects of foreign language anxiety on your learning abilities?

Q: 22. How do you view the provision of immediate CF and delayed CF in terms of time for self-error correction?

Q: 23. What do you think about the effect of foreign language anxiety on your oral accuracy?

Table 2: Themes Generated from (G_1) and (G_2) Responses.

Themes	**Immediate CF Group (G_1)**	**Delayed CF Group (G_2)**
Confidence	Reduced	Boosted
Pressure	High Pressure	Reduced Pressure
Improvement Ability	Hindered	Facilitated
Motivation	Demotivated	Increased
Learning Mindset	Negative	Positive
Time for Error Correction	Insufficient Time	More time
Anxiety Effects	Impaired Focus	Improved Focus
Accuracy	Affected	Enhanced

The learners' response to first open-ended items was categorized into five themes namely confidence, pressure, improvement ability, motivation and learning-mindset. Likewise, form second questions response the theme time for error correction was generated and form the last question two themes i.e., anxiety effects and accuracy was developed. The learners of G_1 in response to the open-ended items reported a low level of oral accuracy as a result of high levels of anxiety, pressure, low level of motivation, and confidence due to the provision of immediate CF. Nevertheless, the learners from G_2 reported low levels of FLA, pressure, and elevated levels of motivation and self-confidence that helped in improved language accuracy.

Discussion According to SLA researchers, there is a correlation between the timing of CF provided to learners on their mistakes, resulted FLA and their target language accuracy. Furthermore, CF (immediate & delayed) that is provided by language teachers have the potential to trigger learner's anxiety (Ellis, 2010; Shabani & Safari, 2016). In order to fully comprehend how CF affects anxiety, it is critical to take individual differences into account. Thus, the foremost goal of this research was to discover how learners perceive immediate and delayed CF in relation to FLA and accuracy. In this regard, data were collected using twenty closed-ended items from FLCAS and three open-ended questions. The results of quantitative data disclosed that there was a noteworthy variation between the levels of anxiety experienced by the learners of both groups.

The descriptive statistical analysis of the first item revealed that students of G_1 were more uncertain and nervous (M= 3.50, SD=1.439) as compared to G_2 (M=3.07, SD=1.430). Moreover, the inferential statistical analysis (t=2.119, p=0.035) showed that there was a substantial difference in nervousness experienced by both groups in language classrooms. The second was related to worry of making mistakes the learners of G_1 were more worried (M=3.02, SD=1.477) about errors in comparison to G_2 learners (M=2.62, SD=1.469) but, the inferential statistics (t=1.920, p=0.056) revealed that there was not a substantial difference as the learners of both groups were worried about the language errors. The third item was related to trembling when called on stage, the G_1 learners reported a higher level of trembling (M=3.29, SD=1.217, t=2.036, p=0.043) in contrast to G_2 learners (M=2.91, SD=1.415), the high t-value and lower p-value also indicated the prominent difference in response of both groups.

The analysis of the item related to panic level showed that the learners of G_2 were less panic when speaking without preparation (M=3.00, SD=1.363) in comparison to G_1 learners (M=3.40, SD=1.385). Moreover, the inferential statistics also revealed a significant difference (t=2.058, p=0.041) in the panic level of the groups. The next item was related to anxiety after preparation the G_2 learners expressed less anxiousness (M=3.35, SD=1.441, t=1.873, p=0.032), while one the other side, the participants of G_1 expressed elevated levels of anxiety even after preparation (M=3.73, SD=1.479), the low p-value and high t-value also specified the difference among the groups. In the same vain, when the learners were inquired about their confidence level when speaking English in classroom, the findings of inferential statistics of G_1 (M=3.79, SD=1.399) in comparison to G_2

(M=3.38, SD=1.389, t=1.147, p=0.044) showed that the confidence level of immediate CF group was lower than delayed CF, the p-value also evidenced the difference in response.

Additionally, the response analysis to item-related worry of failing in the classroom disclosed that the respondents of G_1 were more nervous about the outcomes of failing (M=3.49, SD=1.573), in comparison with G_2 (M=3.06, SD=1.384). Furthermore, the inferential statistical analysis unveiled a prominent difference in the response of the groups (t=2.052, p=0.041). The subsequent question measured the response of learners regarding the anxiety of forgetting, the G_2 learners were more calm and relaxed (M=3.08, SD=1.340) as compared to G_1 (M=3.93, SD=1.691). The soaring t-value (4.212) and sunken p-value (0.011) demonstrated the difference between both groups. The next item was related to the embracement experience in the classroom and unfolded that the learners of G_2 were less embraced (M=3.44, SD=1.336), while students of G_1 experienced more fear of embracement (M=3.46, SD=1.359) in the classroom with high t-value (t=2.151, p=0.033) demonstrating a substantial difference in the experience of both groups.

Moving ahead, the item ten of questionnaire was related learners' confusion regarding teacher's CF, the learners of G_1 who are given immediate CF by teacher on errors were more confused and upset (M=3.98, SD=1.592) because they had no enough time to identify, understand, and correct the mistake they made while, the G_2 (M=3.21, SD=1.275, t=4.303, p=0.023) were less upset in this matter, the inferential statistical analysis i.e., t-value and p-value expressed the difference among groups. Likewise, the succeeding item measured the level of anxiety despite of preparation. The descriptive analysis revealed elevated level of nervousness of participants of G_1 (M=3.63, SD=1.321) in contrast to G_2 (M=3.45, SD=1.329). The learners of delayed CF also exhibited anxiety but less than immediate CF group, this difference was also verified by inferential statistical analysis in which the high t-value (2.678) and p-value (0.047) lower than significant p-value showed the variance in response of both groups.

The question related to confidence in speaking English demonstrated a considerable difference in both groups (t=2.872, p=0.005), the G_2 learners were more confident (M=3.04, SD=1.317) while speaking in English in contrast to G_1 (M=3.56, SD=1.242). The subsequent item was associated with the fear of correction by the language instructor, the G1 participants who received immediate CF on their error reported a high level of anxiety (M=3.89, SD=1.197) in comparison to G_2 learners who experienced reduced anxiety (M=3.11, SD=1.449) due to the provision of delayed CF on their errors. The undetectable zero p-value (0.000) and extremely high t-value (4.151) suggested a noteworthy dissimilarity among the groups. In response to the question related to anxiety while participating in classroom both groups experienced anxiety, but this was high in G_1 (M=3.87, SD=1.183) and comparatively low in G_2 (M=3.48, SD=1.368). Moreover, the inflated t-value (4.096) and deflated p-value (0.038) also signified the difference in anxiety experience of both groups.

Likewise, the response against the question about self-consciousness while speaking in front of other learners the G_1 learners were more self-conscious (M=3.52, SD=1.235) as compared to G_2 learners (M=3.01, SD=1.322), the inferential statistics (t=2.819, p=0.005) also demonstrated a huge difference between these groups as p-value was very low than significant p-value. Additionally, the learners' response to question related high tension and nervousness in language classroom compared to other classes exhibited that both groups experienced these feelings but these were highly experienced by the participants of G_1 (M=3.97, SD=1.121) in comparison to G_2 (M=3.36, SD=1.299), the results of t-value (2.811) of p-value (0.033) also revealed the disparity in both groups' response. The next question was about nervousness and confusion while speaking, the G1 learners who were treated with immediate CF were more nervous and confused (M=3.58, SD=1.312) in comparison to G_2 learners who were given delayed CF (M=2.93, SD=1.358). Furthermore, inferential statistical analysis (t=3.443, p=0.001) validated a substantial difference in nervousness as well as confusion in both groups.

The response to the question about feeling overwhelmed when learning new language rules the G_1 participants were more overwhelmed (M=3.40, SD=1.477) after learning new language rules, while learners of G_2 were less excited (M=3.08, SD=1.236) about learning new structures also, very high p-value (t=1.661, p=0.098) in inferential analysis indicated there was no noteworthy difference in feelings of both groups. The second last question was about the fear of peer laugh pointed out that G_1 (M=3.36, SD=1.389) learners were more anxious as compared to G_2 (M=2.97, SD=1.344) who reported a low level of fear of being laughed, and also, t-value (2.017) and p-value (0.045) indicated a

high concern of social judgment among learners. The final question was about speaking with natives, the G_2 participants were more comfortable (M=3.62, SD=1.277) in comparison to G_1 (M=3.15, SD=1.410) as their confidence level was low due to anxiety and fear. Moreover, the inferential analysis (t=-2.471, p=0.014) showed a substantial statistical variation in the anxiety and comfort of both groups.

Based on the outcomes discussed above, it can be determined that ESL learners have different attitudes toward the delivery of immediate as well as delayed CF in terms of the anxiety they face. The data analysis confirmed that the students in both the control group and the experimental group experienced foreign language anxiety. Nonetheless, the participants in the control group (G_1) who received immediate CF for their errors, experienced boosted anxiety levels and the participants in the experimental group (G_2), who received delayed CF, exhibited a decreased level of anxiety. These findings support Krashen's Affective Filter hypothesis (1985), which suggests that affective factors like anxiety and motivation may function as a barrier to inhibit the subconscious acquisition of a new language. These results are consistent with the findings of Horwitz et al., (1986), when it came to speaking, foreign language learners experienced the greatest amount of anxiety. Furthermore, the findings demonstrate that, in contrast to G_1, who experienced a more stressful environment and higher levels of anxiety, students in G_2 were more self-assured, less anxious, and at ease. These findings therefore support earlier studies that discovered students received delayed feedback on their mistakes were more self-assured and less nervous (Rahimi & Dastjerdi 2012; Shabani & Safari, 2016). As a result, the current research specifies that the language learning environment in ESL classrooms during the acquisition process may be less advantageous and less anxiety-inducing for learners due to the variability in immediate vs. delayed CF and the way it is delivered.

Moreover, analysis of the open-ended questions revealed that G_1 students had an abundance of anxiety because their mistakes were immediately corrected, which made it difficult for them to construct coherent and accurate structures. They also stated that they high level anxiety, lower pace of development, low self-assurance, and motivation to practice further on tasks while not having enough time for reformulating the mistakes due to providing immediate CF by the teacher. Conversely, G_2 students had a decrease in anxiety after receiving the delayed CF because it gave them greater self-assurance and more time to identify and rectify their mistakes that led to improving their language skills. These results are in-line with Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, which postulates that learners must recognize a discrepancy between input they receive and output they produce.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to understand how learners' perspectives of error correction affect their language learning, as well as whether immediate or delayed CF affected their anxiety levels during oral production and accuracy throughout oral tasks. The findings revealed that employing delayed CF resulted in a considerable reduction of L2 anxiety and a noticeable increase in accuracy, confirming the alternative research hypothesis (H_1). Horwitz et al. (1986), developed a foreign language classroom anxiety scale (FLCAS) was utilized and effectively revealed the degrees of communication apprehension among ESL secondary-level learners. Nevertheless, the incorporation of open-ended questions to know about learners' perception of the timing of CF provided a greater depth to the numerical scores that learners conveyed through FLCAS. These findings not only disprove the null hypothesis (H_0), which proposed that there would be no appreciable impact on anxiety levels or language accuracy, but they also led to the rejection of that hypothesis. With significant numbers of research conducted within the realm of anxiety in ESL and EFL classrooms, this study underscores the necessity of more in-depth analysis to enlighten the learners, the language teachers also administrators about the factors that influence levels of foreign language anxiety experienced by the learners. The findings can subsequently assist both teachers as well as learners in effectively managing the anxiety they may confront due to the timing (immediate or delayed) of CF provided by language teacher.

Reference

Abedi, D., Mahdavi, Z., & Hassaskhah, J. (2016). Iranian EFL learners' preferred oral corrective feedback: High anxious learners vs. low anxious learners. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning, 5*(2), 75-86.

Amiri, M., & Ghonsooly, B. (2015). The relationship between English learning anxiety and the students' achievement on examinations. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(4), 855.

Anggraini, H. W., & Wijaya, A. (2018). An Analysis of Students' Writing on the Basis of Writing Anxiety Level and Cross-Cultural Understanding of the Target Language.

Berowa, A. M. (2018). Levels of language anxiety toward English: A sample from Davao del Norte. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, *8*(3), 118-128.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE publications.

Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form.

Ellis, R. (2010). Epilogue: A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*(2), 335-349.

Ellis, R. (2017). Oral corrective feedback in language teaching: A historical perspective. *Avances En Educación Y Humanidades*, 7-22.

Gkonou, C., & Miller, E. R. (2019). Caring and emotional labour: Language teachers' engagement with anxious learners in private language school classrooms. Language teaching research, 23(3), 372-387.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal*, *70*(2), 125-132.

Housen, A., Kuiken, F., & Vedder, I. (2012). Complexity, accuracy and fluency. *Dimensions of L2 performance and proficiency: Complexity, accuracy and fluency in SLA*, *32*, 1-20.

Krashen, S. (1977). Some issues relating to the monitor model. *TESOL*, *77*(144-158).

Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.

Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System. *System*, *84*, 93-109.

Loewen, S. (2005). Incidental focus on form and second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *27*(3), 361-386.

Mamhot, A. M., Martin, M. H., & Masangya, E. (2013). A comparative study on the language anxiety of ESL and EFL learners. *Philippine ESL Journal*, *10*(1), 200-231.

Matsuda, S., & Gobel, P. (2004). Anxiety and predictors of performance in the foreign language classroom. *System*, *32*(1), 21-36.

Mullet, H. G., Butler, A. C., Verdin, B., von Borries, R., & Marsh, E. J. (2014). Delaying feedback promotes transfer of knowledge despite student preferences to receive feedback immediately. *Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*, *3*(3), 222-229.

Nakata, T. (2015). Effects of feedback timing on second language vocabulary learning: Does delaying feedback increase learning?. *Language Teaching Research*, *19*(4), 416-434.

Quinn, P. (2014). *Delayed versus immediate corrective feedback on orally produced passive errors in English* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto).

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

Rahimi, M., & Zhang, L. J. (2015). Exploring non-native English-speaking teachers' cognitions about corrective feedback in teaching English oral communication. *System*, *55*, 111-122.

Rassaei, E. (2014). Scaffolded feedback, recasts, and L2 development: A sociocultural perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, *98*(1), 417-431.

Salimi, A., Amini, D., & Yousefzadeh, M. (2015). Combining Explicit-Implicit with Focus on Form-Focus on FormS Feedback in EFL Learners' Written Task Accuracy. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, *4*(6), 113-118.

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The role of consciousness in second Language Learning1. *Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 129-158.

Shabani, K., & Safari, F. (2016). Immediate vs delayed correction feedback (CF) and accuracy of oral production: The role of anxiety. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, *6*(11).

Smith, R. (2020). Behaviourism. In *Companion to the History of Modern Science* (pp. 410-424). Routledge.

Teimouri, Y., Goetze, J., & Plonsky, L. (2019). Second language anxiety and achievement: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *41*(2), 363-387.

Titscher, S., & Jenner, B. (Eds.). (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis: In search of meaning*. SAGE.

Zhang, X. (2019). Foreign language anxiety and foreign language performance: A meta-analysis. The Modern Language Journal, 103(4), 763–781.