

Exploring Different Oral Corrective Feedback Preferences: Role of Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Intelligences

Mahmood Hashemian,¹ Azizullah Mirzaei,² & Helena Mostaghassi³

¹Corresponding author, Shahrekord University, m72h@hotmail.com

²Shahrekord University, mirzaei-a@lit.sku.ac.ir

³Shahrekord University, h.mostaghassi@gmail.com

Received: 24/02/2015

Accepted: 27/12/2015

Abstract

This study explored corrective feedback (CF) types and their relationship to L2 learners' intelligence types. Participants were 60 intermediate L2 learners aged 18-29 in Isfahan, Iran. Based on their intelligence types as intrapersonal and interpersonal, the participants were divided into 2 groups. McKenzie's MI Inventory (1999) and a researcher-designed questionnaire on CF types were employed. Spearman correlation was applied to find out the relationship between the participants' intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences and their preferred CF. Then, multiple regression analysis was run to indicate the significant representation of the specific CF among the participants. Results revealed that there was a strong positive relationship between the participants' intrapersonal intelligence and explicit types of CF. Regression computations indicated that the interpersonal participants showed a great significant tendency towards repetition, paralinguistic signs, clarification requests, and translation; however, conversational and didactic recasts as well as elicitation, explicit, and metalinguistic CF made a unique and significant contribution to the intrapersonal participants. Accordingly, L2 teachers should take into account their learners' preferred CF types in their teaching and, consequently, suggest activities designed to help them make maximum use of their intelligence types. L2 teachers could also adapt their classroom activities to their learners' intelligences and CF types to create the most productive learning environment.

Keywords: Intrapersonal/Interpersonal Intelligences; Corrective Feedback (CF); Multiple Intelligences (MI)

1. Introduction

Corrective feedback (CF) has been an important practice in L2 classrooms. It refers to any indication of L2 learners' non-L2-like use of an L2 (Lightbown & Spada, 1999). CF has generally been found to be beneficial to L2 learning (Gass, 1997, 2003; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Li, 2010). Thus, during the years, there has been a growing interest in the role of CF in SLA, and a number of researchers have

looked specifically into its nature and role in L2 learning/teaching (e.g., Doughty & Varela, 1998; Havranek, 1999; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Ohta, 2000; Oliver, 2000).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six different CF types classified into two broad categories: reformulations and prompts. Reformulations consist of recasts and explicit correction because they both provide L2 learners with authentic L2 restatement of their nonnative-like output. Prompts contain a variety of signals other than reformulations that make L2 learners to self-repair (i.e., elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition). Having considered this classification and the knowledge gained from a substantial amount of research on CF since 1997, Sheen and Ellis (2011) suggested a similar taxonomy of oral CF strategies which accounts for the distinction between reformulations and prompts as well as the distinction between implicit and explicit CF. In addition to the inclusion of the seriously underresearched topic of paralinguistic signals (Schachter, 1981), Sheen and Ellis (2001) distinguish between conversational and didactic recasts.

Considering a historical perspective, several theories have been proposed to define the concept of *intelligence* from which Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences (MI; 1983) has received so much attention from contemporary researchers and educators. Gardner (1983) defined intelligence as a compound of different abilities or aptitudes and stated that intelligence is not a single universal unchangeable entity; rather, it is made up of seven subcategories (i.e., linguistic, musical, logical/mathematical, intrapersonal, interpersonal, spatial, and bodily/kinesthetic) that every individual possesses to different extents and can be nurtured and developed through education.

Interpersonal intelligence involves the sensitivity to others' moods, feelings, thoughts, needs, struggles, and motivations. This intelligence is also manifested through the ability to understand, to empathize with, to care for, and to deal with people in an effective way. One who has this type of intelligence can use an innate understanding of others to motive and influence them to certain actions. Generally, people with this intelligence are good at persuasion, negotiation, and working in teams well. It can also be observed in our relationships where we collaborate with each other in order to agree or disagree.

Abilities such as self-analysis, self-reflection, introspection, self-consciousness, and self-awareness can thoroughly manifest intrapersonal intelligence. People with this intelligence have the capacity to understand themselves and adapt their personal lives to any different situations. The strength of this intelligence indicates that people can distinguish the similarities/differences between themselves and others, and they can manage their feelings/emotions appropriately. The following activities can help L2 teachers to improve the intrapersonal intelligence in their students: reflection moments, providing options

for homework and assignments, giving opportunities for choices, setting personal goals and hopes like personal journal writing, independent study, encouraging individual work that increase self-esteem, and doing self-evaluation activities.

2. Literature Review

The term *feedback* originally stemmed from Wiener's (1948) cybernetic notion and described processes by which a control unit gets information about the effects and consequences of its actions. Afterwards, feedback was used in different fields, especially in educational settings. Different types of CF came to be known, among which spoken (oral) CF was studied in this research. Oral CF that provides L2 learners with positive evidence (e.g., recasts) can contribute directly to the development of implicit knowledge (Long, 1996). One of the most important empirical studies in the realm of oral CF is that of Lyster and Ranta (1997), which has been greatly stimulating for other researchers (i.e., Erlam, Ellis, & Batstone, 2013; Li, 2013; Lochtmann, 2002) who investigated the relationships between error types and kinds of CF and uptake. The findings revealed that whereas recasts were the most widely used oral CF, they were the least likely to lead to successful uptake. It was also found that the most successful type of oral CF leading to the participants' repair and restructuring was elicitation.

Rydahl (2005) explored if and how L2 teachers in upper secondary school used oral CF when they corrected their students' oral mistakes. She detected that the majority of the teachers found oral CF an important tool to assist their learners to achieve a higher proficiency. The results also indicated that CF was most often used when the learners made errors regarding content and pronunciation. Most of the respondents were aware of the necessity of applying different CF approaches to different errors made by the students. Moreover, the teachers chose to provide CF in different occasions more directly, but more commonly indirectly to a single student or later on to a full class. Most L2 teachers also preferred a mixture of CF approaches (i.e., multiple CF), depending on the specific student and situation.

Moreover, Lochtmann (2002) studied CF types by observing and audiotaping 600 min of L2 classrooms involving three teachers. The findings indicated that 90% of the errors received CF from the teachers, and that they generally used three types of oral CF: explicit corrections, recasts, and teacher initiations to self-corrections (i.e., elicitation, clarification requests, metalinguistic CF, and repetition). Brown (2009) claims that L2 learners think that a quality of effective teachers is to be able to correct oral errors immediately. There is, nonetheless, some variation in the degree to which they want to be corrected. For instance, the learners in Lasagabaster and Sierra's (2005) study reported that constant correction might debilitate communication and expressed a preference for focused CF on selected errors, whereas 80% of the L2 learners in Singapore in

Oladejo's (1993) study stated that CF had not inhibited their willingness to communicate in the L2.

Much less research has been conveyed to compare the relative effectiveness of oral CF types that differ regarding their directness. The only study to mention is that of Yilmaz (2013) who investigated the effectiveness of explicit correction (i.e., direct) vs. recasts (i.e., indirect), utilizing an experimental design with two posttests (i.e., immediate and delayed). Oral production, comprehension, and recognition tests were employed to measure the learners' performance. The results showed that explicit CF was more effective than recasts on the oral production and comprehension tasks, and that not only explicit CF in the form of metalinguistic CF but also explicit CF in the form of explicit correction was more effective than recasts with respect to the learners' oral speech and production.

According to Johnson (2007), the MI theory recommends a model that confirms each individual's strength, talents, and skills. Rubado (2002) integrated the MI theory into her instruction and found that the learners naturally began to identify their abilities. In order to enhance their cognitive growth, they started to identify which intelligences would improve their performance through the process of self-reflection. Additionally, Rubado (2002) claims that by the help of the MI theory, L2 learners will be able to share their opinions, help others better, be respectful to their peers, make intrapersonal and interpersonal changes, take educational risks, and retain more information for longer period. Thus, L2 learners will take part in classroom activities more enthusiastically, which can be helpful for L2 teachers in understanding which types of CF whether implicit or explicit are preferred by L2 learners.

During recent years, many SLA researchers have studied the relationship between MI and the different aspects of L2 learning such as reading, writing, and vocabulary. For example, Sadeghi and Farzizadeh (2012) tried to find the relationship between MI and the writing ability of L2 learners. The results showed that there was no significant relationship between the university L2 learners' MI and their writing ability. Ahmadian and Hosseini (2012) also studied the relationship between L2 learners' MI and their performance in writing. The results revealed a significant correlation between the participants' MI and their performance on writing, and linguistic intelligence was the best predictor of writing performance. Moreover, Marefat (2007) aimed at discovering the relationship between L2 learners' MI profile and their writing product. Multiple regression analysis was conducted that indicated that existential, bodily-kinesthetic, and interpersonal intelligences were the best indicators of writing ability of the learners. Moheb and Bagheri (2013) attempted to figure out the relationship between MI and the writing strategies employed by Iranian L2 learners. A series of correlations such as Pearson

and regression were calculated that pinpointed that logical, existential, kinesthetic, verbal and visual intelligences correlated with general writing strategies. With respect to interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences, Nejad Ansari and Dabaghi (2010) tried to shed light on Iranian EFL students' writing strategies at the revision substage of the process of writing in relation to their interpersonal or intrapersonal intelligences. A significant relationship between the participants' writing revision strategies and their dominant MI profiles was observed, and the intrapersonal participants tended to apply personal and individual strategies such as checking in a dictionary, guessing, and restructuring sentences, and the interpersonal participants used social and interactional strategies like asking their teacher/friends for help in the final outcomes of the study.

Having considered the relationship between MI and reading comprehension, Hashemi (2009) explored the relationship between MI and the participants' reading ability. According to the correlation coefficient, the reading ability had a high correlation with existential intelligence and a low correlation with logical intelligence. Shearer (2006) examined the distinctions in the MI profiles of high school students with different levels of reading skills. As a result, the males with high reading skills tended to be more intrapersonal and logical in their reading ability, but the females preferred to use linguistic, interpersonal, and musical approaches. Moreover, a more recent study was reported by Rahimi, Mirzaei, and Heidari (2012) in which the researchers investigated the role of the L2 readers' MI in their effective use of reading strategies. The results indicated a significant positive relationship between linguistic, logical/mathematical, spatial, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences and reading strategy use. A significant positive relationship was also observed between linguistic intelligence and the participants' use of memory strategy. Furthermore, there was a significant positive relationship between interpersonal intelligence and compensation/social strategy use.

The relationship between different types of MI and other variables such as learning strategies, test performance, and vocabulary learning was also investigated by different scholars. For instance, Skourdi, Damavand, Viyani, and Kashef (2012) investigated the relationship between linguistic intelligence and vocabulary knowledge among L2 learners. The result showed a significant and positive relationship between linguistic intelligence and vocabulary knowledge, and it was reported as a good index of vocabulary learning.

Panahi (2012) examined the relationship between spatial intelligence and learning vocabulary. After calculating ANOVA and Pearson correlation, the results extracted from ANOVA showed that the groups with nonpictorial intelligence-based instruction and pictorial intelligence-based instruction performed differently on

learning vocabulary. According to the Pearson correlation, there was a significant relationship between spatial intelligence and learning vocabulary.

Regarding MI and learning strategies, Akbari and Hosseini (2008) studied the relationship between the use of L2 learning strategies and MI scores. The correlation analysis of the results showed a relatively weak, but statistically significant, relationship between the use of L2 learning strategies and the MI scores of the learners. Indeed, kinesthetic intelligence correlated with memory learning strategies, but musical intelligence did not correlate with any strategy use. Similarly, the relationship between MI profiles and language learning strategies used by Iranian high school students was investigated by Hajhashemi, Ghombavani, and Yazdi Amirkhiz (2011). The findings of the Pearson correlation were indicative of a low positive correlation between the MI profiles of the high school students and their L2 learning strategies. As far as communication and maintaining social relationship is of great importance in terms of speaking ability, Shangarffam and Zand (2012) researched the relationship between communication strategies and three MIs (i.e., linguistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences). Through the application of Pearson correlation coefficient and regression analysis, the results revealed that (a) there was a significant positive relationship among linguistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal intelligences and speaking strategies, (b) there was a positive relationship between interpersonal strategies and listening strategies, (c) and there was not a significant correlation between intrapersonal intelligence and oral communication strategies.

In spite of the growing number of studies investigating the relationship between MI and L2 learners' preferred CF types, especially in their writing ability, communication strategies, and L2 learning strategies, less research, to the best of our current knowledge, is reported to explore the relationship between certain types of intelligences and different explicit and implicit CF types preferred by L2 learners. Thus, to bridge the gap, this study was an attempt to find the (possible) relationship between L2 learners' preferred CF types and their interpersonal and/or intrapersonal intelligences in their speaking ability. This study did not investigate different extraneous variables (i.e., gender, age, proficiency level, and sociocultural backgrounds) and sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is there any significant relationship between interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences and implicit CF types received by L2 learners?
2. Is there any significant relationship between interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences and explicit CF types received by L2 learners?
3. Do interpersonal or intrapersonal intelligences significantly predict L2 learners' oral CF preferences?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

Sixty female and male L2 learners, aged 18-29, were randomly selected from different language institutes with similar levels of proficiency. They were studying English as a foreign language in language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. They were all native speakers of Persian and had already studied English as a part of their curricula in their secondary school or high school.

3.2 Instruments

Two instruments were employed: McKenzie's MI Inventory (1999), with the reliability of .88, was administered to the participants to check the different types of intelligences to which they belonged. The survey contained nine major sections regarding intelligence types (i.e., naturalistic, musical, logical/mathematical, existential, interpersonal, bodily/kinesthetic, verbal/linguistic, intrapersonal, and visual/spatial). Each section contained 10 statements which the participants had to mark each part which was true regarding their personality. Afterwards, the number of the marked statements was multiplied by 10 and the total score of each participant was computed. Having considered the aim of this study, only the scores of sections 5 and 8 which were related to interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences were considered. It is also worth mentioning that more than one absolute intelligence was possible for the participants.

The second instrument was a CF researcher-made questionnaire, developed based on a 5-point Likert-type format, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Agree*) to 5 (*Strongly Disagree*), and the major aim of which was to investigate the participants' preferred types of CF in their speaking activities. The questionnaire consisted of 25 items with respect to the different sorts of CF, and it was designed based on Ranta and Lyster's (2007) as well as Sheen and Ellis' (2011) classifications in which CF types were divided (see in Table 1):

Table 1. *Corrective Feedback Classification*

CF Types	Implicit	Explicit
Reformulation	Conversational Recasts	Didactic Recasts
		Explicit Correction
		Explicit Correction With Metalinguistic Explanation
Prompts	Repetition Clarification Request Translation	Metalinguistic Clue
		Elicitation
		Paralinguistic Signal

The validity of the questionnaire was examined through content and construct validity. The content validity of the CF questionnaire was ensured through the development and use of a detailed item specification as the blueprint, expert judgment, and pilot-testing to ensure that the questionnaire was carefully and accurately planned to include the items that were related to the various types of CF preferred by the participants.

The construct validity of the CF questionnaire was also examined based on factor analysis. The 25 items of questionnaire, which was administered to the 60 learners, were subjected to principal component analysis (PCA), using the Statistical Package for Social Science Software (SPSS, version 22). Before conducting the PCA, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed. The inspection of the correlation matrix showed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .63, and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. In fact, Kaiser's values of .6 and above are required for good factor analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

The internal consistency of the CF questionnaire was also estimated through running Cronbach's alpha in the piloting stage. The results indicated that the Cronbach's alpha value for the instrument was .79 that, according to DeVellis (2003), a Cronbach's alpha coefficient above .7 is preferable. Therefore, the CF questionnaire showed a very good internal consistency and proved to be highly reliable (see Table 2):

Table 2. *Reliability Analyses and Descriptive Statistics of Different Oral CF*

		Reliability		Descriptive Statistics	
		Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean	Standard Deviation
Implicit	Conversational Recasts	3	.756	3.10	1.48
	Repetition	4	.643	3.75	0.84
	Clarification Request	3	.723	3.61	1.09
	Translation	2	.773	2.30	1.38
	Total	12	.750	3.21	1.42
Explicit	Didactic Recasts	2	.708	3.77	0.95
	Explicit Correction	3	.683	3.53	1.20
	Metalinguistic Clue	3	.630	3.56	1.16
	Elicitation	3	.717	3.55	1.37
	Paralinguistic Signal	2	.766	3.42	1.28
Total		13	.708	3.56	1.21
Total Questionnaire		25	.792	—	—

As can be seen in Table 2, the reliability for each individual item of the CF questionnaire was computed, and the results indicated that the total reliability for both implicit and explicit categories was above .7, which is acceptable.

3.3 Procedure

The two instruments (i.e., MI and CF questionnaires) were administered to the participants in two consecutive weeks. In the first step, after selecting 60 participants, the MI questionnaire was distributed to identify the participants' interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences. The last step was to give out the CF questionnaire to them to know about their CF types preferences during their speaking activity. Moreover, one of the researchers attended in all classes for further explanations regarding the items in the questionnaire to eschew the occurrence of any possible misunderstanding on the part of the participants.

4. Results

To address the first and second research questions considering the potential relationship between intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences and the two main subcategories of implicit and explicit CF types, Spearman correlation was computed and the results are presented in Table 3:

Table 3. *Correlations Between Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Intelligences and Oral CF*

MIIs	Oral CF Types	Spearman's Rho	Sig. (2-tailed)
Intrapersonal	Implicit	-.012	.92
	Explicit	.325*	.01
Interpersonal	Implicit	-.057	.66
	Explicit	-.124	.34

Note. * $p < .05$ (2-tailed).

Table 3 shows the correlations between the participants' intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences and their oral CF. There was only a positive and significant relationship between the intrapersonal participants and the explicit CF compared with the implicit one ($p < .05$). On the other hand, the correlation between the interpersonal intelligence of the participants indicated a very small negative relation with both implicit and explicit CF types—but not significantly. Thus, it can be inferred that as the scores of the MI test for the intrapersonal participants increased, their tendency towards the explicit CF types augmented; however, a reverse relationship was observed for the participants with interpersonal intelligence (see Table 4):

Table 4. *Regression Analyses for Different Types of Implicit CF in Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Intelligences*

		<i>B</i>	Std. Error	St. Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Conversational Recasts	Constant	2.263	0.707		3.201	0.001
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.101	0.069	0.216	1.463	0.149
	Interpersonal Intelligence	-0.082	1.240	-0.030	-0.066	0.947
Repetition	Constant	2.115	1.263		1.674	0.094
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	-0.087	0.848	-0.014	-0.097	0.923
	Interpersonal Intelligence	0.930	0.473	0.308	1.964	0.049
Clarification Request	Constant	3.464	1.177		2.943	0.003
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.073	0.205	0.051	0.357	0.721
	Interpersonal Intelligence	0.383	0.241	0.319	1.589	0.112
Translation	Constant	2.890	1.492		1.937	0.053
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.031	0.022	0.090	1.365	0.172
	Interpersonal Intelligence	-0.787	0.352	-0.129	-2.238	0.025
Total Score	Constant	2.708	1.274		2.126	0.034
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.072	0.108	0.099	0.667	0.505
	Interpersonal Intelligence	0.384	0.164	0.357	2.343	0.020

To compare the predictive power of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences for the different types of implicit CF, the values under Beta should be checked. Looking down this column, in front of conversational recasts, one could notice that the larger value was the one for intrapersonal intelligence. Intrapersonal intelligence style, thus, made a stronger contribution to explaining conversational recasts (although this contribution was not statistically significant as the relevant *p* value under the *Sig.* column was greater than .05). However, for the other types of implicit CF (i.e., repetition, clarification request, and translation) and even for the total implicit CF score, the Beta values in front of interpersonal intelligence were larger than the Beta values in front of intrapersonal intelligence. Therefore, it could be concluded that interpersonal intelligence had a stronger contribution to accounting for repetition, clarification request, translation, and even to accounting

for the total implicit CF score. Additionally, the contribution of interpersonal intelligence to repetition ($p = .04$), translation ($p = .02$), and total implicit CF score ($p = .02$) reached statistical significance (see Table 5):

Table 5. *Regression Analyses for Different Types of Explicit CF in Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Intelligences*

		<i>B</i>	Std. Error	St. Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Didactic Recasts	Constant	3.817	2.499		1.527	0.127
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	-0.275	0.495	0.086	-0.556	0.578
	Interpersonal Intelligence	-0.096	0.366	0.038	-0.263	0.793
Explicit Correction	Constant	3.451	1.134		3.043	0.002
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.261	0.349	0.112	0.746	0.455
	Interpersonal Intelligence	-0.186	0.313	-0.084	-0.596	0.551
Metalinguistic Clue	Constant	3.076	1.854		1.659	0.097
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.327	0.155	0.153	2.109	0.035
	Interpersonal Intelligence	-0.125	0.173	-0.106	-0.725	0.468
Elicitation	Constant	2.184	1.096		1.993	0.046
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.873	0.230	0.534	3.792	0.000
	Interpersonal Intelligence	0.218	0.206	0.139	1.058	0.290
Paralinguistic Signal	Constant	2.080	0.826		2.518	0.012
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.114	0.063	0.235	1.792	0.073
	Interpersonal Intelligence	0.623	0.166	0.541	3.763	0.001
Total Score	Constant	2.080	1.031		2.017	0.044
	Intrapersonal Intelligence	0.813	0.234	0.494	3.476	0.001
	Interpersonal Intelligence	-0.252	0.173	-0.194	-1.455	0.146

Looking down the Beta column, in front of didactic recasts, one could see that the largest value, irrespective of any negative marks, was the one for intrapersonal intelligence (Beta = .27, $p = .57$). This held also true for explicit correction, metalinguistic clue, and elicitation. That is, for explicit correction ($p =$

.45), metalinguistic clue ($p = .03$), and elicitation ($p = .000$), intrapersonal intelligence was a better predictor. And, the contribution of intrapersonal intelligence was of statistical significance in the case of metalinguistic clue and elicitation. On the face of it, regarding paralinguistic signal, interpersonal intelligence turned out to be a significantly better predictor ($Beta = .62, p = .001$) than intrapersonal intelligence was. Finally, for the total explicit CF score, intrapersonal intelligence appeared to be a significantly better predictor ($Beta = .81, p = .001$).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The correlation between the implicit and explicit types of oral CF and the interpersonal and/or intrapersonal intelligences of the participants revealed a positive and significant correlation between intrapersonal intelligence and explicit CF types, and the correlation between interpersonal intelligence and CF types pinpointed to a small negative relationship. The findings are consistent with several studies, as they adhered the relationship between MI and reading, writing, communication, and learning strategies, particularly for interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences (i.e., Ahmadian & Hosseini, 2012; Hashemian & Adibpour, 2012; Marefat, 2007; Moheb & Bagheri, 2013; Rahimi, Mirzaei, & Heidari, 2012; Shangarffam & Zand, 2012). In fact, the point that intrapersonal intelligence correlated significantly and positively with the explicit types of oral CF might point out that intrapersonal intelligence is connected with self-awareness and consciousness in order to distinguish correct utterances from incorrect ones. As the intrapersonal participants were more involved in reflecting about their surrounding events, affairs, and self-evaluations, they preferred explicit and metalinguistic explanations to assess their performance in oral activities. The progressive sense of evaluation, analysis, and reflection is likely to intrigue intrapersonal learners to change their preferences for explicit and overt corrections with metalinguistic definitions in which they can receive more awareness about the corrected feature.

Moreover, the results of the regression revealed that among the implicit types of CF (e.g., repetition, translation, and clarification requests), the interpersonal participants showed a great tendency towards them. As interpersonal learners are in favor of social interaction with their peers, the reason might be that repetition and asking for clarification or translating from their peers or more expert students give them the opportunity to think about their classmates' errors and to attempt to correct the errors that helps them to focus more on the problematic L2 structures. These results are in line with those of Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study in which it was shown that repetition resulted in more uptake moves than recasts did and Tsang's (2004) findings that repetition ended in the highest number of uptake moves. In

Havranek's (2002) study, it was also revealed that repetition contributed to better results on a grammar test, which is in line with the outcome of the current study.

Regarding recasts, both conversational and didactic were advocated significantly by the intrapersonal participants. Recasts were advocated by several scholars (i.e., Ellis, 2006; Leeman, 2003; Muranoi, 2000), especially in the acquisition of grammatical structures and vocabularies. Thus, this type of CF also proved to be practical in the participants' oral activities.

A closer look at the regression findings about elicitation, which falls under the category of explicit CF, showed that a majority of the intrapersonal participants supported this type of CF to be familiar with different functions of that erroneous part and to avoid using them in their further oral activities. The advantage of elicitation was similarly found in Sato and Lyster's (2007) study and other studies (i.e., Fujii & Mackey, 2009; Garcia Mayo & Pica, 2000; Gass & Varonis, 1989; Porter, 1986; Shehadeh, 1999) in which the learners provided one another with significantly more elicitation CF who, in turn, provided them with significantly more reformulation choices.

Considering the role of explicit and metalinguistic CF, the intrapersonal participants contributed more differently. So, the findings of this study provide empirical support for negative evidence, especially the explicit type of CF. This will, subsequently, corroborate Schmidt's (2001) noticing hypothesis which emphasizes attracting L2 learners' attention to the formal aspects of an L2 in order to achieve linguistic gains. On the converse side of the coin, the interpersonal participants showed a greater positive attitude towards paralinguistic signs, and the potential reason could be the social interaction and maintenance as well as communication that can be achieved through gestures, facial expressions, and paralinguistic signs. That is why these groups of participants tended more strongly towards this CF type.

The results gleaned from the Spearman correlation indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between the participants' intrapersonal intelligence and their tendency toward the explicit types of CF. In other words, as the participants' scores in their intrapersonal intelligence test increased, they leaned toward the explicit types of CF more (i.e., explicit, metalinguistic feedback, and explicit feedback accompanied by metalinguistic definitions, etc.). However, the relation between the participants' interpersonal intelligence and the explicit or implicit CF types was not positive and conspicuous.

From the results of the current study, it was revealed that the interpersonal participants showed a great significant tendency towards repetition, paralinguistic signs, clarification requests, and translation; however, conversational and didactic recasts as well as elicitation, explicit, and metalinguistic CF were encountered with

the great value of the intrapersonal participants. Overall, intrapersonal intelligence appeared to be a significantly better predictor for explicit CF types, and interpersonal intelligence was shown to be a better indicator of implicit CF types.

6. Implications and Limitations

According to the findings, it sounds appropriate that L2 teachers attend to L2 learners' MI profiles as a significant factor relevant to their L2 speaking performance. In fact, taking account of the relationship between MI and CF types in L2 oral performance, L2 teachers can identify their learners' MI types, match their CF provisions to their MI profiles, and devise more appropriate CF types to address the learners' tendencies and boost their fluency and accuracy in their L2 oral activities. This way, they accomplish to adopt an effective approach toward teaching and practicing L2 oral skills.

It is also recommended that L2 teachers plan to identify their learners' dominant intelligences and devise their class activities and tasks accordingly. As Armstrong (2009) points out, they should use a broad range of techniques, tools, and strategies beyond typical linguistic and logical strategies to consider different L2 learners. In addition, they should be conscious of the interaction of MI and different aspects of L2 performance, including L2 oral performance, so that they could have a better understanding of their learners' strengths and weaknesses and manage to provide proper individualized instruction.

Moreover, L2 teachers should plan to introduce the MI theory to their learners. In this way, L2 learners can benefit from teaching approaches that assist them think about their own learning processes. L2 teachers are also advised to raise their learners' awareness toward their MI profiles, as well as their strengths and weaknesses in L2 performance and allow them to know the areas they should focus and practice more. Furthermore, they should also inform the learners that their MI profiles can be nurtured and developed: They should plan to "create learning environments that foster the development of all intelligences" (Haley, 2004, p. 163).

Along the same lines, L2 textbook developers should address various intelligences in preparing L2 textbooks. Presenting wide-ranging materials and varied activities in accordance with different interests and intelligences, L2 textbooks could effectively address the educational needs and interests of various L2 learners.

However, it is worth mentioning that this study had some limitations. The first limitation was related to the sample size that was not large enough to generalize the findings. Initially, the instruments were administered to a larger number of L2 learners; however, many of the learners were excluded from the study due to their lack of attention and care in replying to the questions as well as their inappropriate

levels of proficiency. Indeed, in order to ensure the quality of the data, only the carefully answered instruments were kept. Apparently, such studies require a greater number of participants.

The second drawback of this study dealt with the participants' gender. The data were collected from both male and female L2 learners and the effect of gender on the study results was not monitored. Potentially, gender might have influenced the results. Thus, it is recommended to consider such an issue in interpreting the results.

The third limitation was related to the fact that the participants came from merely the language centers in Isfahan, Iran; as such, they were not representative of all the Iranian L2 learners who study at different cities of Iran.

The fourth shortcoming is that the participants belonged to different sociocultural backgrounds. In fact, sociocultural factors could have particularly influenced the participants' MI profiles, and we unfortunately failed to consider them due to the issue of practicality.

And, the final limitation is related to the descriptive design of this study because the major goal was to describe CF preferences and frequencies among the two intelligences groups. The study needs to be replicated in order to find out if these specified types of oral CF also differ among other intelligences groups. Furthermore, experimental studies with a design of immediate and delayed posttests are needed to test the effect of these new types on learning outcomes.

7. Suggestions for Further Research

This study opens up new ideas for prospective L2 researchers interested in MI profiles and their associations with L2 learning. Considering the substantial role of L2 learners' personal attributes in their L2 performance and the abovementioned limitations of the study, the following suggestions are put forward for further research:

First, this study should be replicated with larger samples while controlling the effect of some extraneous variables such as gender, age, and sociocultural background. As noted above, an accurate investigation of such relationships requires extensive research, adequate replication, and meticulous control of extraneous variables. Thus, one cannot simply rely on a limited number of such studies—a considerable need for further research should be taken into account.

Stemming from the limitations of the current study, a meticulous experimental design through the provision of certain types of CF as the treatments and adding a control group could be employed in future for other types of intelligences to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the issue. Such L2

learners can be given pretests and posttests related to fluency and/or accuracy tasks before and after the study in order to see whether there is a significant difference after the treatment and, in this way, a more valid statistical comparison of the performance of the learners can be insured. Moreover, as the division of the participants within one class in terms of their MI types was not permitted, the segregation of participants can be applied in other contexts to examine the effect of their MI types on their CF preferences in various fluency and/or accuracy tasks in their oral activities.

Finally, considering the possible interplay of L2 learners' intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences and their L2 oral performance, besides the significance of such relationships in L2 teaching/learning, it is suggested to explore the potential relationships between L2 learners' other MIs (e.g., linguistic, musical, etc.) and their L2 oral performance.

References

- Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29, 1859-1868.
- Ahmadian, M., & Hosseini, S. (2012). A study of the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' multiple intelligences and their performance on writing. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 111-126.
- Akbari, R., & Hosseini, K. (2008). Multiple intelligences and language learning strategies: Investigating possible relations. *System: An International Journal of Educational Technology and Applied Linguistics*, 36(2), 141-155.
- Allan, D. (1992). *Oxford placement test*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Armstrong, T. (2009). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brown, A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 46-60.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Doughty, C. J., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. J. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review*, 19, 18-41.

- Erlam, R., Ellis, R., & Batstone, R. (2013). Oral corrective feedback on L2 writing. *System*, 41(2), 257-268.
- Fujii, A., & Mackey, A. (2009). Interactional feedback in learner-learner interactions in a task based EFL classroom. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 47(3), 267-301.
- Garcia Mayo, M., & Pica, T. (2000). Interaction among proficient learners: Are input, feedback, and output needs addressed in a foreign language context? *Studia Linguistica*, 54(2), 272-279.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gass, S. M. (2003). Input and interaction. In C. J. Doughty & M. H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 224-255). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gass, S., & Varonis, E. (1989). Incorporated repairs in nonnative discourse. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 71-86). New York: Plenum Press.
- Hajhashemi, K., Ghombavani, F., & Yazdi Amirkhiz, S.Y., (2011). The relationship between Iranian EFL high school students' multiple intelligence scores and their use of learning strategies. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 214-314.
- Haley, M. H. (2004). Learner-centered instruction and the theory of multiple intelligences with second language learners. *The Teachers College Record*, 106(1), 163-180.
- Hashemi, J. (2009). *The relationship between emotional intelligence, language proficiency, and L2 learners' writing performance in Iranian EFL learners*. Unpublished master's thesis, Arak University, Arak, Iran.
- Hashemian, M., & Adibpour, M. (2012). Relationship between Iranian L2 learners' multiple intelligences and language learning strategies. *RALs*, 3(1), 26-43.
- Havranek, G. (1999). The effectiveness of corrective feedback: Preliminary results of an empirical study. Acquisition et interaction en langue étrangère [acquisition and interaction in a foreign language]. *Proceedings of the Eighth EUROSLA Conference*, 2, 189-206.
- Johnson, M. (2007). *The effect of multiple intelligences on elementary student performance*. Dominican University of California, San Rafael, CA.

- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness, 14*, 112-127.
- Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and L2 development: Beyond negative evidence. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25*(1), 37-63.
- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*, 309-365.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lochtmann, 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.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of research on second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37-66.
- Marefat, F. (2007). Multiple intelligences: Voices from an EFL writing class. *Pazhuhesh-e Zabanhaye Khareji, 32*, 145-162.
- McKenzie, W. (1999). *Multiple intelligences survey*. Retrieved October 9, 2014, from the World Wide Web: <http://surfaquarium.com/MI/MIIInvent.htm>
- Moheb, N., & Bagheri, M. (2013). Relationship between multiple intelligences and writing strategies. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(4), 777-784.
- Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Integrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning, 50*, 617-673.
- Nejad Ansari, D., & Dabaghi, A. (2010). Iranian EFL students' writing strategies for error correction: An MI approach. *English Language Teaching journal, 3*(4), 40-46.
- Ohta, A. (2000). Rethinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese classroom. In J. K. Hall & L. Verplaetse (Eds.), *The construction of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 47-71). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Oladejo, J. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preferences. *TESL Canada Journal, 10*(2), 71-89.

- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pair-work. *Language Learning*, 50, 119-151.
- Porter, P. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 200-222). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Rahimi, M., Mirzaei, A., & Heidari, N. (2012). How do successful EFL readers bridge between Multiple Intelligences and reading strategies? *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 17(9), 1134-1142.
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The awareness-practice-feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology* (141-160). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubado, K. (2002). Empowering students through multiple intelligences. *Reclaiming Children and Youth*, 10(4), 233-235.
- Rydahl, S. (2005). *Oral feedback in the English classroom, teachers' thoughts and awareness*. Retrieved July 14, 2014, From the World Wide Web: <http://kau.divaportal.org/smash/get/diva2:6576/FULLTEXT01>
- Sadeghi, K., & Farzizadeh, B. (2012). The relationship between multiple intelligences and writing ability of Iranian EFL learners, *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 136-142.
- Schachter, J. (1981). The hand signal system. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(2), 125-138.
- Shangarffam, N., & Zand, A. (2012). Iranian foreign language learners' multiple intelligences and their use of oral communication strategies, *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(4), 310-328.
- Shearer, C. B. (2006). *Criterion related validity of the MIDAS assessments*. Kent, Ohio: MI Research and Consulting, Inc. [www. MIResearch.org](http://www.MIResearch.org).
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593-610). New York: Routledge.
- Shehadeh, A. (1999). Nonnative speakers' production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning. *Language Learning*, 49(4), 627-675.
- Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Eds.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). New York, Cambridge University Press.

- Skourdi, S., Damavand, A., Viyani, A., & K, S. H. (2012). On the relationship between linguistic intelligence and vocabulary knowledge among Iranian EFL learners. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(6), 289-303.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. Pearson international edition: Pearson.
- Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics and control and communication in the animal and the machine*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Yilmaz, Y. (2013). The relative effectiveness of mixed, explicit and implicit feedback in the acquisition of English articles. *System*, 41, 691-705.