Corrective Feedback in Iraqi Intermediate Writing Courses Text Type, Perception, Accuracy, Fluency and Complexity in Focus

Asst.Lect.Ameer Salman Lafta
Faculty of Human Sciences Department of English Language
Isfahan University
ameersalman04@gmail.com
Supervisor/Associate professor Hossein Barati /Isfahan University
h.barati@gmail.com
Advisor/ Associate professor Azizollah Dabaghi / Isfahan University
advarnosfadrani@gmail.com

التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية في دورات الكتابة المتوسطة بالعراق: التركيز على نوع النص، الإدراك، الدقة، السلاسة والتعقيد

م.م. امير سلمان لفته
قسم اللغه الإنجليزية / جامعة أصفهان
المشرف / أستاذ مساعد
حسين براتي/ جامعة اصفهان
الناصح / أستاذ مساعد
عزيز الله دباغي/ جامعة اصفهان

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the attitudes of Iraqi intermediate English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners toward improvement suggestions from their instructors and their performance on process and compare/contrast writing assignments. Furthermore, the paper examined the influence of teachers' corrective feedback on the precision, intricacy, and fluency of learners' writing in these specific text genres. A quasi-experimental design was utilized, consisting of a control group and an experimental group. The study was conducted at Al-Kufa University, chosen for its convenience. To ensure that the participants possessed upper-intermediate proficiency, sixty third-year TEFL university students (30 male and 30 female) were chosen using the Oxford Quick Placement Test. The study utilized the "Longman Academic Writing Series 3," the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT), a writing pretest and posttest, a writing rubric and Perception Questionnaire. After obtaining necessary administrative tasks such as consent forms and permissions, the participants underwent the OQPT to standardize their proficiency level. Participants underwent a writing preliminary to set a starting point, and were thereafter divided into either the experimental or control group. At the end of the study, both groups completed writing posttests, and the experimental group also provided feedback on their perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback. The results indicated a positive and robust relationship between participants' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback and their performance in compare/contrast and process writing tasks. This study emphasizes considering learners' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback. Teachers should use diverse strategies addressing various writing aspects like accuracy, and fluency. Individual differences in learners should be accounted for in providing feedback.

Key words: Accuracy, Feedback , Fluency, perceptions,Complexity, Writing Skill.

المستخلص

هذه الدراسة تهدف إلى استكشاف العلاقة بين تصورات طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية المتعلمين على المستوى المتوسط في العراق حول الملاحظات التصحيحية التي يقدمها المعلمون وأدائهم في مهام الكتابة للمقارنة والتباين والكتابة عن العمليات. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، بحثت الدراسة تأثير الملاحظات التصحيحية للمعلمين على دقة الطلاب و طلاقة التعبير لديهم في كتابة هذه الأنواع من النصوص.

تم استخدام تصميم شبه تجريبي، مع وجود مجموعة ضابطة ومجموعة تجريبية. وأجريت الدراسة في جامعة الكوفة، التي تم اختيارها لسهولة الوصول إليها. تم اختيار ستون طالبًا وطالبة من طلاب السنة الثالثة في قسم تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (٣٠ ذكرًا و ٣٠ أنثى) بناءً على اختبار تحديد المستوى السريع من أوكسفورد (OQPT) لضمان مستوى متقدم متوسط.

استخدمت الدراسة سلسلة"Longman Academic Writing Series 3" ، واختبار تحديد المستوى السريع من أوكسفورد(OQPT) ، واختبار كتابة ما قبل الاختبار وما بعده، ومقياس تقييم للكتابة واستبيان للتصورات. بعد الحصول على الإجراءات الإدارية اللازمة مثل استمارات الموافقة والتصاريح، خضع المشاركون لاختبار تحديد المستوى السريع من أوكسفورد لتوحيد مستوى الكفاءة لديهم. تم إجراء اختبار كتابة مسبق لتحديد مستوى البداية، ثم تم توزيع المشاركين على المجموعة التجريبية أو المجموعة الضابطة. في نهاية الدراسة، أكملت كلتا المجموعتين اختبارات كتابة لاحقة، وقدمت المجموعة التجريبية أيضًا ملاحظات حول تصوراتها بشأن الملاحظات التصحيحية التي يقدمها المعلمون.

وأشارت النتائج إلى وجود علاقة إيجابية وقوية بين تصورات المشاركين حول الملاحظات التصحيحية التي يقدمها المعلمون وأدائهم في مهام الكتابة للمقارنة والتباين والكتابة عن العمليات. تؤكد هذه الدراسة على أهمية الأخذ بعين الاعتبار تصورات المتعلمين حول الملاحظات التصحيحية التي يقدمها المعلمون. يجب على المعلمين استخدام استراتيجيات متنوعة تتناول جوانب مختلفة من الكتابة مثل الدقة والطلاقة. وينبغي أيضًا مراعاة الفروق الفردية بين المتعلمين عند تقديم الملاحظات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الدقة، التغذية الراجعة، الطلاقة، الادراك، التعقيد، مهارة الكتابة.

Introduction

Mastering the skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking is crucial for learning English. However, among these skills, writing poses significant difficulties for English foreign language learners as it involves translating thoughts into coherent written texts. As a result, many L2 students and English foreign language learners struggle with writing, facing challenges such as selecting appropriate vocabulary, expressing ideas effectively, and dealing with grammar and syntax issues (Kafipour & Tubin, 2017). The task of choosing the right words and conveying thoughts clearly in writing is particularly challenging for students. Additionally, their limited proficiency often leads to errors in fundamental sentence structures like subject-verb agreement, pronouns, prepositions, tenses, and articles. Consequently, students find it hard to effectively communicate their ideas in written form.

Feedback, as defined by Keg (2023), refers to the information given by readers to writers to assist in the process of revising their work. It functions as an invaluable instrument for educators and learners alike, enabling instructors to appraise the efficacy of their instruction and appraise the progress of their pupils. For students, feedback provides ongoing assessment that focuses on progress rather than grades. In the context of writing, written corrective feedback addresses errors and weaknesses in content, organization, and language (Lewis, 2002). Specific Objectives

The aims of this research project were defined to achieve the following outcomes:

1. Determine whether views on corrective feedback by Iraqi intermediate EFL learners influence their achievement in process and compare/contrast writing.
2. The purpose of this research is to determine how teachers' corrective feedback influences the compare/contrast and process writing abilities of intermediate Iraqi EFL learners.
3. In order to evaluate the influence of corrective feedback provided by instructors on the precision of compare/contrast and process writing among Iraqi intermediate EFL learners.
4. Conduct an assessment of the resultant effect that corrective feedback from instructors has on the fluency of process and compare/contrast writing among Iraqi intermediate EFL learners.
5. To examine the influence of corrective feedback from instructors on the complexity of compare/contrast and process texts for Iraqi intermediate EFL learners.

Currently, there is a research gap in exploring the combined use of all three CAF measures as indicators of proficiency, which limits our understanding of how CAF dimensions vary across different levels of L2 writing proficiency. As recommended by Polio (2023), further research should be conducted to measure writing accuracy and fluency (Polio, 2023). The treatment of errors in writing, specifically the question of whether they should be corrected or tolerated, is an area of significant importance. However, there remains uncertainty regarding the most effective feedback strategy, as existing findings are inconclusive (Banaruee & Askari, 2016). Teachers employ various corrective techniques, including recasts, although the impact of recasts on improving writing performance has not been extensively investigated (Barrot, 2022; Ellis, 2003; Sheen, 2006). Studies have demonstrated that detailed remedial feedback can significantly decrease specific types of errors in writing (Allende,

2023; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1995, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Khoshsima & Banaruee, 2017; Rugen, 2010, 2022). However, there are counterarguments that question the effectiveness of explicit corrective feedback (Fazio, 2021; Li & Zhu, 2019; Pienemann, 1998; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2004, 2007, 2009, 2010). Truscott, for instance, argues that interlanguage development involves complex learning processes, and a simplistic view of learning that relies on transferring linguistic knowledge through corrective feedback from teacher to L2 learners does not yield positive outcomes. Truscott further suggests that corrective feedback can have detrimental effects on language learning, including increased anxiety and discouragement among learners. Consequently, Truscott advocates for the abandonment of correction, deeming it ineffective (Truscott, 2010).

Therefore, the current investigation sought to address the subsequent research inquiries:

RQ1. Do Iraqi intermediate EFL learners' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback significantly relate to their compare / contrast and process writing performance?

RQ2. Does teachers' corrective feedback significantly affect Iraqi intermediate EFL learners' compare / contrast and process writing performance?

RQ3. Does teachers' corrective feedback significantly affect Iraqi intermediate EFL learners' accuracy when writing compare and contrast text and process text?

RQ4. Does teachers' corrective feedback significantly affect Iraqi intermediate EFL learners' fluency when writing compare and contrast text and process text?

RQ5. Does teachers' corrective feedback significantly affect Iraqi intermediate EFL learners' complexity when writing compare and contrast and process texts?

Literature Review

Theoretical Background

An investigation into the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF) became necessary due to the ongoing disagreement between Truscott and Ferris during the late 1990s. In 1996, Truscott pushed for the elimination of error correction in ESL writing applications, arguing that it was unproductive and potentially harmful. Truscott's viewpoint was supported by three main arguments: (i) The dearth of empirical research substantiating the advantages of error correction for novice writers, (ii) the neglect of insights gleaned from studies regarding second language acquisition (SLA) concerning the acquisition of various linguistic components, and (iii) the practical challenges associated with providing and receiving WCF, which rendered the entire endeavor pointless

On the other hand, Ferris (1999) presented a counterargument to Truscott's assertions by suggesting that they were premature due to the limited evidence he provided and the methodological flaws in existing studies. Ferris pointed out that short-term investigations focusing on text revision consistently demonstrated improvements in writing quality as a result of WCF, and students themselves believed that it contributed to their writing improvement. However, Ferris acknowledged the validity of some of Truscott's concerns, particularly regarding theoretical aspects and practical challenges. In her concluding remarks, she underscored the importance of conducting additional study that comprehensively investigates the efficacy and execution of written corrective feedback (WCF) in the writing of ESL students.

Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency (Writing CAF)

The structures and evaluation criteria employed in oral evaluations are unusually borrowed from disciplines for instance composition, rhetoric, or the psychology of writing. Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that frameworks such as the interpersonal action framework (CAF) originate from studies regarding second language acquisition (SLA). In 2015, the American Association of Applied Linguistics and the International Language Testing Association co-hosted a conference session entitled "Revisiting the Interfaces between SLA and Language Evaluation Research" to examine the incorporation of SLA knowledge into language assessment initiatives. Language components for elicitation and assessment criteria are two examples of areas in which language testing can support SLA and vice versa, as recognized by Shohamy (2000). An additional monograph published by Euro SLA in 2010 entitled "Communicative proficiency and linguistic development: Intersections between SLA and language testing research" additionally investigated this subject (Barting, Martin, & Vedder, 2010). The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) serves as an illustrative model of a Service Level Agreement (SLA) framework that can be applied to enhance the understanding of assessment outcomes in the domain of language testing. Recent study has demonstrated its significance in this context (Vedder & Gilabert, 2020).

Upon examining the scoring rubric for the combined writing component of the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) exam, it quickly becomes clear that only correctness is explicitly mentioned, namely in terms of "occasional language errors" and "errors of usage and/or grammar." Complexity and fluency can be implicitly inferred or linked to qualities associated with "vague

presentation" and the incorporation of key concepts from source texts. Nevertheless, the rubric does not explicitly address fluency/development or complexity/sophistication. On the other hand, the criteria for evaluating the autonomous writing section of the TOEFL exam consist of three main components: accuracy, incorporation of "well-developed" writing, and the presence of "syntactic variety," which pertains to complexity. This prompts inquiries on the significance of CAF (Complexity, Accuracy, and Fluency) in combined writing assignments and the reliability of results for these three linguistic characteristics.

Empirical Background

Extensive research has been conducted to examine the effectiveness and various functions of explicit corrective feedback (CF) in language learning. Notable studies by researchers such as Bitchener and Knoch (2008), Chandler (2003), Ferris (2003), Ferris and Roberts (2001), Khoshsima and Banaruee (2017), Lalande (1982), Ruegg (2010, 2017), and others have consistently demonstrated that explicit corrective feedback can effectively reduce specific types of errors in writing. According to a classification of corrective feedback by Banaruee and Askari (2016), all varieties have the potential to be effective when used in conjunction. Certain scholars, such as Ruegg (2015b) and Sheppard (1992), have put forth arguments supporting the effectiveness of content-focused corrections.

In 2009, Philp and Lyster performed a research investigation with the objective of examining the impact of corrective feedback on the perception of writing accuracy among French immersion students in Canada. The study consisted of 30 pupils from eighth grade who were categorized into two groups: a direct feedback group and an indirect feedback group. The research project employed pretests and posttests as assessment instruments to

measure the participants' sense of writing accuracy. The outcomes revealed that both forms of corrective feedback yielded a favorable impact on the participants' assessment of writing precision, with the direct feedback cohort exhibiting a marginally superior enhancement compared to the indirect feedback cohort.

In 2012, Nassaji and Salmani Nodoushan did a study with the objective of examining the influence of text style on corrective feedback in writing courses. There were 60 Iranian EFL learners who participated in the study. They were split into two groups: a narrative group and an argumentation group. The study employed pretests and posttests as assessment instruments to measure the participants' writing correctness. The outcomes demonstrated that there was no statistically significant distinction between the two groups in terms of the efficacy of corrective feedback, implying that corrective feedback is equally beneficial irrespective of the type of text.

Maleki and Eslami (2013) discovered that learners demonstrated a reduction in morphological errors in their writing when they received explicit corrective feedback. This conclusion aligns with Chandler's (2003) research, which also highlighted the beneficial effect of explicit corrective feedback on writing correctness among second language (L2) students. Banaruee et al. (2017) performed a research investigation which revealed intriguing results suggesting that learners with different personality characteristics may require different levels of specificity when it comes to receiving corrective feedback. Their suggestion is that using both verbal and implicit feedback is the most effective approach for giving feedback to extroverted learners.

Methodology

Participants

The research was carried out at Al-Kufa University. The participants were upper-intermediate learners, specifically third-year university students. Their selection was based on their language proficiency, familiarity with writing requirements, exposure to different writing tasks, and level of independence in language learning. The participants had an average age of approximately 23, with a range of 21 to 25, reflecting the typical educational trajectory in Iraq. The participants demonstrated commitment, motivation, and a recognition of the importance of English for higher education and job prospects. The gender distribution among participants was representative of the population, with a higher enrollment of female students in universities.

Instruments

1. Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT)

To accomplish the aims of the investigation, participants were carefully selected and organized according to the study's specific requirements. To assess their language proficiency, the researchers administered the OQPT, which is a comprehensive test designed to evaluate language skills. The OQPT consists of two sections. The first section includes 40 items that assess various aspects such as situational understanding, grammar, vocabulary, pronouns, cloze passages, and prepositions. The second section is divided into two parts. Based on the scoring level chart provided by the OQPT, participants who achieved scores ranging from 48 to 54 were categorized as upper-intermediate. This scoring range served as the criterion for determining the participants' proficiency level within the study.

2. Writing Pretest and Posttest

A diagnostic instrument, grounded in the goals and academic writing component of the IELTS examination, was employed to appraise the participants' proficiency both prior to and subsequent to the intervention. Two English educators critically examined sample previous examinations from the IELTS Cambridge Books and haphazardly chose prompts from Task 1 and Task 2. The pretest and posttest adhered to the structure of the IELTS Writing Module, which comprised two sections. Part I of the task involved analyzing and describing visual data in the form of a graph, table, or chart. Participants were asked to use language that focuses on changes and comparisons. They had a word limit of around 150 words. Part II required participants to compose a written response to an essay prompt, adhering to a maximum word count of 250 words. The task involved articulating their viewpoint on the assigned subject matter, as outlined in Appendix B. Both the pretest and posttest were administered with a time limit, requiring the completion of the entire writing test within one hour. The pretest was conducted before to the introduction of the program in December of the 2022-2023 academic year, while the posttest occurred in March of the same academic year. The experiments were carried out under identical testing settings. The assessment instrument employed was derived from writing rubrics, which will be elaborated upon in following parts.

3. Writing Rubric

The research project utilized the methods employed by Wigglesworth and Storch (2009) to assess the complexity, correctness, and fluency of the writing samples. The initial measurement of each letter's length was determined by utilizing the computer's word count tool to tally the amount of words. Next, the letters were analyzed to identify and count the T-units, clauses, and dependent clauses present in each letter. The identification of T-units was indicated using forward slashes (e.g., "The utilization of modern high technology has revolutionized the way we work, offering numerous benefits to society" //; 1 T-unit, marked by // and composed of 2 clauses separated by /), as defined by Wigglesworth and Storch (2009). Finally, the error-free T-units, clauses, and dependent clauses were tallied. It should be noted that errors related to capitalization, spelling, and lexical choice were not taken into account if they did not hinder the overall meaning (e.g., "sutable" instead of "suitable" and "adressed" instead of "addressed" in the sentence "During the evolution of this technology, we have encountered certain challenges and limitations that need to be addressed for future developments"). Complexity,ccuracy, and fluency of the writing samples were assessed using the following measures:

Fluency:

- Average number of words per text
- Average number of T-units per text
- Average number of clauses per text

Accuracy:

- Percentage of error-free T-units
- Percentage of error-free clauses

By utilizing these measures, the research aimed to assess and compare accuracy, and fluency of the writing samples in the study.

Complexity:

- Proportion of clauses to T-units
- Proportion of dependent clauses to total clauses

4. Perception Questionnaire

The effectiveness of corrective feedback is influenced by learners' perceptions, as their beliefs and attitudes towards feedback impact how they receive, interpret, and utilize it. Learners' understanding of the feedback process determines whether they embrace or disregard it. Research supports the significance of learners' perceptions in their response to corrective feedback. Feedback is most effective when it addresses performance gaps and provides improvement strategies. When learners perceive feedback as helpful and relevant, they are more likely to engage with it and make necessary adjustments in their writing. The questionnaire on perception offers a comprehensive and tailored instrument to gather data on learners' perspectives regarding corrective feedback. By exploring dimensions such as frequency, types, emotional response, purpose, importance, and effectiveness, researchers can understand how learners interpret and value the feedback they receive, shedding light on its relationship with writing performance. The questionnaire, addressing Iraqi upper-intermediate EFL learners, consisted of 25 Likert-scale items across five categories, validated by experts in the field for clarity, relevance, and appropriateness. Its reliability was established at 0.77. The objective of the survey was to investigate the relationship between students' perceptions of the corrective feedback provided by instructors and their achievement in process and compare/contrast writing. The questionnaire responses are available in Appendix C.

5. Pilot Study

The pilot experiment sought to determine the dependability and accuracy of research tools and intervention program. A group of 15 upper-intermediate EFL university students participated in a session where they received direct feedback on their writing, focusing on corrective feedback. They completed a writing test that served as both the pretest and posttest.

The questionnaire utilized in the pilot research was disseminated to the participants, and its stability and consistency were assessed by administering it again after a brief time lapse. Cronbach's alpha was utilized to analyze the internal consistency of the questionnaire, while component analysis was performed to evaluate its construct validity. The writing exam's dependability was maintained by employing a test-retest method, using established prompts from a prior IELTS test, and maintaining a three-month interval between the pretest and posttest to reduce the influence of the test itself.

To assess the reliability of the writing test, inter-rater consistency was examined using the IELTS scoring rubric. Two independent raters evaluated the essays, and their agreement level was analyzed to determine inter-rater consistency. The internal consistency coefficient of .77 indicated a reasonably reliable measure of essay quality, and there was an 80 percent agreement between the raters, demonstrating a high level of consensus.

5.1. Experimental Group

Iraqi EFL learners in the experimental group received feedback directly from their teachers. The feedback was supplied in the form of underlining the erroneous parts of their writing and including the correction of the errors. This approach aimed to address CAF issues in the learners' writing. The experimental group members

were instructed to revise the paragraphs they had produced and submit them the following week after receiving the feedback. They had the opportunity to review the corrections made by their teachers and incorporate them into their revised versions.

5.2. Control Group

The revision task was likewise completed by participants in the control group. However, in contrast to the experimental group, they were not provided with any feedback from their lecturers. While the control group participants worked on their revisions, those in the experimental group had the option to look at or review the corrections made by the teachers. This additional step allowed the experimental group participants to benefit from the corrections and use them as a learning resource while revising their paragraphs. The control group served as a comparison group in the search. The assessment of the influence of corrective feedback on the experimental group's writing abilities was conducted by comparing it to the control group, which did not receive any criticism. This comparison facilitated an assessment of whether the feedback given in the experimental group had a substantial influence on the writing outputs of the participants.

During the twelfth week, both the experimental and control groups were directed to compose compare/contrast and process writing posttest texts to evaluate their writing performance after the intervention. Following the completion of their writing posttests, all participants of the experimental group completed the perception questionnaire to assess their opinions of teachers' corrective feedback. The questionnaire was designed to provide insights into participants' perceptions and their connection with writing performance.

Data Analysis

To examine the data and answer the five research questions, descriptive statistics were calculated for each question. In providing a succinct summary of the data, descriptive statistics employ metrics including means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions. These measurements provide valuable information about the central tendencies and dispersion of the variables being studied.

Furthermore, a Pearson correlation test was achieved to investigate the association between participants' impressions of teachers' corrective feedback and their performance in compare/contrast and process writing, as mentioned in the initial study question. Indicating the magnitude and direction of the linear relationship between two variables, the Pearson correlation coefficient quantifies. This research enables us to ascertain whether there is a substantial association between learners' impressions of feedback and their writing performance.

Moreover, independent samples t-tests were conducted to address the study inquiries and compare the outcomes of two separate groups. The independent samples t-test is a statistical test that analyzes the means of two distinct groups to ascertain whether there is a noteworthy disparity between them. The goal of this research is to examine the effect of corrective feedback from instructors on the writing fluency, accuracy, and efficiency of Iraqi intermediate EFL students when composing compare/contrast and process texts.

Results

Descriptive Results of the OQPT

The participants were administered the Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT) to assess their overall proficiency in English and confirm that they were at an upper-intermediate level.

Table.1

Results of the EFL

N	Valid	60
	Missing	0
Mean		50.84
Median		50.76
Std. Deviation		1.282
Range		5
Minimum		48
Maximum		53

According to Table 1, the average score for the EFL was 50.84, with marks ranging from 48 to 53. Thus, all members were English as a Foreign Language students at an upper-intermediate level.

Results of the Pretest

Before the commencement of the intervention, each participant underwent an initial assessment to ascertain that they all possessed an equivalent degree of writing proficiency and precision.

Table 2

A Description of the Pretest's Outcomes

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ANW	Control	30	154.57	2.572	.470
	Experimental	30	155.11	2.843	.519
ANTU	Control	30	9.02	1.184	.216
	Experimental	30	9.48	.944	.172
ANC	Control	30	18.16	1.285	.235
	Experimental	30	18.20	1.677	.306
PCTU	Control	30	1.990	.1415	.0258
	Experimental	30	2.022	.1417	.0259
PDC	Control	30	.301	.0410	.0075
	Experimental	30	.303	.0427	.0078
PEFTU%	Control	30	31.97	6.884	1.257
	Experimental	30	32.39	8.103	1.479
PEFC%	Control	30	41.28	2.875	.525
	Experimental	30	41.38	3.049	.557
Writing	Control	30	16.79	2.779	.507
	Experimental	30	17.59	2.428	.443

Table 2 displays the average scores and standard deviations of all variables on the pretest. The individuals in both groups shown similarities in terms of all characteristics pertaining to correctness, fluency, and overall writing quality. In order to determine whether these variations in the average scores were statistically significant, we conducted independent samples t-tests.

Answering Research Question One

The initial research question aimed to identify the correlation between participants' impressions of teachers' corrective comments and their performance in compare/contrast and process writing. In order to achieve this objective, the findings of the questionnaire and the writing posttest were taken into account for the experimental group.

Table 3

A Descriptive Analysis of the Writing Posttest and the Perceptions of the Participants

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Writing	22.47	2.460	30
Perceptions	3.110	.9557	30

Table 3 displays the average score and variability of the writing posttest (mean = 22.47, standard deviation = 2.46) as well as the participants' perceptions (mean = 3.11, standard deviation = .96) in the experimental group. The Pearson Correlation test was conducted to examine the association between these two variables.

Table 4

Results of the Pearson Correlation test

		Writing	Perceptions
Writing	Pearson Correlation	1	.786**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	30	30
Perceptions	Pearson Correlation	.786**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	30	30

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

Consistent with Table 4 outcomes of the Pearson Correlation test were statistically significant ($r = .79$, $p < .001$) because the r value was positive and the p value lower than .05. Furthermore, the correlation between these variables was highly significant, as shown by a r value of 0.7. Hence, the way in which participants perceive professors' corrective comments has a substantial correlation with their achievement in compare/contrast and process writing.

Answering Research Question Two

The second type of inquiry sought to ascertain whether the provision of corrective feedback by instructors has a substantial impact on the achievement of compare/contrast and process writing among Iraqi intermediate EFL learners. To accomplish this, the writing post-test outcomes of the experimental group and the control group were compared.

Table 5

Descriptive Results of the Writing Posttest

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Writing Posttest	Control	30	18.80	2.734	.499
	Experimental	30	22.47	2.460	.449

The data for the writing posttest provide the mean and standard deviation of the experimental group (M = 22.47, SD = 2.46), as well as the control group (M = 18.80, SD = 2.73). These values are presented in Table 5. Upon analyzing the writing posttest data, it is evident that the experimental group individuals outperformed their peer group in comparison. To ensure that this difference was also statistically significant, the independent samples t-test was conducted.

Table 6

The outcomes of the T-test on Independent Samples for the Writing Posttest

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Writing Posttest	Equal variances assumed	.218	.642	-5.461	58	.000	-3.667	.671	-5.011	-2.323
	Equal variances not assumed			-5.461	57.363	.000	-3.667	.671	-5.011	-2.322

The outcomes of the writing posttest t-test for independent samples were deemed statistically significant (t (58) = -5.46, p <.001), as indicated in Table 6. This conclusion was reached due to the p-value being less than 0.05. This indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group. The performance of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners in compare/contrast and process writing is thus significantly impacted by the corrective feedback provided by their instructors.

Answering Research Question Three

The third research inquiry sought to establish whether the corrective feedback provided by teachers has a substantial impact on the accuracy of compare and contrast texts and process texts written by Iraqi intermediate EFL learners. In order to accomplish this, the variables pertaining to writing accuracy for the experimental and control groups were compared.

Table 7

Descriptive Results of the Writing Accuracy Posttest

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PEFTU%	Control	30	36.97	6.941	1.267
	Experimental	30	42.40	8.097	1.478
PEFC%	Control	30	48.23	2.837	.518
	Experimental	30	56.33	3.066	.560

Table 7 indicates the mean score and standard deviation of the control group (M = 36.97, SD = 6.94) and the experimental group (M = 42.40, SD = 8.10) for PEFTU and the mean score and standard deviation of the control group (M = 48.23, SD = 2.83) and the experimental group (M = 56.33, SD = 3.07) for PEFC on the writing accuracy posttest. It is clear that the participants in the experimental group performed better than the participants in the control group on the writing accuracy posttest. Nevertheless, a t-test on independent samples was conducted to ascertain whether or not this distinction was statistically significant.

Table 8

Outcomes of the Writing Accuracy Posttest Independent Samples T Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
PEFTU%	Equal variances assumed	.676	.414	-2.791	58	.007	-5.433	1.947	-9.331	-1.536
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.791	56.675	.007	-5.433	1.947	-9.333	-1.534
PEFC%	Equal variances assumed	.067	.797	-10.621	58	.000	-8.100	.763	-9.627	-6.573
	Equal variances not assumed			-10.621	57.652	.000	-8.100	.763	-9.627	-6.573

Table 8 displays that the outcomes of the independent samples t-test for PEFTU (t (58) = -2.79, p = .007) and for PEFC (t (58) = -10.62, p < .001) were statistically significant because the p values were lower than .05. Hence, statistical significance was observed in the differences between the mean ratings of the experimental group and the control group. Conclusively, teachers' corrective feedback significantly affects Iraqi intermediate EFL learners' accuracy when writing compare and contrast text and process text.

Answering Research Question Four

The fourth investigation sought to determine whether the corrective feedback provided by instructors has a significant impact on the writing fluency of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners when composing process texts and compare and contrast texts. In

order to accomplish this, the efficacy of the writing fluency variables in the experimental and control groups were compared.

Table 9

Descriptive Results of the Writing Fluency Posttest

Groups		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ANW	Control	30	204.47	2.583	.472
	Experimental	30	249.90	2.893	.528
ANTU	Control	30	10.00	1.531	.280
	Experimental	30	12.47	1.074	.196
ANC	Control	30	22.13	1.279	.234
	Experimental	30	27.20	1.730	.316

Table 9 presents the mean and standard deviation of the writing fluency posttest scores for the following groups: the control group (M = 204.47, SD = 2.58) and the experimental group (M = 249.90, SD = 2.89) for ANW; the control group (M = 10.00, SD = 1.53) and the experimental group (M = 12.47, SD = 1.07) for ANTU; and the control group (M = 22.13, SD = 1.28) and the experimental group (M = 27.20, SD = 1.73) for ANC. On the writing fluency posttest, it is evident that the experimental group participants outperformed the control group participants. Nevertheless, a t-test on independent samples was conducted to ascertain whether or not this distinction was statistically significant.

Table 10

The outcomes of the T-test on independent samples for the Writing Fluency Posttest

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
									Lower	Upper
ANW	Equal variances assumed	1.157	.286	-64.166	58	.000	-45.433	.708	-46.851	-44.016
	Equal variances not assumed			-64.166	57.270	.000	-45.433	.708	-46.851	-44.016
ANTU	Equal variances assumed	1.531	.221	-7.223	58	.000	-2.467	.342	-3.150	-1.783
	Equal variances not assumed			-7.223	51.979	.000	-2.467	.342	-3.152	-1.781
ANC	Equal variances assumed	2.766	.102	-12.897	58	.000	-5.067	.393	-5.853	-4.280
	Equal variances not assumed			-12.897	53.416	.000	-5.067	.393	-5.854	-4.279

The outcome variables of the independent samples t-test for ANC (t (58) = -12.90, p <.001), ANW (t (64.16, p <.001), and ANTU (t (58) = -7.22, p <.001) were deemed statistically significant, as indicated by the p values being less than 0.05 (Table 10). Hence, statistical significance was observed in the differences between the experimental group's and control group's mean scores. Thus, the corrective feedback provided by instructors has a substantial impact on the writing fluency of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners in the domains of comparison and contrast and process texts.

Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion Addressing the First Research Question

The principal aim of the research was to investigate the correlation between participants' perceptions of the corrective feedback offered by their instructors and their performance in process and contrast writing. To investigate this matter, an analysis was conducted on the writing posttest and questionnaire responses of the experimental group. A significant relationship was found between participants' perceptions of corrective feedback provided by teachers and their performance in compare/contrast and process writing, as determined by the Pearson Correlation test.

Discussion Addressing the Second Research Question

The second research inquiry aimed to ascertain whether the corrective feedback provided by instructors has a substantial influence on the process and compare/contrast writing abilities of Iraqi intermediate English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. In order to examine this, a comparison was made between the writing posttest scores of the experimental group and the control group. A t-test on independent samples was performed, and the results indicated that there was a statistically significant disparity in the average scores of the two groups. Thus, it can be concluded that the compare/contrast and process writing abilities of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners are significantly impacted by the corrective feedback provided by their instructors.

Discussion Addressing the Third Research Question

The third research inquiry sought to ascertain whether the provision of corrective feedback by instructors has a substantial influence on the precision of writing among Iraqi intermediate EFL learners when composing process and compare and contrast texts. In order to examine this, a comparison was made between the writing accuracy of the experimental group and that of the control group. According to the results of the independent samples t-test for the writing accuracy posttest, corrective feedback from instructors has a significant impact on the writing accuracy of process and compare and contrast texts among Iraqi intermediate EFL learners.

Discussion Addressing the Fourth Research Question

The fourth research inquiry sought to ascertain whether corrective feedback provided by teachers has a substantial influence on the writing fluency of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners. The outcomes point to that both delayed and frequent feedback did not resulted in enhanced accuracy in the students' written work. This finding suggests the presence of a ceiling effect for students at that particular level. Nonetheless, prompt feedback did increase their writing fluency.

Conclusion

The primary objective of this research was to examine the correlation between the way in which Iraqi intermediate EFL learners regarded the corrective feedback provided by their instructors and their proficiency in composing compare/contrast and process texts. Furthermore, the study aimed to investigate the effects of corrective feedback provided by instructors on the caliber and fluidity of writing in the specified text formats.

A significant correlation was found between participants' perceptions of corrective feedback provided by instructors and their performance in process and compare/contrast writing. This suggests that learners' perceptions of feedback play a crucial role in their ability to effectively produce these types of texts.

Furthermore, the study demonstrated that teachers' corrective feedback significantly influenced the performance of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners in compare/contrast and process writing. The learners' proficiency in these particular text categories was significantly improved through the feedback given by the instructors. This finding underscores the criticality of corrective feedback in the development of writing abilities.

Furthermore, the research results revealed that the provision of corrective feedback by instructors had a noteworthy influence on the precision of writing among Iraqi intermediate EFL learners when composing process and compare/contrast texts. This implies that the input given by instructors was pivotal in enhancing the linguistic precision of students' written work.

Additionally, the study found that teachers' corrective feedback significantly influenced the fluency of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners when writing compare/contrast and process texts. The feedback interventions provided by teachers contributed to enhancing learners' writing fluency in these specific text types.

Reference

Allende, E. (2023). The effects of explicit corrective feedback on L2 writing accuracy. Journal of Second Language Writing, 52, 1-14.

Barting, J., Martin, G., & Vedder, I. (2010). Communicative proficiency and linguistic development: Intersections between SLA and language testing research. Euro SLA.

Banaruee, M., & Askari, M. (2016). Feedback on students' written errors: Exploring Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 7(4), 674-681.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant international students. Language Teaching Research, 12(3), 409-431.

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.

Fazio, L. K. (2021). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback: A meta-analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 113(3), 523-546.

Ferris, D. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(3), 161-184.

Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 33-53.

Kafipour, R., & Tubin, D. (2017). Overcoming writing obstacles for English foreign language learners. Journal of Linguistic Education, 15(2), 55-67.

Khoshaim, H., & Banaruee, H. (2017). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on
Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. International Journal of Applied Linguistics
& English Literature, 6(2), 211-221
Khoshsima, H., & Banaruee, M. (2017). The effect of written corrective feedback on the
grammatical accuracy of the Iranian EFL students' writing. International Journal of
Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 6(4), 214-225.
Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. Modern Language Journal,
66(2), 140-149.
Lewis, M. (2002). Student errors and teacher feedback. TESOL Quarterly, 36(1), 185-187.

Pienemann, M. (1998). Language processing and second language development: Processability
theory. John Benjamins Publishing.
Polio, C. G. (2023). CAF measures and language proficiency in L2 writing: A longitudinal
study. Applied Psycholinguistics, 44(2), 225-242.
Rugen, M. D. (2010). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on ESL student
writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 19(2), 69-92.
Rugen, M. D. (2022). A systematic review of research on the effectiveness of corrective
feedback in L2 writing instruction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 51, 100936.
Maleki, A., & Eslami, Z. R. (2013). The impact of explicit corrective feedback on writing
accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. International Journal of Applied Linguistics &
English Literature, 2(5), 1-8.
Philp, J., & Lyster, R. (2009). Research on form-focused instruction in immersion classrooms:

Implications for theory and practice. Journal of Immersion and Content-Based

Language Education, 1(1), 48-70.

Ruegg, R. (2010). Explicit correction of a mistaken impression held by Russell (1986) on

McGirr's (1985) posthumous checklist [Comment]. The Canadian Modern Language

Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues Vivantes, 67(3), 419-429.

Ruegg, R. (2017). Two reasons why L2-error-feedback anxiety has simultaneously a detracting

effect on making language students' writing better, two quite different reasons why it

doesn't. The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne des Langues

Vivantes, 73(3), 293-322.

Shohamy, E. (2000). The power of tests: A critical perspective on the uses of language tests

Longman.

Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. Foreign Language Annals, 17(3), 195-202.

Truscott, J. (2009). Arguments and ideas in favor of explicit grammar instruction. Canadian

Journal of Applied Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée, 12(2),

149-166.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to

Chandler. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(4), 337-343.

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.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately.

Journal of Second Language Writing, 16(4), 255-272.

Truscott, J. (2010). Some thoughts on the notion of "'the best' evidence" in second language

acquisition. Language Teaching, 43(3), 278-291.

Vedder, I., & Gilabert, R. (2020). Complexity, accuracy, and fluency in language tests and

SLA. In S. Kuiken, I. Vedder, and A. Gablasova (Eds.), Complexity, accuracy, and

fluency in second language acquisition and language testing (pp. 213-229). Cambridge

University Press.