

*In the name of god*



**Shahrood University of Technology**

**English Language Department**

**M.A. Thesis in Language Teaching**

# **Learners' Perceptions of Editing Tasks in an EFL Context: A Qualitative Study**

**By: Najmeh Kashiri**

**Thesis Advisor:**

**Dr. Seyyed Ali Ostovar-Namaghi**

**October 2021**

شماره: ۱۴-۲۴۴  
تاریخ: ۱۵/۹/۱۴

باسمه تعالی



ادبیت و تحصیلات تکمیلی

### فرم شماره (۳) صورت جلسه نهایی دفاع از پایان نامه دوره کارشناسی ارشد

با نام و یاد خداوند متعال، ارزیابی جلسه دفاع از پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد خانم / آقای ..... ترجمه  
کشتری ..... با شماره دانشجویی ..... ۹۷۱۳۷۸۴ ..... رشته ..... زبان  
انگلیسی ..... گرایش ..... آموزش ..... تحت عنوان .....  
Exploring Iranian EFL Learners' Perceptions of Editing Tasks in a Writing Course: A Qualitative Study  
که در تاریخ ..... ۱۴۰۰/۷/۲۷ ..... با حضور هیأت محترم داوران در دانشگاه صنعتی شاهرود  
برقرار گردید به شرح ذیل اعلام می گردد:

الف) درجه عالی: نمره ۱۹-۲۰ ☐ (ب) درجه خیلی خوب: نمره ۱۸/۹۹ - ۱۸ ☒  
ج) درجه خوب: نمره ۱۷/۹۹ - ۱۶ ☐ د) درجه متوسط: نمره ۱۵/۹۹ - ۱۴ ☐  
ه) کمتر از ۱۴ غیر قابل قبول و نیاز به دفاع مجدد دارد ☐  
نوع تحقیق: نظری ☒ عملی ☐

عضو هیأت داوران	نام و نام خانوادگی	مرتبه علمی	امضاء
۱- استاد راهنمای اول	دکتر سید علی استوار نامقی	دانشیار	
۲- استاد راهنمای دوم			
۳- استاد مشاور			
۴- نماینده تحصیلات تکمیلی	دکتر فاطمه مظفری	استادیار	
۵- استاد امتحن اول	دکتر ابوالطالب ایرانهیبر	استادیار	
۶- استاد امتحن دوم	دکتر فرهاد معزی	استادیار	



***Dedicated to:***

***My dear family***

***&***

***The memory of my father***

## *Acknowledgments*

This report would not have been possible without the essential and gracious support of many individuals. Therefore, I feel obligated to express my deepest and sincerest gratitude toward the followings:

First and most of my acknowledgements should go to God who has helped me in every stage of my life without whom I cannot accomplish anything. Then, I will always be grateful to my professor, Dr. Seyyed Ali Ostovar-Namaghi, for inspiring and encouraging me to take up this project. I appreciate him for the many hours he kindly devoted to discussing my progress, reading and responding to my numerous drafts, and giving me his insightful suggestions. His support and guidance have made my academic journey enjoyable and valuable one. Special thanks also go to all my professors at the English Language department for their efforts throughout my MA education. My deepest appreciation also goes to the learners who participated in this study and their sincere cooperation helped me accomplish the goal of this thesis. I wholeheartedly would like to dedicate my last but not the least thanks to my loving family specially my beloved mother who have been a source of support and encouragement throughout all stages of my life and the memory of my dear father.

Najmeh Kashiri

## تعهد نامه

اینجانب فاطمه خرم دانشجوی دوره کارشناسی ارشد رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی دانشکده مهندسی صنایع و مدیریت دانشگاه صنعتی شاهرود نویسنده پایان نامه تجزیه و تحلیل توابع بین فردی در مقالات توضیحی زبان آموزان EFL: یک مطالعه اکتشافی تحت راهنمایی دکتر سید علی استوار نامقی متعهد می شوم.

- تحقیقات در این پایان نامه توسط اینجانب انجام شده است و از صحت و اصالت برخوردار است.
- در استفاده از نتایج پژوهشهای محققان دیگر به مرجع مورد استفاده استناد شده است.
- مطالب مندرج در پایان نامه تاکنون توسط خود یا فرد دیگری برای دریافت هیچ نوع مدرک یا امتیازی در هیچ جا ارائه نشده است.
- کلیه حقوق معنوی این اثر متعلق به دانشگاه صنعتی شاهرود می باشد و مقالات مستخرج با نام « دانشگاه صنعتی شاهرود » و یا « Shahrood University of Technology » به چاپ خواهد رسید.
- حقوق معنوی تمام افرادی که در به دست آمدن نتایج اصلی پایان نامه تأثیرگذار بوده اند در مقالات مستخرج از پایان نامه رعایت می گردد.
- در کلیه مراحل انجام این پایان نامه، در مواردی که از موجود زنده (یا بافتهای آنها) استفاده شده است ضوابط و اصول اخلاقی رعایت شده است.
- در کلیه مراحل انجام این پایان نامه، در مواردی که به حوزه اطلاعات شخصی افراد دسترسی یافته یا استفاده شده است اصل رازداری، ضوابط و اصول اخلاق انسانی رعایت شده است.

### تاریخ

### امضای دانشجو

### مالکیت نتایج و حق نشر

- کلیه حقوق معنوی این اثر و محصولات آن (مقالات مستخرج، کتاب، برنامه های رایانه ای، نرم افزار ها و تجهیزات ساخته شده است) متعلق به دانشگاه صنعتی شاهرود می باشد. این مطلب باید به نحو مقتضی در تولیدات علمی مربوطه ذکر شود.
- استفاده از اطلاعات و نتایج موجود در پایان نامه بدون ذکر مرجع مجاز نمی باشد.

## ***Abstract***

Writing skill is considered the ultimate goal of training competent EFL learners, especially, in academic settings, and due to its importance, there has been a long line of research attempts probing writing instructions so far. However, most of the current body of research on process-oriented writing instruction is dedicated to testifying the effects of certain task types, feedback types, or assessment types and very few studies have considered the EFL learners' perceptions of the task types presented in EFL writing instruction courses. This study, based on grounded theory, aimed at probing 14 EFL learners' perception of using editing tasks in a writing instruction course. The data were collected via interviews and then were analyzed using Charmaz (2008) framework. The results showed that not only the editing task is a satisfactory option in an EFL writing classroom, based on the overall perception of the participants, but also a source of writing improvement for the learners. Based on the results, the sources of satisfaction with this task lies in repetition and rehearsal of the strategies, reviewing and reviving of the sub-skills, teacher rapport, competitive atmosphere, contextualized practice, problem-solving, and discovery learning. It was also found that these factors lead to a more motivating and encouraging atmosphere in which the learners are willing to pursue doing such tasks due to their gained self-confidence and perceived progress. The results have some implications for EFL teachers in that they have to pave the ground for implementing editing tasks through ensuring the existence of the contributing factors enumerated in this study.

**Keywords:** Editing tasks, EFL learners, Grounded theory, Perceptions, Writing

## *Table of Contents*

Dedicated to:.....	IV
My dear family.....	IV
&.....	IV
The memory of my father .....	IV
Acknowledgments .....	V
Abstract .....	VII
Table of Contents .....	VIII
List of Abbreviation.....	X
Chapter One:.....	1
Introduction .....	1
1.1. Overview .....	2
1.2. Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study .....	5
1.3. Significance of the Study .....	6
1.4. Research question .....	7
1.5. Definition of Key Terms .....	8
1.5.1. Editing task .....	8
1.5.3. Task .....	8
1.5.5. Writing .....	8
1.6. Limitations and Delimitations .....	8
Chapter Two: .....	11
Literature Review .....	11
2.1. Wring: A Theoretical Perspective .....	12
2.2. Process vs. Product Approach .....	16
2.3. L2 Writing Instruction.....	19
2.4. Empirical Studies.....	22
2.4.1 Studies Related to Focus on Form.....	27
2.4.2 Studies Related to Recasts and Prompts.....	28
2.4.3. Studies Related to Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback .....	32
2.4.4. Studies Related to Form-focused Tasks .....	34
2.4.5. Summary of the Empirical Findings .....	35
Chapter Three: .....	37



Method .....	37
3.1. Introduction .....	38
3.3. Research Method .....	38
3.2. Participants and Teaching Context .....	38
3.4. Data Collection.....	39
3.5. Data Analysis .....	40
3.6. Credibility of the Findings .....	41
3.7. Ethical Considerations .....	42
Chapter Four.....	43
Results .....	43
4.1. Restatement of the Problem .....	44
4.2. Results .....	44
4.2.1. Editing encourages noticing .....	44
4.2.2. Editing gives learners a sense of achievement.....	46
4.2.3. Editing encourages recurrent practice.....	47
4.2.4. Editing helps learners use their previous knowledge.....	49
4.2.5. Editing improves teacher-learner interactions.....	51
4.2.6. Editing merges competition and cooperation.....	52
4.2.7. Editing encourages problem-solving and discovery learning .....	53
4.2.8. Editing leads to contextualized and meaning-based practice .....	54
4.2.9. Editing tasks helps learners gain confidence in writing .....	55
Chapter Five: .....	57
Discussion .....	57
5.1. Introduction .....	58
5.2. Discussion .....	58
5.3. Conclusion.....	60
5.4. Pedagogical Implications .....	61
5.5. Suggestions for further Research .....	63
References .....	65

## ***List of Abbreviation***

**EFL** English as a Foreign Language

**L2** Foreign or Second Language

# ***Chapter One:***

## ***Introduction***

## **1.1. Overview**

Writing skill, as a fundamental language skill in the L2 learning process, is seen as the final language skill that has to be acquired for a learner to be a competent L2 user (Hamp-Lyons & Heasley 2006). It is also significant since L2 learners' academic life and lifelong learning would not be possible unless they master this productive skill (Warschauer, 2010). In addition, writing is not only the goal but also a means of L2 learning since, according to Warschauer (2010), as learners more eagerly explore advanced lexical or syntactic expression in their written work, writing can be a valuable tool for the development of academic writing proficiency. In addition, as Yih and Nah (2009) declared, writing across the curriculum can be invaluable for learning various subject matter since it helps learners increase their awareness of their knowledge gaps, form new subsumption of knowledge into their existing schemas, and a more detailed mental representation of their knowledge.

Most EFL learners, however, think writing is the most difficult skill they are going to learn (Tuan, 2010). This may justify why, as Ackerman (2006) reported, up to 40 percent of learners lack great performance in their writing courses. Similarly, there have been several studies that have shown EFL learners lack interest and motivation regarding doing writing assignments (Davis & Lyman-Hager, 2007; Kajdar & Bull, 2003; Witte, 2007). This may lie in what Maghsoudi and Haririan (2013) stated, that is, most Iranian EFL learners think writing in English is difficult because it demands several cognitive and linguistic strategies and because they lack ideas to write about.

Writing in L2 is a two-stage process in which at first learners create a message then they criticize the message. Writing is one of the most significant and vital for learners in school, college, and lifelong (Warschauer, 2010). There are three reasons for which writing is known as a necessary tool for instruction of second and foreign language: the first reason introduces writing well as a crucial skill for academic or occupational success although it is

not easy to master (National Commission on Writing, 2004). Second, according to Warschauer (2010), as learners more eagerly explore advanced lexical or synthetic expression in their written work, writing can be a valuable tool for the development of academic writing proficiency. Third, as Yih and Nah (2009) declared writing across the curriculum can be inestimable for mastering various subject matter, as written expression let learners increase their awareness of knowledge gaps, abstract problem-specific knowledge into schemas that can be applied to the other related cases, also a detailed mental representation of knowledge that can be a case to be retrieved, while concurrently allowing instructors to better understand learners' state of knowledge and thinking process and thus just essential instruction. Most of the learners think this important skill as the most difficult one (Trang, 2009).

Based on Maghsoudi and Haririan (2013), Most of our English language learners are faced with several problems. First, Based on their opinion writing in English is a difficult process because it demands using several cognitive and linguistic strategies of which they are not certain about it. The second problem is that sometimes learners lack ideas and the ability to think of anything interesting which is helpful in writing. Besides learners, teachers are not able to find an efficient way to arouse learners' imagination and to help their minds working. In this way, most teachers adopt a product-based approach which is based on focusing on exemplifying contrast and composition, clarification, description, and so on. As another problem, second language writing is considered more confusing than the composition of the first language. Second language composition includes components of first language composing such as delivering content, drafting thoughts, picking proper jargon, overhauling composing, and altering content which is confused with second language handling issues. According to Casanave (2004), Writing is known as a social practice that needs deep engagement with several writers and reading.

Nunan (1999) declared since the reader has to comprehend what has been written without asking any question for clarification or writers' tone of voice, producing a fluent and coherent piece of writing is the most difficult thing in language. Acquiring the ability to master grammar vocabulary and accuracy in using the language is an indivisible part of writing. This is because writing needs a high level of learning. Learners are supposed to write the ideas in writing as a means of communication to express the idea and to use the full sheet energy to complete the process.

Hamp and Heasley (2006) declared that few people try to write spontaneously and feel comfortable with a formal writing task that is selected for the eyes of someone else. When "someone else" is the teacher who has a critical eye and may assign an individual assessment to the written product of the learners, most people feel uncomfortable. Several learners find themselves in a hide-and-seek game with ideas since they normally have to write about their teachers' assignments. Hyland (2003) declared that in the process of learning to write, tasks are essential. According to Hyland, tasks are a beneficial instrument in which its usage will lead to develop an understanding of skills and texts. The tasks that learners do by themselves are more significant in teaching writing, even though texts are essential as writing materials. There are five skills such as content, process, system genre and context that are beneficial for the order to produce effective texts. Content is related to knowledge of the subject and what is included in the text. The system is referring to knowledge of language form learners need to deliver a message. Knowledge of revising and drafting, knowledge of communication purpose and knowledge of readers' expectations sequentially construct process, genre, and context.

Hyland (2003) also believes that writing tasks can be categorized into two groups: real-world tasks and pedagogic tasks. Real-world tasks are kind of tasks which are based on communication purpose and delivering a message but pedagogic tasks are based on pupils'

composing skills development. As a result, this agreement on the significance of writing and learners' poor performance in writing created a great challenge for the educators and researchers to search for ways to teach and motivate learners to write efficiently. Educators should feel a responsibility towards their learners to create and retain environments that motivate them to keep on learning even after class ends. In this regard, the present study aims to investigate the realm of writing instruction and focus on a writing method instruction which makes the learners responsible for correcting their errors based on teacher and peers' feedback. To this end, unlike most previous studies which adopted an experimental approach to explore the effects of editing tasks on L2 learners writing performance, this study concentrated on the learners' perceptions of editing tasks in an intermediate EFL class.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study**

To help learners face and overcome these difficulties, teachers try to move beyond a product-based approach to writing instruction and adopt a process-based approach which is based on focusing on exemplifying contrast and composition, clarification, description, etc. It is thought that this approach would help learners to deliver content more easily, drafting their thoughts innovatively, picking proper jargon, overhauling composing, and altering content in a step-wise manner with the help of teachers as a social practice (Casanave, 2004). The cognitive complexities of a writing task (Nunan, 1999) and the teacher's expectations (Hamp-Lyons & Heasley, 2006) make accomplishing writing tasks more demanding for EFL learners. However, as Hyland (2003) declared, tasks are the only practical ways of teaching writing skills. They are beneficial since they can help learners develop an understanding of the skill itself and how the text works.

Considering the significance of writing tasks in developing EFL learners' writing skills, several studies have been done on discovering how the implementation of a task or

feedback type may affect the writing quality of the learners (e.g. Ebadi, 2014; Maarof, Yamat & Li, 2011; Kamimura, 2006; Huang, 2012; Sayyad & Sayyadmahaleh, 2013; Zhao 2010; AbuSeileek & Abualsha'r, 2014; Rodríguez & Mosquera, 2020). Although there has been a large body of experimental studies on the process of writing tasks, little research has been done to explore the process of task implementation and task completion from the learners' perspective. Because previous studies have found using tasks to be a beneficial approach to teach writing skills, this study attempted to broaden the scope of the previous studies by seeking the EFL learners' perceptions after accomplishing editing tasks. The purpose of this paper, thus, was to provide the results of the analysis of the qualitative data from the interviews done based on Charmaz's (2008) framework of constructive grounded theory.

This study was an attempt to explore the perceptions of the intermediate EFL learners who participated in a course of writing instruction based on editing tasks. The researcher sought how they perceived applying this sort of writing task after experiencing it in a two-month course.

### **1.3. Significance of the Study**

Having worked as an English instructor for several years, the researchers have understood that in comparison to the other language skills, such as grammar that learners have mastered it very well; writing is most neglected by both students and instructors. It is also observed that a significant number of instructors are not familiar with appropriate techniques and strategies to help their learners improve their writing proficiency. The majority of students, including those at higher levels of second language learning, despite mastering grammar completely fail to use accurate grammar needed for acceptable writing. The nature of the procedures is adopted by the instructors in teaching grammar without involving learners in the process of writing. In several classes, instructors will have some exercises to ensure whether their learners have learned grammar or not. They provide students with conflicting



comments on their writings and make arbitrary corrections. Moreover, it is not known to what extent the corrective feedback on grammatical errors is effective in learners' accurate performance in writing.

The most common method for providing corrective feedback on second language writing in Iranian language institutes is still traditional; language learners are assigned to write a paragraph on a particular topic. Their writings are then corrected by underlining and circling the errors and writing the correct form above the errors. And after this process they are given back to the learners. This process won't be helpful to improve their writing proficiency because they are usually forgotten as the learners begin new writing.

Following these reasons, we found this situation of Iranian language institutes a big problem which leads not only to an English language grammar being unusable but also does not improve EFL learners' writing proficiency. As it is clear knowing grammar is a means and writing is a goal. This thesis sought to introduce the teachers not only the most efficient ways of improving learners' ability to accurate use of grammatical forms and structures in writing but also learning grammar by providing students with choices that would allow them to distinguish the correct form by themselves.

#### **1.4. Research question**

The following research question guided this study:

- What are the EFL learners' perceptions of editing tasks?

## **1.5. Definition of Key Terms**

### **1.5.1. Editing task**

Editing task is the identification of the errors and editing of the first draft which is used to develop its grammatical and lexical correctness, organization, style, and appropriateness (Nation, 2009). It is operationally defined as error identification, editing the drafts for grammatical and lexical correctness of writing topics included in the students textbooks.

### **1.5.2. Learners' perception**

To determine how learners are going to treat and perceive the formal and functional properties of tasks which are useful in language learning process (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). It is operationally defined as the learners' comments on the interview prompts and their responses to interview questions held by the researcher.

### **1.5.3. Task**

This can be defined as a work-plan that requires learners of a class to pragmatically process language in order to achieve an outcome. This outcome can be evaluated based on whether the correct propositional content has been conveyed during accomplishing the task (Ellis, 2003). In this study, task is operationally delimited to editing task.

### **1.5.5. Writing**

Deane, et al. (2008) declared writing is a complex cognitive activity, which includes organizing strategies and solving problems to attain communicative purposes. These perspectives led to the formation of a process-oriented approach to writing instruction and using writing tasks to develop EFL learners' writing skills.

## **1.6. Limitations and Delimitations**

This research aimed to investigate the impact of editing tasks, learners' perception of intermediate-level EFL learners' writing proficiency. The study consisted of participants in one of the Gorgan foreign language institutes. Although the current study was precise in its

design, it faced some limitations during its processes such as the size of the selected sample, the amount of time devoted to study, and sampling profile regarding their proficiency level. The size of the sample can be a limitation because just 6 learners of one institution in Gorgan are selected here. The size of the sample is small because of Corona Virus and its consequences. The second limitation is the time constraint which doesn't let the researcher have exact research and examination of all factors such as participants and their learning in such a short deadline. The third factor is sampling profiles regarding their proficiency level. We have selected learners based on their book level.

In terms of delimitation, this study was delimited to the learners' perception of the editing task and its effect on their performance was not in the scope of this study. In addition, this study was based on qualitative data and grounded theory and did surpass this scope of inquiry to include quantitative data on learners' perceptions.



***Chapter Two:***

***Literature Review***

## **2.1. Wring: A Theoretical Perspective**

Based on cognitivists point of view writing is a problem-solving and thinking process (Reid 1993) and from the social constructivists' point of view, writing is like a social activity that happens in a social context for a specific goal, and the result of social interaction is the construction of knowledge. Deane, Odendahl, Quinlan, Fowles, Welsh, and Bivens-Tatum (2008) declared writing is a complex cognitive activity, which includes organizing strategies and solving problems to attain communicative purposes. These perspectives led to the formation of a process-oriented approach to writing instruction and using writing tasks to develop EFL learners' writing skills.

According to Kent (2003), process-based instruction happens as an interchange among language users such as writer and audience, who are trying to recognize language in a specific context (interpretive). The post-process theorists shift from a view of writing as a matter of cognitive and psychological process which is reflected in the recurrent cycles of prewriting, drafting, and revising, to a view of writing as linguistically and culturally determined. Based on Grahaam and Harris (2000), at first, writing is a complex meta-cognitive activity that makes use of individuals' knowledge, basic skills, strategies, and ability to match several processes. Writers need to have a great deal of lexical and syntactic knowledge and principles of an organization in a second language to produce good writing. So, writing is considered a complex meta-discourse activity. Second language learners need to have a great deal of second language background knowledge regarding rhetorical organizations, appropriate language use, or special lexicon with which they want to communicate to their readers.

The core of the writing process is drafting and revising (Brown, 2007). An important part of revising is editing the first draft which is used to develop its grammatical and lexical correctness, organization, style, and appropriateness (Nation, 2009). According to

Smith and Brown (1995) using different feedbacks from teachers, peers and self can be used to encourage learners in the process of editing their composition. Hayes and Flower (1980) make a distinction between editing which is the process of identification and correction of error (more properly termed copyediting) and revising in which the writer intends to improve the text. A wide range of writing problems consists of editing and revising. For example, distinguishing several types of typographical errors can include processing several types of linguistic information, such as orthographic, phonological, syntactic, and semantic (Levy, Newell, Snyder, & Timmins, 1986).

In the revising model intended by Stratman, and Carey (1987), the revising process involves comprehending, evaluating, and defining problems. Based on Hayes (2004) revising is a function of reading comprehension. According to McCutchen, Francis, and Kerr's (1997) study of children's revising, it is concluded that writers must become critical readers of their texts to assess the potential difficulties their readers might face in the process.

To date, there have been numerous studies focusing on the effect of different task types or feedback types on EFL learner's writing ability and performance. Ebadi (2014) studied the impact of focused meta-linguistics written corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate level EFL learners' essay writing ability. This process of the correction of their own errors helps them to improve the proficiency of their writing.

In sum, it was concluded that this type of feedback is more effective than the traditional model of presenting corrective feedback. Another study examined ESL students' perception of the role of teacher, peer, and combined teacher-peer feedback in ESL writing. They found that combining peer feedback and teacher feedback in ESL writing not only helps to enhance immediate writing abilities but also helps promote the durability of the skill. Learners believe that learning to write essays by using this combined method is advantageous

and beneficial because it supposed others to give different helpful opinions (Maarof, Yamat, & Li 2011).

In another study, Huang (2012) investigated the effect of learners' receptivity to instructional feedback on writing proficiency among Chinese-speaking English language learners. The main results in this study showed proficient writers are those learners who are receptive to timely feedback and receive it, so they are able to pass writing multiple measurement assessments. The degree to which a student values feedback can directly affect writing proficiency development.

Zhao (2010) showed that learners' understanding of feedback should be considered as an equally crucial factor as learners' use of feedback in examining the relative value of peer and teacher feedback for developing learners' writing proficiency. Rodríguez and Mosquera (2020) studied the efficacy of feedback on EFL learners' writing proficiency also has activated a significant controversy between supporters and detractors. The findings of the study proved that the group which received the combined treatment gained higher grades and showed better control of relevant micro-skills in their writing production.

In addition, they showed providing explicit instruction or successful feedback separately has a significant positive effect on promoting learners' writing proficiency. It also indicates that when feedback is mixed with rhetorical instruction, it supplies some opportunities for greater improvement. The combined impact of feedback and explicit instruction also proved to be effective for developing learners' writing micro-skills and improve learners' scores and the quality of the writing.

Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid (2012) explored the role of peer assessment and self-assessment in developing the writing performance of language students. This study established the significance of self-assessment and peer assessment in developing student's writing performance. It seems that providing the learners with several opportunities for self-



assessment will help them to improve their meta-cognition. Integrating peer/self-assessment into EFL courses will increase learners' involvement in learning. Through these assessments, the students will compare their work during the time, discuss their strategies for writing papers, analyze their errors and mistakes and judge their progress.

Puegphrom, Chiramanee, and Chiramanee (2014) studied the effectiveness of peer assessment on writing and the subject's attitude towards the technique and being assessed by peers. It was found that subjects' writing ability improved after experiencing the writing instruction with peer assessment and being assessed by peers.

Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad (2018) explored the practicality and effect of dynamic assessment on the second language writing ability of Iranian English as foreign language learners. The findings revealed that dynamic assessment affected participants' scores, increases their writing ability, and showed that experimental groups' dynamic assessment scores were higher than control group scores. The result of the learners' interview indicated that the dynamic assessment could improve the EFL learners' writing process and their writing confidence. It also enhanced learners' motivation in their writing ability.

Sotoudehnama and Pilehvari (2016) explored the impact of peer review on EFL learners' writing proficiency. They showed that students who were trained to review their peers' essays to provide feedback improved their writing abilities more than the ones who used the received feedback to revise those essays.

Ebadi and Rahimi (2017) also studied the influence of online peer editing using Google Docs on EFL learners' writing skills. The result of the study revealed a great development in learners' academic writing during a peer editing process both through in the face-to-face and using Google Docs. So in both the long and short term, peer editing through using Google Docs outperforms the face to face one.

As the review of related literature clearly shows, the majority of the studies explored the effects of different types of feedback, assessment, instruction among other variables on the writing products of the learners at the end of the course. However, little is investigated about the learners' perceptions of the types of tasks, assessment, and feedback among other variables. Accordingly, this study seems to be promising in terms of touching this neglected area of research

## **2.2. Process vs. Product Approach**

Traditionally, a product-based approach to teaching writing addresses the flawless end product (Nunan, 1999). . This vision leads teachers to focus on the textual aspects of the product and ignore the black box that develops ideas, orders ideas, and unites them into a cohesive whole (Brown, 2010). Based on product-based approach to teaching writing, there is only one draft and that is only the final draft. There is no review by the author. The student's draft is given to the teacher, who corrects the draft based on grammar, word use, and text errors that the student may make (Brown, 2010).

The process approach, which contrasts sharply with the traditional product approach, refers to the process of written discovery and organization development (Mastuda, 1998). As Matsuda (1998) pointed out, teaching writing as a process is based on the idea that both advanced L2 writers and L1 writers can benefit from a guide that emphasizes the writing process. In contrast to product-based writing, which emphasizes the reproduction of previously learned syntactic or discursive structures, the process-based approach views writing as a process of organizational and meaning development.

In written language, the cognitive processes that students go through while writing can occur through dialogical interaction between teacher and student (Brown, 2010). The writing process is important because it is not possible to make sense of written language

simply by looking back from the finished pages. Meaning is achieved when students learn to focus on the process. Therefore, writing courses should be set up in such a way that students become aware of the different phases of writing. There are three phases in the writing process: pre-writing, actual writing, and post-writing (Brown, 2010).

When it comes to process writing, most secondary or foreign language writing teachers and researchers agree that process writing provides an opportunity for multiple revisions and this makes teacher feedback more effective by being in the intermediate stages of the writing process makes corrections (Ferris, 2007). During this process, students can act on teacher feedback while conducting subsequent reviews. To facilitate this process, writing teachers encourage students to practice writing the same essay multiple times by reviewing it multiple times.

Process writing allows teachers to provide different types of feedback between drafts and to focus on different topics of student writing. Meanwhile, students have numerous opportunities to experience the process of discovering what they want to express in writing (Ferris & Hedgcock , 2005), receiving feedback, and revising their writing based on feedback from teachers. When writing in multiple drafts, emphasis is placed on proofreading so that misuse of grammar by students or inappropriate choice of words is not considered an error when evaluated on a single writing assignment or final product.

As Matsuda (1998) suggests, process writing offers the opportunity to clarify and refine between the intended meanings and what is written. Multiple writing, along with other strategies such as discovery strategies and formative feedback from teachers and peers, becomes an important part of second language writing (Matsuda, 1998).

Several studies were conducted to examine the impact of multiple draft reviews on student writing. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) surveyed 247 L2 authors to assess the level of

usefulness of teachers' comments on their writing, including grammatical accuracy. The results of their study show that students prefer teacher feedback on grammar mistakes. Students also preferred that teacher feedback with grammar correction be provided on both initial and final drafts from students.

Ferris (2005) conducted a study of the effects of a multi-draft composition on student responses to teacher feedback, involving 155 ESL students at universities. The results of their study show that students reread their work more often, pay more attention to teachers' comments on earlier drafts than final drafts, pay more attention to teachers' comments on grammar than other aspects and they think that the teacher's comments have helped them improve their writing.

To examine the impact of teacher feedback on student revision in a multi-draft composition environment of 47 advanced ESL students, Ferris (2005) found that a significant amount of teacher feedback appeared to be used by the teachers. Similarly, the study by Hammond (2001), which included 11 ESL students in the United States, found that multiple design revisions resulted in an overall improvement in the trial. His study was supported by the results of the study of Hamp-Lyon and Kroll (1997) on the re-education with 100 students in ESL high school in Hong Kong, which showed that students in repeating groups progressed more than students in the group without repetition.

The results of these studies are corroborated by the most recent Ferris (2007) multiple design study that enrolled 92 college ESL students in the United States. Their study found that students were able to make effective revisions in response to teacher feedback and that students were able to make changes both in the short term (from one draft to the next) and in the long term (from the first draft to the final draft in at the end of writing class). The results of their study also support Khawailehs (1991) in the sense that the writing accuracy of ESL

students increased significantly in later drafts in groups that received direct or indirect feedback.

### **2.3. L2 Writing Instruction**

Students need to know different types of paragraphs to choose the correct one. According to Niquet (1983) who divides the paragraphs into three categories:

1. Paragraphs that develop a fact;
2. Paragraphs that form an opinion;
3. Paragraphs that answer a question.

To develop a paragraph based on a fact, the student must choose between several elements that could help to represent that fact: the people who participated or initiated it, the causes, the consequences, the opposition, and the perspectives of the Fact. In the first phase, we ask our students to do the following types of exercises:

1. Analyze the paragraph to find out what elements are used in it (usually a table is used for this);
2. The reconstruction of the fact that is developed in the paragraph.
3. After that, students are asked to write paragraphs about various facts, analyze the elements used, and justify their choice.

Students need to know that “it is not enough to give an opinion, it is imperative to show that it is correct” (Cohen-Vida, 2002). To do this, students can use several techniques:

1. To illustrate the opinion: "Examples are taken from reality or scenarios are invented" ( Niquet, 1989, p. 28), which are specific to the subject of the paragraph;

2. To prove that the opinion is correct: arguments are used.

Considering the techniques used to develop an opinion about a paragraph, Niquet (1989) classified the paragraphs that form an opinion into three categories

1. Paragraphs that develop an opinion based on the example;
2. Paragraphs that develop an opinion using the setting;
3. Paragraphs that form an opinion using the arguments.

The example is a real event that takes place in a certain place and at a certain time. The characters involved are real and notorious people. If the examples are well-chosen, they will convince the reader that the author is right in giving his opinion. The tasks to be solved by the students are:

1. analyze the examples used in different paragraphs;
2. add one or two examples of how to develop a paragraph;
3. Write paragraphs that use two or three examples to form an opinion.

The setting is an imaginary story with imaginary characters. Both the story and the characters try to show that the opinion is correct. Niquet (1989, p. 28) stated that “the characters and the story must be relevant to the opinion”. Students are asked to do the following types of exercises:

1. Analyze the scenarios used to develop different paragraphs;
2. To add a scenario or two to the development of a paragraph; to show that the setting is relevant;
3. Write paragraphs that use scenarios to develop an opinion.

The argument is argumentation, a logical sequence of ideas that demonstrate the correctness of the opinion. This requires that the arguments used to be solid and linked so that they form a convincing whole (Baril 7 Guillet, 1992).

Learners of English as a Foreign Language should know what kinds of arguments can best be used in specific circumstances. The strongest argument should be set in the context of the entire argument, addressing the audience. Sometimes the strongest argument is not the one with the highest logical value, but the most unexpected one that will surprise readers and encourage them to read. It is not possible to separate logic and psychology from reasoning. It is important to choose the best argument, but also to develop it well, to give it the meaning it deserves in a given situation. To write good reasoning, students should keep a few key points in mind:

1. clearly define the objective;
  2. tailor the argument to the audience;
  3. adapt reasoning to material conditions;
  4. Order available raw material: facts, technical data, statistics, experiments;
  5. Choose the arguments that best suit the communicative situation.
- (Cohen-Vida, 2002, p. 12).

To write successful argumentative paragraphs, students are asked to:

1. Analyze the arguments used in the different paragraphs;
2. add one or two arguments to develop a paragraph;
3. compare paragraphs that, through reasoning, develop the same opinion;

4. Write opinion-forming paragraphs using two or three arguments.

This third type of paragraph is very similar to the previous one. It consists of three parts:

1. The question;
2. The answer to that question;
3. The explanation of the answer.

The third part is in fact similar to the paragraph developing an opinion because once the question has been answered, the opinion must be developed. This paragraph can be seen as a reinforcement of the previous one, so once the students have answered the question, they must perform the same exercises as the paragraph to develop an opinion.

Among the various approaches to teaching writing as a process, the sociocultural theory seems to be the most prominent, as it emphasizes the importance of interaction and dialogue. The teacher takes on the role of a reader in written dialogue and, more importantly, the role of an expert to help the student grow.

## **2.4. Empirical Studies**

The significance of peer support and scaffolding has been studied in different studies. For example, Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid (2012) examined the role of peer assessment and self-assessment in the development of language learners' writing performance. The research results of this study demonstrate the importance of self and peer assessment in developing students' writing performance. Including self-assessment training in general English as foreign language classes and writing classes. In particular, it seemed like a beneficial process. It appears that providing multiple self-assessment options helps students improve their



metacognition. Integrating self-assessment/self-assessment into English as a Foreign Language courses will increase student engagement in learning.

Similarly, Puegphrom, Chiramanee, and Chiramanee (2014) examined the effectiveness of written peer review and the subject's attitudes toward technology and peer review. It was found that the writing skills of the subjects improved after they had undergone the writing class with peer assessment and were assessed by peers. Very positive attitudes were found in the following areas: development of writing ability, learning self-directed, cooperative learning, and self-confidence.

In another study, emphasizing collaboration, Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad (2018) examined the feasibility and effect of dynamic assessment on Iranian English writing skills as a foreign language student in the second language. From this, it can be concluded that dynamic assessment has a predictable nature that tries to detect that students are having difficulties. It also provides reasonable information on the root cause of the problem, the evolution, and the superiority of the student's ability to help teachers design more effective courses to remedy the situation. The results showed that the dynamic evaluation influenced the results of the participants, increased their writing skills, and showed that the dynamic evaluation of the experimental groups has a result which were higher than those of the control groups.

In addition, different approaches to process writing instruction were found to be of great significance in EFL contexts. For example, Maghsoudi and Haririan (2013) examined the influence of brainstorming in the writing performance of students of English as a foreign language. The result of the study indicated that the brainstorming strategy instruction could have a positive effect on the writing performance and performance of Iranian intermediate EFL students. The teaching and brainstorming strategy showed significant improvements in

the student's ability to write essays in terms of content and organization. The mechanics of writing, language used, and skills have emerged from creative thinking skills and significant changes to strengthen student collaboration in essay writing. Using a brainstorming strategy has a significant impact on students' average English writing proficiency scores.

Other innovative methods to improve process writing have found to be effective, as well. For instance, Abedi, Keshmirshekan, and Namazianost (2019) compared the effect of flipped classroom lessons with traditional EFL English composition writing lessons. The results showed that there was a significant difference between the performance of the experimental and control groups in the posttest. They found that using reversed instructions in the classroom to learn to write in English could be a useful technique that can greatly expand writing skills. As a result, students who taught composition writing in English in an upside-down classroom performed better than those who taught in their traditional-style classes. In fact, using a flipped classroom lesson improved the writing of English compositions more effectively. Additionally, the reversed instructions had a drastic effect on learning the lesson forms.

As another example, Fageeh (2011) examined the use of a blog in an intermediate writing course in English as a foreign language university and its impact on students, as well as its effect in creating positive attitudes towards writing as opposed to the tradition of oral presentation of the teaching of writing. The result of the study showed that students believe that the weblog can be used as a tool to develop their English in terms of their writing skills and attitudes towards writing. Students see their opinion of weblogs as an opportunity to express themselves in English, write for a local and global audience, create active and interactive social exchanges on blogs, and maintain an interactive relationship with readers in real-time.

Two independent scholars, such as Tuan (2010) and Sholah (2019), examined the extent to which journal writing increased students' writing ability. Tuan (2010) first examined the advantage of journal writing as a complementary activity to promote students' motivation for writing and improve their writing skills and also produce a close relationship between teachers and students. The results showed the benefits of writing magazines to increase students' motivation to write and improve their writing skills, as well as to create a close relationship between teachers and students.

Similarly, Sholah (2019) examined whether students can improve their writing skills and overcome writing difficulties by participating in magazine writing activities. Based on the results of the data analyzed in this research, it can be understood that implementing a journal in the teaching and learning process of writing is a useful way to improve the writing skills of students. Students can learn many components independently. It is the student diaries that help teachers measure the competence of each student and identify their needs, thoughts, and feelings. Knowing all of this helps teachers instill in students a preference for teaching methods and techniques that are appropriate for students. In terms of quantitative data, he described the improvement in students' writing skills that was evident from the students' writing results and their questionnaires.

Studies related to teachers' and learners' approaches toward CF and learners' preference for different types of feedback described below are Shulz (1996), Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2005), Yoshida (2008), and Lee (2011) which focused on different CF types in order to discover which types were used more by teachers and students.

Shulz, (1996) conducted a study to compare student and teacher approaches toward the role of grammar and error correction. The findings indicated that learners were more positive toward formal grammar study than do the instructors. Also, it was shown that most

of the learners had a positive attitude toward negative feedback; however, there were disagreements among teachers providing the students with negative feedback. While Latin teachers held a more favorable view toward grammar and error correction than did foreign language teachers, ESL teachers displayed more negative attitudes.

In another study, learners' perception about interactional feedback provided through task-based dyadic interaction was explored by Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2005). In terms of lexical, phonological, and syntactic feedback, learners were accurate in their perception, while regarding their perceptions about morphosyntactic feedback, they were inaccurate. It was also revealed that both the nature and content of the feedback could affect learners' perceptions.

Similarly, Yoshida (2008) also conducted a study to find teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective aspects in three Japanese classrooms at a university in Australia. The results of 30 hours of recordings and stimulated recall interviews showed that teachers used recasts more frequently because of the time restrictions, although they knew other feedback types like prompts were more effective. On the other hand, learners preferred to have time to think about correct answers rather than being immediately corrected by the teacher; therefore, the found clarifications or elicitations became useful.

In an analogous study in 2011, Lee attempted to search the types of feedback (lexical, morph syntactic, and affective) and techniques (metalinguage) that L2 students used to show concentration to linguistic difficulties in a Spanish-American tele-collaborative interchange by using a reactive approach to FonF. The results revealed that the American group used more linguistic feedback (lexical and morphosyntactic) while the Spanish students used more emotive feedback. Concerning feedback strategies, the US learners preferred to use metalinguistic explanations, while the Spanish learners tended to provide reformulations as a

quick way to provide target-like forms. However, no significant difference was found in the distribution rate of strategy type used by both groups.

#### **2.4.1 Studies Related to Focus on Form**

There have been many studies supporting the influence of focus on form (FonF) on learners' accuracy. The effects of FonF and corrective feedback through communicative language teaching on foreign language teaching were investigated by Lightbown and Spada in 2006. The results indicated that the children in the intense programs developed higher levels of comprehension ability than learners in the regular programs; moreover, those in intensive programs outperformed those in the control group regarding achieving fluency in oral production and gaining communicative confidence in using the second language

Moreover, in their quasi-experimental study, Spada and Lightbown (2006) tried to analyze the effect of instruction and corrective feedback on the development of interrogative constructions in the oral performance of ESL learners. The results of the pre-test and three post-tests (one immediately following the instruction, another one 5 weeks later, and the other one 5 months later) indicated that they could lead to second language development if form-focused instruction and corrective feedback are provided within the context of communicative interaction.

Similarly, in 2001, in a descriptive study, Williams explored the effect of unplanned concentration on form. Also, the study investigated reactive language-related episodes (LREs) initiated in the forms of different feedback aspects by both the instructors and students. It was revealed that low proficiency learners benefitted more from teacher feedback than the feedback provided by other peers, but with students in higher levels, the feedback provided by both the teacher and other learners proved to be effective.

Moreover, the connection between interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms was examined by Oliver and Mackey (2003). The findings showed that only in explicit language the focus of interaction was on linguistic forms. In other contexts, they weren't focusing on forms but on other aspects of the classroom settings. The proportion of recasts was higher in content, management, and communicative exchanges; however, regarding explicit feedback, it was rarely provided in the content, management, and communicative exchanges, but it occurred more frequently in explicit language-focused exchanges, and it also led to more modified output than other contexts.

Similarly, a year later in 2005, Lewon investigated the validity of focus on form in developing second language learning. The findings revealed that incidental focus on the form was useful in L2 learning. The immediate test showed that participants could produce nearly 60% of the targeted items correctly, and in the delayed posttest they were able to recall 50% of the correct form.

Furthermore, Nassaji (2010) conducted a study regarding the occurrence and effectiveness of unplanned concentrate on the form (FonF) in adult English Second Language classrooms. The findings indicated that incidental focus on form occurs more frequently and with regard to the occurrence of different types of FonF, pre-emptive FonF occurred more than reactive FonF and was more effective. It was also shown that the learners' level of language proficiency were strongly related to amount, type, and effectiveness of FonF.

#### **2.4.2 Studies Related to Recasts and Prompts**

There has been a large number of valuable studies on the role of recasts and prompts in not only improving the learners' linguistic accuracy, but also keeping interaction between teachers and students. For example, Mackey and Philp (1998) examined the effects of conversational interaction with intensive recasts on the improvement of target language

question forms. The results indicated that learners at higher developmental levels who were given intensive recasts during interaction outperformed those groups participating only in interaction without receiving any recasts. It was also found out although recasts may not be included in learners' immediate responses, they have short-term inter-language development. They proposed that repetitions of recasts may be red herrings.

Similarly, in 2003, Philp tried to investigate the role of dyadic interaction in prompting students to attend to native speakers' reformulations of their ill-formed questions supplied to them in the form of recasts. It was found out that high and intermediate learners outperformed the low group. Furthermore, the study demonstrated that short recasts were more effective than long recasts, and those recasts which included fewer changes were recalled more accurately than those with more changes.

In the same vein, in a quasi-experimental study, Lyster (2013) examined the effects of prompts and recasts on immersion learners' acquisition to use grammatical gender accurately through form-focused instruction. It was found out that the treatment groups outperformed the control group. The results of both written tasks in particular and oral tasks to a smaller degree indicated that form-focused instruction has more positive effects when combined with prompts than with recasts or no feedback.

In the same year, Lyster carried out another study to examine the results of form-focused instruction of four target features namely perfect vs. imperfect present tenses, the conditional mood, second-person pronouns, and grammatical gender in the context of Canadian French immersion classroom to students of the second language of French. It was shown that prompts were more effective than recasts since they outperformed the comparison group on all measures, while the recast group only marginally performed better than the group receiving no feedback.

Furthermore, in a quasi-experimental study by Ammar and Spada (2006), they tried to investigate the usefulness of recasts and prompts. It was demonstrated that prompts were more effective than recasts particularly with low proficiency learners, but for high proficiency learners, no significant difference was found between prompts and recasts.

In a similar attempt, the characteristics, explicitness, and effectiveness of recasts were investigated by Loewen (2001) on L2 adult English second language classrooms. The results of the pretest did not indicate a significant difference in comparing recasts with other types of CF. the only difference was in the rate of successful uptake which was a factor with elicitation and metalinguistic feedback but not with recasts. The important factors for recasts, however, were intonation, length, and the number of changes that influence learners' accuracy in the posttest, not uptake, so this study observed that the degree of implicitness of recast affects their effectiveness.

Moreover, Lyster and Sato (2013) conducted research in 2 different settings: French immersion for English-speaking children in Canada and Japanese immersion for English-speaking children in the United States to see the effects of explicit correction, recasts, and prompts on the uptake and learner repair. In terms of uptake and repair, different patterns emerged. Prompts led to more uptake and repair than recasts or explicit correction in FI classrooms, whereas regarding JI students the greatest proportion of uptake and repair followed recasts.

Additionally, in 2010, Nassaji examined the helpfulness of two types of interactional feedback (recasts and elicitations) in both implicit or explicit forms, and their effects on learning linguistic forms. The results showed that in the immediate post-interaction, learners benefitted more from recasts than elicitations, but they could recall those that were corrected by elicitations more than those being corrected by recasts in the delayed post-interaction.



Regarding explicitness, it was demonstrated that explicit feedback led to a higher percentage of correction than did implicitly in both forms of recasts and elicitations. However, the impact of explicitness seemed to be greater for recasts than for elicitations.

Moreover, the differential results of prompts and recasts in dyadic interaction were explored in different studies. For instance, Lyster and Izquierdo (2009) using the repeated-measure ANOVA demonstrated that both groups benefitted from the form-focused instructions, regardless of feedback type. Although it had been predicted that the prompt group would outperform the recast group, no significant difference was observed between the two groups.

Similarly, effects of form-focused instruction and various CF treatments (either recasts or prompts) on Chinese EFL learners' acquisition of regular and irregular present tense forms were investigated in quasi-experimental research by Yang and Lyster in 2010. The pretest, the immediate- and- late posttests in the forms of both oral and written tests revealed the prompt group subjects had superior performance over those in the recast or control group. It was also shown that in the use of regular present tense forms prompts were more effective, whereas in improving accuracy in the use of irregular present tense forms, prompts and recasts had similar effects.

In the same line, Kartchava and Ammar (2014) in a quasi-experimental study investigated the usefulness of three Corrective Feedback strategies (recasts, prompts, and a combination of the two) in relation to the target aspect which is the English Second Language students' acquisition of the English present tense and questions in the present. The results of the pre-and-post tests indicated that regarding both present tense and questions the Recast group reported less noticing of CF than did the Prompt and Mixed groups. In terms of the grammatical target, the present tense accuracy levels were more significant than those for

questions, but regarding the groups, the differences were not significant for either of the targets.

Moreover, Assai (2014) performed research to examine the effect of scaffold feedback and recasts on SL development. It was showed that both experimental groups performed better than the control group. On the other hand, the scaffolded feedback group benefitted more from the treatment than the recast group.

### **2.4.3. Studies Related to Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback**

The effectiveness of implicit and explicit feedback has been a controversial issue in EFL teaching. Some studies were in favor of explicit feedback. For example, in an empirical study, Carrol and Swain (1993) attempted to examine the impacts of explicit and implicit negative feedback on the acquisition of the English dative alternation. The results revealed that all treatment groups outperformed the control group during all three test sessions; however, it was shown that group a subjects who were given explicit CF performed better than the other groups.

In 2014, Zohrabi and Ehsani tried to recognize the role of implicit and explicit CF in Persian speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. The findings indicated that both implicit and explicit CF was shown to be effective in improving the process of English language learning and learners' awareness of English grammar. The researchers of the study also found out that explicit correction is more useful than implicit one in the process of teaching.

Some other researchers found implicit feedback to be more effective. For example, Loewn, and Erlam guided a study in 2006 to compare the effectiveness of two types of CF: explicit (metalinguistic information) and implicit (recast) on the acquisition of the target

structure (present tense-ed). Based on the result of the current study both types of implicit and explicit knowledge need to be measured in experimental studies.

Rohollahzadeh, Ebadi, and Abedalaziz (2014) worked on the effects of CF in the form of recast on implicit and explicit knowledge. Results of the three tests (Elicited Oral Imitation Test, TGJT, and Metalinguistic Knowledge Test) yielded that the learners in the experimental group outperformed the learners in the control group. Furthermore, it was revealed that the impact of implicit CF was more on learners' implicit knowledge than on their explicit knowledge.

However, some studies questioned the effectiveness of feedback of either types. The role of error correction in foreign grammar knowledge and writing proficiency was investigated by Dekeyserin in 1993. The findings revealed that error correction did not lead to a significant improvement; however, some students benefitted more from error correction than others based on the interaction of individual differences including previous achievement, extrinsic motivation, and anxiety with the treatment.

All in all, there is plausible evidence of the effectiveness of feedback of either type and it can be concluded that no matter what type of feedback is provided, giving feedback is better than ignoring errors. For example, Kim and Mathis (2001) conducted a study as well to find out which form of negative feedback, in the use of dative alternation either explicit or implicit is more effective. The results of the post-tests specified no significant differences between the groups who participated in the current study. However, the findings emphasized the need for continuous feedback.

In 2005, the effects of implicit feedback and students' feedbacks on English Second Language questions development were examined by McDonough. Logistic regression indicated that modified output which consisted of developmentally advanced questions was

predictive of ESL question progress. It also yielded that clarification requests indirectly promoted both ESL questions and modified output.

#### **2.4.4. Studies Related to Form-focused Tasks**

There has been a number of seminal studies that supported the use of form-focused tasks in EFL pedagogy. For example, Garcia Mayo (2003) guided a study to discover the effectiveness of two form-focused tasks (dictogloss and text reconstruction) which required students to produce output collaboratively in advanced EFL pedagogy. The findings yielded that the text reconstruction led to greater production of LRE turns than the dictogloss. It was, moreover, demonstrated that because of the nature of its LREs, it was found to be more effective than the dictogloss since it only made learners produce a coherent paragraph not reflect on their language choices.

In the same vein, Garcia Mayo (2003) conducted another study to find out the effectiveness of two form-focused tasks (dictogloss and text reconstruction) which required the students to produce output collaboratively. The findings yielded that the text reconstruction led to greater production of LRE turns than the dictogloss. It was, moreover, demonstrated that because of the nature of its LREs, it was found to be more effective than the dictogloss since it only made learners produce a coherent paragraph not reflect on their language choices.

Instructor-learner feedback samples during naturally occurring classroom interaction in terms of the amount, type, and use of interactional feedback as a function of whether a task was concentrated or un-concentrated were examined by Gurzynski-Weiss, (2012). They found out that more errors were detected during unfocused tasks, however, students had more opportunities to produce modified output during focused tasks. The proportion of implicit feedback provided by the teacher was more than explicit feedback in each task phase,

especially in the post-task stage. It was also showed that errors occurred and were corrected more frequently in the during-and-posttest stage than in the pretest stage.

#### **2.4.5. Summary of the Empirical Findings**

As reported above, there has been a plethora of research dealing with students' writing performance under different conditions providing a focus on form, different types of corrective feedback, and teaching methods that pave the way for process-oriented approaches to writing, such as journal writing. However, a closer look at these studies shows that the previous attempts were generally based on quasi-experimental design and were interested in exploring the effects of specific process-based writing instruction approaches such as journal writing or discovering the effects of certain corrective feedback types.

This implies that although the pedagogic values of these instructional methods and corrective feedback types were researched and proven, little, if any, is known about the learners' perspectives, attitudes, and perceptions about these variables that have been recurrently researched. Above all, since editing is a key to a process-based approach, little is known about the EFL learners' perceptions about the process of editing implemented in EFL classes for teaching writing skills .

Based on what is revealed in previous research, process-based methods and editing are key to EFL learners' better performance in writing; however, there is still a gap in terms of how the learners who do the editing task perceive the process and the instruction. This study, implementing grounded theory is interested in delving into the learners' mentality about editing tasks they experienced in their EFL classes and explore their perceptions in terms of the factors which are critical to accepting and welcoming the task in an EFL class.



# *Chapter Three:*

## *Method*

### **3.1. Introduction**

This chapter aims at giving a comprehensive picture of the context in which the research was conducted. It revolves around introducing the participants of the study, and the design of the research, and the procedure of data collection. Also, this part contains the theoretical basis on which this study was based, that is, the constructivist grounded theory proposed by Charmaz (2006).

### **3.3. Research Method**

Grounded theory is rooted in symbolic interactionism, perceiving reflexive interaction as a must in responding to environment. Consequently, having the purpose of the study in mind, the researcher found grounded theory a suitable method for probing the perceptions of the learners to editing task as a pedagogical element in their classroom environment. It was also an appropriate topic due to the social nature of this inquiry. The research method of this study aims to develop a theory that is grounded in the words and actions of the individuals under study.

### **3.2. Participants and Teaching Context**

As noted, this study is situated in Iranian private language institutes, which comprises general English teaching programs for learners of different ages. This study was conducted in a class with adolescent students who studied English to further their education. More specifically, the learners who participated in this study were college students who were generally more academically inclined and tended to continue their studies in English-speaking countries. Generally, since they saw English learning as peripheral to their education in their colleges, they are more likely to take part in private school classes to achieve their goals.



The participants were 14 Iranian EFL learners who volunteered to answer the interview questions. The participants came from different colleges. With this inevitable convenience sampling, it would be fair to assume that the participants were learners interested in developing their writing skills. To ensure the confidentiality of the participants' perspectives, pseudonyms are used throughout this paper.

### **3.4. Data Collection**

Grounded Theory is a systematic comparative inductive interactive inquiry that is conducted through different levels of analysis including coding, constructing abstract categories, and offering a conceptual analysis of these categories (Charmaz, 2006). This approach has a constructivist orientation in that the researcher is part of what is researched. The qualitative data are normally co-constructed through the interaction between the researcher and the interviewees.

In this study, also, grounded theory was used and the data were collected via semi-structured interviews, seen as a social practice (Talmy, 2010). The study began with preparing the initial prompts for the interview through consulting related sources and studies which were conducted in the realm of writing instruction. The prompts were then refined after consulting experts on language teaching and research. Next, the students attending the course were informed about the purpose of the interview and the research in which they were asked to participate. Agreements were made about the confidentiality of the data collected in this study. Then, the learners' interview sessions were arranged so that every interviewee had enough time to attend a one-to-one interview session.

The participants were asked to comment on different prompts which were considered to be the starting point of the interviews and were guided by the follow-up questions of the researcher to further clarify their perceptions on different aspects of editing tasks as they were

raised in the interview sessions. Each session lasted about 10 to 15 minutes and was tape-recorded.

### **3.5. Data Analysis**

The constructivist approach (Charmaz, 2006) to grounded theory research was applied in this study, as pinpointed above. Accordingly, the coding process of the qualitative data in this study included the three main steps of initial coding, focused coding, and theoretical coding .

The recorded data were transcribed and went through multiple-stage coding. In the initial coding stage, the researcher's main aim was to analyze the transcription sentence by sentence and explore the existing codes. Next, she went through the emerging codes to develop possible initial categories. The second stage was focused coding, through which the researcher conducted a comparative analysis of the emerging codes and categories. In this stage, core categories were decided on after the data saturation has occurred. In the final stage, theoretical coding was completed by linking the core categories into one whole theoretical framework which revealed the emerging aspects of the learners' perceptions on editing tasks are formed and maintained as one whole.

In this study, the “voice” of the interviewees about editing tasks was situationally contingent, and both the content and the linguistic and interactional resources collaboratively generated the data in this research. This was certainly the case in this study given that the researcher who conducted the interview was herself the foreign language teacher who conducted the tasks. Thus, based on this perspective, both the data and their analyses were produced collaboratively (Charmaz,2006; Talmy,2010), and “generalizations remain partial, conditional, and situated” (Charmaz, 2011, p. 366).

The initial coding of data, in this study, was the initial step to start the process of fracturing the data to compare incident to incident and to search for similarities and differences in transient patterns that emerged from the data. According to Charmaz's (2006)

guidelines, as many codes as possible were generated from the initial data set. Accordingly, important words or phrases identifying socio-psychological processes and actions perceived by the learners doing editing tasks were identified and labeled. According to Charmaz (2006), the codes were kept as similar to the data as possible. For example, in this stage, the words or phrases containing the cognitive or affective loads such as "notice", "pay attention", "work together", "patiently answered", etc. were identified.

Focused coding was then done to identify core categories, theoretical data saturation, and the theoretical sensitivity of the constructivist grounded theory process (Birks & Mills, 2015). Focused coding in this study was built on the initial coding phase to transform basic data into more abstract concepts allowing the theory to emerge from the data. Categories were reviewed to see which ones, if any, can be subsumed beneath other categories (Moghaddam, 2006). For example, the existing codes such as "notice", "see", "understand", and "pay attention" were classified under a more abstract focused code of "noticing".

Theoretical coding, as the final step of the constructivist approach, was done to integrate the emerged codes from focused coding to the substantive theory. According to Saldana (2021, p. 224) "theoretical coding integrates and synthesizes the categories derived from coding and analysis to now create a theory". In this study, the finalized findings from the original data from the interview were developed into an editing task implementation model, as discussed in the following sections.

### **3.6. Credibility of the Findings**

For the sake of the credibility of the findings, the researcher tried to meet as many criteria as possible. First and foremost, in order to avoid researcher bias, the researcher did not make further changes in the syllabus of the observed classroom than entering the editing tasks assignments to be done in the class. That is, the learners were covering the routine syllabus of

the institute, and their classroom activities in terms of teaching language skills did not undergo any changes in comparison to what the learners had been doing in the previous terms.

Moreover, in order to achieve data saturation and hence, to ensure sufficient depth and relevance of data collection and analysis, the researcher continued data collection in several rounds so that, as defined in Charmaz (2006) words, further new codes and issues did not emerge. Furthermore, the researcher tried to avoid bias via coding and analyzing the data using a second coder so that the analysis did not contain a biased interpretation of the interviewees' words.

### **3.7. Ethical Considerations**

In order to observe ethical considerations in this study, the researcher informed the interviewees about the purpose of the study and data collection before conducting the interviews. They were informed that their voice was recorded and was going to be used for no other purpose than this study. The researcher described her commitment to keeping the interviewee's content confidential and their data was used anonymously.

# *Chapter Four*

## *Results*

#### **4.1. Restatement of the Problem**

There has been a plethora of research on the effectiveness of editing tasks and feedback on EFL learners' writing performance. However, beyond the scope of this many experimental studies conducted on the effectiveness of editing tasks on EFL learners writing ability, little, if any, research has been conducted to inform us about the learners' perceptions of this type of task. In accordance with this research gap, the researcher probed how EFL learners participating in an intermediate course of writing in an institute perceived editing tasks .

This chapter includes the results of qualitative analysis done on the data collected via interview sessions with the intermediate EFL learners who participated in this study and conducted editing tasks under the researcher's supervision. The analysis was done according to the steps highlighted by Charmaz (2006) within her approach to constructivist grounded theory.

#### **4.2. Results**

Iterative data collection and analysis yielded a set of propositions that reflect the participants' perceptions of editing tasks. Moreover, variables that might have influenced their learning through the implementation of the editing tasks are discussed. That is, topics that emerged from the data and evolved into influencing factors are described. In particular, what the learner participants talked about and perceived to be useful activities to develop proficiency during their participation in editing tasks are discussed.

##### **4.2.1. Editing encourages noticing**

The participants believed that the presence of the target grammatical forms in the text which they were going to edit could increase their concentration and their level of attention to the target structures so that they could notice the wrong forms and how the target structure is applied. So based on their opinion they could correct the existing mistakes as a result of

increasing and using their noticing skill. Emphasizing the role of editing tasks in stimulating noticing, one of the participants explained:

(Excerpt 1) It was very interesting that after reviewing and teaching the grammar points, she had given the grammar in the form of texts and the texts that I had to look at carefully so that *I could see and understand* what was wrong and what was right, and I tried to write the right form in the papers in order to have a better completed-task and [...]. *As a result of this noticing, I could pay more attention* to these points when I was writing the next time.

Also, the participants highlighted the fact that although they could notice the wrong forms in the text, they sometimes needed teacher help to correct the forms. That is, noticing sometimes occurred with the teacher's assistance and support. Explaining the role of the teacher's help in noticing, one of the participants stated:

(Excerpt 2) Sometimes I started to read the paragraphs then I would try to find all the verbs, according to my own technique I draw a line under those verbs and look accordingly to see when they could be used correctly with *the teacher's help*. However, sometimes I had to seek *the teachers' help* to find a clue without which it was hard or sometimes impossible for me.

Analysis revealed that learners' overall attitude toward the innovative course was positive. They had a variety of reasons for their satisfaction with the course. One of the reasons was that they compared the editing task activities with the ones they had already done by the time they entered the new course. In traditional classes, the learners were not aware of the points that could affect the accuracy of their products. As reflected in the following comments, the editing task activity was a source of noticing and conscious-raising activities for the learners during instruction. Editing tasks made them notice the aspects of their

language which they had already been introduced to in previous terms. This was also noted in previous studies, e.g. Hanaoka and Shinichi (2012). It can be argued that editing, as implemented in this study as well as previous ones, can engage the learners with the linguistic complexities of the piece of the language they are editing or producing.

#### **4.2.2. Editing gives learners<sup>2</sup> a sense of achievement**

The learners who participated in this study also confessed that the method could make a tangible improvement in their writing ability, especially in terms of using structural features of English accurately. This task gave them a sense of development and achievement because it could add to their previous knowledge and it could help them to learn how to use their existing passive knowledge. Highlighting the importance of editing tasks in increasing the sense of achievement, one of the participants argued:

*(Excerpt 3) It definitely got much better, our writing I mean. I could learn how English sentences work through editing my own drafts. I could learn through working with my classmates to correct my draft or theirs which helped me to understand how to use verbs correctly or how to use prepositions in the right way, generally it helped me to dominate my grammar knowledge which is helpful in writing process. I could see I was writing better and better.*

A further source of satisfaction was the fact that learner improvement was tangible enough to make them more interested in continuing the path of editing and revising. This sense of achievement was not only felt by the learners individually but also rooted in the ripple effect of a learner's success. The editing task was done within a class and the learners were aware of their classmates' success and even more that they mutually commented on doing such activities were contributing to their development of grammar knowledge and writing skills. This would provide a domino of a satisfying attitude toward the task at hand.



As pinpointed by Ebadi and Rahimi (2017), self-edition or peer-edition can be a source of achievement in writing and can improve the learners' linguistic competence, in general. Especially, as mentioned by Ebadi and Rahimi (2017), the effect could be more significant if the edition is done with time intervals or in separated sessions as was the case in this study.

As participants mentioned, part of this sense of achievement is due to the collaborative nature of the class. That is, the learners can come to a belief that they know and they have already learned what was embedded in the tasks with the help of their classmates in this pair and group besides their individual works. Concerning the impact of editing tasks on the learners' sense of achievement, one of the participants stated:

(Excerpt 4) Besides our own editing activity, we also had to edit the drafts of our classmates or group members. During this process also we could learn some new points besides our individual works. This was perfect since after a while we could see that we not only could write better but also could help others better, too. It was a great success in a short time.

The role of peer revision and edition in gaining a sense of achievement is also reflected in the excerpt above. In other words, they could find the mistakes they made themselves in their own drafts in other students' drafts as well and this can be defined in terms of the learners' achieving the pedagogical objectives defined for a general writing course.

#### **4.2.3. Editing encourages recurrent practice**

The participants believed that the cyclic and repetitive nature of the tasks could help them master the target forms. This repetition helped them remember their errors and carefully handle the sentences in the new task and have the feedback the teacher already gave them in

mind. Highlighting the importance of editing tasks in rising repeated practice, one of the participants explained:

(Excerpt 5) I think this repetition made me learn better because I was careful every time, I repeated my grammar checking activity, I did not repeat that mistake and I increased my sense of achievement and this was a positive aspect. [...] I think this method is very attractive. This repetition and repeated study besides receiving feedback and notes made me take this grammar in my mind and it made it very easy for me to learn grammar and use it unintentionally.

One of the most recurrent themes in the interviews was the fact that the editing task provided recurrent opportunities for practicing the same grammatical point or a writing tip already covered in the previous terms so that the learners could review the same point and re-learn it. In addition, they further acknowledged that such a repetitive pattern could compensate for their lack of rehearsal of writing tips out of the class. That is, task editing was specifically important because they did not have a chance or were not active enough to review writing exercises out of the class. In addition, a part of the writing practice and rehearsal was covered in the workbooks which were not seriously covered in the previous terms; so, they did not have a chance to review these points. A further key issue that has to be considered is the fact that the learners were satisfied with this teaching technique because they could receive abundant feedback through repetition and rehearsal.

Part of this repetition and recurrent practice was due to the collaborative nature of the task. That is, the participants believed that they had to correct and comment on their peers' drafts, as well. Consequently, they faced similar content and repeated structures several times during a session or two consecutive sessions which could reinforce their competence in

writing. Emphasizing the significance of the editing tasks in promoting recurrent practice, one of the participants claimed:

(Excerpt 6) I repeatedly corrected several drafts and consulted my classmates about what they meant or what the correct structure or term would be, generally after the individual works we searched and studied about the grammar parts together over and over to do our best. The same pattern, structure, or word [collocation] is repeated 10 times for example. This was a perfect practice that could help us to internalize the correct forms and as a result of this internalization, we became better writers to use the presented structures.

#### **4.2.4. Editing helps learners use their previous knowledge**

The learners believed that editing tasks can help them remember what they had already covered in the previous terms. They believe that editing tasks can help them remember the older lessons and also help them related the new points to the older ones in the editing process. Actually, it made their passive knowledge of grammar a part of their active knowledge that can be easily used. One of the participants explained the role of editing tasks in using previous knowledge as follows:

(Excerpt 7) Yes, I saw the grammar point that I had already learned well and seemed familiar to me, we started with a small grammar [lesson]. But it helped me to review several grammar points I had already learned in previous semesters and use them in the process of editing. Maybe before we knew these points but we didn't know how to use them. In my opinion, your class was very useful and choosing this clever method by you helped us to review and

remember what we covered since it gave us a chance not only to learn new things but also to review old things.

The participants stated that editing is using one's background grammar knowledge; hence, instead of an exclusive focus on learning new grammar points, the learners found editing empowering since it gave them a chance to use what they already know in doing something worthwhile. In addition, they had a chance to practice the language they have already learned in a balanced way and subsume the variety of points they have learned into a balanced whole. Describing the role of editing tasks in using previous knowledge, one of the participants stated:

(Excerpt 8) What we did was valuable because the task made what I already learned meaningful for me and it was like practicing what I previously learned. It gave me a chance to make all the pieces I learned connected and make a meaningful whole.

The reason why the learners welcomed the editing task was the fact that this could give them a chance to re-learn and brush up their knowledge of the grammatical point and vocabulary use. They mentioned the fact that they have learned some points in a linear order rather than in a cyclical fashion in the sense that they had already been exposed to a specific grammar point in previous terms and did not have a chance to use it so that they could revive the point. Even worse, due to the lack of contextualized practice, they assumed that they had already learned how to use a specific structure or a word but they could not put the word into their speech. This editing task gave them a chance to be aware of their deficient knowledge of the structures that they assumed they knew but actually they could not actively and voluntarily use.

#### **4.2.5. Editing improves teacher-learner interactions**

The participants in this study found this approach to writing instruction improving the teacher-student interaction and level of communication or negotiation established while doing this task. They believed that not only the nature of the task itself but also how the task was presented was conducive to teacher-learner interaction. For example, the teacher's removing their fear and stress and also establishing a sense of collaboration and support were found to be important. With regard to the significance of the editing tasks in increasing teacher-learner interaction, one of the participants stated:

(Excerpt 9) The first time you started, we thought we were a stranger to this task, but your information and trying to be with us killed the feeling of strangeness and fear in us. Yes, exactly. And moving from the small parts to the big parts, and also repetition was very useful in removing stress and close collaboration with my classmates and you.

The participants also stated that the teacher was open to any question, negotiation, and comment before, while, and after doing the task and backed the learners when they were editing. The purpose was to help them not only grasp the knowledge of language structure and vocabulary as well as other writing tips but also have a clear view of how the task was working. The participants favored the teacher's emphasis on clarifying the process rather than focusing on the product or how much they are expected to do was an effective instructional strategy. One of the participants described the importance of editing tasks in improving teacher-learner interaction as follows:

(Excerpt 10) Explaining and sending different texts made me ask any question I had. It was very effective that you answered the questions patiently. Improving the process in each session made me have fewer questions to handle the editing task. I think

intimacy with you was effective in the field of questions and answers, and because I have known you and my teacher for a long time, I could easily ask you about your characteristics. You also answered calmly and faster than other teachers.

#### **4.2.6. Editing merges competition and cooperation**

The learners who participated in this study believed that the tasks were done in an intimate environment in the group that consists of these individuals. Although the teacher incorporated the atmosphere of collaborative and cooperative work, the participants believed that the teacher's use of competition among the individuals in this group to invest in facilitative stress within her class was also useful. One of the participants described the link between editing tasks and completion and cooperation as follows:

(Excerpt 11) The first session that you gave us a full explanation was very helpful and the sense of competition that you created was effective in that we were constantly trying to make fewer mistakes and be better than other classmates in identifying the errors in the paragraphs you gave us.

The learners in this study also believed that the competition in terms of finding the errors and in terms of finding more errors than other group members and pairs could help them take the job more seriously. Emphasizing the impact of editing tasks on improving cooperation and competition, one of the participants stated:

(12) Yes, yes, it was very effective, both on my writing and on my editing, [...]. And you could create a good learning environment and a sense of competition. We cooperated in pairs to find the errors and fix them [...] at the same time we were competing with each other in our individual works to do the editing job better.

The combination of cooperation and competition could make up a secure yet serious atmosphere for doing the task. It has to be noted that the competitive atmosphere was established after having all the means of support provided for the learners. That is, assuring the fact that they were provided with adequate teacher support and that they were familiar with the task and processes they had to undertake to achieve the task objective, the teacher added a controlled level of competition to the instruction which was welcomed by the learners.

#### **4.2.7. Editing encourages problem-solving and discovery learning**

The participants also perceived the editing task as a problem-solving task which may be attractive for those learners who are curious or motivated. This enables them to learn new knowledge by facing some problems to be solved. In addition, it was an opportunity to discover the target language better through asking peers, consulting the previous textbooks, and asking the teacher. One of the participants emphasized the role of editing tasks and problem-solving and discovery learning as follows:

(Excerpt 13) It is very useful and a useful experience in terms of increasing curiosity and motivation to solve our problems in writing better. We were expected to observe, analyze and find solutions in order to apply them in the text. In This way, for example, you make a wrong text for us to correct made us learn and search so that we can correct the errors and write better.

The participants believed that editing tasks could trigger their motivation and self-regulation in that they were considered to be responsible for their own learning, constructing their own knowledge, and managing the process of editing by using the information given by the teacher. They believed that since they were given a share in the teaching-learning process, they could feel more motivated and regulated for their learning language. With regard to the

effect of editing tasks on the development of problem-solving and discovery learning, one of the participants argued:

(Excerpt 14) The task was useful [...] I learned how to approach writing and editing, I learned to monitor my writing by using the knowledge you gave to us. I was motivated to do the writing tasks and I was not indifferent about writing. I could manage it after a while. I did not escape writing tasks anymore at the end of the term.

#### **4.2.8. Editing leads to contextualized and meaning-based practice**

The learners perceived editing tasks to be meaning-based. They stated that they came to this understanding that the form and meaning are related, and the tasks could not be fulfilled unless the grammatical errors were interpreted according to the meaning of the sentence. Emphasizing the link between editing tasks and contextualized practice, one of the participants stated:

(Excerpt 15) It made it much easier for us to learn. After looking at a text we discovered the meaning and concepts in the text first and then we started editing. After we discovered the subject or the meaning, we could think better. [...] I could see how the structure and meaning are interrelated and grammatical errors are fixed with reference to the meaning of the sentence.

In addition, the learners confessed that they were heavily dependent on translation when doing the grammar activities. However, emphasis on the meaning-form relationship in this task could give the learners a new perspective to writing in English, which implied that they do not have to rely on a different system other than their L2. Highlighting the significance of editing tasks in meaning-based practice, one of the participants argued:



(Excerpt 16) We mostly rely on translation from Persian when we write in English; however, I learned to focus on the intention and meaning which is going to be transferred rather than the Persian sentences and phrases I have in mind. I mean I see how this system [writing in English] is working now.

#### **4.2.9. Editing tasks helps learners gain confidence in writing**

The learners also stated that they felt more confident about their language abilities after the course since it could help them come into a belief that they were competent enough to use their knowledge to communicate their ideas and correct their errors by themselves. With regard to the link between editing tasks and learners' confidence in writing, one of the participants stated:

(Excerpt 17) In my opinion, [...] I am a better writer in English now. I know how to write correct sentences and even if I make a mistake while I am writing I can certainly find and correct my errors quite well when I am looking at my draft for the second time.

The participants also stated that the task should be used in the course for a longer time. The length of time was important to them because the longer they did the task, the more confident they felt. In addition, the learners perceived the importance of editing and are more determined to use it confidently in the future. One of the participants explained the role of editing tasks in increasing the learners' confidence in writing as follows:

(Excerpt 18) Yes, it was very effective for me to do something well. But just a few sessions are not enough, if you [the teacher] continued it during the semester, our writing ability would improve much more greatly. However,

[...] now, I know the importance of editing and I will certainly edit my drafts on the tests or when I am doing my homework.

# *Chapter Five:*

## *Discussion*

## **5.1. Introduction**

In this chapter, conclusion and related implications on the basis of the findings of three research questions of this study are presented, and at the end, suggestion for further research is provided.

## **5.2. Discussion**

Constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2008) was used in this study to explore the perceptions of the Iranian EFL learners taking part in editing task writing courses. The results of the study, as indicated earlier in the previous section, depicted that generally, the learners' perceived editing task to be effective in promoting their learning the process of writing and how to develop their ideas into a promising draft. According to the findings, several elements are contributing to the learners' satisfaction with the editing task. Learners' propositions clearly show that the participants found editing quite useful since they believed these tasks: are conducive to noticing, give them a sense of achievement and progress, encourages recurrent practice, encourages them to use their previous knowledge, help merge the benefits of competition and cooperation. In this section, first, the learners' perceptions of the dynamics of editing task implementation in their respective teaching contexts are reported. Based on the results of the study, the first factor was repetition and rehearsal which according to Karami, Sadighi, Bagheri, and Riasati (2019) leads to learners' noticing the target forms and hence better learning. Similarly, it can be claimed that the second factor, reviewing and revising, also has the same effect.

In addition, the results of the study showed that teacher's role is also a significant factor. Some previous studies such as Tuan (2010) revealed that teachers are able to measure develop learner's writing competence and understand their needs, thoughts, and feelings through reading and responding to learners' drafts. This will help teachers adapt their

teaching ways to learners' preferences and give learners appropriate assistance to their problems along the writing course. The results of this study also showed that establishing close rapport between teachers and learners boosts learners' writing motivation and enhances their perception of the task. In addition, the results of this study implied that establishing a competitive atmosphere among the learners also may result in the learners' gain.

In the same vein, the results of the study revealed that the contextualized practice which emphasized meaningful presentation of forms is also a determining factor in developing a learner's writing ability. This finding may not be surprising according to the fact that the role of contextualization in writing instruction has been established long ago in the works of Hyland (2003) and Kent (2003), among many others. In addition, process-oriented instruction as realized in editing tasks establishes a meaningful context through discovery learning and problem-solving, which, as highlighted by Osolon (1999), contributed to a better understanding of how the system of L2 works when a text is developed and how meaning and forms are interrelated.

The established model in this study also implies that the situational satisfaction gained after doing a task which is embedded in one or a few of these reasons leads to learners' confidence (Puegphrom, Chiramanee & Chiramanee, 2014; Rashidi & Bahadori Nejad, 2018) in their abilities and skills to take on the process of editing in the coming sessions and use this approach together with their teachers persistently. The mix of these two elements would finally lead to the learners' willingness to pursue editing tasks and develop their own performance.

The findings of the study are also in line with those of Birjandi and Hadidi Tamjid (2012), Puegphrom, et al., (2014), Rashidi and Bahadori Nejad, (2018) who emphasized the role of peer assessment in the development of language learners' writing performance. This

study also reported dialogue among the students and also between teacher and student to be a source of collaboration which was found to be the route to writing performance improvement among foreign language learners .

Moreover, similar to Fageeh (2011), this study showed that introducing a new method in an intermediate writing course in English as a foreign language is effective in creating positive attitudes towards writing as opposed to the tradition of oral presentation of the teaching of writing. Similar to Tuan (2010) and Sholah (2019), it can be argued that introducing a complementary activity need to promote students' motivation for writing and improve their writing skills, and also produce a close relationship between teachers and students. It seems that the editing task has the pedagogical potential to achieve this goal.

Similar to Lyster and Izquierdo (2009), Mackey and Philp (1998), Philip (2003), the effects of language classrooms have been emphasized in this study. It seems that the editing task is effective in producing the threshold level of interaction among the learners to bring about the learner's satisfaction with the writing instruction. In line with previous studies, it can be argued that the learners are aware of the role of interaction in foreign language writing development and perceive editing tasks to be a useful means of achieving this objective.

### **5.3. Conclusion**

This study aimed at probing EFL learners' perception of using editing tasks in a writing instruction course and came down with the result that not only editing tasks is a satisfactory option in an EFL writing classroom, based on the overall perception of the participants, but also a source of writing improvement for the learners. As clearly shown in the results section, the sources of satisfaction with this task lie in repetition and rehearsal of the strategies, competitive atmosphere, problem-solving, and discovery learning. It was also found that

these factors lead to a more motivating and encouraging atmosphere in which the learners are willing to pursue doing such tasks due to their gained self-confidence and perceived progress.

This study also showed that the perceptions of the learners toward the task they are undertaking are also as important as the type of task. It has to be noted that the learners are not only cognitively but also affectively engaged with the task so that, as stated previously in language learning theories, such as Affective Hypothesis, if they do not feel encouraged to take the task and if the preliminaries of implementing a certain task are not met, the effectiveness of the task defined in terms of the learners' achievement would not be guaranteed.

Basically, this study tried to move beyond the concept of superficial dynamics of a foreign language classroom and delve into the learners' minds and factors affecting their choice of adopting a certain type of task. However, it has to be noted that the factors may not be limited to those discussed in this study, and also it is likely that the factors may vary from a context to another. The important thing is that teachers, syllabus designers, and course developers note the significance of the factors highlighted in this study along with the ones mentioned in a similar body of research.

#### **5.4. Pedagogical Implications**

This study has several pedagogical implications for EFL teachers, syllabus designers, and learners. According to the findings of the study, it has to be mentioned that the editing task is perceived to be useful for language teachers in improving the writing ability of the learners based on the positive attitudes of the participants reported in this study. In addition, according to the results of this study, it is suggested that teachers of EFL consider the factors highlighted in this study such as group work and cooperation, student-teacher interaction, feedback, and correction as the key factors of successful editing task implementation and emphasize principal factors when doing editing tasks in their classes. Thus, because of this

significance teachers prefer to use this task to have a better teaching process in their classes and create a satisfying environment for learning.

This study has implications for teacher trainers, as well. Based on the findings of this study, teacher trainers should go beyond introducing editing tasks when reviewing the possible useful tasks for improving the EFL learners' writing ability and/or grammar accuracy. They need to make the pre-service or in-service teachers aware of the factors, such as student-teacher interaction and peer-support, which are perceived by the EFL learners as the leverages boosting editing task effectiveness. In other words, they need to learn how to set the scene for using editing tasks in their classes and develop the teaching methods which are useful for better teaching.

Moreover, syllabus designers and material developers also need to consider editing tasks not only as a means of improving EFL learners' writing ability, as it was confirmed in previous studies as well but also as a means of raising teacher-student interaction, peer assistance, and assessment in EFL classes. Using these tasks in their materials could lead to a creative change in the result of using the materials. Accordingly, it is suggested that editing tasks are inserted in EFL material, wherever possible, to help teachers achieve both objectives simultaneously.

Another implication of the study is that promoting learners' writing proficiency is not just through teaching them the structures and grammar of the language. Writing is a two-stage process: at the first stage you create a message then you criticize the message. Editing task is a process which helps learners to learn several grammatical structures by engaging in the editing process.



### **5.5. Suggestions for further Research**

The results of this study also open a vista for future research in that the identified factors are expected to be further researched in different EFL contexts. For one thing, several factors were identified in this study; however, little is known about the extent to which each of these factors can contribute to the overall effectiveness of the editing task. In addition, besides editing tasks, many other promising writing instruction tasks were also identified; though, the learners' perceptions toward them are still unknown. It is recommended that future studies probe the EFL learners' perceptions about other writing task types.



# *References*

AbuSeileek, A., & Abualsha'r, A. (2014). Using peer computer-mediated corrective feedback to support EFL learners' writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 18(1), 76-95.

- Ackerman, J. D. (2006). *Motivation for writing through blogs* (Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University).
- Birjandi, P., & Hadidi Tamjid, N. (2012). The role of self-, peer, and teacher assessment in promoting Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(5), 513-533.
- Birks, M., & Mills, J. (2015). *Grounded theory: A practical guide*. London: Sage.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2007. *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Personal Education.
- Brown, Sally, & Brenda Smith. 1995. *Research teaching and learning in higher education*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Bull, G., Bull, G., & Kajder, S. (2003). Writing with Weblogs. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 31(1), 32-35.
- Casanave, C. (2004). *Believes and realities: A framework for decision making in controversies in second language writing*. Boston: University of Michigan Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (2008). Reconstructing grounded theory. In Charmaz, K. (ed.). *The Sage handbook of social research methods*. London: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (2011). Grounded theory methods in social justice research. *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*, 4. 336-344.
- Davis, N., & Lyman-Hager, A. (1997). Computer and L2 reading: Student performance, student attitudes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30 (1), 58-72.

- Deane, P., Odendahl, N., Quinlan, T., Fowles, M., Welsh, C., & Bivens-Tatum, J. (2008). Cognitive models of writing: Writing proficiency as a complex integrated skill. *ETS Research Report Series*, 13 (2), 1-36.
- Ebadi, E. (2014). The Effect of Focused Meta-linguistic Written Corrective Feedback on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Essay Writing Ability. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 5(4), 17-26.
- Ebadi, S., & Rahimi, M. (2017). Exploring the impact of online peer-editing using Google Docs on EFL learners' academic writing skills: A mixed methods study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 30(8), 787-815.
- Fageeh, A. A. (2011). At crossroads of EFL learning and culture: How to enhance cross-cultural awareness in EFL college students. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 7(1), 62-72.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. (2000). The role of self-regulation and transcription skills in writing and writing development. *Educational psychologist*, 35(1), 3-12.
- Hamp-Lyons, L., & Heasley, B. (2006). *Study writing: A course in written English for academic purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanaoka, O., & Shinichi, I. (2012). Noticing and uptake: Addressing pre-articulated covert problems in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 332-347.
- Hayes, R. (2004). What triggers revision?. In *Revision cognitive and instructional processes* (pp. 9-20). Springer, Dordrecht.

- Hayes, R., & Flower, L. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L. Gregg & E. R. Steinberg (Eds.), *Cognitive processes in writing* (pp. 3-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hojeij, Z., & Hurley, Z. (2017). The Triple Flip: Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 11(1), 1-12.
- Huang, J. (2012). The effect of student receptivity to instructional feedback on writing proficiency among Chinese speaking English language learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(1), 35-48.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese context. *TESL Canada Journal*, 4(3), 12-39.
- Karami, S., Sadighi, F., Bagheri, M., & Riasati, M. (2019). The Impact of Application of Electronic Portfolio on Undergraduate English Majors' Writing Proficiency and Their Self-Regulated Learning. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1319-1334.
- Kent, T. (2003). *Post-process theory: Beyond the writing-process paradigm*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Levy, B., Newell, S., Snyder, J., & Timmins, K. (1986). Processing changes across reading encounters. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 12(4), 467-478.
- Lyster, R., & Izquierdo, J. (2009). Prompts versus recasts in dyadic interaction. *Language learning*, 59(2), 453-498.

- Maarof, N., Yamat, H. & Li., K. (2011). Role of teacher, peer and teacher-peer feedback in enhancing ESL students' writing. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 15 (2), 35-29.
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings?. *The modern language journal*, 82(3), 338-356.
- Maghsoudi, M., & Haririan, J. (2013). The impact of brainstorming strategies Iranian EFL learners' writing skill regarding their social class status. *International Journal of language and Linguistics*, 1(1), 60-67.
- Martin, P. & Turner, B. (1986). Grounded theory and organizational research. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 22(2), 141-157.
- McCutchen, D., Mardean F, & Kerr, K. (1997). Revising for meaning: Effects of knowledge and strategy. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(4), 667-676.
- Moghaddam, A. (2006). Coding issues in grounded theory. *Issues in Educational Research*, 16(1), 52-66.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second English Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Olson, M. M. (1999). The fairness of report card grading adaptations: What do students with and without learning disabilities think?. *Remedial and Special Education*, 20(2), 84-105.

- Puegphrom, P., Chiramanee, T. & Chiramanee, T. (2014). The effectiveness of implementing Peer Assessment on students' writing proficiency. In *Factors Affecting English Language Teaching and Learning*. Bangkok: Prince of Songkla University
- Rashidi, N., & Bahadori Nejad, Z. (2018). An investigation into the effect of dynamic assessment on the EFL learners' process writing development. *SAGE Open*, 8(2), 19-31.
- Rashidi, N., & Bahadori Nejad, Z. (2018). An investigation into the effect of dynamic assessment on the EFL learners' process writing development. *SAGE Open*, 8(2), 215-234.
- Rodríguez, L., González, M., & Pedro Álvarez Mosquera. (2020). The Impact of Feedback and Explicit Rhetorical Instruction on EFL Students' Writing Proficiency in Higher Education. *Atlantis Journal of the Spanish Association for Anglo-American Studies*, 4(2), 120-142.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: Sage.
- Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage.
- Samadi, S. F. & Mousazadeh Sayyadmahaleh, M. (2013). The effect of direct corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate EFL learners' writing proficiency. *Asian journal of social sciences & humanities*, 2(4), 64-73.
- Sholah, H. M. (2019). Enhancing EFL Learners' Writing Skill via Journal Writing. *Alsuna: Journal of Arabic and English Language*, 2(2), 96-116.
- Sotoudehnama, F, & Pilehvari, A. (2016). The impact of peer review on EFL learners' writing proficiency: Global and local aspects. *Porta Linguarum*, (25), 35-47.



- Stratman, F., & Linda C. (1987). Cognitive processes in revision. In S. Rosenberg (Ed.), *Advances in applied psycholinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, Steven. "Becoming "local" in ESL: Racism as resource in a Hawai 'i public high school." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 9.1 (2010): 36-57.
- Tuan, L. (2010). Enhancing EFL Learners' Writing Skill via Journal Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 3(3), 81-88.
- Warschauer, M. (2010). New tools for teaching writing. *Language learning & technology*, 14(1), 3-8.
- Witte, S. (2007). That's online writing, not boring school writing: Writing with blogs and the Talkback Project. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 51(2), 92-96.
- Yih, M., & Er A. (2009). Writing web logs in the ESL classroom: A study of student perceptions and the Technology Acceptance Model. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 5 (1), 18-23.
- Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing writing*, 15(1), 3-17.

مهارت نگارش به عنوان هدف نهایی آموزش فراگیران ماهر زبان انگلیسی به ویژه در فضای دانشگاهی تلقی میشود و به واسطه ی اهمیت آن تاکنون تحقیقات بسیاری در زمینه بررسی روش های تدریس نگارش انجام شده است. اما بیشتر تحقیقات کنونی تدریس فرایندمحور نگارش، به سنجش تاثیرات انواع فعالیت های خاص، انواع بازخوردها، و انواع ارزیابی ها پرداخته اند و مطالعه ادراک و احساس فراگیران زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه نسبت به انواع فعالیت های کلاس های تدریس نگارش دور از توجه مانده است. این مطالعه که براساس نظریه داده بنیاد انجام شده به بررسی احساس ۱۴ فراگیر زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه نسبت به استفاده از فعالیت های ویرایشی در کلاس آموزش نگارش می پردازد. داده ها از طریق مصاحبه جمع آوری شده و با استفاده از چهارچوب ۲۰۰۸ «چارماز» تحلیل شدند. یافته ها نشان دادند که براساس احساس کلی زبان آموزان انجام فعالیت ویرایشی روشی رضایت بخش در کلاس نگارش زبان خارجه است و نگارش آنان را بهبود می بخشد. طبق یافته ها، تمرین و تکرار استراتژی ها، بازنگری و احیاء خرده مهارت ها، ارتباط معلم، فضای رقابتی، تمرین بستر سازی شده، حل مسئله، و یادگیری کاوشی از جمله علل رضایت فراگیران فعالیت های ویرایشی هستند. یافته ها همچنین نشان دادند که این عوامل فضایی مشوق و انگیزشی به ارمغان می آورند که در آن اعتماد به نفس بدست آمده و پیشرفت ادراک شده تمایل زبان آموزان به انجام این فعالیت ها را افزایش می دهد. این یافته ها به معلمان زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه نشان می دهد که باید از طریق اطمینان حاصل کردن از وجود عوامل نامبرده راه را برای اعمال فعالیت های ویرایشی هموار کنند.

**کلمات کلیدی:** فعالیت های ویرایشی، فراگیران زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه، نظریه داده بنیاد،

احساس، نگارش



دانشگاه صنعتی شاهرود

گروه زبان انگلیسی

پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد آموزش زبان

احساس زبان آموزان نسبت به فعالیت‌های ویرایشی در فضای فراگیری زبان انگلیسی به عنوان  
زبان خارجه: مطالعه‌ای کیفی

نگارنده : نجمه کشیری

استاد راهنما:

دکتر سید علی استوار

مهر ۱۴۰۰