

**THE EFFECT OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK TOWARDS
STUDENTS' SPEAKING PERFORMANCE
RELATED TO LEARNING STYLE**

**The Effect Of Corrective Feedback Towards
Students' Speaking Performance
Related To Learning Style**

Oleh

Adhi Nurhartanto, Cucu Sutarsyah, Mahpul

This research was intended to identify to what extent students with different learning style benefitted from corrective feedback. The subjects of the study were the students of Diploma program of Lembaga Bahasa Inggris (LBI) Bandar Lampung. This study took 15 students as the subject of the research. The data were taken by using oral tests scored by two interraters. The classification of the students' learning styles was done based on Willing's Learning Style Questionnaire (1988). The students were asked to make oral production based on series of pictures in simple present tense and simple past tense. The result found that concrete learners gained more benefit from corrective feedback than the other learning styles while the authority-oriented learners gained very little from corrective feedback.

Keywords: *Corrective feedback, learning style, speaking.*

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengidentifikasi sampai sejauh apa siswa yang memiliki perbedaan gaya belajar mendapat keuntungan dari feedback. Subyek penelitian adalah siswa Program Diploma Lembaga Bahasa Inggris (LBI) Bandar Lampung. Penelitian ini mengambil 15 siswa sebagai subyek penelitian. Data diambil dengan menggunakan tes lisan dan dinilai oleh dua interrater. Klasifikasi gaya belajar siswa ditentukan dengan menggunakan Kuesioner Gaya Belajar milik Willing (1988) Siswa-siswa diminta untuk memproduksi kalimat secara lisan berdasarkan seri gambar dalam bentuk simple present tense dan simple past tense. Hasil penelitian menemukan bahwa pembelajar konkrit mendapat keuntungan lebih banyak dari feedback yang bersifat mengoreksi dibandingkan gaya belajar yang lain sementara siswa dengan gaya belajar yang berorientasi otoritas mendapat keuntungan paling sedikit.

Kata kunci: *Berbicara, gaya belajar, umpan balik yang bersifat mengoreksi,.*

INTRODUCTION

Giving direct correction to a student's performance is debatable. Some might say that, direct correction, especially when it is done in front of the student's friends, in the classroom, is affecting his/her confidence. The serious danger of correction includes embarrassment, anger, inhibition feelings of inferiority, and a generally negative attitude toward the class and possibly toward the language itself (Truscott, 1999 p. 5). This implies that correcting directly tends to ruin the students' pride and giving hurtful memory and for worse, they might hate the teacher or the subject. Otherwise, other opposite opinions say that correcting is accelerating the students' knowledge. Ellis and Sheen (2006, p. 588) have summed the evidence that exposing learners to recasts can lead to acquisition.

Krashen (1982) mentions the use of corrective feedback is harmful. He adds that learners need comprehensible input to trigger acquisition. Krashen has pointed out that what is needed by L2 students is comprehensible input or positive input. Moreover, Krashen (1982) also mentions the need to lower the affective filter because a strong affective filter may result in the not-optimal learner's acquisition. In acquisition, it is believed that learners will produce language when they are ready to produce the language. Therefore, error correction has little or no effect in subconscious acquisition because the error

correction tends to interrupt and higher the affective filter and tends to be assumed as negative input which is harmful for learner's acquisition process. The hypothesis seems to put the students under an unlimited time. They will only produce the language when they are ready. However, there is growing evidence that corrective feedback can influence acquisition (Ellis, 2005, p. 16). Therefore, it may accelerate acquisition.

Corrective feedback is defined as 'non-targetlike use of the target language' Gass as cited in Kim (2004, p. 1), also described as 'responses to learner's utterances containing an error' (Ellis, et.al., 2006, p. 340). Schmidt as cited in Ellis (2005, p. 19) shows that corrective feedback is important to show the importance of noticing and noticing-the-gap in L2 acquisition. Ellis (2005, p. 19) mentions that the use of corrective feedback is motivated from the claim that L2 learners should be showed not only positive evidence but also negative evidence. It means, as an addition from the expose of correct examples, students will also need to be showed what errors they have made.

With the number of findings in the research, the roles of corrective feedback are still debatable to the contribution to learners' acquisition of second language. Lyster and Ranta (1997, p.46-48) classify corrective feedback into six different types, namely; *explicit correction*, *recasts*, *clarification requests*, *metalinguistic*

feedback, elicitation, and repetition. In their research in four French immersion classrooms, Lyster and Ranta's (1997, p. 53-54) study mentions that even though recasts appeared to be the most common error correction used by teachers, 55% of the corrective feedback uses recasts, it is found to be ineffective since only 31% of the recasts are followed by the uptake (immediate response to the feedback) by the students while the other 69% goes unnoticed. The study also reveals that recasts lead only on 18% of student-generated-repair, which is the lowest, while four other feedback types - *clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition* – lead to better student-generated-repair.

Since then, the studies which compare recasts with other types of corrective feedback have been done which mostly compare between recasts with other type of feedback. In their research in low-intermediate of second language class, Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) apply *recasts* as *implicit feedback* and *metalinguistic explanation* as *explicit feedback* in correcting students' errors in regular past tense. Their research concludes that explicit feedback in the form of metalinguistic information is more superior than the implicit feedback in the form of recasts in oral imitation test, grammaticality judgment test, and metalinguistic knowledge test in delayed posttest.

In other research, Mackey (2006) discusses feedback in the form of instructed second language learning which inserts feedback in a game-

show quiz activity involving questions, plurals, and past tense forms. Mackey mentions that the purpose of the study is to determine whether the interactional feedback is associated with learners' reports about noticing. The study concludes that there may be association between noticing and learning.

Other study from Sheen (2008) discusses the level of language anxiety related to learners' ability in improving the accuracy when the learners are provided with corrective feedback in the form of recasts. The result shows that the low anxiety group which is treated by recasts as the corrective feedback scores significantly higher than high-anxiety-recast- group and the control group. The finding shows that language anxiety is a factor that influence not only whether recasts lead to modified output but also whether they promote learning.

From the previous studies, it seems the previous researches have not touched the learners' acceptance on corrective feedback based on their individual differences. Therefore, this study is focusing on whether individual differences is a factor that influence whether corrective feedback lead to modified output but also whether corrective feedback is effective to promote learning. In this study, learners' learning style is the individual factor to be observed from the learners' acceptance on corrective feedback.

Harmer (1998, p. 79) mentions that based on the learning style, some

students are fantastically quick at picking up language just by looking and listening, while, for other students, it may take a little longer. Oxford as cited by Kaminska (2014:5) sees learning style as encompassing four aspects: (1) cognitive style, as defined above; (2) typical attitudes and interests that influence the learner's choice as what to pay attention to in a learning situation; (3) an inclination towards seeking situations compatible with an individual's ways of learning; and (4) consistencies in choosing some learning strategies, as well as avoiding others.

Therefore, this study is aimed to investigate the effectiveness of corrective feedback on students based on their dominance in using language learning style categories, namely; concrete, communicative, analytical, and authority-oriented based on Willing's questionnaire as cited in Wong and Nunan (2011:145).

Based on background of the problems, the problems are formulated as the research questions as follows: Is there a difference in students' speaking performance between the groups of students with different learning styles after corrective feedbacks were applied?

RESEARCH METHODS

This research was conducted in Diploma 1 program of Lembaga Bahasa Inggris (LBI) Bandar Lampung. The research was conducted in the second semester of 2015/2016 academic year from April 2016 – July 2016. The research was

done in 8 meetings which took 8 weeks.

The subjects of the research were taken from all students of LBI in the academic year of 2015/2016 consisting 15 students. The grouping was done based on their dominant choice used by the student based on the questionnaire. The subjects were expected to be classified into four groups which reflected the four styles of learning style based on Willing's classification. The research was conducted based on the observation from the researcher that the students mostly ignored corrective feedback and repeated the same error during their daily performance.

The next step was dealing with which pre-dominant learning style gives the best response to corrective feedbacks. After the learning style questionnaire was done by the students, the students were then classified into five groups, namely: (1) Concrete, (2) Communicative, (3) Authority-oriented, (4) Mixed 1 (Communicative Authority-oriented), and (5) Mixed 2 (Concrete Communicative). The Concrete and Communicative group which consisted of respectively 6 and 7 students were only be taken 3 students for each group. The 3 students for these two groups were chosen based on the result of the speaking pre-test.

Based on students' responses to a learning style questionnaire, the learners were classified based on their learning style. The set that yielded the highest total was considered as the predominant style of the student. The

person could be identified as belonging to the type of learning style group defined by the set of questions (Yufrizal, 2007).

The Learning Style questionnaire used in this research was originally developed in Australian context by Willing as cited in Yufrizal (2007, p.93). Willing was able to relate the four language learning styles to cognitive models developed in psychology by Kolb as cited in Wong and Nunan (2011, p. 152). The questionnaire was adapted to Indonesian EFL learners by Yufrizal (2007, p.94). Therefore, the construct validity in this research is developed by doing expert judgment. The questionnaire is also widely used as in Yufrizal (2007 p. 96) and Wong and Nunan (2011, p. 156). Seeing the result of expert judgment, it was found that all of the items were in line with theories and it can be concluded that this questionnaire can be used to gather the data in this research.

Before the Learning Style Questionnaire was used as an instrument, it had been analyzed by using the Cronbach Alpha Formula. The table below shows the reliability of learning style questionnaire after the results were tested by using SPSS.

Table 1. Reliability of Learning Style Questionnaire

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.885	.880	40

After the questionnaire was analyzed, the Alpha coefficient was found to be 0.885, which meant that the questionnaire was reliable and it could be used as an instrument to determine the students' learning style.

To measure the students' speaking skill, the tests focusing on monologue were conducted. The students performed the oral monologue by telling the stories guided by two series of pictures. The students performed twice in the pretest. The first series of the pictures described about daily activities in which the students performed their speaking ability in describing present events. The second series of the pictures described about past activities where the students performed their speaking ability in describing past events.

To answer the research questions, a case study research design was used to find the effect of corrective feedback towards students' speaking skill related to their learning style. This research was a quantitative study which used *pretest-posttest design*.

To have a valid test, content validity has been done by doing expert judgment. In this research, the speaking test is instructed to match the theories of speaking and the indicators of oral production. The test that was used, was taken from Heaton (1991, p.93). Picture of a scene or an incident can be used for examining the total oral skills (Heaton, 1991. p. 92)

To prevent or reduce the subjectivity in judging the students' speaking skill, the inter rater reliability was applied to

score the students' speaking skill. The reliability of the scoring was scored in the pretests (present tense and past tense) and the posttests (present tense and past tense). In this research, Azwar (2012, p.88) suggests the use of interrater reliability. It meant that the observation was done by two or more observers. The raters were Mr. Refdi Akmal, M.Pd. and the researcher himself who was a senior teacher in the institution and a lecturer in State Polytechnics of Lampung. The first rater was graduated from Post Graduate Study in English Education Faculty of Indonesia University of Education while the second rater was taking his master degree in English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty of Lampung University. The judgment was done by listening to the recording of the students' speaking performance. Thus, the final score was the combination of pretests and posttest which included both of the subjects tested namely; present tense and past tense of both raters.

Table 2. Interrater Reliability in Pretest

	Rater1	Rater2
Rater1 Pearson Correlation	1	.865**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	22	22
Rater2 Pearson Correlation	.865**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	22	22

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation between the two raters for the posttest was shown in the table below.

Table 3. Interrater Reliability in Posttest

	Rater1	Rater2
Rater1 Pearson Correlation	1	.811**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
N	22	22
Rater2 Pearson Correlation	.811**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
N	22	22

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

After the scores were accepted, it can be seen that there were not any excessive scores given by the raters. The inter-rater reliability was counted by using SPSS. The correlation between both raters in the pretest was 0.865, while the correlation between both raters in the posttest was 0.811. According to Azwar (2012) limitation of the difference of the analyzed result between raters is within 0.0 – 1.0. It means that there is consistency between raters and the test is reliable. When the test reached the range of 0.80 – 1.00, it meant that the scores from both raters had very high reliability. Therefore the third rater was not needed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Result

This research deals with which pre-dominant learning style gives the best response to corrective feedbacks. This section attempts to answer whether

corrective feedback is beneficial to some particular learning style and/or

Table 4. Corrective Feedback Percentage

Code	Sentence Produced				Total		Correction Percentage
	Present Tense	Correction Made	Past Tense	Correction Made	Number of Sentences	Correction Made	
ATI	14	3	12	8	26	11	42.31%
CLA	15	14	12	8	27	22	81.48%
DAM	21	11	13	6	34	17	50.00%
DES	19	8	10	9	29	17	58.62%
DEV	16	8	13	6	29	14	48.27%
DEW	17	18	10	16	27	34	125.92%
DIK	14	6	12	11	25	14	56.00%
ELM	13	6	8	10	21	16	76.19
ICH	18	11	17	17	35	28	80.00%
KIN	20	10	12	11	32	21	65.63%
LEN	19	8	14	10	33	18	54.55%
MUT	14	10	11	11	25	21	84.00%
NOV	13	11	11	10	24	21	87.50%
ROH	15	8	9	7	24	15	62.50%
SEP	14	9	13	11	27	20	74.07%
Total					418	289	69.14%

probably harmful to other learning style.

This research was done as a way to find how corrective feedback might affect the students' speaking skill. Because of its characteristic in which corrective feedback was done shortly, it was probably doubtful to only use corrective feedback as a teaching method. Therefore, that corrective feedback might be inserted during and after the lessons were taught based on the lesson plan.

From the total number of corrections made, it can be seen that the students still made errors, even though the learning process of each lesson, present tense and past tense had been conducted.

From Table 4, it is found that the students made 69.14% errors. For some students whose percentage value is more than 100%, it is probably because they failed to correct the sentences and the correction was made more than once for a single error. Even though generally, corrective feedback was performed directly after the students made the errors.

From the present tense test showed in Table 5, it can be seen that corrective feedback seemed to have no effect on the students' speaking skill, even though there was tendency that the students' speaking skill increased after corrective feedback was applied.

From the past tense test, the pretest sig (0.222) and the posttest sig (0.244) were higher than 0.05, which meant that there was no difference between each group in past tense pretest and past tense posttest. It can be seen in Table 2.

Table 5. ANOVA Test for The Tests

	df	F value	Significance
The Simple Present Tense Pretest	4	2.351	0.124
The Simple Present Tense Posttest	4	0.675	0.625
Differences of Pretest to Posttest	4	0.787	0.559
The Simple Past Tense Pretest	4	1.718	0.222
The Simple Past Tense Posttest	4	1.621	0.244
Differences of Pretest to Posttest	4	4.423	0.026*

*significancy level $p < 0.05$

From the present tense test showed in Table 5, it can be seen that corrective feedback seemed to have no effect on the students' speaking skill, even though there was tendency that the students' speaking skill increased after corrective feedback was applied.

The significant difference can be seen in the increase/decrease. In the pretest and posttest the difference was insignificant but from the increase or decrease in scores, there might be groups who benefited more than the others. The significance in the increase meant that one or more groups might surpass the others in

getting the benefit from corrective feedback.

Table 6. The Description for The Increase in Past Tense Tests

Group	Mean	Minimum Differences	Maximum Differences
Concrete	8.667	2.00	14.00
Communicative	4.000	2.00	6.00
Authority-oriented	-1.333	-4.00	.00
Mixed 1	6.667	6.00	8.00
Mixed 2	2.000	.00	4.00
Total	4.000	-4.00	14.00

From the analysis shown in Table 6, it can be seen that in the Minimum Differences column, group 3 (Authority-oriented) had the lowest in the decrease, which was -4.00, while the best in the increase was 14.00 points gained by group 1 (Concrete). This is a finding from the research that one learning style might surpass the others in getting benefit from corrective feedback.

Discussion

The result of the hypothesis testing showed that there were not any significant differences in students' pretest, posttest, and differences in pretest and posttest in present tense. In past tense, there were not any

significant differences in pretest and posttest, but there was a significant difference in the difference between posttest and pretest, which means that one or more groups surpassed the others in terms of achievement.

The highest achiever was from Concrete group while the lowest achiever was from Authority-oriented. There might be some factors to explain how Concrete learners might gain more benefit from corrective feedback than the other groups. This section might also be used to explain how Authority-oriented group gain less or even no benefit from corrective feedback.

Willing as cited in Wong (2015, p.41) describes a Concrete learner as kinesthetic modality, people-oriented, imaginative, and dislikes routinized learning. Willing as cited in Wong (2015, p.42) also mentions that concrete learners are field-dependent, passive, enjoy social interaction and authority. From these statements, the description of Concrete learners can be described as field dependent and passive. Concrete learners also view things holistically (Kaminska, 2014).

From the factor of field-dependent, it is described as showing higher level of aptitude in sound discrimination (Ellis as cited in Tabanlıoğlu, 2003, p. 18). This might explain how the students who were field-dependant had better acceptance since they were able to identify the sound and making it theirs. It might happen because corrective feedbacks in this research were done orally, which would be accepted by the students as sound. Ellis's study as

cited in Tabanlıoğlu (2003) also indicates that the people who own this type are equipped to learn experimentally through the spoken medium. Consequently, the delivery of feedbacks in this research was well accepted by the Concrete learners.

The other factor which is described as owned by a Concrete learner is their passiveness. (Hansen and Stansfield as cited in Kaminska 2014, p. 22) add that Concrete learners are more passive, approving, and performs spectator-like strategies to acquire information. Concrete learners are described to be more attentive to people's face. Therefore, they look at other people's face to discover their feelings. It can be said that a Concrete learners are more of observers. They learn and gain advantage from their environments. From the statements, it can be inferred that concrete learners tend to learn from the surroundings. They examine and watch their friends and learned from not only their mistakes but also their friends' mistakes. They posit themselves as spectators but they pay attention to what is going on. They are also attentive to any inputs provided by the teacher. When the teacher gives the feedback, they pay attention to what the teacher is saying. When they make an uptake, they see their teacher's face to see whether their errors are corrected or not. This might explain why they respond well and have the possibilities to uptake any feedbacks and repair their errors when they can. They also have the possibilities to not repeat the same errors.

Concrete learners are also claimed as approaching problems in holistic way

or holistic. Holistic is described by Kaminska (2014, p. 22) as having many goals and working topics under the aim topic. Kaminska also describes that holistic pays attention and prefers to build the big picture before filling the detail and holistic learners quickly pick up redundancies and recognize clearly where information can be obtained. From these statements, another possibility of why concrete learners get benefit from corrective feedback is from the redundancy. Corrective feedback has the typical of correcting every error made by the students. Therefore, there are always chances to be heard again and again as long as the errors were made. Concrete learners tend to be able to gain advantage from the repetition. Every time the error repeated, there are chances for them to get more inputs to correct their errors.

In one of the researches where a Concrete learner was involved, Ellis as cited in Tabanlıoğlu (2003) mentioned that in the diary of a concrete learner, it was revealed that the learner tried to learn based on-form, concentrating on linguistic accuracy, and avoiding free expression. This may also be used as a judgment that even in the practice session the concrete learners still make some errors. They were able to find the errors and fixed what they had made in the posttest. They focused on the accuracy and tended to avoid improvised words or sentences. Ellis's finding on Concrete learner also explained what had happened to answer why Concrete learners might take advantage from feedback.

In contrast, Authority-oriented learners seem to gain no benefit or not benefitting from corrective feedback since the difference between the posttest and pretest score was -4.00 until 0.00. It meant that the score decreased. There might also some factors why Authority-oriented learners did not get any or very few benefits from corrective feedback.

Corrective feedback is done directly from the teacher to learner when they make errors. Authority-oriented learners are described as field-independent and passive (Willing as cited in Kaminska (2014, p.66)), self centered, and engaging high psychological barrier (Skehan as cited in Kaminska (2014, p.67)). The following will try to explain of how Authority-oriented learners did not gain any benefit or only small benefit from feedback.

This showed that independent learners like to think by themselves and process it by themselves. Independent learners tend to choose individual task better than group task. In Willing's Psychological Model of Language Learning Style Differences in Tabanlıoğlu (2003, p.14), Authority-oriented learner is classified in the area where receiving information and processing information overlap. It means that personality determines how information is processed and how information is searched for and collected. From this information it may be reasonable to say that Authority-oriented learners focus on themselves. They rely on themselves. The environment will not give them big influence. This had probably

become a barrier because they prefer to believe in themselves and neglect their surroundings. When teachers corrected the errors, the learners seemed to not recognize the feedback. Even though they had many uptakes, but they seemed to not remember the feedback, as a result they failed to correct their errors.

Authority-oriented learners like the teacher to explain everything, like to have their own textbook, to write everything in a notebook, to study grammar, learned by reading, and learned new words by seeing them (Willing as cited in Wong and Nunan (2011, p. 145)). According to Skehan as cited in Kaminska (2014, p.67) Authority-oriented learners are opposed to taking responsibility for their learning outside the classroom, so engaging them in planning simulations may overcome their psychological barrier and encourage them to become more autonomous. From this description, it was likely that authority-oriented learners tended to have psychological barrier. As a result they only focused to themselves and decided to be passive since they wanted the teacher to explain everything. It is probably relevant to say that authority-oriented learners were “closed” people.

In her research Sheen (2008, p.861) mentions that students with speaking activity feel fearful in front of the whole class and this might have blocked their capacity to process the input provided by the recasts. This research did not measure the anxiety level, but from the description of Authority-oriented learners, it might

be possible that they possessed fear, especially when the test was about speaking. Although the speaking test was not done in front of their friends, the test was known to be scored for their semester test. Therefore, it might produce fear and had the students worried. Authority-oriented learners’ personality makes them unable to process corrective feedback used by the teacher.

In short, it can be seen that personal difference, in this case learning style has become a factor of why corrective feedback can accelerate students’ language acquisition. Even though other factors may also influence the acceptance of corrective feedback, this research has shown that individual learning style plays important role in students’ ability to receive and make good use of corrective feedback.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This study was done as an attempt to find a relationship between the usage of corrective feedback orally with students’ personality which was represented by their learning style. It is found that the reception of corrective feedback was different in each student depending on their learning styles. The results reveal that concrete learners have the most progress or benefited the most from corrective feedback compared to other types. Otherwise, authority-oriented learners are found to have no benefits from corrective feedback. It is effective to give corrective feedback to the students. Even though, the ones

who get the benefit may not only be the ones performing the language. The obstacles in this research were the time limit. The research was done by the writer himself. The students did not get the test at the same time. There were possibilities that the test materials had already been leaked.

REFERENCES

- Asari, Y. (2012). Types of recasts and learners' uptake. *Dialogue, Vol. 10*. 1-20.
- Azwar, S. (2012). *Reliabilitas dan Validitas*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition A Literature Review*. New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Ellis, R., and Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *SSLA, pp. 28, 575–600 Printed in the United States of America*.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., and Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies of Second Language Acquisition 28* 339-368. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Goo, J., and Mackey, A. (2013). The case against the case against recasts. *Studies in SLA, 2013, 36*. 127-165.
- Harmer, J. (1998). *How to Teach English*. Essex: Addison Wesley Longman. Limited
- Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Kaminska, P. M. (2014). *Learning Styles and Second Language Education*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Kim, J. H. (2004). Issues of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, Vol 4, No.2*. Columbia University.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Great Britain: Phoenix ELT.
- Lyster, R., and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37 – 66 .
- Mackey, A. (2006). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. *Applied Linguistics 27/3: 405–430*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sheen, Y. (2008). Recasts, language

anxiety, modified output, and L2 learning. *Language Learning* 58:4 December 2008. 835-874.

Tabanlıoğlu, S. (2003). The Relationship Between Learning Styles and Language Learning Strategies of Pre-Intermediate EAP Students. Thesis for The Degree of Master of Arts. Middle East Technical University.

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction. *Canadian Modern Language Review* Vol 55, No. 4, June/June 1999.

Wong, L. and Nunan, D. (2011). The learning styles and strategies of effective language learners. *Science Direct System* 39 (2011). 144-163.

Wong, W. L. H. (2015). A Study of Language Learning Style and Teaching Style Preferences of Hong Kong Community College Students and Teachers in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) Contexts. Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education. University of Canterbury.

Yufrizal, H. (2007). *Negotiation of Meaning by Indonesia EFL Learners*. Bandung: Pustaka Reka Cipta.