

Teaching English Language, Vol. 15, No. 1, Winter & Spring 2021, pp. 251-280

DOR: 20.1001.1.25385488.2021.15.1.10.4

## Teaching English Language Journal

ISSN: 2538-5488 – E-ISSN: 2538-547X – <http://tel.journal.org>

© 2021 – Published by Teaching English Language and Literature Society of Iran

TELL



Please cite this paper as follows:

Moradian, M. R., Ramezanzadeh, A., & Rostamian, N. (2021). A contribution of teacher vs. student languaging in response to direct corrective feedback to Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Teaching English Language*, 15(1), 251-280. <https://doi.org/10.22132/TEL.2021.134980>

### Research Paper

## A Contribution of Teacher vs. Student Languaging in Response to Direct Corrective Feedback to Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy

**Mahmood Reza Moradian<sup>1</sup>**

*Associate Professor, Lorestan University, Khorramabad, Iran*

**Akram Ramezanzadeh**

*Assistant Professor, Lorestan University, Khorramabad, Iran*

**Neda Rostamian**

*M.A. in TEFL, Lorestan University, Khorramabad, Iran*

### Abstract

This study endeavored to investigate into teacher vs. student languaging in response to Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) and its effect on promoting writing accuracy. To this end, 45 pre-intermediate Iranian English learners were selected based on their performance on an Oxford Placement Test and were randomly assigned into the three groups of Student-Generated Languaging (SGL), Teacher-Generated languaging (TWCF), and Non-generated Languaging (NGL). The groups were invited to write a composition with the same topic based on the written prompts in their textbook as the pretest while they revised the composition on the final session as the posttest. During 14 sessions of treatment, each group was provided with direct WCF on the erroneous parts of their compositions differing from each other in that the SGL group was requested to language about the reasons behind the erroneous items; the TWCF group received direct languaging by the teacher while the NGL group received direct WCF without any languaging. The results of the ANOVA revealed that the SGWL group significantly outperformed the other two groups in writing accuracy on the posttest. It came to light that direct WCF

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: [moradian.m@lu.ac.ir](mailto:moradian.m@lu.ac.ir)

followed by written languaging by the learners led to increased gains in English learners' writing accuracy.

**Keywords:** Teacher/Student Languaging, Sociocultural Theory, Writing Accuracy, Written Corrective Feedback

*Received: February 5, 2021*

*Accepted: August 7, 2021*

## 1. Introduction

As a fundamental productive skill, writing plays a significant role in the process of L2 learning. The review of theoretical and practical works on writing clarifies its importance in the domain of L2 instruction (e.g., Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts, & McKee, 2000; Jia, 2015; Moradian & Hossein Nasab, 2019; Moradian, Miri, & Hosseini Nasab, 2017; Suzuki, 2012, 2017). The skills involved in writing are especially complex ranging from higher level skills of planning and organizing to lower skills of spelling, pronunciation, word choice, and so on. As it is in many instructional-learning contexts, teaching writing is examination-oriented, with accuracy as an important benchmark of evaluating students (Almasi & Nemat Tabrizi, 2016; Suzuki, 2017). Accordingly, correctness in writing is highly valued in these contexts and a major concern of many L2 writing teachers is to help students produce accurate writings.

To put it another way, research has indicated that writing accuracy is an important issue and most students in many contexts expect teacher corrective feedback on their written errors (Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts, & McKee, 2000; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Leki, 1991). Thus, researchers were apt to find effective ways of rectifying writing accuracy in learners. A substantial number of studies (e.g., Jia, 2015; Moradian & Hossein Nasab, 2019; Moradian, Miri, & Hosseini Nasab, 2017; Suzuki, 2012, 2017) provide evidence for the efficacy of offering direct Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) and the demand for producing written languaging given that these two

approaches could stimulate a deeper reflection on the part of students and this can bring about real changes in writing accuracy.

Hyland and Hyland (2006) maintain that feedback is a central aspect of L2 writing programs useful for teachers across the world and is a mediator to influence student learning of the L2 knowledge. Most researchers favour providing WCF in response to the writing errors (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Also, Ellis (2005) argues that L2 acquisition requires students' attendance to form, which can occur through corrective feedback. Thus, WCF is an important part of second language writing because it helps providing teacher-to-student interaction in the L2 writing class (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997). Many L2 teachers feel that WCF is influential in the improvement of their students' L2 writing accuracy (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), accompanied by providing much time for students to have greater awareness of the gaps. Ashwell (2005) found evidence relating to support for the use of WCF for developing grammatical accuracy in written compositions as well. Despite the widespread use of WCF in the language classroom, and its theoretical support (e.g., Schmidt, 1990; Swain, 1985), there is still no consensus on how WCF can indeed help students become more accurate writers in the L2 (e.g., Ferris, 1999; 2002; Truscott, 1996, 2007). As an example, Truscott (1996) maintains that CF does not improve accuracy or the use of complex structures. He insists that providing "feedback gives a simplistic view of language learning as it is essentially the transfer of information from teacher to student" (p. 342).

As formerly mentioned, in addition to WCF, written languaging has proved to be a good way to reinforce accuracy in writing. As one of the upshots of Swain's (1995) comprehensible output hypothesis, languaging also has its roots in the sociocultural theory. Thus, this study is designated specifically for the issue of providing written corrective feedback within the sociocultural perspective. In Vygotsky's (1978) perspective, learning can occur through

scaffolding, provided by learners themselves or another person. This perspective essentially deals with the role of mediation at the top of learning and development. Besides, Vygotsky (1978) asserts that a human being uses tools, signs, and activities to mediate his relationships with others. Alternatively, language is the most important tool of mediating the mind, which governs and reshapes our thinking in the L2. For this reason, Vygotsky emphasizes the crucial role of language in the development of higher mental functions including memory and attention. Languageing can be one of the processes involved in this development, meaning the activity of mediating cognitively complex ideas using language (Swain & Lapkin, 2011). Following Vygotsky's sociocultural theory or SCT, Swain (2006) maintained that languageing reflects the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language and is where the mediation of output resides. More importantly, languageing about language is the source for Second Language Acquisition (SLA); in it, learners can be observed operating on linguistic data and coming to an understanding of texts.

Languageing has been categorized into different types, namely, oral and written. Oral languageing is a task with limitations of time and the focus is on words rather than forms (Suzuki, 2012; Suzuki & Itagaki, 2009). Languageing in oral modality has been investigated in two strands, namely, collaborative dialogue and private speech. The former refers to a dialogue through which L2 learners solve problems and build knowledge (Swain & Lapkin 1998) while the latter is taken as an audible speech to self (Ohta 2001). Written languageing is considered as the written mode of private speech, which is written externalization of one's inner dialogue with the self (Dicamilla & Lantolf, 1994; Lee, 2008).

Based on the sociocultural theory, language plays a crucial role in mediating cognitive processes. In effect, language and thought are

intermingled and language completes thought. Thereby, the use of L1, as a mediatory vehicle, "enables learners to construct effective dialogue in the completion of meaning-based language tasks" (Anton & Dicamilla, 1998, p. 337). Accordingly, written languaging can be an effective tool and serves as external memory (Suzuki, 2012) while learners are doing difficult tasks. It may require a more explicit and complete expression of ideas than oral languaging (Suzuki, 2012) specifically when the interlocutor is not physically present.

A review of the literature indicates that languaging has had a crucial role in learning of L2 grammatical and lexical knowledge (Brooks, Swain, Lapkin, & Knouzi, 2010). Written languaging (e.g., written reflection, self-explanation) is associated with correcting errors during immediate revision and with improved accuracy (Suzuki, 2012). Employing the concept of written languaging, this study hopes to shed more light on its role in response to direct WCF on the part of the teacher and learners in text revision and investigates the usefulness of written languaging in improving writing accuracy. In addition, this study aims to make a contribution to the ongoing error correction debate.

## **2. Review of Literature**

### **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

#### **2.1.1 Writing skill**

Writing is considered a primary communication skill in the SLA process. In many settings, writing has moved to a more pivotal place in L2/FL learning (Reid, 1994). This makes teachers find themselves more responsible for responding to their students' writings, which, in turn, enables them to resolve their problems in their knowledge of the target language. Generally, there are two approaches to which teachers could resort to improve students' writing accuracy, namely, WCF and written languaging (WL). As mentioned before, a review of literature (e.g., Jia, 2015; Moradian & Hosseini Nasab, 2019;

Moradian, Miri, & Hosseini Nasab, 2017; Suzuki, 2009, 2012, 2017) clearly reveals the efficacy of these two approaches and their contribution to real changes in learners' writing accuracy.

### **2.1.2 Corrective feedback**

Language learners expect their teachers to provide them with error correction (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010), and research in SLA suggests that CF plays a significant role in helping learners' L2 development (Khanlarzade & Taheri, 2017; Sultan, 2020). Undoubtedly, what teachers really believe in and practice, and what learners really expect teachers to do is comprehensive error correction, that is, CF on all the grammatical errors (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Lee, 2003, 2004; Radecki & Swales, 1988).

Conventionally, feedback has been understood as "any numerous procedures that are used to tell learners if an instructional response is right or wrong" (Kulhavy, 1977, p. 211). A more expansive view is apparent in a notion of feedback as crucial interaction between teachers and students carried out for furthering students' learning. According to Long (1996), feedback can consist of either positive (provision of information on what is grammatical and acceptable) or negative evidence (provision of information on what is ungrammatical and unacceptable), or a combination of both. Within this view, errors and CF are considered as the core components of language learning and teaching (Perez-nunez, 2015). From this perspective, providing relevant feedback based on the mistakes made by a learner has always been a common method for improving students' speaking and writing skills (Ebrahimzadeh & Mashhadiheidar, 2014). Any indication to learners by teachers that their use of the target language is incorrect is referred to as "written corrective feedback" (Lightbown & Spada, 1999). WCF, in other words, refers to "any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of language form" (Russell & Spada, 2006, p. 134).

### **2.1.3 Types of written corrective feedback**

Empirical studies on the efficacy of WCF have resulted in mixed implications. This way, the attention has been drawn to the highly influential WCF methodologies by which learners can notice the errors to improve their learning. Among the various types of corrective feedback, two have received high attention from researches to date: direct and indirect corrective feedback. Direct or explicit feedback occurs when the teacher identifies an error and provides the correct form (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Chandler, 2003). On the contrary, indirect WCF requires learners to engage in guided learning and problem solving; consequently, it promotes the type of reflection that is more likely to foster long-term acquisition (Ferris, 2006). In other words, indirect strategies refer to situations when the teacher indicates that an error has been made but does not provide a correction, thereby leaving the student to diagnose and correct it (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005). Although many studies have illustrated the effectiveness of WCF (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2010; Ferris, 2006; Sheen, 2007; Van Beunegien, de Jong, & Kuiken, 2012), current debates revolve around which type of WCF can assist learners' writing accuracy and the question of what type is effective has remained in dispute.

### **2.1.4 The role of feedback in SLA theories**

The role of feedback has a place in most theories of L2 learning and language education. In either behaviorist or cognitive theories of L2 learning, feedback is seen as contributing to language learning. In both structural and communicative approaches to language teaching, feedback is viewed as a means of fostering learner motivation and ensuring linguistic accuracy (Ellis, 2009). From the perspective of SLA as a set of cognitive skills, language acquisition includes interaction between input, the cognitive system, and the learner's perceptual motor system. Based on this model of language learning,

feedback is essential. This is due to the fact that "it has the properties of informing, regulating, strengthening, sustaining, and error eliminating" (Han, 2001, p. 6). Those who are involved in the field of second language learning assume feedback as a crucial factor for "encouraging and consolidating learning" (Hyland & Hyland, 2006, p. 92). Cognitive theories (e.g., Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Long, 1996; Lyster, 2004; Perez-Nunez, 2015) view CF as facilitative of L2 acquisition and of those grammatical features that are not readily acquirable from positive evidence. Sociocultural Theory also provides support for corrective feedback as it helps scaffold learning in social interaction and assists the subsequent internalization of new linguistic forms (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). However, there is no single preferable type of corrective feedback in SLA; rather feedback needs to be graduated to provide the learner with the minimal level of assistance needed for repair to occur. This involves finding a form of correction such as languaging, which will elicit self-correction by the learner.

### **2.1.5 Languaging**

Languaging was proposed by Swain (2006) as the most recent, suitable, and inclusive alternative to the comprehensible output hypothesis, verbalizing, verbalization, and collaborative dialogue as examples of accounts for language production. To Swain (2006), languaging is a tool that not only externalizes thought but also mediates and shapes thinking in real time. Languaging, therefore, describes language not merely as a vehicle for the communication of meaning but as an agent in the making of meaning and problem-solving. Following Vygotsky's sociocultural theory, Swain (2006) maintained that languaging reflects the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language and is where the mediation of output resides. More importantly, languaging about language is the source for second language acquisition; in it, learners can be observed operating on linguistic

data and coming to an understanding of texts. To highlight the role of languaging in L2 learning, Swain (2006) affirmed that "languaging about language is one of the ways we learn a second language to an advanced level" (p. 96).

### **2.1.6 Written languaging**

As mentioned previously, languaging has mainly been categorized into two different modalities: oral and written. Written languaging refers to explanations and reasons about a given task via learners' own words (Suzuki, 2012). In effect, learners make deductions about materials and revise the previous understanding of them to the most accurate one (Suzuki, 2012). It is a type of languaging through which L2 learners write a paragraph, sentence, and so on, and show it to their teacher for correction. The teacher underlines the mistakes and they are supposed to find why they are wrong and write that down.

From the cognitive psychology viewpoint, written languaging can serve as memory encoding and external memory. For example, when students write explanations about materials during problem-solving, they try to realize the materials and encode them in memory through their own words. In the process of written languaging, students make inferences about the materials and improve previous understanding about them, resulting in deeper processing of these materials (Suzuki, 2012). Thus, the act of written languaging can elevate the internal encoding of information, facilitating subsequent performance.

A body of research has recently revealed that written corrective feedback can lead to L2 writing accuracy. Moreover, since language teachers are overloaded and can provide little feedback on the errors, written languaging on the part of students would lead to improvement of accuracy in writing (Suzuki, 2009). Thus, according to a considerable number of studies (e.g., Jia, 2015; Moradian & Hosseini Nasab, 2019; Moradian et al., 2017; Suzuki, 2009;

Suzuki, 2012, 2017; Yilmaz, 2016), written languaging can significantly promote grammatical accuracy over revision tasks. More precisely, these researchers indicated that the efficiency of WCF can be enhanced by producing written languaging on the part of learners themselves. To be more precise, the part related to empirical studies is devoted to the studies which focused on the efficacy of WCF along with producing written languaging.

## **2.2 Empirical Studies on written languaging and WCF**

Most recently, a review study by Niu and Li (2017) revealed that nearly all the studies which explored WCF and written languaging have focused on Direct Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF). Not much research has investigated into indirect written corrective feedback (IWCF). As a pioneering study, Suzuki (2009) checked the effect of written languaging in response to DWCF on L2 writing accuracy. Twenty-four Japanese EFL learners were required to complete a writing task in three stages. In another study, (Suzuki, 2012), learners were provided with direct corrections of lexis- and grammar-based errors by an English native speaker. Furthermore, learners languaged about these direct corrections in writing. Results indicated that written languaging about direct corrective feedback helped learners to successfully revise those errors in immediate writing revisions, and the L2 learners gained improvement in the correction of both lexis-based and grammar-based errors. Inspired by the aforementioned studies, Moradian et al. (2017) investigated the effect of languaging motivated by DWCF by including a control group, simply because previous studies did not isolate the effect of languaging from that of feedback. Two Iranian EFL groups were allocated to complete a writing task on the same prompt in three stages of writing the first draft, receiving DWCF, and revising the first draft. The only difference was that one group merely reviewed DWCF on their drafts while the other group not only reviewed DWCF but also languaged about DWCF. Results of the study revealed that both groups made

significant gains in grammatical accuracy of their compositions. However, the effect of languaging was corroborated by the finding that the group which received DWCF plus languaging significantly outperformed the DWCF-reviewing group.

In a more recent study, Suzuki (2017), investigated the effect of the quality of written languaging on L2 learning, particularly intending to uncover the relationship between the quality of written languaging and the success of students' immediate revision of essays. He identified three categories of written language episodes (WLEs): noticing only (i.e., explanation without reasons and metalinguistic terminology), noticing with reasons (i.e., explanation with reasons and/or metalinguistic terminology), and uncertainty (i.e., "I don't know" episodes). Results showed that both noticing only and noticing with reasons contributed to accuracy improvement. Likewise, Ishikawa (2018) investigated the effects of WL on L2 grammar learning with a pretest, a posttest, and a delayed posttest design. Eighty-three L2 learners of English were assigned to four groups depending on their WL conditions and proficiency levels, and they worked on the individualised written dictogloss as part of the treatment. A fill-in-the-blank production test and a multiple-choice recognition test were administered as pre- and post-tests. Statistical analyses revealed that only the +WL groups improved their production-test scores significantly from the pre- to the delayed post-tests. No such differences were identified on the recognition tests. Regarding the proficiency level, the lower-level group benefited more from WL than their higher-level counterparts. The findings support the facilitative effect of WL on L2 writing.

This study endeavored to determine merits and demerits of providing the written languaging by the teacher and the students in response to direct corrective feedback. To this end, the following questions were formulated:

1. Are there any significant differences in the writing scores between learners who received teacher-generated languaging and those who received student-generated written languaging?
2. Are there any significant differences in the writing scores between learners who received student-generated written languaging and those who did not receive written languaging?
3. Are there any significant differences in the writing scores between learners who received teacher-generated languaging and those who did not receive written languaging?

### **3. Method**

This study adopted a quantitative experimental methodology following a pretest-posttest control group design to determine merits and demerits of providing written languaging by the teacher and students in response to direct corrective feedback.

#### **3.1 Participants**

The participants were 45 male and female intermediate EFL learners, aged between 18 and 25 years in a private language institute in *Khorramabad*, Iran. To account for the homogeneity of the participants, the Quick Oxford Placement Test (QOPT) was administered. Afterwards, the participants were randomly assigned to three groups. Group One was the teacher languaging group ( $n = 15$ ) as the experimental group that received direct written corrective feedback followed by languaging by the teacher, while Group Two, the student languaging group ( $n = 15$ ), was the second experimental group in which students themselves provided written languaging on the erroneous parts, and Group Three was the control group ( $n = 15$ ), who just received direct corrective feedback by the teacher without any languaging.

#### **3.2 Instrumentation**

To carry out the study, two instruments were used: The Quick Oxford Placement Test and writing prompts. The Quick Oxford Placement Test, designed by Oxford University Press, was given first to ensure participants'

homogeneity. The test contained 60 multiple-choice questions which participants were supposed to answer in 30 minutes. The writing prompts used in this study were adopted from the learners' textbook, namely, *Top Notch* series (Saslow & Asher, 2011). The justification behind choosing writing prompts from the learners' textbook was gathering data from the natural setting of the classroom so as to achieve higher validity. Moreover, learners took the tasks more seriously as they were parts of their class activity. All three groups were requested to write a composition on the same topics containing at least 100 words based on the provided prompts.

### **3.3 Procedure**

First, the Quick Oxford Placement Test was administered to see if participants were homogeneous in terms of their initial level of language proficiency. Then, the homogeneous students were classified into three groups: the Teacher-generated Written Languageing Group, the Student-generated Written Languageing Group (SGWL), and the Non-written Languageing Group (NWL). All groups were provided with direct WCF on the grammatical errors by the teacher. However, the first group received the teacher's written languageing on their errors, and students in the second group produced written languageing on the erroneous items. The third group was not required to language on the erroneous items. In the first session, the three groups were given 30 minutes to write a composition including at least one hundred words with the same topic based on the written prompts in their textbooks as the pretest. Then, the essays were collected. Two extra copies of the paper were made for later analysis. Afterwards, the teacher revised all compositions providing direct correction on all linguistic errors. In the following session, a copy of their writings accompanied by the appropriate feedback was distributed to all groups. Participants in the second group only were devoted enough time to think about the erroneous parts and wrote down their explanations. Following Suzuki

(2012), the students were allowed to express their deliberations either in English or in Persian. Then, the copies of initial writings on which students had languaged were gathered and maintained for later analysis. As the final stage, all groups were administered the second copy of their writing in the first session and requested to revise as the posttest.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

As mentioned before, data were collected during the regular class time over a 7-week semester. According to the purpose of this study, the collected data were analyzed by implementing a quantitative data analysis procedure. Consequently, pertinent statistical tests were employed in order to find the answer to the research questions. In order to respond to the research questions, all written languaging data over seven writing tasks were recorded and analyzed by the researchers. The frequency and percentage of each were measured. Concerning measuring the writing accuracy, all the numbers of students' errors and words in the pre- and post-writing task were counted. The data were analyzed by using the parametric test of one-way ANOVA to compare the mean scores of the three groups on the posttest.

### 4. Results

Initially, to see whether the control and experimental groups were in equal conditions before receiving any treatments, the descriptive statistics are presented. A prerequisite to any comparison of three independent means is the equality of variances. Levene's test measures the assumption of homogeneity of variances. Levene's F value of 0.20 is not significant ( $p = 0.81 > .05$ ). Thus, the first assumption as to homogeneity of variances is met (Table 1).

Table 1

*Levene's Test for the Homogeneity of Variances*

Levene Statistic	Df1	Df2	Sig.
.20	2	42	.81

Moreover, at the beginning of the study before receiving any treatment, a one-way ANOVA was run in order to check the homogeneity of the groups in terms of their English language proficiency. To this end, the mean scores and standard deviations of the control and experimental groups on the language proficiency test (i.e., OPT) were compared. As illustrated in Table 2, the actual difference in the mean scores of the groups was very small (25.13, 26.20, & 26.13).

Table 2

*Descriptive Statistics of the Oxford Quick Placement Test Scores of the SGWL, TWCF, and NWL Groups*

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error
SGWL	15	25.13	1.65	.45
TWCF	15	26.20	1.85	.48
NWL	15	26.13	1.76	.45
Total	45	26.15	1.75	.26

The results shown in Table 3 indicate that there was not a statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level between the means of the three groups:  $F(2, 42) = .00, p < .001$ . Moreover, the small effect size, calculated using eta squared, was 0.002. Post-hoc comparisons using the Scheffe test indicated that the mean score for the TWCF group ( $M = 26.20, SD = 1.85$ ) was not significantly different from both those of SGWL and NWL groups. Moreover, the SGWL group ( $M = 25.13, SD = 1.65$ ) did not significantly differ from the NWL group ( $M = 26.13, SD = 1.76$ ). In short, there was not a significant difference in the OPT scores among the three groups; therefore, the groups could be considered as homogeneous in terms of their English language proficiency (Table 3).

Table 3

*One-way ANOVA Results Comparing the SGWL, TWCF, and NWL Scores on the Oxford Quick Placement Test*

## The Effect of Teacher ...

	Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.04	2	.007	.99
Within Groups	135.86	42		
Total	135.91	44		

Further, a one-way ANOVA was run to compare the mean scores of the three groups on the writing pretest to prove that they were homogeneous in terms of their writing ability prior to the administration of the treatment. The two assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variances should be probed before reporting the results of the one-way ANOVA. Table 4 demonstrates the descriptive results comparing the two experimental and the control group in pretest scores of the writing accuracy.

Table 4

*Descriptive Statistics for the SGWL, TWCF, and NGWL Groups on the Writing Accuracy Pretest*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
SGWL	15	11.03	2.90	.53
TWCF	15	10.23	2.68	.49
NWL	15	10.77	2.60	.47
Total	45	10.85	2.70	.28

As the data show in Table 5, there was not a statistically significant difference at the  $p < 0.05$  level between the means of the three groups:  $(F(2, 87) = .09, p < .00)$ . The actual difference in the mean scores of the SGWL, TWCF, and NWL groups was small (11.03, 10.23, and 10.76, respectively). The small effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .00. Post-hoc comparisons using the Scheffé test indicated that the mean score for the SGWL group ( $M = 11.03$ ) was not significantly different from those of the TWCF group ( $M = 10.23$ ) and the NWL group ( $M = 10.76$ ). Moreover, the TWCF ( $M = 10.23, SD = 2.68$ ) did not significantly differ from the NWL group ( $M = 10.76, SD = 2.60$ ). In short, the mean differences among the three

groups were not significant, and it is assumed that they were at the same level of writing accuracy before receiving any treatment.

Table 5  
*One-way ANOVA Results Comparing the Writing Accuracy Pretest Means of SGWL, TWCF, and NWL Groups*

	Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.42	2	.09	.91
Within Groups	651.70	87		
Total	653.12	89		

Finally, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore differences between the writing accuracy posttest scores of the participants in the SGWL, TWCF, and NWL groups. As shown in Table 6, there was a significant difference in the mean scores of the SGWL, the TWCF, and NWL groups, respectively (22.06, 14.30, and 11.26). Also, based on Table 7, there was a statistically significant difference between the three groups at the  $p < .05$  level on the post-test ( $F(2, 87) = 125.3, p = .00$ ).

Table 6  
*Descriptive Statistics of the Revision Writing Post-test for the SGWL, TWCF, and NWL Groups*

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error
SGWL15	15	22.06	2.08	.38
TWCF15	15	14.30	3.18	.58
NWL 15	15	11.26	2.79	.50
Total	45	15.87	5.30	.55

Table 7  
*One-way ANOVA Results Comparing the Three Groups' Mean Scores on the Writing Accuracy Post-test*

	Sum of Squares	df	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1861.62	2	125.3	.00

## The Effect of Teacher ...

Within Groups	646.03	87
Total	2507.65	89

The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was 0.74, which proved a significant difference according to Cohen's (1988) guidelines (Pallant, 2013). According to Pallant, post-hoc comparisons are used to explore the differences between each of the groups. In this study, the statistical significance of the differences between each pair groups are provided in the Multiple Comparison table (Table 8), which gives the result of the post-hoc test comparisons using the Scheffe' test. The results indicated that the mean score for the SGWL group ( $M = 22.06$ ) was significantly different from both TWCF and NWL groups. Moreover, the TWCF group ( $M = 14.30$ ) significantly differed from the NWL group (11.26). In summary, there were significant differences between the three groups at the  $p < .05$  level.

Table 8

*The Comparison of the TWCF Group and SGWL Group's Mean scores on the Writing Accuracy Post-test*

Group	Group	Mean deference	Std. Error	Sig.
SGWL	TWCF	7.77*	.69	.00
	NWL	10.80*	.64	.00
TWCF	SGWL	-7.77*	.69	.00
	NWL	3.03*	.77	.00
NWL	SGWL	-10.80*	.64	.00
	TWCF	-3.03*	.77	.00

\*. The mean difference is significant at 0.05.

#### 4.1.1 The first research question

The first research question examined if there was any significant difference in the scores on the writing accuracy posttest between Iranian EFL learners who received teacher-generated written corrective feedback and those who received student-generated written languaging on the revision writing task. According to Table 9, TWCF and SGWL group's mean scores were different (14.30 vs. 22.06) at  $p < .05$ . So, there is a need to check if the mean difference is significant or not.

Table 9  
*Descriptive Statistics of the Revision Writing Posttest for the SGWL and TWCF Groups*

N	Mean	SD	Std. Error
SGWL15	22.062.083		.380
TWCF15	14.303.185		.581

As displayed in Table 4.10, the comparison of the TWCF group and SGWL group's mean scores on the writing accuracy posttest pointed to a statistically significant difference in the scores related to the writing accuracy posttest between the TWCF group and the SGWL group ( $p = .00$ ); the mean score difference between these groups was ( $M = 7.77$ ), which is significant at  $p < .05$ .

Table 10  
*Comparison of the TWCF Group and SGWL Group's Mean scores on the Writing Accuracy Posttest*

Groups	Mean difference	Std. Error	Sig.
TWCF vs. SGWL	7.77	.69	.00

\*. The mean difference is significant at 0.05.

Accordingly, the learners who received direct corrective feedback followed by written languaging had a significantly better performance on the posttest in terms of their writing accuracy.

#### 4.1.2 The second research question

The second question aimed to explore if there was any identifiable difference in the scores on the writing accuracy posttest between Iranian EFL learners who received student-generated written languaging and those who did not receive written languaging on the revision writing task. Therefore, the mean scores in writing accuracy on the posttest were compared to check if any possible improvement had taken place due to particular treatment. The result, as displayed in Table 11, indicated that there was a difference in the mean scores of the writing posttest between the SGWL and the NWL group. The mean score for the SWLG group was 22.06 in comparison to 11.26 for the NWL group.

Table 11

*Descriptive Statistics of the Revision Writing Posttest for the SGWL and NWL Groups*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
SGWL	15	22.06	2.083	.380
NWL	15	11.26	2.790	.509

Therefore, according to Table 12, there was a significant difference at  $p < .05$ , between the performances of both groups on the writing accuracy posttest.

Table 12

*Comparison of the SGWL Group and NWL Group's Mean scores on the Writing Accuracy Posttest*

Groups	Mean difference	Std. Error	Sig.
SGWL vs. NWL	10.80	.64	.00

\*. The mean difference is significant at 0.05.

To sum up, the results of the test unveiled that the treatment had significantly enhanced the writing accuracy of the SGWL group. Moreover, the calculated effect size proved a large effect size according to Cohen's (1988)

guidelines. Therefore, it could be claimed that the mean difference was principally due to the effect of the independent variable, i.e. direct WCF followed by written languaging, on the independent variable, i.e. gains in writing accuracy.

#### 4.1.3 The third research question

This question intended to compare the efficacy of direct WCF in the scores on the writing posttest between Iranian EFL learners who received teacher-generated WCF and those who did not receive any written languaging in the revision writing tasks. The results, as shown in Table 13, demonstrated that there was a difference between the TWCF (M = 14.30) and NWL (M = 11.26) groups in their gains on the writing accuracy posttest.

Table 13

*Descriptive Statistics of the Revision Writing Posttest for the TWCF and NWL Groups*

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error
TWCF	15	14.30	3.185	.581
NWL	15	11.26	2.790	.509

As Table 4.14 demonstrates, there was a statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  level in post-test scores between the two groups (sig = .000).

Table 14

*Comparison of the TWCF Group and NWL Group's Mean Scores on the Writing Accuracy Posttest*

Groups	Mean difference	Std. Error	Sig.
TGWL vs. NWL	3.03	.77	.00

---

\*. The mean difference is significant at 0.05.

As a result, as it could be perceived from Table 14, the TWCF group outperformed the NWL group on the writing accuracy posttest.

## 5. Discussion

This study was an attempt to explore the effectiveness of written languaging in response to direct WCF in enhancing Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. The major findings of the study were that the learners who received direct corrective feedback followed by written languaging had a significantly better performance on the posttest in terms of their writing accuracy.

It also came to light that direct written corrective feedback followed by languaging led to significantly increased gains in EFL learners' writing accuracy. The gains can be attributed to the fact that direct WCF prompted learners to language about the target forms; in fact, they were pushed to go towards rule formation. Regarding the role of written languaging and written corrective feedback in improving written accuracy of the learners, the results of this study are in line with Suzuki (2012, 2017), Jia (2015), and Moradian et al. (2017), who explored that languaging in response to direct written corrective feedback could aid L2 learners to redress their own initial errors in a revision task. Moreover, written languaging prompted by direct WCF helped L2 learners to significantly decrease the number of their errors from a draft to the revision task. The results of these studies could be attributed to the mediatory role of written languaging in deepening learners' understanding of the target form.

Additionally, the result of this study lends support to Swain's (2006) claim that languaging can help learners to find out the relationship between form and meaning that they were unaware of prior to languaging. In effect, languaging can involve learners in the process of learning rather than promoting the product of learning; in such a process, learners can mediate their own learning

through producing languaging (Swain, 2006). In essence, written languaging served as a mediatory tool to reorient learners' attention to form; more specifically, it can be argued that the complementary or double focus on form is provoked by provision of WCF and a demand for generating written languaging. Initially, EFL teachers' WCF might have triggered the process of focus on form; then, the task of producing written languaging might have sharpened and deepened L2 learners' attention to the forms. Hence, written languaging could assist L2 learners to regulate their performances to transfer them to the new writing task.

The findings of the study can be associated with the role of direct WCF in L2 learning. Through direct WCF learners are exposed to the correct forms offered by teachers and internalize them subsequently (Chandler, 2003); furthermore, learners have direct and swift access to test their hypotheses (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010). Thus, findings of this study provide clear evidence in support of teacher corrective feedback as advocated by many previous researchers in the field of ESL/EFL writing including Rummel and Bitchener (2015), Almasi and Nemat Tabrizi (2016), Bitchener (2008), Bitchener et al. (2005), Ellis et al (2008), Ferris (1999, 2004), Hyland and Hyland (2001). Findings of the current study demonstrated that teacher corrective feedback is beneficial to student learning; also, they provide additional evidence in support of teacher corrective feedback, which can be used to respond to the claim made by Truscott, who sparked the debate about the effectiveness of corrective feedback. This study added to the current body of research showing that Truscott's (1996, 2007) claims about the ineffectiveness of error correction should be considered with caution. Therefore, the findings of this study are supportive of teacher corrective feedback, confirming that corrective feedback can be effective in improving students' writing accuracy in ESL/EFL contexts, not only in revising subsequent drafts but also in writing a new essay. To

conclude, teacher corrective feedback should be provided to students as it is needed to support their learning.

## **6. Conclusion**

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the potential impact of written languaging on Iranian EFL students' writing accuracy. More specifically and inspired by the sociocultural theory, the study was carried out to shed more light on the effect of WCF by means of written languaging in the EFL context. The findings of the study demonstrated that written languaging accompanied by direct WCF can be considered as a potential means of enhancing writing accuracy.

The findings of the present study shed some light on the three fields of second language research: written languaging from a sociocultural perspective, written corrective feedback, and writing grammatical accuracy. Consequently, the results of the study suggest that EFL teachers and instructors can employ written languaging as a beneficial procedure to provoke L2 learners' noticing and reflection upon their writings so as to help them improve their writing accuracy. Moreover, when teachers provide feedback on many aspects of students' writings, there is a tendency for student writers to value feedback and pay attention to teacher feedback on all aspects of their writing (Ferris, 2003). In the light of the efficacy of WCF, the results of the current study provide incontrovertible evidence in favor of a reliable WCF methodology in the real L2 context, which is valuable to teachers.

Another implication acquired from the results of the present study is that teachers are able to use WCF followed by languaging as a diagnostic tool to understand the weaknesses and strengths of their students. Moreover, teachers can increase learners' engagement in their error correction by asking them to transfer their thoughts and reflections into the written mode. Besides, for students suffering from language deficiencies, languaging is an effective

means for diagnosing and eliminating their problems and obtaining a deeper insight into their understandings.

However, it seems important to bear in mind that the results of this study could not be generalizable to all EFL contexts and learners. This could be attributed to the small number of the participants and the specificity of the EFL context. In order to obtain more reliable and generalizable results, a larger pool of participants from more representative samples should be provided. Furthermore, this study was delimited in that it targeted only the elementary EFL learners. In order to investigate EFL learners at more advanced levels, more studies must be conducted. Finally, this study was a cross-sectional one and limited in time; thus, more longitudinal studies are needed to obtain more reliable and valid results.

## References

- Aljaafreh, A., & Lantolf, J. P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 465-483.
- Almasi, E., & Nemat Tabrizi, A. R. (2016). The effects of direct vs. indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 3(1), 74-85.
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why? *Canadian Journal of applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95-127.
- Antón, M., & DiCamilla, F. J. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 314-342.
- Ashwell, T. (2005). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9, 227-258.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19, 207-217.

- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*, 191-205.
- Brooks, L., Swain, M., Lapkin, S., & Knouzi, I. (2010). Mediating between scientific and spontaneous concepts through languaging. *Language Awareness, 19*, 89-110.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267-296
- Cohen, A. D. (1988). Reformulation: A technique for providing advanced feedback in writing. *A Periodical for Classroom Language Teachers, 11*, 1-9.
- DiCamilla, F., & Lantolf, J. (1994). The linguistic analysis of private writing. *Language Sciences, 16*, 347-369.
- Ebrahimzade, M., & Mashhadiheidar, D. (2014). The effect of post-text written corrective feedback on written grammatical accuracy: Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research, 2*(7), 54-64.
- Ellis, R. (Ed.). (2005). *Planning and task performance in a second language*. John Benjamins.
- Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity and accuracy in L2 oral production. *Applied Linguistics, 30*, 4, 474-509.
- Farjadnasab, A. H., & Khodashenas, M. R. (2017). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 1*, 30-42.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Ed.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-105). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., Chaney, S. J., Komura, K., Roberts, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000). Perspectives, problems, and practices in treating written error. In *Proceedings of Colloquium Presented at International TESOL*

- Convention, Vancouver, BC, 14 March 2000* (pp. 14-18). Canada: Vancouver, The University of British Columbia Press.
- Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 6*, 155-182.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161-184.
- Frear, D., & Chiu, Yi-hui. (2015). The effect of focused and unfocused indirect written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing. *System, 53*, 24-34.
- Gu enette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogical correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 40-53.
- Han, Z. H. (2001). Fine-tuning corrective feedback. *Foreign Language Annals, 34*, 582-599.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*, 141-163.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). State of the art article: Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching, 39*, 83-101.
- Ishikawa, M. (2013). Metanotes (written languaging) in a translation task: do L2 proficiency and task outcome matter. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 9*, 2, 1-15.
- Jia, G., Wang, H., Yan, L., Wang, X., Pei, R., Yan, T., & Guo, X. (2005). Cytotoxicity of carbon nanomaterials: Single-wall nanotube, multi-wall nanotube, and fullerene. *Environmental science & technology, 39*(5), 1378-1383.
- Khanlarzadeh, M., & Taheri, P. (2017). Written corrective feedback in second language writing: Does SEMI feedback suffice? *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences, 6*(2), 329-349.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: New Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. America: Addison-Wedley Longman Group Limited.
- Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kulhavy, R. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research, 47*, 211-232.
- Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessment Writing, 8*, 216-237.

- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 69-85.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preference of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*, 203-228.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1991). *Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Ed.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.
- Long, M. H. (2000). Focus on form in task-based language teaching. In R. L. Lambert & E. Shohamy (Ed.), *Language policy and pedagogy* (pp. 179-192). Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(3), 399-432.
- Moradian, M. R., & Hossein Nasab, M. (2019). Revisiting the role of indirect written corrective feedback in the light of written languaging. *Teaching English Language, 13*(3), 79-95.
- Moradian, M., Miri, M., & Hossein Nasab, M. (2017). Contribution of written languaging to enhancing the efficiency of written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 1-23.
- Niu, R. & Li, L. (2017). A Review of studies on languaging and second language learning. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(12), 1222-1228.
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*(3), 417-528.
- Ohta, A. (2001). *Second language acquisition process in the classroom*. New York: Routledge.
- Pallant, J. (2013). *Survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using IBM SPSS*. USA: McGraw Hill.
- Perez-Nuez, A. B. (2015). The effects of comprehensive written corrective feedback on the revision and acquisition of specific L2 forms. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics, 10*(1), 52-79.
- Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System, 16*, 355-365.

- Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL writing*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Halle Regents.
- Roebuck, R. (2000). Subjects speak out: How learners position themselves in a psycholinguistic task. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 79-95). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rummel, S., & Bitchener, J. (2015). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact of Lao learners' beliefs have on uptake. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 38(1), 64-82.
- Saslow, J., & Asher, A. (2011). *Top notch: English for today's world: 3B with workbook. 2nd Ed.*, New York: Pearson Longman Press.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. N. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In Day, R. R. (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-369). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ELS learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-284.
- Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.
- Sultan H. A. (2020). Efficacy of different types of written corrective feedback on EFL university students' writing quality. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 10(4), 217-226.
- Suzuki, W. (2009). Improving Japanese university students' second language writing accuracy: Effects of languaging. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan*, 20, 81-90.
- Suzuki, W. (2012). Written languaging, direct correction, and second language writing revision. *Language Learning*, 62, 1-24.
- Suzuki, W. (2017). The effect of quality of written languaging on second language learning. *Writing and Pedagogy*, 8(3), 461-482.
- Suzuki, W., & Itagaki, N. (2009). Languaging in grammar exercises by Japanese EFL learners of differing proficiency. *System*, 37, 217-225.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Ed.), *Input in second language acquisition* (235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House, pp. 232-53.
- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook, & B. Seidlhofer (Ed.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Truscott, J. (1996). Review article: The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.

- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 255-272.
- Van Beuningen, C., De Jong, N. H., and Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in Dutch multilingual classrooms. *Language Learning, 61*, 1-41.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.



2021 by the authors. Licensee Journal of Teaching English Language (TEL). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0 license). (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>).