



# Plagiarism Checker X Originality Report

**Similarity Found: 15%**

Date: Wednesday, January 15, 2020

Statistics: 1013 words Plagiarized / 6922 Total words

Remarks: Low Plagiarism Detected - Your Document needs Optional Improvement.

---

The Influence of Different Types of Feedbacks on Learners' Writing Performance At Higher Education Sabarun English Department of IAIN Palangka Raya E-mail: sabarun@iain-palangkaraya.co.id sabarunwhs@gmail.com 085646483912 Abstract: This study examined the influence of different types of feedbacks on learners' writing performance at higher education. The study belonged to a quasi-experimental research. The participants of the study were 65 L2 learners consisting of four different groups: focus direct feedback (FDF); unfocus direct feedback (UDF) ; focus indirect feedback (FIF); and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF).

The data were analyzed using Kruskal Wallis and Mann Whitney U tests. The study revealed that the mean rank for FDF was 25.76; UDF: 45.00; was 15.72; and UIF: 45.97. In this case, UIF (45.97) was higher than UDF (45.00). UDF (45.00) was higher than FDF ( 25.76). and FDF ( 25.76) was higher than FIF ( 15.72). It revealed that there was a difference on the means score among the four group. the value of Chi-Square was 29.949 and asymp.Sig. was 0.000. it meant that Chi-Square= 29.949;  $p < 0.05$ . It was said that different types of feedbacks gave facilitative effect on the learners' writing performance. Then, partially, based on the Mann Whitney U test, it revealed that there was a significance difference between FDF and UDF ( $p < 0.05$ ), between FDF and FIF ( $p < 0.05$ ), between FDF and UIF ( $p < 0.05$ ), and between UDF and FIF  $p < 0.05$ ). However, there was no significance difference between UDF and UIF ( $p > 0.05$ ).

It was recommended that the teachers apply various types of feedback in the learning process by considering the learners' level ability. Key words: effect, types of corrective feedbacks, writing performance, higher education Introduction In the context of L2 writing, giving corrective feedback to learners is an important part in learning process. Learners can get some advantages from the corrective feedback given by the teachers,

such as reducing grammatical errors, improving writing skills, and making the composition writing easier.

Teachers play an important role in providing feedback to the learners. In this case, teachers' aid L2 learners improve their skills to achieve the learning objectives. According to Purnawarman (2011), there are four roles of a teacher in giving feedback to learners. He or she as a reader, a writing language instructor, a grammarian, and an assessor. As a reader, the language instructor responds to the content of composition produced by the learners. He/she may give positive feedback to the learners. As a language instructor, the teacher may locate certain points in learners' composition.

As a grammar expert, the teacher can give comments, suggestions or give feedback with emphasizing on grammar rules. As an assessor, the teacher has the responsibility to assess the quality of students' composition and score the learners' composition based on their assessment (2011). According to Ferris (2003), learners get advantages from feedback. Here, the feedback has an urgent and beneficial role to language development, and learners get benefits from feedback on their linguistic errors and assume it to be powerful.

In the current study, the researcher investigates the effect of four types of corrective feedbacks on learners' writing performance, namely: focus direct feedback (FDF); unfocus direct feedback (UDF); focus indirect feedback (FIF); and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF). Direct Corrective Feedback is a model of the feedback given by teacher with correct linguistic form (Ferris, 2002). It is usually given by teachers, on linguistic errors, by giving the correct form (Bitchener et al., 2005). Some procedures of giving direct feedback are indicating the wrong words or phrases and putting the right form.

Direct Corrective Feedback can be applied in many models, for example, by crossing out the wrong word, phrase, or morpheme; and by giving the correct one (Ellis, 2008; & Ferris, 2006). Direct Corrective Feedback gives information on the correct form to the learners (Ellis, 2008). Lee (2008) argues that it is suitable for beginner learners. In Direct corrective feedback, the teacher locates and corrects errors directly. it enables the students to understand the correct form immediately. For instance, the L2 student writes: I buy two apple. The teacher revised: I buy two apples. In his case, the teacher shows the error location and gives the correct answer.

Ellis (2008) stated that direct feedback raises the interaction of the students in the writing class. It improves control of the language since it will not lead the learner to a wrong correction. Direct feedback provided correct forms done by the teacher. In the view of Ferris (2003), it is a kind of feedback given to L2 learners using the correct one

done by language instructors. Elashri (2013) confirmed that Direct Corrective Feedback helped learners since it provided learners' errors and revises them directly. This type is more suitable for low learners (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

The other types of feedback is Indirect Corrective Feedback. It did not allow the teacher to provide correct linguistic forms for students, but just to locate the errors. Indirect corrective feedback is feedback indicating that there was an error; however, the teacher did not put the correct form directly (Ferris, 2003). Indirect corrective feedback is used to show that a linguistic error existed, but not revised, letting the learner correct (Bitchener, 2008).

Indirect feedback occurs when language instructors show indications and make learners realize that an error existed, but they do not give the learners with the correct one. Generally, many models of giving indirect feedback might be: underlining errors and classifying the error types, and noting the number of errors (Bitchener, & Knoch, 2008). In this type, language instructors only show the errors but not give the correct form (Lee, 2008).

For instance, language instructors give signs on the errors by using lines, circles, or codes to show the errors O'Sullivan & Chambers (2006), or by giving a cross (Talatifard, 2016). Moser and Jasmine's (2010) found that learners who were given indirect corrective Feedback achieved better than those treated using Direct Corrective Feedback. The present study uses both models of feedback. However, the researcher adds the investigation with focus and unfocus of direct and indirect feedback. Focus corrective feedback is the model of feedback that teachers provide intensively for a single error or error category.

Bruton (2009) argues that focused feedback is a form of explicit grammar instruction. However, Farris (2010) argues that using focused feedback might not be sufficient to improve writing accuracy. In the current study, Direct focused corrective feedback focuses the feedback on subject-verb agreement for the first writing product, examining missing words for the second writing product, and examining punctuation for the third writing product). In contrast, unfocus feedback is the model of feedback that teachers provide all linguistic errors made by the learners (Ellis et al., 2008; Ellis, 2009; Lee, 2009). Unfocused feedback involves giving feedback on all errors.

Here, feedback was given on all language forms. There were some studies investigated the four types of feedbacks. For example, Bitchener, 2010, Young & Cameron, 2005) reported an advantage for indirect feedback; and Chandler (2003) reported positive evidence for both direct and indirect feedback (Bitchener, 2010). Studies conducted by

Ferris and Roberts (2001) examined the effectiveness of different types of indirect feedback. The finding revealed no difference between the different types (Bitchener, 2010).

Manifold studies have investigated the influence of various kinds of direct written CF on students' accuracy development. They came up with the fact that students receiving direct CF and oral elaborations did better than other groups. Karimi and Fotovatnia (2010) revealed that focused CF and Unfocused CF can equally contribute to the grammatical accuracy in L2 writing. Then, Farrokhi (2011) proved focused CF as more effective on the students' improved grammatical accuracy than unfocused CF in terms of pedagogy. In addition, Frear (2010) proved that no difference existed among the three groups.

It was found that the experimental class did better than control group in terms of their performance on second writing. Then, Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2011) found that focus feedback performed better than the other groups in terms of grammar accuracy. Then, Kassim and Lee Luan Ng (2014) found that the experiment groups did better than the control group. Moreover, Fateme Saeb (2013) found that there was a great improvement in accuracy for the two experimental groups. However, there was no significant difference between the focused and unfocused groups. Next, Araghi and Sahebkhair (2014) revealed that the focused group performed better than unfocused and control groups.

It also showed that gender did not influence the learners' grammar accuracy over effectiveness of focused and unfocused feedback. Next, Ellis et al. (2008) investigated the effects of focused and unfocused CF. They found that the feedback gave effect for both focused and unfocused groups. Then, Sheen et al. (2009) found that focused CF contributed to grammatical accuracy in L2 writing. Later, Frear (2010) found that the experimental groups performed better than the group receiving no feedback in L2 writing. Rouhi and Samiei (2010) also studied on the effectiveness of focused and unfocused indirect feedback.

They found that there was no statistically significant difference among the three groups. Then, Sun (2013) revealed that the focused group improved significantly in the accuracy of case forms while the unfocused and the control group did not make any apparent progress. The results indicated that focused WCF was effective in increasing case accuracy in learners' writings.

Studies on the impact of direct corrective feedback have also been conducted (see Mirzaii, Aliabadi, 2013; (Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2014; Vyatkina, 2010; Jiang & Xiao,

2014; and Hartshorn., 2015). (Mirzaii, Mostafa., Aliabadi, Reza Bozorg, 2013) revealed that direct was more effective than indirect feedback. (Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W, 2014) found that direct feedback is more helpful. (Vyatkina, N, 2010) also found that all groups improved their accuracy in redrafting. (Jiang, L., & Xiao, H, 2014) found that both the direct-only correction and the direct metalinguistic correction benefited explicit and implicit knowledge.

Some researchers relate the advantages in using direct corrective feedback; (Hartshorn., K. James, 2015) their study observed dynamic feedback on rhetorical appropriateness. The study by Stefanou & Révész, (2015) found that respondents with higher grammatical sensitivity proved more likely to achieve gains in the direct feedback, Then, (Han, Y, 2012) found that direct feedback can significantly increase learners' writing. The similar researches were also conducted (see Sheen, 2007; Daneshvar & Rahimi, 2014; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012; Moazamie & Mansour, 2013). (Sheen, Younghee, 2007) found that written feedback improved learners' accuracy. (Daneshvar, E.,

& Rahimi, A, 2014) the lasting effect of recast was more helpful than the lasting effect of direct focused on the grammatical accuracy. (Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S., 2012) focused feedback is more effective than unfocused feedback. Moreover, (Moazamie, Parvin., & Mansour, Koosha, 2013) found that there is **no significant difference between** EA-based and CA- based error correction. (Maleki, Ataollah., & Eslami, Elham, 2013) revealed that the recipients of feedback achieved better than those in the control group.

Studies **on the effectiveness of** feedback have also been conducted by ( Zabor & Rychlewska, 2015; Wawire, 2013; Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2008; and Kurzer, 2017). (Zabor, L., & Rychlewska, A, 2015), revealed that feedback improved the learners' accuracy. Then, (Wawire, B. A., 2013) indicated that students appreciate and prefer feedback structured within the sociocultural framework. (Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F, 2008) revealed that corrective feedback can be effective in improving students' accuracy. Then, (Kurzer, Kendon, 2017) found that **direct written corrective feedback** was helpful to improve linguistic accuracy.

Studies on the effect of direct/ indirect and focus/ unfocus **corrective feedback have been conducted** (see Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017; Amirani, Ghanbari, & Shamsoddini, 2013; Jamalinesari, Rahimi, Gowhary, & Azizifar, 2015; and Kassim & Ng, 2014). (Farjadnasab, Amir Hossein., & Khodashenas, Mohammad Reza, 2017) revealed that direct feedback gives facilitative effect on students' writing accuracy. Then, (Amirani, Sara., Ghanbari, Batoul., & Shamsoddini, Mohammad Rza, 2013) considered to be useful in methodological issues related to writing ability, grammar instruction and error correction techniques. Then, a study by (Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H.,

& Azizifar, A, 2015) revealed that the class with indirect feedback improved better than direct feedback. (Kassim, Asiah., & Ng, Lee Luan, 2014) also found that **there was no significant difference between the unfocused and focused** feedback. The similar studies also conducted by some experts (see Poorebrahim, 2017; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Moini, & Salami, 2013; Esther Lee, 2013). (Poorebrahim, Fatemeh, 2017) found that more explicit feedback is better for revising purposes; on the contrary, more implicit feedback is good for learning purposes. (Frear, David & Chiu, Y.

H, 2015) found that both focused indirect feedback and unfocused indirect feedback were unable to notice the target structure. (Moini, Mohammad Raouf., & Salami, Malihe, 2013) found that unfocused group achieved the highest accuracy gain scores. (Esther Lee, 2013) found, that the most frequent type of corrective feedback was recasts. Studies on Focused corrective feedback by (Saeb, 2014; Sonja 2013). (Saeb, Fateme, 2014). She revealed that focused group did **better than both unfocused and control** groups. Later, (Sonja Huiying Sun, 2013) indicated that **focused written corrective feedback** was useful in improving writing accuracy.

Different with all studies above, this research emphasizes on measuring the effect of the effect of four types of corrective feedbacks on learners' writing performance, namely: focus direct feedback (FDF) ; unfocus direct feedback (UDF); focus indirect feedback (FIF); and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF). The novelty of this study is that the the focus and unfocus corrective feedback are involved and taken into consideration for deeper analyzing of **the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback in L2 writing** class.

In this case, the aim was to measure the effect of the **different types of corrective** feedbacks on learners' writing performance. Method The study applied quasi using experimental research using pre test post test design with intact L2 writing classes. The participants were 65 L2 learners at IAIN Palangka Raya of 2018/ 2019 academic years. The participants were assigned into four groups: focus direct feedback (FDF) class (17 learners); unfocus direct feedback (UDF) class (16 learners); focus indirect feedback (FIF) class (16 learners); and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF) class (16 learners); The distribution of the participants was described in Table 1. Table 1.

The distribution of the Participants Types of Feedbacks \_Number \_ \_Focused Direct Feedback (FDF) \_17 \_ \_Unfocused Direct Feedback (UDF) \_16 \_ \_Focused Indirect Feedback (FIF) \_16 \_ \_Unfocused Indirect Feedback (UIF) \_16 \_ \_Total \_50 \_ \_ Procedures The entire study was spread over one semester in writing essay class. Each meeting was done a week for 16 meetings. At the early beginning, all participants were given pretest



to observe the existing ability in writing essay. Then, the participants were divided into four group classes: focus direct feedback (FDF) class (17 learners); unfocus direct feedback (UDF) class (16 learners); focus indirect feedback (FIF) class (16 learners); and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF) class (16 learners). In FDF and FIF classes the teacher provided the feedback by (1) indicating the location of errors by circling the errors of only one certain type of linguistic error each time (i.e.

Examining subject-verb agreement for the first writing product, examining missing words for the second writing product, and examining punctuation for the third writing product) and providing the correct relevant forms for FDF and UDF classes. Meanwhile, in UDF and UIF classes, the teacher provided the feedback for all linguistic errors on the learners' writing product, and only locating the errors and not providing the correct relevant forms for FIF and UIF classes. At the last session, all participants were given writing test. They should write an essay about 450-500 words. The students' composition were scored using the scoring method as developed by Wiegler (2002, p.

116) and scoring standard of IAIN Palangka Raya (2011, p. 15). It was done to produce the right criteria to score learners' essay writing. Data Analysis The null hypothesis was that **there was no significant** difference on Learners' Writing Performance as seen from different Corrective Feedbacks given. To response the single research question; Kruskal Wallis test and **Mann Whitney U test** were applied to determine if **there was a significant** difference or not on Learners' Writing Performance as seen from different Corrective Feedbacks given.

Kruskal Wallis test is a one-way analysis of variance carried out on rank (Ary, Lucy, Chris, and Asghar, 2010, p.644). Meanwhile, **Mann Whitney U test** is a statistical test for the difference in the group means for two independent samples when the dependant variable is ranked data (Ary, Lucy, Chris, and Asghar, 2010, p.645). To analyze the data, Kruskal Wallis test was applied **to compare the means** of two or more independent groups. Then, in the pos hoc test, **Mann Whitney U test** was used to see the different means of groups with different treatment.

It was used to see **whether there was a significant difference between** groups. All statistical procedures were calculated using SPSS software (version 16). Result Before testing using Kruskal Wallis, the four groups of data had different form of spread as illustrated in Figure 1. Then, Kruskal Wallis test would be applied to test the hypothesis. / Figure 1. The data spread of four groups Partially, the spread of the data of each group, as explained in the following figures. / Figure 2. Learners' writing performance using Focus Direct Feedback / Figure 3.

Learners' writing performance using Unfocus Direct Feedback / Figure 4. Learners' writing performance using Focus Indirect Feedback / Figure 5. Learners' writing performance using Unfocus Indirect Feedback Based on the output above, it was said the data had different form of spread. Therefore, the statistical calculation for Kruskal Wallis could be continued, as described in Table 2. Table 2. Kruskal Wallis Test Ranks

_Types of feedbacks (X)	_N	_Mean Rank	_Writing performance (Y)
_Focus direct feedback (X1)	_17	_25.76	
_Unfocus direct feedback (X2)	_16	_45.00	
_Focus indirect feedback (X3)	_16	_15.72	
_Unfocus indirect feedback (X4)	_16	_45.97	
_Total	_65		

The output found that the mean rank for unfocused indirect feedback (45.97) was higher than unfocused direct feedback (45.00).

The mean rank for unfocused direct feedback was higher than focus direct feedback ( 25.76). and the mean rank for focus direct feedback ( 25.76) was higher than focus direct feedback ( 15.72). Based on the output, there was a difference on the means score among the four group. The next procedure was to measure whether the difference of the means was significant or not, as illustrated in table 3. Table 3. Test Statistics<sup>a,b</sup>

_Writing performance (Y)	_Chi-Square	_df	_3	_Asymp. Sig.	_0.000	_Kruskal Wallis Test
_b. Grouping Variable: types of feedbacks(X)	29.949	3				

The output of Chi-Square was 29.949 and asymp.Sig. was 0.000.

it meant that Chi-Square= 29.949;  $p < 0.05$ . It was said that different types of feedbacks gave facilitative effect on the learners' writing performance. The next step was to do post hoc test using Mann Whitney U test in order to test the different means of groups with different treatment. It was used to see whether there was a significant difference between groups partially: (a) between focus direct feedback and unfocus direct feedback; (b) between focus direct feedback and focus indirect feedback; (c) between focus direct feedback and unfocus indirect feedback; (d) between unfocus direct feedback and focus indirect feedback; and (e) between unfocus direct feedback and unfocus indirect feedback.

Assumption for Mann Whitney U test Mann Whitney U test the so-called Wilcoxon Rank sum test is a non parametric test to test the difference between means. Before testing using Mann Whitney U test, the assumption of Mann Whitney was counted, such as the data variables were ordinal, interval or ratio; the normality test was not fulfilled; the variables were independent; and the variances of both groups were homogeneous. To test the normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied since the data were more than 50, as illustrated in Table 4. Table 4. Tests of Normality

_Types of feedbacks (X)	_Kolmogorov-Smirnova	_Shapiro-Wilk	_Statistic	_df	_Sig.
_Writing Performance (Y)					
_Focus direct feedback	.175	.17			.177

\_Statistic \_df \_Sig. \_Writing Performance (Y) \_Focus direct feedback .175 17 .177



\_.960 \_17 \_635 \_ \_ \_Unfocus direct feedback \_155 \_16 \_200\* \_934 \_16 \_286 \_ \_ \_Focus indirect feedback \_166 \_16 \_200\* \_915 \_16 \_138 \_ \_ \_Unfocus indirect feedback \_165 \_16 \_200\* \_899 \_16 \_077 \_ \_a. Lilliefors Significance Correction \_ \_ \_ \_ \_\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance. \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ Based on the kolmogorov Smirnov test, the sig value of focus direct feedback (0.177); unfocus direct feedback (0.200); focus indirect feedback (0.200); unfocus indirect feedback (0.200). Since they were higher than 0.05, it was said that the data were not normally distributed, and it was one of the assumption test for Mann Whitney U test. The next step was to test the homogeneity using Levene's test as explained in Table 5. Table 5.

Levene's Test \_ \_Levene Statistic \_df1 \_df2 \_Sig. \_ \_Writingperformance (Y) \_Based on Mean \_585 \_3 \_61 \_627 \_ \_Based on Median \_403 \_3 \_61 \_752 \_ \_Based on Median and with adjusted df \_403 \_3 \_49.608 \_752 \_ \_Based on trimmed mean \_513 \_3 \_61 \_675 \_ \_ Since the Sig. value of based on mean is 0.627 higher than 0.05, the varian of four groups were the same or homogeneous. The next step was to test the hypothesis using Mann whitney test in order to see the difference of learners' writing performance between focus direct feedback and unfocus direct feedback, as described in Table 6. Table 6.

Ranks \_ \_ \_Types of feedbacks (X) \_N \_Mean Rank \_Sum of Ranks \_ \_writingperformance(Y) \_Focus direct feedback \_17 \_11.82 \_201.00 \_ \_Unfocus direct feedback \_16 \_22.50 \_360.00 \_ \_Total \_33 \_ \_ \_ The table showed the mean rank of focus direct feedback (11.82) is lower than The mean rank of unfocus direct feedback (22.50). then, based on table statistics, it was described in Table 7. Table 7. Test Statisticsb \_ \_Writing performance (Y) \_Mann-Whitney U \_48.000 \_Wilcoxon W \_201.000 \_Z \_-3.180 \_Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) \_0.001 \_Exact Sig. [2\*(1-tailed Sig.)] \_0.001a \_ \_ The value of U was 48 and the value of W was 201.

Since the value of Z -3.180. The P value was  $0.001 < 0.05$ ; therefore, there was a significance on learners' writing performance between focus direct feedback and unfocus direct feedback. The next step was to see the difference of learners' writing performance between focus direct feedback and focus indirect feedback, as decribed in Table 8. Table 8. Ranks \_ \_ \_Types of feedbacks(x) \_N \_Mean Rank \_Sum of Ranks \_ \_Writing performance (y) \_Focus direct feedback \_17 \_20.65 \_351.00 \_ \_Focus indirect feedback \_16 \_13.12 \_210.00 \_ \_Total \_33 \_ \_ \_ The table showed the mean rank of focusdirectfeedback (20.65) was higher than The mean rank of focus indirect feedback (13.12). then, the table statistics was described in Table 9. Table 9.

Test Statisticsb \_ \_Writing performance (y) \_Mann-Whitney U \_74.000 \_Wilcoxon W \_210.000 \_Z \_-2.243 \_Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) \_0.025 \_Exact Sig. [2\*(1-tailed Sig.)] \_0.025a

The value of U was 74 and the value of W was 210. Since the value of Z -2.243, and P value was  $0.025 < 0.05$ , it was said that there was a significance on learners' writing performance between focus direct feedback and focus indirect feedback. The next step was to test the hypothesis in order to see the difference of learners' writing performance between focus direct feedback and unfocus indirect feedback, as explained in Table 10. Table 10.

Ranks \_ \_ Types of feedbacks (X) \_ N \_ Mean Rank \_ Sum of Ranks \_ Writing performance (Y) \_ Focus direct feedback \_17 \_11.29 \_192.00 \_ \_ Unfocus indirect feedback \_16 \_23.06 \_369.00 \_ \_ Total \_33 \_ \_ \_ The table showed the mean rank of focus direct feedback (11.29) was lower than The mean rank of unfocus indirect feedback (23.06). then, the table statistics was described in Table 11. Table 11. Test Statisticsb \_ \_ Writing performance(Y) \_ Mann-Whitney U \_39.000 \_ Wilcoxon W \_192.000 \_ Z \_-3.504 \_ Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) \_0.000 \_ Exact Sig. [2\*(1-tailed Sig.)] \_0.000a \_ The value of U was 39 and the value of W was 192.

Since the value of Z -3.504, and P value was  $0.000 < 0.05$ , it was said that there was a significance on learners' writing performance between focus direct feedback and unfocus indirect feedback. The next step was to test the hypothesis to see the difference of learners' writing performance between unfocus direct feedback and focus indirect feedback, as described in Table 12. Table 12. Ranks \_ \_ Types of feedbacks (x) \_ N \_ Mean Rank \_ Sum of Ranks \_ Writing performance (y) \_ Unfocus direct feedback \_16 \_23.19 \_371.00 \_ \_ Focus indirect feedback \_16 \_9.81 \_157.00 \_ \_ Total \_32 \_ \_ \_ The table showed the mean rank of focus direct feedback (23.19) was higher than The mean rank of unfocus indirect feedback (9.81). then, the table statistics was described in Table 13. Table 13. Test Statisticsb \_ \_ Writing performance (y) \_ Mann-Whitney U \_21.000 \_ Wilcoxon W \_157.000 \_ Z \_-4.041 \_ Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) \_0.000 \_ Exact Sig. [2\*(1-tailed Sig.)] \_0.000a \_ The value of U was 21 and the value of W was 157.

Since the value of Z -4,041. The P value was  $0.000 < 0.05$ , it was said that there was a significance on learners' writing performance between unfocus direct feedback and focus indirect feedback. The next step was to test the hypothesis in order to see the difference of learners' writing performance between unfocus direct feedback and unfocus indirect feedback as described in Table 14. Table 14. Ranks \_ \_ typesoffeedbacks(x) \_ N \_ Mean Rank \_ Sum of Ranks \_ writingperformance(y) \_ unfocusdirectfeedback \_16 \_16.31 \_261.00 \_ \_ unfocusindirectfeedback \_16 \_16.69 \_267.00 \_ \_ Total \_32 \_ \_ \_ The table showed the mean rank of unfocus direct feedback (16.31) was lower than The mean rank of unfocus indirect feedback (16.69). then, the table statistics was described in Table 15. Table 15. Test Statisticsb \_ \_ Writing performance (y) \_ Mann-Whitney U \_125.000 \_ Wilcoxon W \_261.000 \_ Z \_-.113 \_

\_Asymp. Sig.

(2-tailed) .910 \_Exact Sig. [2\*(1-tailed Sig.)] .926a \_ \_ The value of U was 125 and the value of W was 261. Since the value of Z -0.113. The P value was  $0.910 > 0.05$ , it was said that there was no significance on learners' writing performance between unfocus direct feedback and unfocus indirect feedback Conclusion Based on the Kusskall Walis test, it revealed that the mean rank for focus direct feedback was 25.76; unfocus direct feedback was 45.00; focus indirect feedback was 15.72; and unfocus indirect feedback was 45.97. In this case, unfocused indirect feedback (45.97) was higher than unfocused direct feedback (45.00). unfocused direct feedback (45.00) was higher than focus direct feedback ( 25.76). and focus direct feedback ( 25.76) is higher than focus direct feedback ( 15.72). It was said that there was a difference on the means score among the four group. the value of Chi-Square was 29.949 and asymp.Sig.

was 0.000. it meant that Chi-Square= 29.949;  $p < 0.05$ . It can be inferred that different types of feedbacks gave facilitative effect on the learners' writing performance. Then, partially, based on the Mann Whitney U test, it revealed that there was a significance difference between (a) between focus direct feedback (FDF) and unfocus direct feedback (UDF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; (b) between focus direct feedback (FDF) and focus indirect feedback (FIF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; (c) between focus direct feedback (FDF) and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; (d) between unfocus direct feedback (UDF) and focus indirect feedback(FIF) ( $p < 0.05$ ). However, there was no significance difference between unfocus direct feedback (UDF)and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF) ( $p > 0.05$ ), as illustrated in Table 16.

Table 10. Conclusion of Mann Whitney U test \_Learners' writing performance \_ \_Types of test \_FDF and UDF \_FDF and FIF \_FDF and UIF \_UDF and FIF \_UDF and UIF \_Mann-Whitney U \_48.000 \_74.000 \_39.000 \_21.000 \_125.000 \_ \_Wilcoxon W \_201.000 \_210.000 \_192.000 \_157.000 \_261.000 \_ \_Z \_-3.180 \_-2.243 \_-3.504 \_-4.041 \_-.113 \_ \_Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) .001 .025 .000 .000 .910 \_ \_Exact Sig. [2\*(1-tailed Sig.)] .001a .025a .000a .000a .926a \_ \_p.value \_< 0.05 \_< 0.05 \_< 0.05 \_< 0.05 \_>0.05 \_ \_conclusion \_significance \_significance \_significance \_significance \_Not significance \_ \_ Discussion Based on the finding, it was said that different types of feedbacks gave facilitative effect on the learners' writing performance.The Kusskall Walis test revealed that the mean rank for focus direct feedback was 25.76; unfocus direct feedback was 45.00; focus indirect feedback was 15.72; and unfocus indirect feedback was45.97. In could be inferred that unfocused indirect feedback (45.97) was higher than unfocused direct feedback (45.00). unfocused direct feedback (45.00) was higher than focus direct feedback ( 25.76). and focus direct feedback ( 25.76) was higher than focus direct feedback ( 15.72).

Then, partially, based on the Mann Whitney U test, it revealed that there was a significance difference between (a) between focus direct feedback (FDF) and unfocus direct feedback (UDF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; (b) between focus direct feedback (FDF) and focus indirect feedback (FIF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; (c) between focus direct feedback (FDF) and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; (d) between unfocus direct feedback (UDF) and focus indirect feedback (FIF) ( $p < 0.05$ ) ; In contrast, there was no significance difference between unfocus direct feedback (UDF) and unfocus indirect feedback (UIF) ( $p > 0.05$ ).

This finding was supported by Frear (2010) on the effects focused direct Corrective feedback on the students' use of past tense to unfocused direct Corrective feedback and another group receiving no feedback. The researcher proved that no difference existed among the three groups. It was found that the experimental groups did better than the group receiving no feedback in terms of their performance on second writing. Then, Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2011) found that focus feedback performed better than the other groups in terms of grammar accuracy.

Moreover, Araghi and Sahebkhair (2014) revealed that the focused group performed better than both unfocused and control groups. It also showed that gender did not influence the learners' grammar accuracy over effectiveness of focused and unfocused feedback. Next, Ellis et al. (2008) found that the feedback gave effect for both focused and unfocused groups. Then, Sheen et al. (2009) found that focused CF contributed to grammatical accuracy in L2 writing. The finding was also in accordance with Asiah Kassim and Lee Luan Ng (2014) who revealed that both treatment groups did better than the control group. However, there was no significant difference between the unfocused and focused corrective feedback groups.

Moreover, Fateme Saeb (2013) found that there was a significant improvement in accuracy for the two experimental groups. However, there was no significant difference between the focused and unfocused groups. References Ary, Donald, Lucy, C.J. Chris, S, and Asghar R (2010). Introduction to Research in Education (Eighth edition). United States: Wadsworth Cengage Learning. Amirani, Sara., Ghanbari, Batoul., & Shamsoddini, Mohammad Rza. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL students' writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83(2007). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.18>, 1000–1005.

Araghi and Sahebkhair (2014) The Effect of Focused Versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Developing Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners' Written Performance Within Different Gender Groups *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences* ISSN: 2231– 6345 (Online)An Open Access, Online International

Journal Available at [www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2014/03/jls.htm](http://www.cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2014/03/jls.htm) 2014 Vol. 4 (S3), pp. 720-729. 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(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>, 191–205. Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback.

*Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>, 102–118. Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). Research on written cf in language classes. In *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*, 49–74. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924>, 409–431. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2010.10.002>, 207–217.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2) <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>, 193–214. Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effect of error correction in L2 writing: not so straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 18(2), 136–140. Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3) [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9), 267–296. Daneshvar, E., & Rahimi, A. (2014).

Written corrective feedback and teaching grammar. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.317>, 217–221. Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>, 353–371. Ellis, Rod. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>, 97–107. Ellis, Rod. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2). <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>, 97–107. Ellis, R. (2008).

A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 28(2), 97–107. Ellis, R. 2009. Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal* 1: 3-18. Elashri, I. (2013). The impact of the direct teacher feedback strategy on the EFL secondary stage students' writing performance. (Unpublished Ph.d. dissertation). Faculty of Education, Mansoura University, Egypt. Esther Lee, E. J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 41(2).



<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.01.022>, 217–230. Farjadnasab, Amir Hossein., & Khodashenas, Mohammad Reza. (2017).

The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Research in English Education*, 30–42. Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2012). The effects of direct written corrective feedback on improvement of grammatical accuracy of high-proficient L2 learners. *World Journal of Education*, 2(2).

<https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v2n2p49>, 49–57. Frear, D. (2010). The Effect of Focused and Unfocused Direct Written Corrective Feedback on a New Piece of Writing, *College English: Issues and Trends*, 3, 59-71. Frear, David & Chiu, Y. H. (2015).

The effect of focused and unfocused indirect written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing. *System*, 53.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.006>, 24–34. Farrokhi, F. (2011) The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 12, pp. 1797-1803, December 2011 © 2011 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland. doi:10.4304/tpls.1.12.1797-1803. Ferris, D. (2003). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Writing* Classes. Michigan: University of Michigan Press. Ferris, D. (2006).

Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long- term effects of written error correction. In *Feedback in second language writing?: contexts and issues*.

[https://books.google.gr/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Xn0kwWNy-loC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=error+feedback+in+L2&ots=tVbHwC2McF&sig=L3Chg7yII16Wb\\_rSXKOdl43Bt7U&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=error+feedback+in+L2&f=false](https://books.google.gr/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Xn0kwWNy-loC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=error+feedback+in+L2&ots=tVbHwC2McF&sig=L3Chg7yII16Wb_rSXKOdl43Bt7U&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=error+feedback+in+L2&f=false), 81–100. Ferris, D. R. (2002).

*Treatment of error in second language writing classes*. . Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Ferris, D. R. (2010). *Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2).

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490>, 181–201. Ferris, D. R. . (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.04.005>, 49–62. Ferris, D. R. & Hedgcock, J. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001).

Error feedback in L2 writing classes how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X), 161–184.



Han, Y. (2012). The intra- and inter-task effectiveness of direct and indirect written corrective feedback. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 9(2), 71–96. Hartshorn., K. James. (2015). The effects of dynamic written corrective feedback: A 30-week study. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>, 6–34. Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The effects of teacher-written direct vs. indirect feedback on students' writing.

*Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018>, 116–123. Jiang, L., & Xiao, H. (2014). The efficacy of written corrective feedback and language analytic ability on Chinese learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of English articles. *English Language Teaching*, 7(10). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n10p22>, 22–34. Karimi, M., & Fotovatnia, Z. (2010). The Effects of focused vs. Unfocused Written Teacher Correction on the Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Undergraduates. *The Asian EFL journal*, 62, 117-141. Kassim, Asiah., & Ng, Lee Luan. (2014).

Investigating the efficacy of focused and unfocused corrective feedback on the accurate use of prepositions in written work. *English Language Teaching*, 7(2). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v7n2p119>, 119–130. Kurzer, Kendon. (2017). Dynamic written corrective feedback in developmental multilingual writing classes. *TESOL Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.366>. Lee, Icy. (2004). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(3), 144–164. Lee, Icy. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(3), 144–164. Lee, Icy. (2014).

Teachers' reflection on implementation of innovative feedback approaches in EFL writing. *English Teaching*, Vol. 69, No. 1, Spring 2014, 23-40. Maleki, Ataollah., & Eslami, Elham. (2013). The effects of written corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' control over grammatical construction of their written English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(7). <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.7.1250-1257>, 1250–1257. Moazamie, Parvin., & Mansour, Koosha. (2013). The effect of CA-based vs. EA-based error correction on Iranian EFL intermediate learners' lexical errors of writing. *IJRELT Vol 1. No. 1. 2013*, 39–44. Moini, Mohammad Raouf., & Salami, Malihe. (2013).

The impact of indirect focused and unfocused corrective feedback on written accuracy. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and research* Volume 2, Issue 4, Winter 2013, 32–41. Moser, M & Jasmine, J. (2010). Using Peer Feedback with High School Students to Improve the Use of Analogies and Symbolism within Creative Writing. Unpublished, MA, Thesis, Caldwell College .1475259. Mirzaii, Mostafa., Aliabadi,

Reza Bozorg. (2013). Direct and indirect written corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction on job application letter writing. *Journal of Writing Research*, 5(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2013.05.02.2>, 191–213. O'Sullivan, I., & Chambers, A. (2006).

Learners' writing skills in French Corpus consultation and learner evaluation. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 49–68. Poorebrahim, Fatemeh. (2017). Indirect written corrective feedback, revision, and learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 6 No. 2, January 2017. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4843>, 184–192. Purnawarman, P. (2011). Impacts of Different Types of Teacher Corrective Feedback in Reducing Grammatical Errors on ESL/EFL Students Writing. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Impacts-of-Different-Types-of-Teacher-Corrective-in-Purnawarman/2677b30d3d64d12e16b73322462ac3c6dab475f5>

Rouhi A and Samiei M (2010). The Effects of Focused and Unfocused indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learner. *Social Science* 5(6) 481–485. Saeb, Fateme. (2013). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on the grammatical accuracy of beginner EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.2p.22>, 22–26.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255–283. Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002>, 556–569. Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Correction on the Accurate Use of Grammatical Forms by Adult ESL Learners. *System*, 37, 556–569. Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom.

Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32(2), 203–234. \ Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' accuracy in using two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, 64(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12029>, 103–131. Sonja Huiying Sun. (2013). Written corrective feedback: Effects of focused and unfocused grammar correction on the case acquisition in L2 German. *German: Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004>. Sun, S. H. (2013), Written Corrective Feedback: Effects Of Focused And Unfocused Grammar Correction On The Case Acquisition In L2 German. Dissertation. German department of University of Kansas. Stefanou, C., & Révész, A. (2015).

Direct written corrective feedback, learner differences, and the acquisition of second language article use for generic and specific plural reference. *Modern Language Journal*, 99(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.1263>, 263–282. Talatifard, S. (2016). The Effect of reactive focused corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *Journal of Advances in English Language Teaching*, 4 (3), pp.40-48 Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learner's written accuracy. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156(0). <https://doi.org/10.2143/ITL.156.0.20344>, 279–296. Vyatkina, N. (2010).

The effectiveness of written corrective feedback in teaching beginning German. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2010.01108.x>, 671–689. Vyatkina, N. (2011). Writing instruction and policies for written corrective feedback in the basic language sequence. *L2 Journal*, 3(1), 63–92. Wawire, B. A. (2013). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback taking a sociocultural approach. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1417775866?accountid=14598>. Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Zabor, L., & Rychlewska, A. (2015).

The effectiveness of written corrective feedback in the acquisition of the English article system by Polish learners in view of the counterbalance hypothesis. *Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 25. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07686-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-07686-7_8), 131–150.

#### INTERNET SOURCES:

-----  
 <1% - <https://www.colorincolorado.org/article/five-things-teachers-can-do-improve-learning-ells-new-year>  
 <1% - [https://mafiadoc.com/issn-2251-6204\\_59ccc5b51723dda83b5d20f3.html](https://mafiadoc.com/issn-2251-6204_59ccc5b51723dda83b5d20f3.html)  
 <1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1060374310000421>  
 1% - [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276247681\\_Written\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_Focused\\_and\\_Unfocused](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/276247681_Written_Corrective_Feedback_Focused_and_Unfocused)  
 <1% - [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267556526\\_The\\_Effects\\_of\\_Direct\\_Written\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Improvement\\_of\\_Grammatical\\_Accuracy\\_of\\_High-proficient\\_L2\\_Learners](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267556526_The_Effects_of_Direct_Written_Corrective_Feedback_on_Improvement_of_Grammatical_Accuracy_of_High-proficient_L2_Learners)  
 <1% - <http://www.doc88.com/p-5428958774095.html>  
 <1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286136349\\_Investigating\\_the\\_Efficacy\\_of\\_Focused\\_and\\_Unfocused\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_on\\_the\\_Accurate\\_Use\\_of\\_Prepositions\\_in\\_Written\\_Work](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286136349_Investigating_the_Efficacy_of_Focused_and_Unfocused_Corrective_Feedback_on_the_Accurate_Use_of_Prepositions_in_Written_Work)

<1% -

<https://stats.idre.ucla.edu/spss/whatstat/what-statistical-analysis-should-i-usestatistical-analyses-using-spss/>

<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4853380/>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275542861\\_The\\_Effect\\_of\\_Unfocused\\_Written\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Syntactic\\_and\\_Lexical\\_Complexity\\_of\\_L2\\_Writing](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275542861_The_Effect_of_Unfocused_Written_Corrective_Feedback_on_Syntactic_and_Lexical_Complexity_of_L2_Writing)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278401546\\_Corrective\\_feedback\\_preferences\\_and\\_learner\\_repair\\_among\\_advanced\\_ESL\\_students](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/278401546_Corrective_feedback_preferences_and_learner_repair_among_advanced_ESL_students)

<1% - <http://www.asiatefl.org/rss/>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333608426\\_Twenty-five\\_years\\_of\\_research\\_on\\_oral\\_and\\_written\\_corrective\\_feedback\\_in\\_System](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333608426_Twenty-five_years_of_research_on_oral_and_written_corrective_feedback_in_System)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/post/One-Way\\_ANOVA\\_or\\_Kruskal-Wallis\\_which\\_one\\_should\\_I\\_use](https://www.researchgate.net/post/One-Way_ANOVA_or_Kruskal-Wallis_which_one_should_I_use)

<1% - <https://www.statpac.com/statistics-calculator/percents.htm>

<1% - <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2405942/>

<1% - [https://mafiadoc.com/the-iranian-efl-journal\\_5c82ec1c097c47ee7d8b524f.html](https://mafiadoc.com/the-iranian-efl-journal_5c82ec1c097c47ee7d8b524f.html)

<1% - <https://quizlet.com/233509807/hsci-390-study-guide-flash-cards/>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X08000390>

<1% -

[http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/BS/BS704\\_Nonparametric/BS704\\_Nonparametric4.html](http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/BS/BS704_Nonparametric/BS704_Nonparametric4.html)

<1% -

[https://mafiadoc.com/modern-journal-of-language-teaching-methods\\_5c9e2e8c097c47ce628b45f4.html](https://mafiadoc.com/modern-journal-of-language-teaching-methods_5c9e2e8c097c47ce628b45f4.html)

<1% -

[https://mafiadoc.com/3-corporate-ownership-control-postal-\\_5996fb081723ddcf69a41e1b.html](https://mafiadoc.com/3-corporate-ownership-control-postal-_5996fb081723ddcf69a41e1b.html)

<1% - <https://www.researchgate.net/topic/Mann-Whitney-U-test>

<1% - [https://mafiadoc.com/the-iranian-efl-journal\\_5afd903f8ead0e14228b4574.html](https://mafiadoc.com/the-iranian-efl-journal_5afd903f8ead0e14228b4574.html)

<1% -

<https://panel.waset.org/abstracts?q=congenitally%20corrected%20transposition%20of%20great%20arteries>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319551429\\_Teaching\\_Grammar\\_through\\_Task-Based\\_Language\\_Teaching\\_to\\_Young\\_EFL\\_Learners](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319551429_Teaching_Grammar_through_Task-Based_Language_Teaching_to_Young_EFL_Learners)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287213875\\_The\\_Effect\\_of\\_Peer-feedback\\_on\\_EFL\\_Medical\\_Students'\\_Writing\\_Performance](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287213875_The_Effect_of_Peer-feedback_on_EFL_Medical_Students'_Writing_Performance)

<1% - <http://cibtech.org/sp.ed/jls/2014/03/JLS-096-S3-062-FARNAZ-THE-GROUPS.pdf>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222298830\\_The\\_effects\\_of\\_focused\\_and\\_unfocused\\_written\\_corrective\\_feedback\\_in\\_an\\_English\\_as\\_a\\_foreign\\_language\\_context](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/222298830_The_effects_of_focused_and_unfocused_written_corrective_feedback_in_an_English_as_a_foreign_language_context)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275542221\\_The\\_Effect\\_of\\_Written\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Iranian\\_EFL\\_Students'\\_Writing](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275542221_The_Effect_of_Written_Corrective_Feedback_on_Iranian_EFL_Students'_Writing)

<1% - [http://are.ui.ac.ir/article\\_21347.html](http://are.ui.ac.ir/article_21347.html)

<1% - [https://journal.iain-samarinda.ac.id/index.php/dinamika\\_ilmu/article/view/649](https://journal.iain-samarinda.ac.id/index.php/dinamika_ilmu/article/view/649)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332402657\\_Li\\_S\\_Roshan\\_S\\_2019\\_The\\_associations\\_between\\_working\\_memory\\_and\\_the\\_effects\\_of\\_four\\_different\\_types\\_of\\_written\\_corrective\\_feedback\\_Journal\\_of\\_Second\\_Language\\_Writing\\_First\\_view](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332402657_Li_S_Roshan_S_2019_The_associations_between_working_memory_and_the_effects_of_four_different_types_of_written_corrective_feedback_Journal_of_Second_Language_Writing_First_view)

<1% - <http://journals.uhd.edu.iq/index.php/juhd/article/view/201>

<1% - [https://www.academia.edu/5124239/Written\\_Corrective\\_Feedback](https://www.academia.edu/5124239/Written_Corrective_Feedback)

<1% - [http://jimelwood.net/students/grips/tables\\_figures/bitchener\\_2008.pdf](http://jimelwood.net/students/grips/tables_figures/bitchener_2008.pdf)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248545543\\_Designing\\_research\\_into\\_the\\_effects\\_of\\_grammar\\_correction\\_in\\_L2\\_writing\\_Not\\_so\\_straightforward](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248545543_Designing_research_into_the_effects_of_grammar_correction_in_L2_writing_Not_so_straightforward)

<1% - <https://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/itl.17013.jak>

<1% -

<https://glasgow.rl.talis.com/lists/D475620E-AB8C-3D63-D205-F0560B758ABC/bibliography>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319488281\\_The\\_Impact\\_of\\_Teacher\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_on\\_EFL\\_Student\\_Writers'\\_Grammatical\\_Improvement](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319488281_The_Impact_of_Teacher_Corrective_Feedback_on_EFL_Student_Writers'_Grammatical_Improvement)

<1% -

[http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0123-46412013000200009](http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0123-46412013000200009)

<1% -

<http://www.academypublication.com/ojs/index.php/tpls/article/view/tpls0703166175>

<1% - <http://riset.unisma.ac.id/index.php/LANG/article/view/2862>

<1% - <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23247797.2017.1315267>

<1% - <http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=xgnpvGMAAAAJ&hl=en>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333622473\\_A\\_systematic\\_review\\_of\\_written\\_c](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333622473_A_systematic_review_of_written_c)

orrective\_feedback\_research\_in\_ESLEFL\_contexts

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270039573\\_Retrospective\\_vs\\_Pro prospective\\_Cor rective\\_Feedback\\_Impacts\\_on\\_Developing\\_EFL\\_Learners'\\_Writing\\_Ability\\_and\\_Learner\\_Au tonomy](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270039573_Retrospective_vs_Pro prospective_Cor rective_Feedback_Impacts_on_Developing_EFL_Learners'_Writing_Ability_and_Learner_Au tonomy)

<1% - <https://muse.jhu.edu/chapter/2313127>

<1% -

<https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/book-reviews/feedback-in-second-language-writing-contexts-and-issues-2/>

<1% - <http://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/4279>

<1% - <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40299-019-00456-2>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282555570\\_The\\_Effects\\_of\\_Teacher-Written\\_D irect\\_vs\\_Indirect\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Students'\\_Writing](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282555570_The_Effects_of_Teacher-Written_D irect_vs_Indirect_Feedback_on_Students'_Writing)

<1% - <https://academic.oup.com/applij/CrossRef-CitedBy/163482>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326099725\\_Student\\_engagement\\_with\\_teach er\\_written\\_corrective\\_feedback\\_in\\_EFL\\_writing\\_A\\_case\\_study\\_of\\_Chinese\\_lower-proficiency\\_students](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326099725_Student_engagement_with_teach er_written_corrective_feedback_in_EFL_writing_A_case_study_of_Chinese_lower-proficiency_students)

<1% -

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/journal-of-second-language-writing/vol/17/issue /3>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223245961\\_Learners'\\_writing\\_skills\\_in\\_French\\_Corpus\\_consultation\\_and\\_learner\\_evaluation](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/223245961_Learners'_writing_skills_in_French_Corpus_consultation_and_learner_evaluation)

<1% -

[https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/30067/Purnawarman\\_P\\_Dissertati on\\_2011.pdf](https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/30067/Purnawarman_P_Dissertati on_2011.pdf)

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268267193\\_The\\_Effects\\_of\\_Focused\\_and\\_Unfo cused\\_Written\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_on\\_Grammatical\\_Accuracy\\_of\\_Iranian\\_EFL\\_Learners](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268267193_The_Effects_of_Focused_and_Unfo cused_Written_Corrective_Feedback_on_Grammatical_Accuracy_of_Iranian_EFL_Learners)

<1% - <http://journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/1075>

<1% - <http://journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJALEL/article/view/1289>

<1% -

<https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-teaching/article/written-corrective-f eedback-studies-approximate-replication-of-bitchener-knoch-2010a-and-van-beuninge n-de-jong-kuiken-2012/C407030AFEF8C7C06C10D765DA9FBBE1>

<1% - <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1362168818770921>

<1% - <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1362168818776671>

<1% - [https://issuu.com/marcgreenberg/docs/kurier\\_1\\_f2013](https://issuu.com/marcgreenberg/docs/kurier_1_f2013)



<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X1830191X>

<1% - <https://turkish.ahya.net/node/71>

<1% - <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S106037431500065X>

<1% -

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324135307\\_Corrective\\_Feedback\\_in\\_Writing\\_Essay\\_in\\_the\\_L2\\_Classrooms](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324135307_Corrective_Feedback_in_Writing_Essay_in_the_L2_Classrooms)

<1% - [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07686-7\\_8](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07686-7_8)