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Introduction

In this opening chapter of the thesis an attempt is made to introduce the topic of interest, provide some general background issues gleaned from studies available, state the problem in full detail, review the literature very briefly, delve into the significance of the study, formulate the research questions and hypotheses, define the key terms, and finally close the chapter with limitations of the study.

1.1. Background

There is a general agreement that correction is an essential part of the teaching and learning processes (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Evans, Hartshorn, & Strong, 2011; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2011; Ferris, 2002; Sheen, 2007). Error correction is a valuable pedagogical tool because it can help learners write more accurately (Ferris, 2006). Looking at the history of language teaching shows that various definitions have been put forward by scholars for the term feedback. Kepner (1991), for instance, defines feedback as “any procedure used to inform a learner whether an instructional response is right or wrong” (p. 141). Dekeyser (2007, p. 307) defines it as the “information provided after a given process regarding the success or failure of that process”. In language acquisition, according to Ellis (1994), the term feedback refers to “information given to learners which they can use to revise their interlanguage” (p.702). According to Brandet (2008), any information given to the learners about their performance on a task is called feedback. Naeini (2008) states that an effective instruction entails feedback. He argues that in classes where learners are deprived of feedback, no pedagogically significant result is obtained. He believes that learning happens when there is an exchange of information between learners
and teachers. In the literature of second language acquisition, different terms have been used for the process of providing feedback. Chaudorn (1988), for example, uses the term “treatment of error” which refers to “any teacher behavior following an error” (p. 150). In Schachter’s (1991) view, the terms corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback are used in the fields of language teaching, language acquisition, and cognitive psychology, respectively.

The most frequent term used in the literature is corrective feedback (CF). When learners make a mistake, teachers provide them with CF. Scholars have defined CF in various ways too. “[…] the teacher’s response to a student error” is a definition utilized by Veliz (2013, p. 286). It is a method of form-focused instruction that entails any pedagogical effort used to draw the learners’ attention to language form either implicitly or explicitly (Spada, 1997). Sheen and Ellis (2011) state that “CF refers to the feedback that learners receive on the linguistic errors they make in their oral or written production in a second language (L2)” (p. 593).

One common type of CF is written corrective feedback (WCF). It is a response to multifarious aspects of writing, such as grammatical accuracy, syntactic and lexical complexity, overall quality, content, mechanics, coherence, and cohesion or discoursal features. WCF is provided only offline (i.e. delayed) and explicitly (Pawlak, 2014). CF plays an important role in English language teaching. A lot of studies have been conducted to discover whether providing CF assists learners in improving their writing accuracy (e.g., Ashwell, 2000; Chandler, 2003; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992). The role of WCF in teaching grammar has been a matter of debate in recent decades. Some researchers (e.g., Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992; Truscott,
2007) claim that CF does not have a positive effect on the development of L2 writing accuracy. In contrast, other researchers (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2002; Sheen, 2007) argue that giving CF can improve the accuracy of L2 writing.

Kepner (1991), Semke (1984), Sheppard (1992), and Truscott (1996) came to this conclusion that error correction is a useless attempt and should be abandoned. As a response to Truscott, Ferris (1999) claimed that error correction helps learners improve their writing accuracy. From then on, a controversy has been raised over the issue whether WCF helps L2 learners improve the accuracy and overall quality of their writing. A large body of studies (e.g., Bitchener, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Sheen, 2007) have been conducted to identify the effective WCF techniques in ESL and EFL, but there is no agreement among researchers on the most effective WCF method. However, little is known about whether encouraging learners to discover the correct form by providing them with some cues i.e., metalinguistic explanation (ME), and then asking them to revise their texts would increase L2 learners’ writing ability and decrease their errors in a written text (Lalande, 1982). This study intends to explore the role of discovery learning (Hendrickson, 1980) and revision strategy in improving L2 learners’ regular and irregular past tense.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

A look into the literature indicates that there is a controversy over the role of WCF in teaching L2 grammar. Another point is whether providing opportunities for revision followed by WCF can improve L2 accuracy. In 1997, Ferris initiated a new approach to investigate the effectiveness of WCF along with revision. Her model was new because it made learners notice their mistakes and try to correct them following the teacher’s feedback. Revision followed by the CF promotes noticing and draws learners’ attention to
their mistakes and in turn leads to internalization. According to Schmidt (1990), noticing is necessary for the input to become intake. Dekeyser (2010) also notes that learners need ample opportunities to practice in order to prevent automatization of uncorrected errors which may easily lead to fossilization.

By providing revision, learners find the opportunity to identify the gap between their L1 and L2 and try to fill that gap. Few studies have investigated the effect of revision followed by WCF on the accuracy in new pieces of writing (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Frear, 2012). There is clearly a need for further research to find out whether there is a positive correlation between students’ attitudes towards revision and the development of L2 writing accuracy. To date, few studies have also addressed the role of ME, which is an alternative to WCF, in the accuracy of past tense (Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2014). To fulfill the so-called gaps, the present study explores whether providing opportunities for revision would increase learners’ written accuracy in using English regular and irregular simple past tense. It also intends to investigate the role of ME with and without revision in the accuracy of L2 writing.

1.3. Significance of the Study

The results of this study will have practical implications for ESL/EFL learners, teachers, material developers, and syllabus designers. Learners would benefit from receiving WCF and revision over a short period of time and would increase their grammatical accuracy. WCF can help learners notice the gap between their knowledge and the target language, identify their mistakes, and improve the accuracy of their writing.

By providing CF, teachers and test developers can gain insights from the errors with regard to the processes and strategies of language learning. Therefore, it is important for
teachers to identify appropriate strategies and effective techniques to help learners improve the accuracy of their writing, internalize the materials, and try to be self-regulated.

The results of this study will also help material developers and syllabus designers decide what information and activities might be included in their syllabus. In other words, it can be a help to them in sequencing and gradation of teaching material according to the learners’ cognitive capability and developmental stages (Pienemann, 1998). Pienemman’s (1998) learnability-teachability hypothesis, which emphasizes developmental sequence and order of acquisition, points out that learners cannot acquire the grammatical features earlier than the time they are ready to learn them.

1.4. Purpose of the Study

This study attempts to promote learners’ autonomy, responsibility, and independence in L2 writing. The use of error codes, explanations, and cues has been an effective method to help learners correct their errors (e.g., Sampson, 2012). Corder (1981) argues that it is important for teachers not to correct learners’ errors or give the right answers to them immediately. Supplying learners with the correct forms may not cognitively involve them in the process of learning (e.g., Ellis, 2009; Lalande, 1982). Providing CF, learners notice that there is a gap between their interlanguage and the target language and try to fill the gap with sufficient explanation. So cues are needed to be given to the learners so that they can correct their errors. This suggests that correction alone may not lead to acquisition (Sampson, 2012) and cues and explanations are necessary. To this purpose, this study provides learners with ME feedback in the form of explanation to help them correct their own error and engage them in “guided learning” and “problem solving” (Lalande, 1982). But as SLA researchers have found learners must first “notice” (Schmidt, 1990) that an
error has been made. ME has a positive role in raising learners’ awareness as to language rules and noticing which is an essential component of language learning (Schmidt, 1993). When ME is provided, learners are prompted to think about structures they have used and consequently take responsibility for their own learning.

A bulk of studies (e.g., Farokhi & Sattarour, 2011; Rouhi & Samiei, 2010) have been done on investigating different types of CF on improving learners’ accuracy in writing. To date, few studies have investigated the role of ME and revision in learners’ writing accuracy. Mahili (1994) believes that just underlining learners’ error does not lead to the improvement of learners’ accuracy. Truscott (1996) points out that even when feedback is given, students are often unwilling or unable to utilize it effectively. Therefore, if learners are not asked to revise their writing, they do not modify their errors and their output would not turn into uptake. The aim of the present study is to investigate the effects of form-focused CF, i.e., ME and revision on learners’ past tense to find out whether providing opportunities for revision would increase learners’ writing accuracy.

1.5. Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. Does metalinguistic explanation lead to more accurate use of regular and irregular past tense?

2. Does revision followed by the provided CF lead to more accurate use of regular and irregular past tense?

3. What is learners’ attitude towards metalinguistic explanation and revision?

1.6. Research Hypotheses

1. Metalinguistic CF does not affect EFL learners’ writing accuracy.
2. Revision does not affect EFL learners’ writing accuracy.

1.7. Definition of the Key Terms

1.7.1. Feedback. Feedback refers to “the comments or information learners receive on the success of a learning task, either from the teacher or from the learners” (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992, p. 137).

1.7.2. Corrective feedback. Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) defines CF as any response to the learners’ erroneous utterances which can be in the form of metalinguistic information, provision of the correct L2 form, or an indication of the error, or any combination of these.

1.7.3. Metalinguistic corrective feedback. Metalinguistic feedback is defined by Lightbown and Spada (2006) as the comments, information, or questions which are provided implicitly to learners’ erroneous outputs. There are two types of metalinguistic feedback: The first one is using codes above the errors or in the margin, for example, ‘v.t.’ for verb tense, ‘s.p.’ for spelling, ‘conj.’ for conjunction and ‘pl’ for plurals. The second type identifies the errors and provides a brief explanation for them.

1.7.4. Writing accuracy. The degree of correctness of students’ L2 production in terms of morphological and syntactic structures in the written mode is taken to be an index of writing accuracy (Foster & Skehan, 1996).

1.7.5. Revision. It refers to a series of changes which is done on a writing followed by the provided CF (Sommer, 1980).
1.8. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The limitations of the study were as follows: Since the students were aware that their scores of writing had no effect on their final score, they had no instrumental motivation to try to improve their scores. Since the number of population was low, the lack of generalizability of the results was another shortcoming of the current study.

Usually researchers administer a delayed post-test to compare the results with those of the immediate post-test to talk with high degrees of certainty about the effects of any manipulation on the dependent variable. Due to practicality issues, a delayed post-test was not administered in the current study. Another limitation associated with the present study was the duration of the treatment. In order to be able to explore the effect of the treatment, one has to extend the number of sessions in which participants receive the treatment. In the current study the treatment lasted just for four sessions. It is quite logical to claim that four sessions can hardly be a representative of the effect of WCF and revision on learners’ simple past tense.

Apart from the above-mentioned limitations, some delimitations are in order in this study. Since L2 learners in testing circumstances feel stress and hardly can talk, and analyzing oral production is somehow difficult, this study evaluated only the writing skill of EFL learners of the institute and ignored the role of the treatment in their speaking skill. Furthermore, the study focused on only one grammatical structure, i.e., the simple past tense. Due to learners’ low level of proficiency, detecting so many types of grammatical errors in the writings may distract learners and prevent them from remembering the correct forms. As Ferris, Lui, Shinha, and Senna (2013) propose “Focused WCF is more valuable than unfocused CF” (p. 309). In future studies, other grammatical structures should be
looked at to see whether learners benefit differently as to different grammatical features. As Schachter (1991) points out, CF likely has different degrees of effectiveness for different aspects of language or even different grammatical structures.
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This chapter begins with the role of writing skill in the second language development, then presents different views on correcting L2 learners’ errors. The arguments which have been made for or against WCF are provided in the following sections. History and the importance of revision are discussed one by one. One separate section has also been devoted to the typology of WCF. The last section reviews the empirical studies which have investigated WCF under different circumstances with different groups of learners. The chapter closes with reiterating the gap in the literature which the current study tries to fill.

2.1. The Importance of Writing Skill

Writing has always had a place in the second/foreign language curriculum, but in the 21st century, the ability to write in an L2 may be even more important than ever. With the advent of technologies such as the Internet, computers, smartphones, cellphones… written communication (i.e., texting messages, sending emails or instant messages, posting comments on social networking sites…) has become essential across languages and cultures. People feel there is a great need to learn how to write in a language that is not their mother tongue in order to achieve their purposes such as transacting business, interacting on social-networking sites, earning academic degrees, etc. Thus, writing skill is more important in today’s world and has moved to a more central place in the curriculum (Reid, 2001). No one can deny the importance of writing skill in L2 development. Through
writing, learners find opportunities to use the new vocabulary and grammatical structure which they have previously been exposed to.

In speaking, L2 learners are usually under real time pressure and have no access to their declarative knowledge in terms of structures and the vocabulary items. In writing, however, L2 learners have access to some hidden planning time during which they might seize the opportunity to use those structures and vocabulary which can be automatized and consolidated as a result of practice in the course of time. Nunan (1999) states that producing a coherent, fluent, and extended writing piece is likely the most difficult thing in language since the reader has to comprehend what has been written without asking for clarification or relying on the writer’s tone of voice or expression. As a result, many teachers will find themselves responsible to teach writing.

English writing teachers believe that error correction will help learners enhance their writing ability, so they spend much time on providing effective feedback (e.g., Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Hyland, 2001). It is believed that error correction is an isolated phenomenon that only takes place in the classroom since learners produce incorrect forms and it is the teacher’s job to correct the errors. The way teachers should correct learners’ errors is an important issue in the teaching and learning processes. Hedge (2000) maintains that “there is increasing evidence that learners progress faster with meaningful language practice in a rich linguistic environment with an informed policy of error correction on the part of the teacher” (p. 15). In order to avoid demotivation, teachers often are advised to take into consideration the needs and desire of learners when giving CF (e.g., Ferris, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). They must have enough knowledge to choose the best ways for correcting learners' errors. Brookhart (2010) argues that “positive feedback is considered as
positive reinforcement while negative feedback is considered punishment” (P. 11). Therefore, teachers should pay attention to the role of effective feedback. Sadler (1983) believes that “feedback can encourage and advance learning if it concentrates on growth rather than grading” (P. 60).

2.2. Should Learners’ Error be Corrected?

A look into the literature determines different theories of thought to answer this question. Some theories (e.g., behaviorist theory of language learning) biasedly give the answer YES to this question. Errors are taken as a sin in this view and must be eradicated right there and then. According to Larsen Freeman (2000), treatment of learners’ error is one of the most controversial issues in language pedagogy. Error correction is often considered “a vital part of the teachers’ role” (Harmer, 1998, p. 62) and “one of the things that students expect from their teachers” (Harmer, 2001). Ur (1996) argues that providing learners too much CF can discourage them, however, Ur (2000) makes it clear that correction is important:

First, because that’s what learners want, and, all things being equal, I think we teachers should respect learner’s wishes; and second because even if correcting is only of limited effectiveness, commonsense would argue that if there’s one thing that is less effective than correcting, it is: not correcting. (p. 16).

There have been considerable debates in the literature surrounding the question: “Should learners’ error be corrected?” among researchers. Many theoreticians (e.g., Long, 2003) answer positively to this question arguing that fossilization is avoidable, unless sufficient amount of error correction is given to learners during early stage of learning. Dekeyser (1993) also states that “students in the classroom, even after years of study, have
typically received minimal input compared to first language learners, which may make error correction necessary to avoid fossilization” (p. 502). Chaudron (1988), however, suggests that the question of whether or not errors should be corrected can ultimately be determined by how effective the correction is. He notes that the practice of error correction should be focused on types of error that inhibit communication, that are repeated frequently, and that have highly stigmatizing effect on the listener.

The pervious section discussed why learners’ error should be corrected, and some researchers have argued that error correction is entirely unnecessary and ineffective or even harmful (e.g., Fazio, 2001; Truscott, 1996). This claim relies on teachers’ incapability of providing adequate and consistent feedback and learners’ inability and unwillingness to use feedback effectively. Corder (1967) also found error correction to be ineffective.

In short, there are many conflicting opinions as to whether we should correct errors, and there is no conclusive evidence on the most effective way to correct errors.

2.3. The Arguments For and Against WCF

Debates over the effectiveness of WCF continue in the literature in recent years. As debates evolve, teachers face challenges when they are going to provide WCF; therefore, they should assess their learners’ abilities, needs, goals, and preferences with respect to written accuracy and then provide manageable and useful feedback which fit the teaching context (e.g., Ferris, 2006; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Controversy over the efficacy of the provision of CF arose two opposed views. Some researchers (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2000; 2006; Ferris & Robert, 2001) argue that CF can reinforce L2 learners’ writing while some others (e.g., Fazio, 2001; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992; Truscott, 1996) assert that CF fails to improve writing accuracy. The opponents of Truscott (1996; 1999) argue that
WCF is an integral constitute of L2 writing instruction (Ferris, 2004). Additionally, they argue that WCF provides L2 learners opportunities to notice the gaps in their L2 knowledge (Van Beuningen, 2010) which in turn leads them to test interlanguage hypotheses and engage in metalinguistic reflection which in turn results in prompting L2 accuracy.

Reviewing a number of studies by Kepner (1991), Semke (1984), and Sheppard (1992), Truscott (1996) came to this conclusion that error correction is harmful and should be abandoned for four reasons: (1) it is stressful and discouraging for students to see their paper is full of grammar corrections, (2) it will cause students to shorten and simplify their writing in order to avoid corrections, (3) it will consume students’ time and energy that could better be spent on improving form and content in their writing, and (4) it will consume teachers’ time and energy that could better be spent on helping students improve form and content in their writing” (pp. 354–355). Truscott (1996; 1999; 2004; 2007) has raised objections against the effectiveness of WCF in L2 writing, in particular the impact of grammar correction on improving L2 writing. He argues that providing WCF for grammatical errors of L2 learners has no effect on enhancing their written output.

Truscott (1996; 1999) questions the value of grammar correction in improving L2 learners’ accuracy in written output. He argues that grammar acquisition is not a sudden discovery which might be achieved through WCF since grammar correction through WCF is superficial and counterproductive. He undermines the effectiveness of WCF on L2 learners’ written output due to the fact that a considerable amount of previous studies reveal no significant effect of providing WCF on L2 learners’ ability to write accurately. Truscott (2004) claims that “correction is a bad idea” (p. 342). In his 2007 research, he reaches two conclusions; firstly, he claims that the best estimate is that WCF has a small negative effect
on L2 learners’ ability to write accurately; secondly, he argued that we could ensure that if WCF happens to have any positive effect on L2 writing, this effect would not be significant.

In the same line of argument, Truscott and Hus (2008) underscore the role of WCF and argue that WCF makes little or no contribution to the enhancement of written L2 output. They go to extremes and claim that WCF might harm L2 learning process and therefore it does not deserve any place in language learning classroom context. Similarly, Truscott (2007) claims that WCF might be effective for non-grammatical errors but it is useless or even harmful for grammatical errors. Additionally, having been provided with WCF, L2 learners might avoid more complex constructions. Furthermore, he asserts that WCF takes a great amount of class time which might be used wisely on additional authentic writing practice (Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2012).

In brief, Truscott (1996; 1999; 2007) believes that WCF is ineffective and needs to be abandoned in language learning classrooms. He supports his claim by referring to Krashen’s (1982) monitor model that comprehensible input is a sufficient condition for L2 acquisition. Therefore, he concludes where grammar correction should be discontinued in writing instruction and suggests that the improvement in learners’ accuracy would effectively be achieved through a variety of reading and writing exercises.

He also argues that L2 learners acquire grammatical rules and features in a specific order and problems may appear when the sequences of language instruction are inconsistent with the learning sequences. This claim is also supported by Pienemann’s (1984) “teachability hypothesis” which states that no amount of instruction will move learners to
another stage unless they are ready to move. In other words, if teachers correct the errors that learners are not yet ready to learn them, then error correction would have little value.

On the other hand, Ferris (1995; 1999; 2003; 2004) and a number of other L2 researchers (e.g., Bitchener, 2012; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008) level criticism at the argumentation of Truscott with regard to the ineffectiveness and even detrimental effect of providing WCF on L2 learners’ written output. Ferris (1999) in a paper as a response to Truscott (1996), claims that his argument against grammar correction and infectiveness of WCF on fostering L2 learners’ writing ability is “premature and overly strong” (p.1); instead he argues that CF will be effective if it is provided in an appropriate manner, namely, if it is “selective, prioritized, and clear” (p. 4). He claims that CF is better to be selective than comprehensive. Selective CF includes identifying some errors based on the pre-determined criteria whereas comprehensive CF refers to providing CF on all erroneous sentences.

2.4. Classification of CF

There are different classifications for CF strategies proposed by different researchers (e.g., Burke & Pieterick, 2010; Ellis, 2009; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). However, these classifications differ in essence. Literature is enriched with different types of feedback which are more or less complementary. Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) classification that includes six different categories, namely, clarification request, explicit feedback, recasts, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repletion is mainly used for learners’ oral production, although with a little modification, it could also be used for learners’ writing activities.

Such a modification should be exerted in Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) classification because a technique like elicitation is not possible in a written form. The teacher should use
an offline way of correcting rather than an online one, when the learners immediately get feedback. They also identify a seventh category called *multiple feedback*, which refers to combinations of more than one type of feedback. In Roberts’ (1995) and Lyster’s (1998) listing, there is one more and it is *cue*, which means the teacher provides cues on learners’ error. Panova and Lyster (2002) also adds one more — translation. Among all, the best classification is put forward by Ellis (2009) since it presents a typology of different types of WCF to teachers for correcting learners’ error and the students’ response to the feedback. Ellis’s classification encompasses six major categories, namely, direct, indirect, metalinguistic, focused/unfocused, electronic, and reformulation.

2.5. Written Corrective Feedback Typology

2.5.1. Direct and Indirect WCF. The main factor which distinguishes direct and indirect CF is the learner’s involvement in the correction process. Direct CF (DCF) is defined as the teacher’s provision of correct forms on learners’ linguistic error (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; 2010; Ferris, 2003). Indirect CF (ICF) is a type of feedback where the teacher only indicates that an error has been committed, without providing the correct form; it is left to the learner to correct his own errors (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). ICF can take different forms (such as underlining, marginal description, encircling, and coding of errors) that vary in their explicitness.

Various hypotheses considering the effectiveness of DCF and ICF have been put forward (e.g., Ferris, 1995; Samson, 2012; Vyatkina, 2010), some in favour of direct error correction (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2009), other supporting the indirect approach (e.g., Ferris, Liu, Sinha, & Senna, 2013). It is claimed that learners will benefit more from ICF because they have to engage in a language processing when they are self-editing their
پژوهش حاضر نتایج "پارچه فرازبانی و بانگردی در صحت نوشتار زبان گذشته باقاعدگی و بي قاعدگى در نوشتار زبان آموزان ايرانی" را بررسی کرده است. برای این منظور، 45 زبان آموز ترکی زبان (4 کلاس دست نخورده) در این مطالعه شرکت کردند. در این پژوهش شبه تجربی یک پیش آزمون، تیمار، و یک پس آزمون استفاده شده است. این تحقیق هفت جلسه بطول انجامید. در جلسه اول از تمامی زبان آموزان آزمون مهارت (KET) گرفته شد. بعد از آزمون مهارت هر کلاس بصورة تصادفی به گروه های باردار، ردپای و بازگرد (7 نفر) و گروه کنترل (12 نفر) تکمیل شدند. در جلسه دوم، برای ارزیابی عملکرد زبان گذشته زبان آموز، یک پیش آزمون برگزار شد. زبان آموزان از جلسه سوم تا جلسه ششم، چهار موضوع (هر جلسه یک موضوع) دریافت کردن تا 30 دقیقه 150 کلمه درمرد آن نیم‌زمان. جلسه ی بعد نوشته های زبان آموزان با پارچه‌های مختلف به آنها بارگذارده شد. اشتیاهات گروه بازخود خطر کشیده شده بود و توضیح گردهمایی دربایلی آن در پرانتز نوشته شده بود. اشتیاهات گروه بازخود به‌همراه بازگردی نیز خط کشیده شده بود و از آنها خواسته شد که نوشته‌های خود را بازنوسی کنند. گروه بازگردی با بدکاری اشتیاهات خود را پیدا می‌کردند و گروه کنترل هیچ نوع نویسی بازخود به صورت تکمیل کردند. در جلسه هفتم از تمامی زبان آموزان یک پس آزمون گرفته شد و همچنین زبان آموزان یک پرستارشده تغییر تکمیل کردند. نتایج نشان داد که مهارت نوشته‌دادن دو گروه تجربی که بازخود دریافت کردن به‌همبود یافته است. همچنین نتایج نشان داد که گروه بازخود به‌همراه بازگردی نسبت به گروه های دیگر بهتر تبیین قابل توجه در مهارت نوشتار داشته است.
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