University of Mohaghegh Ardabili

Faculty of Literature and Humanities

Department of Teaching Foreign Langueges

Thesis is approved for the degree of M.A.
In Teaching English Language

Title:

The Effect of Teacher's Electronic Feedback on Iranian Intermediate Learners' Accuracy of Simple Present Passive Voice

Supervisor:

Afsaneh Saeedakhtar (Ph. D)

Advisor:

Reza Abdi (Ph. D)

By:

Robab Palizvan

Family name: **Palizvan**	Name: **Robab**

Title of Thesis: **The effect of teacher's electronical corrective feedback on Iranian intermediatelearners' accuracy of simple present passive voice**

Supervisor: **Dr. Afsaneh Saeedakhtar**
Advisor : **Dr**. **Reza Abdi**

Graduate Degree **M.A.**	
Major: **English Language**	Specialty: **Teaching**
University: **Mohaghegh Ardabili**	Faculty: **Literature and Hunmanities**
Graduation date: **26/2/2018**	Number of pages: **88**

Abstract:

This study attempted to examine the effect of teacher's electronic corrective feedback on Iranian intermediate learners' accuracy of simple present passive voice. A total of 60 intermediate English learners participated in this study in which they received two different kinds of feedback (i.e., e-feedback and paper-based feedback). They were randomly divided into three groups. The electronic group received e-feedback on their writings and communicated with their teacher via email. The teacher used track changes to correct their errors. But the paper-based group received teacher's traditional indirect feedback; they received teacher's comments on their papers. The control group received no feedback. The learners received a 10-session treatment three days a week.The results of the study showed that the e-feedback group outperformed the paper-based one in producing accurate simple present passive voice. Moreover, the findings of the interview showed that the learners had positive attitudes toward e-feedback; they believed that it would increase their autonomy and responsibility, decrease their anxiety, and save their time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Three: Methodology

Chapter Four: Results and Discussion

Chapter Five: Conclusion, Pedagogical Implications, and Suggestion for Further Research

Appendix 1: Pre-test

Appendix1: Post-test

Appendix 1: Delayed Post-test

Appendix 2: Writing Tasks

Appendix 3: Examples of teacher's e-feedback on the learners' writings

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABRIVIATIONS

A	Answer
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ACF	Asynchronous Corrective Feedback
AWE	Automated Writing Evaluation
CF	Corrective Feedback
CMC	Computer Mediated Communication
FFCF	Form Focused Corrective Feedback
FLW	First Language Writing
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELP	English Language Program
ESL	English as a Second Language
L2	Second Language
LAN	Local Area Network
PET	Preliminary English Test
SCF	Synchronous Corrective Feedback
SCT	Socio Cultural Theory
SD	Standard Division
Sig	Significance
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SLW	Second Language Writing
SPPV	Simple Present Passive Voice
WCF	Written Corrective Feedback

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

This chapter elaborates on some preliminary remarks, statements of the problem, significance of the study, purpose of the study, research questions, research hypothesis, and the definition of key terms. At the end of the chapter limitations and delimitations of the study are also explained.

1.2. Preliminary Remarks

Correcting errors is one of the most important issues which attract the attention of many second language writing researchers. English language learners make many errors in their writings, and the teacher should provide them corrective feedback (CF) to help them to correct their linguistic errors (AbuSeileek, 2013). Providing feedback on L2 learners' linguistic errors has been known as one of the central concerns for L2 teachers (Han & Hyland, 2015). Lee (2008) spent large amounts of their time offering written corrective feedback (WCF) on L2 learners' written texts.

It is the most essential issue for both the teachers and the learners to accept this truth that errors can be an inevitable part of the learning process (Davies & Pearse, 2002). Errors often are a sign of learning in language acquisition process. Gass and Lewis (2007) argued that interactional feedback in response to learners' ungrammatical utterances makes it clear that learners notice the gap between their production and the target form and pushes learners to make modifications to their ungrammatical utterances. In addition, Egi (2010) suggested that different types of CF trigger a different learning process.

Ferris (2011) argued that WCF is essential for the learners and the teachers, since there is an assumption that it can support language acquisition. Moreover, Ellis (2008) claimed that CF can facilitate L2 learning, and can increase learners' ability to acquire grammatical features. Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) noted that "error correction consists of not only the teacher feedback and the grammar instruction, but also consciousness rising, strategy training, and student accountability" (p. 1). In addition, some others believed (e.g., Bates, Lane, & Lange, 1993; Ellis, Sheen, Marakami & Takashima, 2008; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Lee, 2011) that error treatment can help the improvement of learners' writing accuracy. They claimed that instructors take a selective approach, when marking papers. Moreover, Bithener (2012) noted that WCF leads to L2 learning and acquisition.

However, in most previous studies the researchers have resorted to paper-based feedback, while with the advent of technology the teachers and the researchers came to investigate the role of electronic feedback, hereafter e-feedback, in improving L2 writing. Tuzi (2004) stated that the form of feedback has been changed with the development of the Internet. Colomb and Simutis (1996) argued that network communication can provide comfortable room for learners to practice their writing skills and receive peer feedback on their work. Tuzi (2004) concluded that e-feedback can increase the amounts of learners' participation, reduce the role of the teacher, increase the ability to monitor conversations, increase the amounts of the time that learners actually write, and finally provide several responses for the learners.

MacLeod (1999) illustrated some of the advantages of e-feedback. E-feedback can help learners be more honest in their responses. Since the teacher can criticize the learners without having to face them, and the teachers feel more comfortable stating their true thoughts. In relation to honesty, e-feedback can allow learners to respond anonymously, a point which is

referred to as "a plus" by MacLeo (1999). Some researchers (e.g., Sollivon & Pratt, 1998) pointed that e-feedback triggers better writings, and also according to Tuzi (2004), it can focus on larger chunks of writing.

Ware and Warschauer (2006) examined various aspects of research and instruction on the concept of e-feedback and outlined three types of research on e-feedback for second language writing. First, they described clearly the usefulness and effectiveness of software generated feedback which can replace direct human feedback. Second, they worked on comparative studies in which they evaluated the effectiveness of computer mediated human feedback on L2 writing in comparison with traditional face to face feedback. Finally, with regard to socio-cultural and socio-cognitive perspectives, they investigated the variation of electronic modes ranging from a specific focus of academic second language writing to a kind of feedback that incorporates other communicative models such as online chat, email collaboration, and multimedia authoring.

1.3. Statements of the Problem

Abuseileek (2013) claimed that there are a few studies which have demonstrated the effectiveness of providing CF on L2 language learners' writing ability. Despite the fact that teachers spent much time for providing feedback on learners' writings (Starn & Solomon, 2006), research on the effect of feedback provided on the adequacy of written products is scare (Graham & Perin, 2007). Then because of both scientific and practical reasons it is important to fill this gap. Further, providing WCF is one of the most important tasks for the teachers. It is the kind of individualized attention, that is rarely possible under normal classroom conditions.

Tuzi (2004) stated that it is important to discover, if limiting the modes of communication to digital written massages is a benefit or an obstacle for L2 learners. It can change our traditional styles of learning. Learners with technology can have access to their instructors whenever they need. Their stress and anxiety may be reduced by technological instructions. Teachers and learners use technology to collaborate on writing tasks, however the researchers believed that the effect of technology on L2 writing has not been considered more, though incorporating technology into L2 classroom has increased (Tuzi, 2004). Further, there are a few studies conducted on using computer-mediated CF in writing. Despite the fact that computer-mediated CF has positive role in facilitating learning even difficult forms, there are a few studies to identify its effect on improving linguistic outcomes (e.g., Sachs & Suh, 2007; Sauro, 2009).

There are numerous studies which have compared learners' outcome in face to face and online construction, however, no significant difference on these kinds of construction has been reported (e.g., Aragon, Johnson & Shaik, 2002; Jang, 2008; legutke, 2007; Mayer, 2003; Means, Toyooman, Murphy, Bakia & Janes, 2009; Sujo de Montes & Gonzales, 2000). And there are a few studies on L2 teachers' online preparation, and less attention has been paid to the impact of online instruction on L2 writing (e.g., Ebsworth, Kim & Kelin, 2010; Geartler, Bollen & Geff, 2012; Kessler, 2007).

According to the above-mentioned explanations, this study compared the effect of e-feedback and teacher's paper-based feedback on the accuracy of intermediate L2 learners' simple present passive voice (SPPV). And also, this study elicited the learners' attitudes towards the teacher's e-feedback.

1.4. Significance of the Study

Writing classes in our educational system can be affected by computers. With the widespread expansion of technology, this study carried out a research in online instruction which is time saving and easy. It demonstrated that on-line instruction can provide opportunities for the learners, the teachers, and the material developers for better education. Since the learners always face problems especially outside the classroom environment, thus online instruction can help them whenever they need any help. They can express their problems through email, telegram, and blog. The learners can also work with their peers online on their lessons and problems. It can reduce learners' anxiety, can lead the learners to better feelings towards learning materials, and can present non-threatening environments compared with face to face instruction.

Online instruction can provide better opportunities for teachers who want to be successful in their occupation. They can communicate with the learners whenever they need. And they can work more with their weaker learners. In addition the need for tutoring is decreased. And it is worthy to note that since the class time is limited, the teacher cannot provide CF for each learner, while this opportunity has been raised in e-feedback and online instruction. Online instruction can encourage syllabus designers to focus on more attractive, authentic, and up to date topics and materials. They can consult with the teachers and learners in providing materials. And they also can use the learners' and the teachers' ideas for improving education.

Online environment can be a superior medium for instruction because of its flexibility and student-centered approach (e.g., Logan, Augustyniak, & Rees 2000; Russell 1999;

Summers, Waigandt, & Whittaker, 2005; York 2008). Online courses can also trigger the learners to take the responsibility for their own education (Logan et. al., 2002).

Thus, the absence of the teacher who is immediately available to respond to the questions on the material can prompt learners to discover answers on their own, a process that usually reinforces learning more strongly (Atkinson & Hunt, 2008). The online environment also provides a more comfortable way for the participation of the learners who are shy and have lack of confidence and who may be intimidated by the public setting. Additionally, online courses provide great flexibility and access to multiple educational methods that may not be available in the traditional classroom (Sitzmann, Kurt, Steward, & wisher, 2006).York (2008) argued that within the online environment, particularly within the courses that are structured around an asynchronous design, the learners have taken the ability to learn at their own pace, go back and reread or review portions that they found challenging, take breaks when they are tired, and work at the times that are the most conducive to their own learning.

1.5. Purpose of the Study

This study investigated the effect of the teacher's e-feedback on the accuracy of SPPV among Iranian intermediate L2 learners. And also it examined weather the teacher's traditional WCF can improve the accuracy of the learners' SPPV. Finally the learners' attitudes were elicited towards the e-feedback.

1.6. Research Questions

1. Would teacher's e-feedback improve intermediate L2 learners' accuracy of simple present passive voice more than the traditional paper-based feedback?

2. What is the attitude of the learners towards the teacher's e-feedback and traditional paper-based feedback?

1.7. Research Hypothesis

1. The teacher's e-feedback would not improve the accuracy of simple present passive voice more than the traditional paper-based feedback.

1.8. Definition of Key terms

Feedback: Feedback is the information which is given by an external person with regard to some aspect(s) of the learner's task performance, and can modify the learner's cognition, motivation, and behavior (e.g., Kluger & DeNisi, 1996; Shute, 2008). Feedback is an instructional practice which is indicated as enhancing both learner' skills and motivation (e.g., Brown, 2004; Bruning & Horn, 2000; Kellogg & Whiteford, 2009; Kluger & DeNisi, 1996).

Error Correction: Error correction is a technique used to help learners correct their errors by providing them with feedback about their errors (Abuseileek, 2013).

Electronical Feedback: It is the correction of learners' error orally or written via electronical devices such as email, blog, wiki, and telegram (Tuzi, 2004).

Track-changes: Track changes is a singular corrective feedback tool that can be used in an implicit and explicit form to support CF (Abuseileek, 2013).

Email: Email is an interpersonal communication through the Internet which can be used in L2 writing classes (Crystal, 2001).

1.9.   Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

The limitations of this study include:

- The email group always had problem with the Internet connection, then their emails were not regular.

- Generalization of this study is not possible for large populations, since it was conducted on small number of participants.

- In the present study learners only were at intermediate level. Then its generalizability on the other levels may not be reasonable.

The delimitations of the current study are:

- This study only focused on one grammatical point i.e., SPPV. Although learners had so many errors in other grammatical structures in their writing, only SPPV errors were corrected, since correcting all of them may get away the learners and the teachers from the main point.

- In the present study only the teacher provided e-feedback and there was no peer-peer e-feedback.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter Two

Literature Review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter explains written or oral feedback, the importance of CF, the typology of

feedback, WCF and L2 theories, the importance of e-feedback, computer-mediated

communication (CMC), and its role in CF, track-changes and CF, email and its advantages in

language learning, and finally empirical studies which have been conducted on CF.

2.2. Written or Oral Feedback

2.2.1. Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

The teacher's written response continues to play an essential role in most L2 and

foreign language writing classes. Many teachers think that they must write substantial

comments on papers of the learners to provide reaction to their efforts, to help them improve

their writings, and to justify the grade they have been given (K. Hyland, 2003).

In a longitudinal study, Hyland and Hyland (2006b) found that the teachers did not

simply mark a text, but use its information to contextualize the writing, the strengths and

weaknesses of the individual student, and his or her explicit requests for particular kinds of

help. The survey of the learners' feedback preferences generally indicated that ESL learners

greatly value the teacher's WCF and consistently prefer it more highly than alternative forms

such as peer and oral feedback (e.g., Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Leki 1991; Radecki &

Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994; Zhang, 1995).

Studies have also suggested that learners like to receive WCF in combination with

other sources, including conferences (e.g., Arndt, 1993; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994). They

also had positive attitudes toward receiving indirect feedback on errors, receiving them clues

rather than corrections, so that it could encourage them to be more active in benefiting from

the feedback (e.g., Arndt, 1993; Saito, 1994; F. Hyland, 2001a). Although L2 learners

themselves had positive views about the teacher's WCF, its contribution to writing

development is still unclear, both in terms of its immediate impact on revisions to drafts and

the longer term development of their writing skills (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Studies have

suggested that learners may ignore or misuse the teacher commentary when revising drafts.

Sometimes they may misunderstand it (e.g., Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Ferris, 1995), or they

may understand the problems that pointed out, but are unable to come up with a suitable

revision (e.g., Ferris 1997; Conrad & Goldstein 1999), and sometimes it may cause them to

simply delete the text to avoid the issues raised (F. Hyland, 1998).

2.2.2. Oral Corrective Feedback

While it has widely been accepted that oral interaction plays an important role in the

planning, writing or revision stages of producing a text in L1 contexts, but the scope and

extent of its contribution are still unclear (Bruffee, 1984). Especially for L2 writers or many

learners oral feedback takes place in writing conferences, where there is a potential for

meaning and interpretation is constantly negotiated (Bruffee, 1984), since a significant

number of L2 learner now have participated in writing conferences (Bruffee, 1984).

It has been argued that some L2 learners have cultural or social inhibitions about

engaging informally with authority figures such as teachers, then this can lead the learners to

passively and unreflectively incorporate the teacher's suggestions into their work (Goldstein

& Conrad, 1990). Goldstein and Conrad (1990) found that only those learners who negotiated

meaning successfully in conferences were able to carry out extensive and better revisions to

their writing.

2.3. The Importance of WCF

Feedback plays an important role in second language acquisition and SLW studies in general and particular (Ene & Upton, 2014).Truscott (1996, 2007) noted that error correction is not useful for language development and emphasized that it is harmful and can lead to form focused corrective feedback. But providing feedback on learners' written errors is one of the important concerns of L2 teachers (Han & Hyland, 2015) who spend large amounts of time for WCF on L2 learners' written text. Joughin (2008) referred to three primary roles of feedback: supporting the learning process, judging current successful, and holding disciplinary and professional standards.

Second language scholars are interested in how to respond to the learners' writings more effectively (Miller, 2014). In addition, learners' engagement has a basic role in the CF mechanism which facilitates teacher's provision of CF and learning outcomes (Ellis, 2010). Providing feedback in the form of written commentary, error correction, the teacher student conference, or peer discussion have been recognized as one of the ESL writing teacher's most important tasks (Hosseini Mehr, 2013).

WCF pedagogically is useful (e.g., Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994), since it has largely been seen as informational, a means of channeling reactions, and advice to facilitate improvements. Consequently, its important interpersonal aspects, the role it plays in expressing a teacher's stance and the ideas about writing and negotiating a relationship with the learners is often overlooked. Lee (2008) claimed that the teacher without understanding the learners' feeling about feedback may involve himself in the risk of using continually strategies that are counter-productive. Lee (2008) noted that feedback occurs between the teacher and the learners' cultural, institutional, and their personal context,

and also different contexts which can affect learners' responses. Some researchers (e.g., Ferris, 1995; Hyland, 1998) believed that the teacher's feedback is useful and almost always the learners prefer feedback on their writings.

2.4. Typology of Feedback

There is an argument (Ellis, 2009) that feedback on writing can only focus on organization, content or linguistic form. While the concerning only concern is linguistic feedback, which comes in various forms (Ellis, 2009). It can be focused or unfocused depending on whether it is directed at just one or two linguistic errors or a broad range of errors. It can also be indirect or direct depending on whether the errors are just indicated or corrections are provided. Learners can also receive metalinguistic clues or explanations on their errors. These dimensions are explained in detail below:

2.4.1. Direct CF

In the direct CF the teacher provides the learner with correct form. As Ferris (2006) noted it can take a number of different forms─crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form.

2.4.2. Indirect CF

Indirect CF shows the errors to the learners without actually correcting them. It can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to point out omissions in the learner's text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error.

2.4.3. Metalinguistic CF

Metalinguistic CF consists of providing the learners with some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors which they have been made. The explicit comments have two forms. The most common form is using error codes, which involves abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors. These labels are placed over the location of the error in the text or in the margin. In the next form, the exact location of the error may or may not be present. In the former, the learners have to work out the correction needed from the clue provided, while in the latter the learners require first locating the error and then working out the correction.

2.4.4. Focused versus unfocused CF

In the case of unfocused CF teachers can choose to correct all of the learners' errors. Alternatively they can select specific types of error for correction in terms of focused errors.

Processing corrections may be more difficult in unfocused CF, since the learner is exposed to a variety of the errors, and then there is possibility that he cannot concentrate much on each error. Thus, focused CF may be proved more effective, since the learner can examine multiple corrections of a single error and then gain rich evidence to know why and what errors they had to acquire.

If learning is dependent on the attention to form, then reasonably we can assume that the more intensive the attention, the more likely the correction leads to learning. Focused metalinguistic CF can especially be helpful in this respect because   it promotes not just attention, but also understanding of the nature of the error. In contrary, unfocused CF has the advantage of addressing a range of errors, so although it might not be as effective as focused CF in assisting learners to acquire specific features, it can prove superior in the long run.

2.4.5. Electronic Feedback

Extensive corpora of written English (either carefully constructed or simply available via search engines such as Google) can help learners in their writing. This assistance can be accessed by means of software programs or it can be utilized as Downloadeds.

Milton (2006) defined an approach based on a software program which is called Mark My Words. This method provides the teachers with an electronic store of approximately 100 recurrent lexico-grammatical and style errors found frequently in the writing of Chinese learners. The store can also provide a brief comment on each error with links to resources showing the correct form. This program can enable the teacher to use the electronic store to insert brief metalinguistic comments into a learner's text and writings. Then the text is returned to the learner who then consults the electronic resources to compare his/her usage with that illustrated in the samples of language made available. This can help the learner to self-correct.

Milton (2006) has reported that the learner's revisions were successful. There are some clear advantages to this option. Firs it can remove the need for the teacher to be the arbiter of what constitutes a correct form. Arguably, a usage-based approach is more reliable, since teachers' intuitions about grammatical correctness are often fallible. It can also be argued that the key to effective error correction is identifying the learner's textual intention. It can allow the learners to locate the corrections that are most appropriate for their own textual intentions and it encourages learners to be independent.

2.4.6. Reformulation

The final option is similar to the use of concordances in which the purpose is providing resources to the learners to correct their errors, but places the responsibility for the final decision about whether and how to correct.

There is a standard procedure in error analysis which is called reconstruction that is for identifying an error, the analyst (and the teacher) should construct a native speaker version of that part of the text containing an error. The idea for reformulation as a technique for providing feedback to learners grew out of this procedure. It consists of a native-speaker rewriting the learner's text in such a way as "to preserve as many of the writer's ideas as possible, while expressing them in her own words so as to make the piece sound native like" (Cohen 1989, p. 4).

Therefore, the writer can revise by deciding which of the native-speaker's reconstructions should be accepted. In essence, reformulation has two options such as 'direct correction' plus 'revision', but it is different in how these options are executed in that the whole of the learner's text is reformulated thus laying the burden on the learner to identify the specific changes that have been made.

2.5. WCF and L2 Theories

Recently more feedback researches have focused on strengthening the relations between feedback on writing and SLA theories, and have sought to examine whether feedback has an effect on language proficiency and development, with a focus on the potential role of WCF. Other theories have also led to many developments in feedback research. Feedback from a genre perspective is seen as having an essential role in terms of the development of the academic and professional literacy skills needed for participation in new communities of

practice (Hyland, 2010).Considerably, learners' understanding of good writing is dependent on feedback on their written assignments (Inoue, 2005, 2007). Feedback in language development is supported by Swain's (1985, 1995) output hypothesis, which claims that pushing learners to produce challenging output increases a learner's awareness of linguistic input and gaps.

In addition, Krashen's (1985) monitor model—the first general SLA theory—suggested that WCF, either directly or indirectly, leads to language learning. According to Anderson's (1990) adaptive control of thought (that refers to the role of explicit and implicit knowledge in learning) explicit learning and explicit knowledge achieved through instruction and CF can be converted to implicit knowledge which is necessary for acquisition.

According to Vygotskian sociocultural theory, SCT, (1978), CF encourages learners to produce language above their independent abilities and facilitates their progress towards the target language (Ene & Upton, 2014). According to SCT, all cognitive development (including language development) happens as a result of social interactions between individuals (Bitchner, 2012).Therefore, SCT provides different points of view toward the role of interaction in L2 learning, and illustrates that how learners with regard to interaction respond to and use (or fail to respond to and use) the CF they are given. Some studies (e.g., Lantolf & Thorne, 2007; Swain, Brooks, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002) have suggested that L2 learners can reach to the higher levels of linguistic knowledge when they receive suitable 'scaffolding' (Including CF) and that it helps the learners move from 'other regulated' to 'self-regulated' state (i.e., being able to use L2 independently and without assistance).

2.6.   The Importance of E-feedback

Today, there has been a considerable growth in the use of digital and communication technology bringing writing from paper to screen, to provide feedback on L2 learner' drafts (e.g., Ware & Warschauer, 2006; Warschauer, Zheng, & Park, 2013). Colomb and Simutis (1996) claimed that a computer-assisted learning tool is 'only as valuable for teaching writing as the pedagogical designs which it serves' (p. 203). Williams, Brown, and Benson (2013) have noted that advances in educational technology have increased feedback options for the teacher and learner, more than traditional CF (e.g., from one-to-one to one-to-many or even to many-to-many feedback opportunities in e-learning environments.

The study of de Andrés Martínez's (2012) is an example of using online electronic media to enhance L2 pedagogy. He explored 'how blogs [or electronic learning logs] as digital learning environments for L2 acquisition presented learning opportunities to complement a traditional face-to-face course' (p. 200). de Andrés Martínez (2012) argued that educational technology can be applied to create reflective tools to help learners connect their past learning experience and knowledge with their current performance and their ultimate learning goals. According to Nicol & MacfarlaneDick (2006), interactive activities that allow for careful quiet reflection can enable learners to consider and interact with the concurrent feedback from outside and their own intrinsic feedback during task assessment, especially when there is an opportunity for learners to resubmit the task for reassessment. Such technology-assisted interrogation of one's learning process can lead to using feedback on one's performance more and more, and then it can assist learners to personally experience their performance gap.

Tuzi (2004) argued that "Most research incorporating e-feedback is conducted with technology not designed for writing and responding" (p. 220). He explained that the importance of the user-friendliness, and affordances offered by the medium, for example feedback website interface, can form peer feedback and reduce errors. Tuzi (2004) claimed that the learners can make much better revisions in reaction to feedback which is received through the website in comparison with the face-to-face verbal feedback.

Denton, Madden, Roberts, and Rowe (2008) illustrated that the advantages of the feedback, which the learners received in L1 from their tutors electronically through the Microsoft Office application, include providing the transparency of the marking schemes, the legibility of feedback comments, and the clear statement of the areas of one's good and poor performance. Tuzi (2004) also mentioned that e-feedback has the following advantages: less paperwork, better task monitorship, more candid feedback responses, increased learner involvement, and less teacher dominance. de Andrés Martínez (2012) described the affordances of technology-enhanced learning as follow: flexibility, accessibility, multimodality, and asynchronous interactions.

2.7. Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) and its Role in Corrective Feedback

With the advent of network technology multiple users can separately communicate and work together. It is noticeable that using collaboration in CMC is different from collaboration in face-to-face communication conditions (Hsiao & Chiu, 2010). Face-to-face communication requires rich variety of verbal and non-verbal cues, such as facial expressions, glances, tones, and hand gestures that can improve the process. However, CMC often lacks providing perceptual clues (Hsiao & Chiu, 2010).

post-test (week 12) in writing. Results showed that

نام‌خانوادگی‌دانشجو: **پالیزوان**   نام: **رباب**
عنوان پایان‌نامه: **تاثیر بازخورد تکنولوژی محورمعلم بر صحت وجه مجهول حال ساده بر یادگیرندگان سطح متوسط ایرانی**
استاد راهنما: **خانم دکتر افسانه سعیداختر**
استاد مشاور: **اقای دکتر رضا عبدی**

مقطع تحصیلی: **کارشناسی ارشد**	رشته: **زبان انگلیسی**
گرایش: **آموزش**	دانشگاه: **محقق اردبیلی**
دانشکده: **ادبیات وعلوم انسانی**	تاریخ دفاع: **۹۶/۱۲/۷**	تعداد صفحات: **۸۸**

چکیده:

این تحقیق تاثیر بازخورد تکنولوژی محور معلم را بر صحت وجه مجهول ساده برروی یادگیرندگان سطح متوسط ایرانی بررسی کرد. حدود۶۰یادگیرنده ی زبان انگلیسی در این مطالعه شرکت کردند که دو نوع متفاوت از بازخورد یعنی تکنولوژی محور و کاغذ محور را دریافت کردند. انها به طور تصادفی به سه گروه تقسیم بندی شدند: دو گروه ازمایشی ویک گروه کنترل. گروه بازخورد تکنولوژی محور از طریق ایمیل نوشته های خود را به معلم فرستادند، و معلم نوشته های أنها را با استفاده از ابزار track changes تصحیح کرد و به أنها ایمیل کرد. اما گروه بازخورد کاغذ محور بازخورد سنتی معلم را دریافت کردند و گروه کنترل هیچ نوع بازخوردی از طرف معلم نداشتند. تمامی یادگیرندگان به مدت ۱۰جلسه سه روز درهفته در این مطالعه شرکت کردند. نتایج بدست آمده نشان داد که گروه بازخورد تکنولوژی محور دراستفاده ی صحیح وجه مجهول حال ساده بهتر از دو گروه دیگر عمل کرده است. بعلاوه نتایج پرسشنامه نشان داد که یادگیردگان نگرشی مثبت به بازخورد تکنولوژی محور داشتند و بر این باور بودند که این نوع بازخورد می تواند مسئولیت و استقلال انها را افزایش دهد، اضطرابشان را کاهش دهد،و باعث صرفه جویی در زمان شود.

کلیدواژه‌ها: بازخورد غیر مستقیم، بازخورد تکنولوژی محور، وجه مجهول ساده، ایمیل، ترک چنجز

دانشکده‌ی ادبیات وعلوم انسانی

گروه آموزشی زبان های خارجی و ادبیات انگلیسی

پایان‌نامه برای دریافت درجه‌ی کارشناسی ارشد

در رشته‌ی زبان انگلیسی گرایش آموزش

عنوان:

تاثیر بازخورد تکنولوژی محور معلم بر صحت وجه مجهول حال ساده بر یادگیرندگان سطح متوسط ایرانی

استاد راهنما:

دکتر افسانه سعید اختر

استاد مشاور:

دکتر رضا عبدی

پژوهشگر:

رباب پالیزوان

زمستان۹۶