

The Impact of Three Types of Written Feedback on the Motivation and Writing Skill of English Major Students at Hebron University

تأثير ثلاثة أنواع من التغذية الكتابية الراجعة على دافعية الكتابة ومهارتها لدى طلبة قسم اللغة الانجليزية في جامعة الخليل

Riyad Zahida, Mohammed Farrah & Najj Zaru

رياض زاهدة، ومحمد فراح، وناجي الزرو

English Department, Hebron University, Hebron, Palestine

E-mail: rzahida@yahoo.com

Received: (12/3/2013), Accepted: (5/9/2013)

Abstract

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of three types of written feedback (*meaning-focused feedback*, *positive feedback*, and *form-focused feedback*) on the motivation and writing skill of English major students at Hebron University. Sixty students divided into three groups and given different type of feedback participated in this study. The study utilized two questionnaires: pre-treatment and post-treatment to check whether there were any statistically significant differences among these groups towards the three different types of feedback and the writing skill. The study also used two tests: pre-test and post-test to explore if there were any significant differences in the groups writing performance before and after the type of the feedback. In addition, the study used classroom observation as an instrument to record students' immediate reaction to the type of feedback utilized. The results revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the post treatment questionnaire and the post test in favor of the *meaning-focused feedback* group. The researchers recommended using the *meaning-focused feedback* in writing classes as it is more motivating and beneficial.

Key words: EFL writing, meaning-focused feedback, positive feedback, form-focused feedback, motivation.

ملخص

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة مدى تأثير ثلاثة أنواع من التغذية الكتابية الراجعة على دافعية الكتابة ومهارتها لدى طلبة قسم اللغة الانجليزية في جامعة الخليل والأنواع الثلاثة هي: التغذية الراجعة التي تركز على المعنى، التغذية الراجعة التي تركز على التعزيز الإيجابي (الثناء)، والتغذية الراجعة التي تركز على التركيب اللغوي. شارك في هذه الدراسة ستون طالبًا وطالبة حيث تم تقسيمهم إلى ثلاثة مجموعات بحيث تم إعطاء كل مجموعة نوعًا مختلفًا من أنواع التغذية الكتابية الراجعة. استخدم الباحثون استبيانين قبل التغذية وبعدها وامتحانين قبلي وبعدي؛ وذلك بهدف معرفة إن كان هناك فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في اتجاهات الطلبة وأدائهم. إضافة لذلك استخدم الباحثون أداة المشاهدة الصفية لمعاينة ردود فعل الطلبة المباشرة للأنواع المختلفة من التغذية الراجعة. أظهرت النتائج وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية لصالح مجموعة التغذية الكتابية الراجعة التي تركز على المعنى في كل من الاستبيان والامتحان. وبناءً على ذلك يُوصي الباحثون على استخدام هذا النوع من التغذية في مساقات الكتابة، لكونها أكثر فائدة وتحفيزًا.

Introduction

Feedback plays a pivotal role in EFL classroom for both learners and teachers. It has attracted the attention of many theoreticians and practitioners in the field of education. It is generally believed that feedback, if properly given and carefully selected, can enhance students' performance and motivation. Ideally, feedback should be beneficial for learners; it should give them information about their performance of a task, an activity, etc. They, in turn, should use this information as a basis for improvement in their own writing, i.e., they should avoid making the same errors in the future; otherwise, feedback would be a waste of time.

Students' motivation or positive response to feedback is of paramount importance here. It depends on the type of feedback which competent teachers would opt for in dealing with the errors made by their students. There are various types of feedback, such as peer feedback, teacher feedback, student feedback, meaning-focused feedback, positive feedback, and form-focused feedback. The present study will be restricted to three types of feedback, namely: *meaning-focused feedback*, *positive feedback*, and *form-focused feedback*. It will shed light on the role these types play in motivating Hebron University students in EFL writing classrooms.

Statement of the Problem

Many scholars expressed their concern that the lack of motivation and development in EFL writing is correlated with the feedback method which teachers use. In conferences, they talk about effective methods, and they hint that some of the suggested teaching methods are not very successful. Moreover, they often raise the issue of effective feedback as some students are not motivated to write because they do not get appropriate feedback from their instructors. Some instructors provide feedback to the students; however, this feedback usually focuses on the form and if it is given on the content, it is often general, unclear, and unhelpful (Covill, 1997; Rassaei & Moinzadeh, 2011; Zamel, 1985). The students then would feel frustrated and lose motivation, which would eventually lead to low levels of English language proficiency. Therefore, to reverse such an unfavorable outcome, English writing teachers should carefully select the most helpful feedback, the one which motivates their students and helps them improve their writing skill. Thus, it follows that there is a need to explore some common feedbacks and investigate their effects on motivating English writing students.

Significance of the Study

There is a dearth of research conducted on the effect of using different types of feedback to improve students' writing skill in the academic context, or rather at the university level. The present study can be regarded as an original contribution to the field of language teaching and learning, as it attempts to shed some insights into the nature and types of feedback which can best motivate EFL students at Hebron University as well as at other universities and colleges in Palestine. Furthermore, it is the first study of its kind to be conducted in Palestine. The results of this study will hopefully have far-reaching implications on English language teaching in general. The researchers also hope that this study will come up with practical conclusions and recommendations which will hopefully improve the academic writing performance of EFL students in general as well as that of EFL writing teachers in particular at the Palestinian university level.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following main questions:

1. Are there any attitudinal differences between the three groups of participants towards the writing skill due to the type of feedback they received?
2. Are there any differences in writing performance between and within groups of participants due to the type of feedback they received?
3. What is the effect of using *meaning-focused feedback* on increasing the motivation of English major students at Hebron University and ultimately improving their writing skill?
4. What is the effect of using *positive feedback* on increasing the motivation of English major students at Hebron University and ultimately improving their writing skill?
5. What is the effect of using *form-focused feedback* on increasing the motivation of English major students at Hebron University and ultimately improving their writing skill?

Literature Review

Determining the effectiveness of *meaning-focused feedback*, *positive feedback* and *form-focused feedback* is something that many writing researchers and EFL/ESL writing teachers have been struggling with. The debate has even been over the effectiveness of feedback itself—whether it is helpful or not. In case it was helpful, then what type of feedback should writing teachers provide their learners with? In case it was harmful, then what type of feedback should writing teachers avoid providing their learners with? Before investigating the effect of different types of feedback on writing students' development, previous studies that attempted to explore the effect of writing teachers' comments on writing students' improvement will be reviewed.

A well-known debate in the field occurs between Truscott and Ferris. Truscott (1996, 1999) believed that correcting errors would not enhance

students' writing ability, and it might sometimes be harmful to second language writing development. On the contrary, Ferris (1999, 2002) claimed that error correction feedback would be of great value to second language writing learners. Furthermore, she suggested that grammar correction was favored by second language writers. In line with the view above, Chandler (2003) suggested some positive results for the form-focused feedback in writing as it helped learners to produce better writing performance in comparison to other types of feedback. This debate has many sides backed up by research. Reviewing both the pros and cons of this debate can benefit second language teachers.

Ferris (2006) distinguished between direct and indirect feedback. She defined direct feedback as providing writing students with the correct linguistic form next to their errors; whereas indirect feedback means highlighting (i.e. underlining, circling, etc.) the writing students' errors without providing them with the correct linguistic form. Based on her research, Ferris recommended the two types of feedback (i.e. direct and indirect) and proposed that the selection between them depends on the type of the error.

Olson and Ratteld (1987) investigated the effects of content comments and surface comments on students' writings on two groups of students. The content comment aimed to encourage students to focus on the needed content and ideas. On the other hand, the surface comment focused on problems such as word choice, spelling, punctuation, and/or language use. They reported significant differences among groups for holistic scores and for learning course content. As they explained, "the treatment group that received content comments wrote significantly better essays than the other treatment group or the control group. The treatment group that received content comments and the control group received significantly better scores on the course content test" (p. 273).

Believing that revision and feedback is the key to effective writing, Nelson and Carson (2006) found that writing learners prefer to get feedback from their teachers. Moreover, they found that peer feedback is beneficial, especially when students are trained to provide their counters with such feedback.

Straub (1997) asserted: “students read and *make use of teacher comments* and that well-designed teacher comments *can help* students develop as writers” (p.92, emphasis ours). Whereas, Marzano and Arthur (1977) claimed that: “Different types of teacher comments on student themes have equally *small influences* on student writing. For all practical purposes, commenting on student essays might just be an exercise in *futility*” (p.6, emphasis ours).

Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) believed that “responding supportively to student writing is indeed central to enlightened instruction, *despite the apparent weight of evidence to the contrary*” (p.1, emphasis ours). Unlike Knoblauch and Brannon, Sommers (1982) believed that “although commenting on student writing is the most widely used method for responding to student writing, it is the least understood” (p. 148). In her study, she found that “teachers comments can take students attention away from their own purposes in writing a particular text and focus that attention on the teacher’s purpose in commenting” (p. 149); the second major finding was “most teachers’ comments are not text-specific and could be inter-changed, rubber-stamped, from text to text” (p. 152), i.e. generic rather than text-specific.

Covill (1997) tested and confirmed the assertion made by many writing experts that teachers' written comments on students' writing should primarily concern the ideas or content of the writing and not the mechanics or surface features.

Vygotsky (1978) stressed the importance of negotiation of meaning among learners in developing their cognitive skills and promoting social interaction. Farrah (2012) indicated that better writing is achieved when students are engaged in meaningful and problem-solving activities. He opined that such activities can promote the learners’ critical thinking skills and creativity rather than receiving and memorizing information. Similarly, Zamel (1985: p.82) stated that “we should hold in abeyance our reflex-like reactions to surface-level concerns and give priority to meaning.” This indicates that focusing on surface errors may hinder learners who are in the process of learning a foreign language. Learners would be more motivated if they responded to meaning rather than form,

and in this way, they would feel that they have been involved in constructing knowledge. Zamel (1982, p.195) explained that “methods that emphasize form and correctness ignore how ideas get explored through writing and fail to teach students that writing is essentially a process of discovery.”

This disagreement in previous research creates bewilderment and confusion for writing teachers leaving them in disorder, unable to decide upon what type of feedback to provide their writing students with. Therefore, it is crucial for second language writers to decide whether feedback is necessary or not and to decide what type of feedback is most helpful for second language learners, if necessary. In the present study, the researchers attempt to investigate these controversial issues.

Methodology

Participants

Sixty Hebron University sophomores enrolled in the second semester of the academic year 2011/12 served as the participants for this study. The participants, being English major students in the same academic level, were supposed to share almost a similar academic background of English language and literature. There were three groups of participants registered for the same writing course⁽¹⁾ and distributed over three sections, each of which comprised almost 20 students, had a different instructor and received a different type of the feedback types involved in the study.

Research Instruments

In order to fulfill the aforementioned objectives and answer the five stated questions of the study, two questionnaires (see Appendix A & B) and two tests (see Appendix C) were developed and employed by the researchers in consultation with an expert from the Faculty of Education. The questionnaires, like the tests, were administered in two separate

(1) This is Writing II course which aims at giving guidance and training in steps needed towards writing essays.

classroom settings. There were a pre-treatment questionnaire and a post-treatment questionnaire. The former was organized at the outset of the course and the latter at the end of the course. Similarly, there were two tests: a pre-test organized at the beginning of the course and a post-test at the end of the course. In addition, the researchers used classroom observation as a research instrument. The following is a description of these instruments.

The Questionnaires

There were two questionnaires: a pre-treatment questionnaire (see Appendix A) and a post-treatment questionnaire (see Appendix B). These questionnaires, though similar in terms of the eliciting information technique, were in fact different in terms of purpose. Both used a 5-point Likert scale (5 = *strongly agree*, 4 = *agree*, 3 = *neutral*, 2 = *disagree*, 1 = *strongly disagree*). The pre-treatment questionnaire consisted of twenty statements devised to elicit somehow relevant, but general, information about the students' attitudes and expectations from writing. The pre-treatment questionnaire was a valuable technique to check for any pre-treatment differences among the three participating groups.

Similarly, the post-treatment questionnaire consisted of twenty statements designed to serve a dual purpose. The first ten statements were similar in content to those of the pre-treatment questionnaire, yet they were different in terms of tense or structure as the pre-treatment questionnaire was given at the beginning of the course and the post-treatment questionnaire at the end of the course. These ten statements were intended to identify any changes in the participants' attitudes towards the writing skill and their expectations of the course in general. They were good enough to check for any attitudinal differences that could take place during the course among the three participating groups or classes.

The remaining ten items, or statements, addressed specific issues related to students' attitudes towards the three types of feedback (*meaning-focused feedback*, *positive feedback*, and *form-focused feedback*) that they received during the course. These ten items aimed to

find out which type of these three types of feedback students found most helpful and whether there were any differences in achievement and motivation among the participating groups due to using one type or another of feedback.

The Tests

There were two tests: a pre-test and a post-test (see Appendix C and Appendix D). The three participating groups were asked to write a five-paragraph essay in each of these two-hour tests. About 72 hours before each test, students were given a list of twenty thematically different topics mostly drawn from the Test of Written English (TWE). They were given this opportunity in order to prepare them for the topic of the essay they were expected to write. The pre-test was intended to explore if there were any significant differences in the students' writing performance before they were given any feedback. The post-test, however, was meant to check for any significant differences or improvement in the groups' writing performance after they were given the designated type of feedback.

The reliability, practicality and content validity were approved by a jury of experts, including the three instructors or researchers

Classroom Observation

The purpose of this instrument was to determine which type of feedback was most effective and helpful through observing and recording students' immediate verbal reaction to the type of feedback they received from their instructors. The researchers wanted also to identify any classroom problems (such as frustration, boredom, anxiety, lack of interaction or motivation) due to feedback inequities for each participating group of students.

Reliability of the Questionnaire

The reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was tabulated. The result showed that the overall Cronbach Alpha Coefficient of the

questionnaire was low to medium ($r = 0.61$). Though the reliability ($r = 0.61$) was not high, the researchers expected it as the number of the items in the questionnaire and the number of the respondents were limited. Statisticians considered this result to be indicating an intermediate degree of internal consistency, and therefore, presenting a considerably reliable instrument.

Results

This section presents the results of the study. Since there are two questionnaires (pre-treatment and post-treatment) and two tests (pre-test and post-test) as explained earlier, the results are presented here in two parts: the first is concerned with the results of the pre-treatment questionnaire and the pre-test, and the second deals with the post-treatment questionnaire and the post-test. Quantitative data was analyzed statistically by using the SPSS program version 15.

Results of the Pre-treatment Questionnaire

As mentioned above, there were three writing groups divided according to the type of feedback which each group received. Specifically, group 1 (G1 hereafter) received *positive feedback*, group 2 (G2 hereafter) received *meaning-focused feedback* and group 3 (G3 hereafter) received *form-focused feedback*. The pre-treatment questionnaire was used in order to make sure that these groups were of the same attitudes towards the writing skill and the feedback expected from their instructors.

Means and standard deviations were calculated and tabulated in Table 1 below to check for any differences in students' attitudes towards the writing skill and the expected feedback.

Table (1): Means and Standard Deviations for Students' Attitudes towards the Writing Skill and the Expected Feedback in the Pre-Treatment Questionnaire.

G	N	M	SD
G1	19	3.83	.43103
G2	21	3.83	.34129
G3	20	3.80	.44956
Total	60	3.82	.40195

G=group; N= number of students; M= mean square; SD= standard deviation

The results in Table 1 indicate that there were no differences in the students' attitudes towards the writing skill and the expected feedback in the pre-treatment questionnaire.

In order to find out whether the results of Table 1 were significant or not, One-Way ANOVA was also conducted to check for attitudinal differences between and within the three groups towards the writing skill and the expected feedback as shown in Table 2.

Table (2): One-Way ANOVA for Attitudinal Differences between and within Groups towards the Writing Skill and the Expected Feedback in the Pre-Treatment Questionnaire.

Source of variance	S S	d.f.	M S	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.019	2	.009	.056	.945
Within Groups	9.514	57	.167		
Total	9.532	59			

SS= Sum of Squares; d.f.= degrees of freedom; MS= Mean Square; F=F-ratio; Sig.= Significance

Table 2 shows that there were no significant differences at 0.05 levels. This means that the three groups had almost the same attitudes towards the writing skill and the expected feedback in the pre-treatment questionnaire, which statistically confirms the results in Table 1.

Results of the pre-test

As mentioned above, the aim of the pre-test was to explore if there were any significant differences in the students' writing performance before they were given any feedback. The pre-test was scored out of 20. Table 3 shows that there were no significant differences at 0.05, which means that the three groups had similar writing performance before receiving any feedback.

Table (3): Means and Standard Deviations for Students' Writing Performance in the Pre-Test.

G	N	M. (out of 20)	SD
G1	19	12.73	1.82093
G2	21	13.38	2.20173
G3	20	12.55	2.13923
Total	60	12.90	2.06422

G=group; N= number of students; M= mean square; SD= standard deviation

In order to find out whether the results of Table 3 were significant or not, One-Way ANOVA was also conducted to check for differences in writing performance between and within the three groups. There were no significant differences at 0.05 between or within these groups as can be seen in Table 4.

Table (4): One-Way ANOVA for Differences in Writing Performance between and within Groups of Participants in the Pre-Test.

Source of Variance	S S	d.f	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	7.813	2	3.907	.914	.407
Within Groups	243.587	57	4.273		
Total	251.400	59			

SS= Sum of Squares; d.f.= degrees of freedom; MS= Mean Square; F=F-ratio; Sig.= Significance

As seen in Table 3 and Table 4, the three groups had almost the same writing performance.

Results of the Post-Treatment Questionnaire

As mentioned before, the purpose of the post-treatment questionnaire was to find out if there were any general attitudinal differences between the three groups after receiving the different types of feedback. Post-treatment means and standard deviations for students' attitudinal differences were calculated for the three groups.

Table (5): Post-Treatment Means and Standard Deviations for Students' Attitudes.

G	N	M	SD
G1	19	3.56	.36699
G2	22	3.68	.34036
G3	19	3.42	.84842
Total	60	3.56	.55965

G=group; N= number of students; M= mean square; SD= standard deviation

Table (6): Post-Treatment One-Way ANOVA for Differences in Students' Attitudes between and within Groups of Participants.

Source of Variance	S S	d.f	M S	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.666	2	.333	1.065	.352
Within Groups	17.814	57	.313		
Total	18.749	59			

SS= Sum of Squares; d.f.= degrees of freedom; MS= Mean Square; F=F-ratio; Sig.= Significance

Table 5 and 6 show that there are no significant attitudinal differences at 0.05.

However, post-treatment means and standard deviations for students' attitudes were calculated for the three groups.

Table (7): Post-Treatment Means and Standard Deviations for Students' Attitudes towards Writing Feedback.

G	N	M	SD
G1	19	3.87	1.47905
G2	22	3.91	.94043
G3	19	2.90	.69282
Total	60	3.58	1.16102

G=group; N= number of students; M= mean square; SD= standard deviation

Table (8): Post-Treatment One-Way ANOVA for Attitudinal Differences between and within Groups of Participants.

Source of Variance	SS	d.f	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	12.940	2	6.470	5.538	.006
Within Groups	66.590	57	1.168		
Total	79.503	59			

SS= Sum of Squares; d.f. = degrees of freedom; MS= Mean Square; F=F-ratio; Sig.= Significance

Tables 7 and 8 show that there were significant differences in students' attitudes towards specific types of feedback, in favor of the *meaning-focused feedback*.

Results of the Writing Post-Test

The researchers investigated whether there was a significant difference in the achievement of the three groups owing to the type of feedback each group had received. The post-test was scored out of 20. Table 9 shows that the difference in students' achievement or progress in the writing skill was significant at 0.001.

Table (9): Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for Achievement in Writing Skill.

G	N	M	SD
G1	19	12.26	1.93913
G2	22	14.45	1.47122
G3	19	12.36	2.52125
Total	60	13.10	2.22238

Table 9 shows that the difference in students' achievement or progress in the writing skill was significant at 0.001. Results of the One-Way ANOVA test showed exactly where that difference occurred (see Table 10).

Table (10): Post-Test One-Way ANOVA for Differences in Achievement Between and within Groups of Participants.

Source of Variance	SS	d.f	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	63.840	2	31.920	7995	.001
Within Groups	227.560	57	3.992		
Total	291.400	59			

SS= Sum of Squares; d.f.= degrees of freedom; MS= Mean Square; F=F-ratio; Sig.= Significance

This is in line with the results of the studies reviewed below.

Discussion and Conclusion

As can be seen from the above results of the pre-treatment questionnaire, all three groups have "great expectations" about the writing skill (items 1-10) and the course feedback (items 11-20). In other words, they all had almost the same attitudes towards the writing skill and the expected feedback. The majority of the participants in the three groups thought that they will enjoy Writing II, which focuses on essay writing, more than Writing I, which focuses on paragraph writing. They thought that writing essays will have a positive effect on improving their

English, and by the end of the course they will be able to express themselves in writing more easily. They believed that writing essays will be a good experience for them, encourage them to study English more and change their attitudes towards English in general. As for the expected feedback, they also believed that they will get useful, detailed and constructive feedback from their instructors. In addition, they believed that the feedback on their essays will be critical and satisfactory, increase their motivation and creativity, and contain some positive comments and effective explanations.

However, the results of the post-treatment questionnaire revealed the great frustration and disappointment for G1 and G3 as a result of the feedback (*positive feedback* and *form-focused feedback*) they received from their instructors; whereas, G2 was satisfied with the type of feedback they received (*meaning-focused feedback*). G1 and G3 simply said that the whole experience was, to some extent, no more than waste of time and the feedback they received was unhelpful and much below their expectations.

The result for G1 and G3 was also backed up by the instructors' classroom observation of the students' immediate *discourage* and even *cynical* verbal remarks to these two types of feedback—a situation which caused obvious boredom, anxiety and lack of proper interaction on the part of the students as well as embarrassment to the instructors who felt that they had to explain what was going on to their "still awaiting for *real* feedback" students. On the other hand, the result for G2 is also supported by their instructor's classroom observation where students were positively engaged and seemed interestingly satisfied with the kind of feedback (*meaning-focused feedback*) they received.

Accordingly, when giving feedback, writing instructors should focus on the *meaning-focused feedback* or content of the students' paragraphs and essays rather than the *form-focused feedback* or the surface features. The results of the present study are in line with Fattash (2006), who found that *meaning-focused feedback* contributes to the development of students' writing. Moreover, the results are in agreement with Covill's (1997) who reported that *content-feedback* may have a better positive

effect on the students' writings than the *form-feedback*. Olson and Ratteld (1987) concluded that the treatment group that received *content comments* wrote significantly better essays than the other treatment group or the control group indicating that the *meaning-focused feedback* is more beneficial in helping students to have standards of good writing and in qualifying them to be better writers.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Due to its benefits, *meaning-focused* feedback in writing should be an integral component of every writing course. Nevertheless, other types of feedback could be integrated. Thus, instructors can offer *form-focused* and *positive feedback* depending on learners' academic level, error type, and the purpose of the activity. Such parameters can be taken into consideration in future studies.
2. Similar future studies, but with larger population, should be carried out at other universities in order to see whether their results corroborate or oppose the results of the present study.

References

- Chandler, J. (2003). *The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing*. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12(3), 267–296.
- Covill, A. (1996). *Students' revision practices and attitudes in response to surface-related feedback as compared to content-related feedback on their writing*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 58. (UMI No. 9716828).
- Farrah, M. (2012). *The impact of peer feedback on improving the writing skills among Hebron University students*. An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities). 26(1), 179-209.

- Fattash, K. (2000). *The use of Grice's maxims in providing content-feedback for the students writers of An-Najah National University*. (Unpublished thesis). An-Najah National University, Palestine.
- Ferris, D. (1999). *The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996)*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language writing classes*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (2006). *Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction*. In K. Hyland & F.
- Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). New York: Cambridge.
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (Eds.) (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Knoblauch, C. & Brannon, L. (1981). *Teacher commentary on student writing: The state of the art*. *Freshman English News*, 10(2), 1-4.
- Marzano, R. & Arthur, S. (1977). *Teacher comments on student essays: It doesn't matter what you say*. ERIC, Document Reproduction Service No. ED 147 864.
- Nelson, G. & Carson, J. (2006). *Cultural issues in peer response: Revisiting "Culture."* In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 42-59). New York: Cambridge.
- Olson, M. & Ratteld, P. (1987). *The effects of written comments on the quality of student compositions and the learning of content*. *Reading Psychology*, 8(4), 273-293.

- Rassaei, E. & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). *Investigating the effects of three types of corrective feedback on the acquisition of English wh-question forms by Iranian EFL learners*. *English Language Teaching*, 4(2), 97-206.
- Sommers, N. (1982). *Responding to student writing*. *College Composition and Communication*, 33(2), 148-156.
- Straub, R. (1997). *Students' reactions to teacher comments: An exploratory study*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 31(1), 91-119.
- Truscott, J. (1996). *The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes*. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). *The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scriber & E. Souberman, Eds. & Trans.). Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.
- Zamel, V. (1982). *Writing: the process of discovering meaning*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16 (2), 195-209.
- Zamel, V. (1983). *The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17(2), 165-87.
- Zamel, V. (1985). *Responding to student writing*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19(1), 79-101.

Appendix A

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to examine if certain types of written feedback are helpful and useful for teaching English as a foreign language. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous.

Indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following statements by putting a tick (/) in the appropriate box using the following scale:

1. *Strongly disagree* 2. *Disagree* 3. *Neutral* 4. *Agree* 5. *Strongly agree*

	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1.	I think I am going to enjoy writing essays.					
2.	I think writing essays will have a positive effect on improving my English.					
3.	I think Writing II is more enjoyable than Writing I.					
4.	By the end of this course, I think my writing will be better than it was in Writing I.					
5.	By the end of this course, I will be able to express myself in writing more easily than I did in Writing I.					
6.	I think writing essays is a good experience for me.					
7.	Writing essays will encourage me to study English more.					
8.	I look forward to getting my essays back from the instructor.					
9.	Writing essays will change my attitude towards English.					
10.	Writing essays will improve my performance in other courses.					
11.	I think that my instructor will provide me with critical feedback on my essays.					
12.	The feedback will help me improve my assignments.					
13.	The feedback process will increase my motivation to write.					
14.	The feedback process will enhance my creativity.					
15.	I expect to get satisfactory written feedback.					
16.	The feedback will conform with my expectations					
17.	The feedback will be detailed.					
18.	The feedback will be constructive.					
19.	The feedback will contain some positive comments.					
20.	The feedback will provide effective explanations.					

Thank you for your participation and cooperation

Appendix B
Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to evaluate students' attitude about writing. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous.

Indicate the extent you agree or disagree with the following statements by putting a tick (/) in the appropriate box using the following scale:

1. *Strongly disagree* 2. *Disagree* 3. *Neutral* 4. *Agree* 5. *Strongly agree*

	Statements	1	2	3	4	5
1.	I enjoyed writing essays.					
2.	Writing essays had a positive effect on improving my English.					
3.	Writing II was more enjoyable than Writing I.					
4.	From Writing II, I could understand that writing is a gift that is given to some students but not to others.					
5.	Now, at the end of this course, I can express myself in writing more easily than I did at the beginning of this course.					
6.	Writing essays was a good experience for me.					
7.	Writing essays encouraged me to study English more.					
8.	I used to look forward to getting my essays back from the instructor.					
9.	Writing essays has changed my attitude towards English.					
10.	Writing essays has improved my performance in other courses.					
11.	I think that my instructor did a good job in providing me with critical feedback on my essays.					
12.	The feedback helped me improve my assignments.					
13.	The feedback process increased my motivation to write.					
14.	The feedback process enhanced my creativity.					
15.	I am satisfied with the written assignment feedback.					
16.	The feedback was as expected.					
17.	The feedback was detailed.					
18.	The feedback was constructive.					
19.	The feedback contained some positive comments.					
20.	The feedback provided effective explanations.					

Thank you for your participation and cooperation

Appendix C
Writing II Topics

1. People attend school for many different reasons (for example, expanded knowledge, societal awareness, and enhanced interpersonal relationships). Why do you think people decide to go to school? Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.
2. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? One should never judge a person by external appearances. Use specific reasons and details to support your answer.
3. If you could change one important thing about your country, what would you change? Use reasons and specific examples to support your answer.
4. "When people succeed in life, it is because of hard work. Being lucky has nothing to do with success in life." Do you agree or disagree with the quotation above? Use specific reasons and examples to explain your position.
5. Some people believe that university students should be required to attend classes. Others believe that going to classes should be optional for students. Which point of view do you agree with? Use specific reasons and details to explain your answer.
6. Neighbors are the people who live near us. In your opinion, what are the qualities of a good neighbor? Use specific details and examples in your answer.
7. Some people think that they can learn better by themselves than with a teacher. Others think that it is always better to have a teacher. Which do you prefer? Use specific reasons to develop your essay.
8. A person you know is planning to move to your town or city. What do you think this person would like and dislike about living in your town or city? Why? Use specific reasons and details to develop your essay.
9. Is it better to enjoy your money when you earn it or is it better to save your money for some time in the future? Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.
10. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? With the help of technology, students nowadays can learn more information and learn it more quickly. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

Appendix D

Writing II/ Essay Topics

1. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Parents are the best teachers. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.
2. It has been said, "Not everything that is learned is contained in books." Compare and contrast knowledge gained from experience with knowledge gained from books. In your opinion, which source is more important? Why?
3. If you could make one important change in your university, what change would you make? Use reasons and specific examples to support your answer.
4. Some people prefer to live in a small town. Others prefer to live in a big city. Which place would you prefer to live in? Use specific reasons and details to support your answer.
5. How does television influence people's behavior? Use reasons and specific examples to support your answer.
6. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? Watching a sporting event on television is more enjoyable than attending it. Use specific reasons and examples to support your opinion.
7. Technology is making communication easier in today's world, but at the expense of personal contact as many people choose to work at home in front of a computer screen. What dangers are there for a society which depends on computer screens rather than face-to-face contact for its main means of communication?
8. Some businesses now say that no one can smoke cigarettes in any of their offices. Some governments have banned smoking in all public places. Do you agree or disagree? Give reasons.
9. "Israel says that it is building a barrier around the West Bank for security reasons." Do you agree or disagree with the quotation above? Use specific reasons and examples to explain your position.
10. What is a very important skill a person should learn in order to be successful in the world today? Choose one skill and use specific reasons and examples to support your choice.

The End