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ملخص الدراسة

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على فعالية التغذية الراجعة والتصحيحية من إدارة التعلم تشوبي على الطلاب في نظام إدارة التعلم تشوبي. كما هدفت الدراسة في تطوير مهارة الكتابة باللغة arabic.

وتلقت الطلاب نهج التغذية الراجعة والتصحيحية على كتاباتهم عبر نظام إدارة التعلم تشوبي. تتألف العينة من 22 طالبة تقسم إلى المجموعتين الضابطة والتجريبية بالتساوي. صممت الباحثة أدوات لتجميع بيانات البحث وهما اختبار كتابة المقال القبلي والبعدي واستبانة.

أظهرت الدراسة عددًا من النتائج، بما في ذلك وجود فروق ذات لائحة إحصائية بين متوسطي المجموعتين التجريبية والضابطة في أدائهم الكتابي في اختبار البعدي وذلك لصالح المجموعة التجريبية، التي أثبتت فعالية تزويد الطالبات بالتغذية الراجعة والتصحيحية على كتاباتهم عبر تشوبي.

كما أكدت النتائج على الحاجة لتزويد الطالبات بالتغذية الراجعة والتصحيحية، خاصة فيما يتعلق بالكتابة. فقد أظهرت النتائج بأن استراتيجية التصحيح المباشر كانت لها تأثير إيجابي على أداء الطالبات، بينما أثرت استراتيجيات التصحيح غير المباشر على ذلك.

 كما أثبتت الدراسة فعالية التغذية الراجعة عبر نظام إدارة التعلم تشوبي. أوصت الدراسة بإجراء المزيد من الدراسات حول فعالية التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية من خلال نظام إدارة التعلم تشوبي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التغذية الراجعة، التغذية الراجعة بالخطا المكتوبة، تصحيح استراتيجيات التغذية الراجعة، نظام إدارة التعلم تشوبي.
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Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

In recent years, there has been an immense development in the use of the internet and the World Wide Web (WWW). These developments and advancements in technology have created new pedagogical opportunities in teaching and education (Dogoriti, Pange, & Anderson, 2014; Yu, Sun, & Chang, 2010). Therefore, the growing ubiquity of technology in education has resulted in creating better opportunities for learners and teachers to experience English language teaching (ELT) and learning in addition to traditional classrooms (Johns & Torrez, 2001). Nowadays, there has been an expanding use of computer-assisted language learning (CALL) platforms in the field of education that can positively affect learning outcomes and academic achievements (Crosby, 1997; Peterson, 1998; Vrtacnik et al., 2000). One of the essential benefits of the growing use of CALL tools in education is to enable students to submit their written work to the teacher and receive feedback on it evading face-to-face interaction (Carliner, 2005; Hill, 2014). Computer-assisted language learning is a language learning and teaching approach in which computer is used as a tool for facilitating learning, assisting students, providing feedback, and creating an interactive environment (Chapelle, 2001; Egbert, 2005; Levy, 1997; Levy & Stockwell, 2006).

Recently, it is more evident that learning management systems (LMSs) is becoming increasingly important and considered as a supplement to the traditional classroom. Learning management systems such as Showbie are excellent electronic learning (EL) platforms that create a link between students and their teachers via technology (Cavus, Uzunboylu, &
Ibrahim, 2007; Smith, 2016). Through using Showbie, it is accessible for students to submit their written work. Additionally, it also enables teachers to provide both oral and written feedback to each learner in a number of ways (Padovan, 2016). In this manner, LMSs such as Showbie help teachers and students to have a paperless classroom.

Since, feedback plays a vital role in all language learning contexts, it is considered as a key to successful foreign language (FL) learning. Through feedback learners are able to enhance their learning and improve their performance. Researchers have termed feedback as an essential element in improving writing proficiency (Ferris, 2003; Hyland & Hyland, 2006a). The importance of writing in language learning is well established in the literature. Needless to say, it has become one of the most effective tools used for communication. Despite its significance, writing competence in a FL is not an easy skill to acquire.

In order to enhance students' writing abilities, positive and corrective feedback (CF) are pedagogical tools that can be employed to assess students in learning English writing. Both positive and CF provide students with information that inform them about their writing performance and help them become proficient writers. Positive feedback apprises students about progress in performance. Since it was reported in 1970, CF has attracted considerable attention from researchers (Ellis, 2013). Corrective Feedback refers to responses that inform the learner that his construction of the language is erroneous in some way (Nassaji, 2017). Corrective feedback can be provided to the learner both orally and in written form in response to a range of errors. Writing teachers always provide written corrective feedback (WCF) on students' English writing. Ellis (2009) grouped Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) strategies into six categories: (a) direct feedback, (b) indirect feedback, (c)
metalinguistic feedback, (d) focused/unfocused feedback, (e) electronic feedback, and (f) reformulation.

Corrective feedback is a feature of language pedagogy that is important for both teachers and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers. The provision of CF is the most common practice used by Second Language (L2) writing teachers to enhance their students' English writing accuracy. One of the main issues of concern for both teachers and researchers is relating with how to correct students’ errors. With regards to CF, both teachers' insights about CF as shown in teachers' guides and researchers' insights gained through research can be mutually informing. On the one hand, teachers’ guides emphasize the importance of providing positive feedback and confirm that CF should be given in an affirmative manner. While on the other hand, SLA researchers are concerned about whether or not CF facilitates SLA. These controversies have been the subject of debate and interest within teachers and researcher community.

A considerable number of researches have questioned the effectiveness of teacher WCF as a way of improving students' English writing accuracy in traditional classrooms. However, little attention has been paid to the role of providing computer-mediated feedback via LMSs. Investigating feedback using CALL tools is becoming a major area of interest in FL teaching all over the world due to the impact of technology on today's society. Consequently, it is vital to study positive feedback and CF that is provided via CALL platforms.
1.2 Statement of the Problem

The significance of writing skill is widely accepted for academic and career success. However, learning writing skills is considered a complex, difficult, and challenging endeavor for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners (Alsamadani, 2010). In the Saudi Arabian learning context, EFL teachers often treat writing as a product: expecting the students to produce a piece of written work to be evaluated. Moreover, teachers tend to give feedback which is simply brief on their students’ written work as compared to standard WCF strategies. Thus, Saudi teachers need to identify WCF strategies that will have positive effects on students' writing performance.

Generally, it has been observed that most EFL teachers provide students with CF only, which is not considered as the only way students can learn. Teachers just provide WCF, which leads to students' frustration. For instance, AlKhatib (2015) reported that Saudi teachers do not provide positive feedback to their students. According to Ellis (2013), teacher guides paid little attention to SLA research and suggested that it is important to build a bridge between SLA research and language pedagogy. In teacher guides, correcting students' errors may be regarded as important, but it is seen as possibly harmful to learner's receptivity of learning. Thus, it is necessary that correction be given in "an atmosphere of support and warm solidarity" (Ur, 1996, p. 255).

According to Lightbown (2000), it is important to take the received opinions about teaching as expressed in teacher guides as a starting point and then relate them to SLA research. Lightbowen (2000) suggests that SLA serves best as the basis for helping teachers to question their own intuitions about teaching. Hence, positive feedback along with WCF
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can be used as teaching tools to develop EFL students' English writing skills. Teacher guides address the usefulness of providing both positive as well as negative feedback (i.e. corrective feedback). Teacher guides insist that positive feedback be equally important as CF (Ellis, 2013). This study is aimed to fill this pedagogical gap.

The study is also intended to identify EFL students' attitudes towards receiving feedback on their English writing by using the new form of technology. It is based on the premise that social learning platforms are not employed by most EFL teachers to provide feedback to their students' English writing assignments. Saudi teachers need to integrate technology into their English writing classes, which can enable them to provide immediate and useful feedback. Thus, this study attempts to investigate the effectiveness of implementing the LMS i.e. Showbie in English writing classes and its impact of providing feedback on students' writing achievement. Hence, the researcher has an expectation that the use of the CALL tool would not only revise students' attitudes and perceptions towards English writing, but it would improve their writing performance.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of this research is to determine how computer-mediated positive, WCF via Showbie can enhance students' English writing performance. Showbie is designed mainly for students' assignments. However, computer-mediated feedback via Showbie can help teachers give particular attention to students' English writing. In traditional classroom activities, a teacher's distinctive attention can hardly be realized.

The second purpose of this research is to identify the WCF strategies that have had a positive impact on students' English writing. Finally, keeping in view the growing
importance of technology in language teaching and learning, the study is aimed to determine whether Showbie, an interactive LMS that enables teachers and students to interact collaboratively, has an impact on students' writing achievement. Learning management systems are an effective medium for providing feedback. In this manner, this study aims to examine the effectiveness of integrating Showbie into English writing classes to provide computer-mediated positive feedback and CF to students. The existing body of research on feedback using students' reactions towards teacher written feedback on their writing suggests that some students have struggled to fully comprehend teachers’ hand-written feedback, as they often misread it (Chen, 2012; Grimm, 2016; Leki, 1990)

1.4 Research Questions

Based on previously discussed issues, the main research questions of this study include:

1. Does providing computer-mediated positive, written corrective feedback on students' English writing make a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of writing development?

2. What are the written corrective feedback strategies that have a positive impact on the development of the students' writing performance?

3. What are the experimental group students' attitudes toward receiving computer-mediated positive and corrective feedback on their English writing assignments using the Showbie application?
1.5 Significance of the Study

The development of writing skills calls for adjustments to be made. There are limited studies in the field of providing computer-mediated feedback on students' English writing process, particularly in the context of Saudi Arabia. This study provides new insights into the impact of providing computer-mediated positive feedback, WCF on improving students' writing performance. It may shed new light on Saudi students' views and attitudes towards the usefulness of receiving teacher’s feedback through LMSs. It explores the most effective WCF strategies that have a positive impact on EFL students' development in English writing that Saudi teachers need to identify.

This study will be an early study in terms of studying the effectiveness of providing both positive and CF on students' English writing assignments in a Saudi context. The results of the study may be utilized to add to the results of the previous studies on the effectiveness of CF. Moreover, it is the first study that sheds light on the effectiveness of the pedagogical use of the Showbie application for providing feedback on the students' English writing. Fewer studies have examined the experiences of English Language Learners (ELLs) using LMSs, and to date it is lacking to examine how the LMS Showbie supports students' academic achievement and language learning development. The results of this study will be significant in providing valuable insights on the methodology of teaching writing and the use of computer-mediated feedback for the enhancement of students' English writing.

1.6 Operational Definitions of Terms

This section provides operational definitions of key terms used in the study:
Computer-mediated feedback: Any type of feedback which is delivered via the use of separate electronic devices between two or more individual people who interact with each other through the internet or a network connection using social software (Hyland & Hyland, 2006b).

Positive feedback: In the field of education, positive feedback is a reinforcing feedback that encourages the student to repeat or expand upon a desirable language performance.

Corrective feedback: Any teacher’s response that attempts to inform a learner of the nature of an error (Chaudron, 1988). It is defined as any feedback provided to a learner’s error in language form (Russel & Spada, 2006).

Written corrective feedback: Written corrective feedback refers to a teacher's or peer's responses to students' written work (formal or informal) either a draft or a final version (Ferris, 2002). According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012), written corrective feedback is defined as grammar/error correction.

Written corrective feedback strategies: Written corrective feedback strategies includes Ellis’s (2009) classification that encompasses six different categories: (a) direct feedback, (b) indirect feedback, (c) metalinguistic feedback, (d) focused/unfocused feedback, (e) electronic feedback, and (f) reformulation corrective feedback.

Direct corrective feedback: Direct CF is a kind of CF in which the teacher underlines an error and provides the learner with its correction (Lalande, 1982; Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986).
**Indirect corrective feedback:** Indirect CF is a kind of CF in which the teacher indicates and locates where the error exists but without correction (Chandler, 2003; Ferris and Roberts, 2001).

**Metalinguistic corrective feedback:** Metalinguistic CF is the kind of CF that can be done by providing the student with a metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error. There are two ways of providing a metalinguistic clue to the nature of the error: (a) writing a code or an abbreviation next to the error or in the margin that shows the type of the error e.g. prep/preposition, pl/plural, art/article, etc. (Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982) or (b) numbering the errors and then writing a grammatical explanation for each numbered error (Sheen, 2007).

**Focused/Unfocused corrective feedback:** Focused CF is a kind of CF in which the teacher provides feedback on certain selective linguistic errors (Chandler, 2003; Ferris 2006). On the other hand, unfocused CF requires the teacher to provide feedback on all or most of the students’ linguistic errors (Sheen, 2007).

**Electronic corrective feedback:** Electronic CF is a kind of CF in which the teacher indicates an error and supplies the learner with a hyperlink to a concordance file that contains examples of the correct usage of the same error (Milton, 2006).

**Reformulation corrective feedback:** Reformulation CF is a type of CF in which the teacher reworks the students' entire sentence while keeping the same content of the original text to make the language sound as native-like as possible (Sachs & Polio, 2007).

**Learning Management System:** A Learning Management System is a software application that assists instructors meet their pedagogical goals and support classroom-based
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learning. Examples of LMSs include Blackboard, Moodle, Sakai, WebCT, (Machado & Tao, 2007) and Showbie which is referred to as “a lighter LMS” by the Co-Founder & CEO of Showbie, Colin Bramm (Bramm, 2016; Foote, 2017).

**Showbie:** Showbie is a free educational assignment app that links students and teachers (Garbutt, 2015; Smith, 2016; Tong, 2016) and manages students’ learning (Foote, 2017). However, there is a version available for sale that has additional features. Showbie allows teachers to assign, collect, review, and grade assignments (Wakefield, 2013). In addition, it allows teachers to provide feedback, which is beneficial to students learning. Showbie was founded in 2012. It is currently used by more than 2 million teachers and students worldwide. Available in 13 different languages including Arabic and English (Showbie), it is ranked as one of the best online learning platforms worldwide (Renard, 2016). It helps to have paperless classrooms on mobile devices (Showbie unveils real time parent updates, 2015; Tong, 2016).

**1.7 Organization of the Study**

The current study is organized into five chapters. Chapter One presents an overview of the study. It introduces the problem statement of the research and its aims. Chapter Two reviews the relevant literature and the previous related studies on WCF and computer-mediated CF. Chapter Three provides details about the methodology used in this study including the participants involved and the instruments used. It also presents the procedures used for data collection and analysis. Chapter Four presents data analysis and the results of the study. Chapter Five provides summary and discussion of the findings. It also provides the pedagogical implications and recommendations for the future research.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

The aim of the study is to investigate how the use of computer-mediated positive, WCF can enhance EFL students' English writing performance. This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section presents a review of the theoretical background to the study, while the second section provides a critical review of previous studies related to WCF in L2 writing and its effectiveness and the field of computer-mediated tools and its effects on students’ writing.

2.1 Theoretical Background of the Study

2.1.1 The role of feedback in second language acquisition:

The literature on the role of feedback in L2 learning has highlighted several theoretical understandings. Among these, the most relevant theories include an Interaction hypothesis theory (Long, 1996), Sociocultural theory (SCT) (Vygotsky, 1978), and Noticing hypothesis theory (Schmidt, 1990). In the following section, these theories are briefly discussed in relation to investigate feedback relevance to SLA.

*Interaction hypothesis theory:* The interaction hypothesis is a concept in L2 acquisition proposed by Michael Long in 1996. This theory emphasizes that SLA takes place through interaction and communication. It suggests that using comprehensible input through modification and negotiation of meaning are seen as an opportunity for the development of language proficiency (Ellis, 1997). In Long's reformulated hypothesis (1996), more emphasis is assigned on the importance of negative evidence including CF during interaction. In view of Bitchener and Ferris (2012) "evidence that a role exists for negative evidence and CF in SLA has mainly arisen from classroom-based research" (p. 17). Although
Long’s hypothesis (1996) is primarily concerned with oral communication, it can be expanded to include written communication and "its significance for the written context has been noted" (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012, p. 16).

Through interaction, learners can use the language and receive feedback to enhance their communication success or indicate failure in producing language. As a result, it enables leaners to notice problematic language use and encourage learners to solve it (Cotos, 2010).

**Sociocultural theory:** Sociocultural theory is a developing theory which refers to the importance of interaction between developing individuals and their culture. In light of its social effects, teacher feedback gives the teacher the chance to interact with students through commenting on their papers and leading social communication and discussion. Based on sociocultural theory, this study is closely related to its interactive perspective, which is the SCT of human mental processing presented by Lev Vygotsky in 1978. This theory provides a very different perspective on the role of interaction in SLA. It emphasizes the importance of social interaction between individuals in all cognitive development, including language development, especially when L2 learners collaborate and interact with speakers of the target language who are more well-informed and experienced than learners itself such as teachers and more advanced learners (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). According to Vygotsky (1978), social interaction assists to link learning and creates an environment to "learn language, learn about language, and learn 'through' language" (Warschauer, 1997, p. 471). Vygotsky (1978) emphasized that collaborative learning is vital for helping students to advance through their own Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Zone of Proximal Development area requires social interaction with teacher or experienced peers to fully develop.
**Noticing hypothesis:** The noticing hypothesis is a theory of SLA proposed by Richard Schmidt in 1990. This theory highlights the importance of noticing in SLA. It states that "subliminal language learning is impossible, and that noticing is the necessary and sufficient condition of converting input into uptake" (Schmidt, 1990, p. 129). According to Schmidt (2001), the occurrence of noticing is "the first step in language building" (p. 31). The hypothesis emphasizes that noticing itself does not result in acquisition, but it is the essential starting point for acquisition. Schmidt (2001) pointed that learners cannot learn the grammatical features of a language unless they notice them. Precisely, CF facilitates the occurrence of noticing the errors that students make in their use of the target language. In other words, there is no unconscious language learning unless the learner pays attention. Therefore, according to Schmidt (1990, 1992, 2001), L2 learners must focus on and notice differences between the target language and their inter language and its representation in their production of output. For instance, there are various types of CF that require the learner to self-edit or modify output. This opportunity to modify the output can be beneficial in promoting the learner's attention of noticing holes in their use of the target language (Swain, 1995).

**2.2 Feedback in second language writing:**

It is now well established that feedback plays an important role in teaching L2 writing (Hyland, 1990; Hyland & Hyland, 2001). Providing feedback is recognized as one of the most important tasks of the English as a second language (ESL) writing teacher (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a). In their State of the Art Article, *Feedback on second language students’ writing*, Hyland and Hyland (2006b) pointed that "the issue of feedback has long been regarded as essential for the development of ESL writing skills, for its potential, for
learning and for student motivation” (p. 83). There is a wider recognition of the significance of feedback for learning. Hyland and Hyland (2006a) stated in their book, *Feedback in Second Language Writing Contexts and Issues*, that previous studies in the field of education have established that feedback is essential for both “encouraging and consolidating learning” (p. 1).

According to Ryan (1997), providing feedback helps the writers understand how well they are writing and how they might further develop their writing. Hyland (1998) also suggests that written feedback of teacher is highly valued by students. Extensive research has shown that L2 writers prefer consider teachers’ feedback on their writing to be motivating and very beneficial (Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991, Rasick & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994; Zhang, 1995). Surveys of students’ feedback preferences indicate that ESL students prefer written feedback on their writing conferences and value it more highly than other types of feedback, such as oral and peer feedback (Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Saito, 1994; Zhang, 1995). As noted by Li (2010), the impact of CF was better in FL as compared to L2 for the reasons that EFL learners paid greater attention to the correction received. In recent years, feedback practices have been transformed. These are now often combined or supplemented with peer feedback, writing
workshops, conferencing, computer-mediated feedback, and teacher comments (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a).

2.2.1 Roles of teachers in providing feedback on student writing:

Keh (1990) and Hedgcock and Leftkowitz (1994) list four roles that teachers of writing play to provide written feedback to their students. First, a teacher plays the role of a respondent when she/he interacts with a writer. While playing this role, the teacher responds to the content and may provide positive feedback without any suggestion or correction. Second, the writing teacher plays the role of a guide by showing concern about certain points. Third, the teacher takes on the role of a linguist or a grammarian by writing comments related to grammatical rules or providing CF with reference to grammatical errors. The fourth role that a writing teacher plays is that of an evaluator. The main role that most writing teachers play is an evaluator of the quality of students' writing as the end product of a writing process (Arndt, 1993).

2.2.2 Positive versus negative feedback:

In general, teachers' feedback has been categorized into two main types: positive and negative feedback. Positive feedback focuses on student’s accomplishments and provides endorsement to the fact that a student's performance is acceptable. In language pedagogy, providing students with positive feedback regarding their performance is crucial to reinforce their learning. On the other hand, CF may discourage their learning (Ellis, 2013) unless it is provided “in an atmosphere of support and warm solidarity” (Ur, 1996, p. 255). Thus, positive feedback should be provided with CF.
In view of Nunan (1991), it is essential for a teacher to provide more positive feedback than CF. Nunan (1991) observes that it helps to “let students know they have performed correctly” and “to increase motivation” (p. 195). Race (2001) argues that it is beneficial to provide students with positive feedback in detail rather than praising the student using adjectives like “excellent.” According to Hyland (2001), teachers' positive feedback is important, especially for less able writers who need more additional support. Positive feedback consolidates students' acceptable language performance and helps students identify their strengths (Hyland, 2001). Keeping in view the significance of positive feedback, in a recent study, Ellis (2013) concluded that positive feedback is equally effective as CF and contends that students should receive positive feedback.

2.2.3 Corrective feedback:

Corrective feedback, also known as error correction may enhance learners' writing performance and can act as an effective method for language learning and teaching (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a). In a study about the historical perspective of CF, Schachter (1991) identifies that various terms have been employed to describe the process in which the learner is informed that his or her output of the target language is unacceptable.

In the pedagogical field of L2 teaching and learning, the terms “error correction,” “grammar correction,” and “error treatment” can be employed to refer to CF. The term “error treatment” was used by L2 and FL teachers in the 1970s (Fanselow, 1977) and the term “corrective feedback” was used in the 1980s (Kasper, 1985). However, different researchers use these terms interchangeably when they investigate the effect of CF on language learning.

Both language teachers and SLA researchers have investigated the impact of oral and WCF on students’ accuracy. However, there has been much disagreement on whether to

Russell and Spada (2006) defined CF as "any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner errors of language form" (p. 134). Besides, WCF is defined as grammar/error correction (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012). Based on these definitions, CF refers to any feedback related to grammatical form. According to Leki (1991), many learners prefer feedback on their grammar. However, the question of whether CF contributes to improving L2 learners’ grammatical accuracy in their writing performance is still an issue of considerable debate.

Researchers are of different views with regards to the effectiveness of CF (Bruton, 2009; Kepner, 1991; Robb et al., 1986; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2004, 2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008). For instance, Kepner (1991) reported that there was no significant effect of error correction on language forms and content in L2 college students' writing and concluded that CF is ineffective for improving learners' grammatical accuracy in writing. Similarly, Truscott (1996) denied the relationship between the effectiveness of CF and L2 learning. Truscott (1996) claimed that it is ineffective, considering it as harmful effects in developing students’ L2 learning and suggested that error correction should be eliminated.

On the other hand, in spite of Truscott's (1996) argument against corrective feedback, a large body of research has revealed that WCF is useful and beneficial for the improvement of students' writing grammatical accuracy (Beuningen, Jong, & Kuiken, 2011, Bitchener & Knoch, 2009, 2010; Ferris, 2010; Ferris, Liu, Sinha, & Senna, 2013; Guénette, & Lyster, 2013; Vyatkina, 2011). These researchers have examined how students who receive appropriate CF show better performance in the accuracy and quality of writing.
Interestingly, Truscott's (1996) argument against the effectiveness of error correction from both theoretical and practical aspects gained immediate attention, stimulated debates, enhanced interest on the topic, and led to debated discussion in the research field of L2 writing (Wang, 2017).

2.2.4 Written corrective feedback:

Researchers have proposed different classifications of CF strategies. These classifications vary according to the nature of feedback strategies. In one classification, Ellis (2009) classified CF strategies into six categories, which are mainly employed by teachers for learner's written production. These include (a) direct feedback, (b) indirect feedback, (c) metalinguistic feedback, (d) focused/unfocused feedback, (e) electronic feedback, and (f) reformulation feedback. In this research, Ellis (2009) classification of CF strategies is used for its relevance to the study.

According to Ellis (2009), oral and written CF strategies are mainly used to correct students' linguistic errors. Scholars have long studied the effect of CF strategies on the writing ability of language learners, but limited number of studies has been conducted in which more than three feedback strategies have been used. In the following section, these strategies are briefly discussed.

Direct CF and indirect CF are the two main types of WCF strategies that are commonly used by English language teachers to correct students' grammatical errors in their written work. Direct CF is highly beneficial for the student in cases where student is unable to identify correction of the error. In such cases, direct CF provides students with explicit guidance (Ellis, 2009). In a study Sheen (2007) found that direct CF can be effective in helping learners acquire specific grammatical features.
Indirect CF is beneficial for the reasons that it helps to engage the students “in guided learning and problem-solving” (Lalande, 1982, p. 143) processes as it promotes the students to extract the correct linguistic form. Thus, it is recognized that indirect CF can lead to long-term learning, while direct CF may not lead to long-term processing (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). In literature, there are conflicting views about the effectiveness of both direct and indirect feedback. For instance, some studies that have investigated the types of CF suggested that indirect CF is more effective as compared to direct CF as it helps students think about their errors before correcting them (Lalande, 1982). While few studies have found that there are no differences between direct and indirect feedback strategies (Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

Metalinguistic CF has two types: metalinguistic CF using error codes and metalinguistic CF using grammatical explanation. Studies have found that metalinguistic CF using error codes can help students improve their accuracy over time (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lalande, 1982). In their study, Robb et al. (1986) found that metalinguistic CF using error codes is not much effective than the other three types of CF that they investigated (i.e. direct feedback and two kinds of indirect feedback). Ferris and Roberts (2001) found that metalinguistic CF using error codes promotes the learner to do self-editing, but not more than indirect CF.

As for Electronic Feedback, the teacher can refer to Mark My Words, which is a Microsoft Word toolbar that helps an instructor to provide useful feedback on students' written assignment (Milton, 2006). In his analysis, Milton (2006) found that teacher's use of Mark My Words led to student’s successful revisions.
Reformulation refers to teacher’s reconstruction of the sentence that contains one or more errors to make it sounds as native-like as possible. Then the writers revises and decides which reformulated sentence to accept (Ellis, 2009). Sachs and Polio (2007) conducted a study that compares direct CF and reformulation and they found that the major difference between these two types of CF was “a matter of presentation.”

As for focused and unfocused CF, unfocused CF seems to be the most authentic feedback methodology (Beuningen, 2010). Different researchers have noted that the aim of providing CF is to improve students’ writing accuracy in general rather than focusing on only one particular linguistic feature (Ferris, 2010). Similarly, Storch (2010) stated that "studies which provide feedback on one type of error and only on one piece of writing and in controlled environments are unlikely to be relevant to language teachers" (p. 43).

Keeping in view the findings of these previous studies, it can be concluded that students’ response to teacher WCF is an essential step to do (Ellis, 2009). Previous studies have shown that the effects of WCF is studied through asking students to respond to teachers’ CF either by studying or correcting the errors (e.g. Chandler 2003; Ferris and Roberts 2001; Sheen, 2007). While some studies have examined what students do after giving back feedback on their written work with revisions (e.g. Sachs and Polio, 2007).

### 2.2.5 Types of treatable linguistic error categories:

According to Ferris (1999), the types of improvable grammatical errors comprise of two categories. These include treatable and untreatable. The parameters of the treatable category of errors entails "verb tense and form; subject-verb agreement; article usage; plural and possessive noun endings; and sentence fragments" (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005, p. 194) and they occur in a rule-governed way. In contrast, the untreatable category of errors
entails “word choice errors, with the possible exception of some pronoun and preposition uses, and unidiomatic sentence structure, resulting from problems to do with word order and missing or unnecessary words” (Bitchener et al., 2005, p. 194) and they are idiosyncratic. Thus, learners are required to utilize acquired knowledge of the language to correct the error. In their study, Bitchener et al. (2005) suggested that classroom L2 writing teachers should provide their learners with both oral feedback as well as written feedback on the more ‘treatable’ types of linguistic error on a regular basis” (p. 202). In his analysis, Ferris (2006) concluded that direct CF might be effective for untreatable errors.

Based on these studies, researchers such as Ellis (2009) have asserted that "there is an obvious need for carefully designed studies to further investigate the effects of written CF in general and of different types of CF… It makes it possible for researchers to conduct research that systematically examines the effect of distinct types and combinations of CF" (p. 106). In the past, most of the research on WCF has been conducted in traditional manners. In a recent book, Nassaji (2017) stated, "current research has even extended this line of research by examining the effects of feedback in various technology-mediated settings and comparing these with those in face-to-face interactions" (p. xi). Interestingly, CALL tools play a major role in helping to facilitate the process of mediating both types of feedback from the teacher to the learner.

2.3 Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching Writing:

Computers were first introduced as part of language teaching and learning in the 1960s (Chapelle, 2001). Computer-assisted language learning (CALL) refers to the use of computers in language learning and teaching and it was the term agreed upon at the 1983 conference (Chapelle, 2001). Recently, the emergence of CALL has begun to change the
way English is taught as a FL and a L2. It is defined more extensively as the study of or the use of computer applications or computer technologies in L2 or FL teaching and learning (Chapelle, 2001; Egbert, 2005; Levy, 1997; Levy & Stockwell, 2006). According to Beatty (2003), "a definition of CALL that accommodates its changing nature is any process in which a learner uses a computer and, as a result, improves his or her language" (p. 7).

The importance of computer technologies in FL learning and teaching has been validated by several researchers (e.g. Crosby, 1997; Peterson, 1998; Vrtacnik et al., 2000). Thus, the progress of language teaching and learning processes might be achieved through an appropriate use and integration of computer technologies in language learning pedagogy (Warschauer & Healey, 1998).

According to Hubbard (2009), having students write on blogs or wikis can assist students who need additional support to get feedback on their written work. Additionally, to facilitate e-learning, a wide range of computer-mediated communication (CMC) tools and LMSs can be integrated into L2 or FL teaching and learning. Computer-mediated communication tools and LMSs facilitate users' exchange of language through audio, video, or texts and organize their e-learning (Blake, 2013). Nowadays, it is easy to integrate such tools by teachers into their individual teaching and learning contexts that are available on mobile devices (Stockwell & Hubbard, 2013).

Recently, all over the world, teachers have started to use LMS tools to support their teaching (Fageeh, 2011; Nanaykkara, 2007). A study highlighting the integration of social networking tools found that most ESL students believe that social networking sites yield great benefits for the reasons that it supports the development of their writing skills (Yunus, Salehi, & Chenzi, 2012). Inside CALL research area, feedback and interactivity are two key
factors that contribute to learner autonomy in CALL (e.g. Alm, 2006; Stockwell, 2012). Language Management Systems offer teachers with opportunities to send their feedback and interact with their students.

2.3.1 Learning management system, Showbie:

Learning management systems are certainly becoming increasingly important as a supplement to a traditional ELT classroom. In view of Albirini (2006), LMS facilitates virtual learning, and its ultimate purpose is to support learning inside the classroom through digital tools and technologies. The use of LMSs in language learning and teaching has many advantages in language learning and teaching. Language management systems can enhance teaching and learning performance by providing a convenient communicative and collaborative environment (Bongey, Cizadlo, & Kalnbach, 2005; Chan & Robbins, 2006; Rosenberg, 2001) anywhere and anytime for their own needs (Cavus et al., 2007; Levy & Stockwell, 2006). Language management systems provide students with opportunities to build on their existing digital skills that are required increasingly in today’s digital era (Allington, 2001; Boyd & Ellison, 2008). Moreover, studies by Auyeung (2004) and Van Olphen (2007) found that learners' confidence and collaboration increased as a result of using LMSs.

In a recent study, Adzharuddin and Ling (2013) describe the affordances of LMS technologies for learning as follows:

“The LMS provides interactive features to the students. As such, threaded discussions, video conferencing, and forums for discussion are the main features of an LMS. The goal of an LMS is to keep track of students’ progress and
performance. The LMS is not just viewed as an instructional trend but as a tool that benefits the adopters as well” (p. 4).

Language management systems facilitate making learning conferences. Writing conferences involve the teacher discussing a piece of writing with the individual student during and/or after the writing process (Saito, 1994). Teacher-student conferences provide teachers with opportunities to give more individual attention to students and respond to the students' written work interactively. For students, writing conferences provide the students with a clear idea of their points of strength and weakness, allows them to raise questions related to their performance, and receive feedback from their teachers (Hyland, 2000; Riley, 1997).

Learning Management Systems facilitates students' access to teacher created activities. For the teacher, LMSs can track students' progress and enable sending of materials and feedback to learners through its built-in email system (Carliner, 2005; Hill, 2014). Until recently, computer-mediated feedback has become a new pedagogic practice in the field of education that emerged with internet expansion. Computer-mediated feedback might be one of the most promising technology advantages that can assist students' English writing. According to Tuffley and Antonio (2015), computer-mediated feedback facilitates the archive of documents and files. In addition, teacher oral or written feedback can be kept for future reference. Computer-mediated feedback is flexible, as it is not restricted in terms of time and place.

Showbie is considered an LMS or an e-learning platform used to facilitate teaching and assisting students in their learning (Edmonton & Canada, 2015; Foote, 2017). In a recent book, Pytash, Ferdig, and Rasinski (2013) recommended this app for teachers who teach
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writing skills. Showbie helps teachers have a paperless classroom (Knight, 2017; Meletiou-Mavrotheris, Mavrou, & Paparistodemou, 2015). It helps teachers expand the classroom in new ways and makes it easier for teachers and students to connect beyond the boundaries of school (Knight, 2017). The designers of Showbie realized the need to engage students in a 21st century connected, collaborative learning environment (Knight, 2017). Showbie is an app where students’ works, or assignments can be stored or shared (Khalid, Jurisic, Kristensen, & Ørngreen, 2014). Showbie saves teachers time, as it allows them to assign, create, collect, review, grade, and share assignments (Wakefield, 2013). In addition, teachers can distribute materials and instructions to the whole class (Foote, 2017). Writing teachers can create writing conferences and interact with the whole class. Teachers can then provide timely feedback to each learner privately. Nonetheless, giving students opportunities to interact with digital literacies in school can provide socially meaningful experiences since they already have e-mail and blogs as a way to communicate outside of school (Sutton, 2001; Williams, 2005).

2.4 Critical Review of Previous Related Studies

2.4.1 An Overview of the Studies on Computer-Mediated Feedback in Teaching

Writing to EFL Learners

A large number of studies have been conducted to assess the effects of computer mediated feedback in teaching writing to EFL learners. For instance, AbuSeileek (2013) conducted a study to examine the effect of computer-mediated CF types in EFL intact class over time. The study was aimed to explore the effect of three computer-mediated CF techniques (track changes, word processing, and a combination of track changes and word processing) on EFL writing performance related to eleven (11) major error types. The
participants were 64 English majors (16 men and 48 women) who were assigned randomly into three treatment groups that received computer-mediated CF while writing and one control group did not receive CF. Each group contained 4 men and 12 women (AbuSeileek, 2013). The research instruments were a pre-test (week 1), immediate post-test (week 8), and delayed post-test (week 12). The findings of the study showed that there was a significant effect for feedback type in favor of the group that used a combination of track changes and word processing. Moreover, the study found that there was also a significant effect for computer mediated CF over the control group (AbuSeileek, 2013).

In a more recent study, Llanos Bultrón (2014) conducted a case study at a public high school in the central north-east region of Puerto Rico. The aim of the study was to ensure the incorporation of teachers' written feedback and computer-mediated feedback into learners' essay written productions (Llanos Bultrón, 2014). The researcher's questions asked students' reactions towards both teacher's written feedback and computer-mediated feedback and how they enhance students' essay writing. The study employed three different research instruments: (a) a questionnaire on teacher-written feedback, (b) another questionnaire on computer-mediated feedback, and (c) an essay writing task (hand and computer). The study employed a mixed method for data collection and analysis. The researcher chose six students from the twelfth-grade population. They were males and females. The study findings revealed several issues. First, teachers emphasized that feedback was a good experience, but an exhausting one as students repeated the same mistakes (Llanos Bultrón, 2014). Second, computer-mediated feedback as a new pedagogic practice was generally successful. Llanos Bultrón found that computer-mediated feedback creates a positive learning environment that is different from the face-to-face classroom environment. In addition, it encourages students'
responsibility for their own written work. Besides, it is facilitative of peer and teacher collaboration, as it increases student participation. Through computer-mediated feedback, a teacher can share learned outcomes among students. Finally, it facilitates providing writing feedback to students electronically. The study found that the use of computer-mediated feedback helps both teachers and students overcome feedback-related challenges and improves students' proficiency in essay writing (Llanos Bultrón, 2014).

In another study, Saadi & Saadat (2015) investigated the effects of direct and metalinguistic electronic feedback (E-feedback) on writing accuracy and attitudes toward computer assisted language learning (CALL). The subjects were twenty-nine EFL Iranian students in two intact English writing classes. Their study employed a mixed-method design for data collection and analysis. The data collected through a pre-post-test, a questionnaire, and interviews. The participants of this study were assigned randomly into two experimental groups. The students in the first group received direct electronic CF using Ginger software. The other experimental group students received metalinguistic electronic CF in the form of error codes provided through Markin 4 software. Results of the study indicated that the use of E-feedback developed the learners' writing accuracy and their attitudes toward CALL. Besides, there were no significant differences between the final overall writing accuracy scores of the two experimental groups. In terms of writing accuracy components including structure, vocabulary, and punctuation, a statistically significant difference between the two groups was found only in terms of vocabulary gain scores. Finally, in the interviews, the students in both groups referred to some barriers and merits in the integration of CALL in their context.
Soltanabidi Farshi and Khalili Safa (2015) conducted a study that aimed to compare the effect of two types of CF on EFL learners' writing skill. The participants were 35 advanced learners in three groups during 14 sessions of treatment. In each session, a related topic was given, and the learners were asked to write about it. The learners in Group A had to deliver their assignments to the teacher and receive feedback from the teacher traditionally who gave their papers back in the next session (Soltanabidi Farshi & Khalili Safa, 2015). Students in Group B had to write their assignments using digital tools and send their written tasks via email to the teacher and receive CF comments electronically through email. Group C as the control group, no CF was given to learners’ errors in their written tasks. Moreover, learners in Group C were free to deliver their writings in class or by email. The results of the study found that both methods were effective since the scores of both experimental groups were significantly higher than the scores of the control group, but electronic feedback was more effective and profitable than the traditional type of feedback; because the scores of the learners in Group B (electronic feedback) were significantly higher than those in Group A (traditional feedback).

In a more recent study, Seiffedin and El-Sakka (2017) conducted a study that aimed to investigate the effect of direct-indirect CF via e-mail on the writing accuracy of students in the kindergarten section at the Suez Faculty of Education, Egypt. Using quasi-experimental design, the main instrument of the study was a pre-post writing test. The participants were 48 junior EFL students randomly divided into two groups: an experimental group and a control group (Seiffedin & El-Sakka, 2017). Both groups were tested using the pre-post writing test before and after the experiment. During the treatment, the experimental group received direct-indirect teacher CF on their writing compositions via e-mail while the
control group received no feedback. A paired samples t-test was used to calculate participants' scores in the pre-test and the post-test revealed significant differences between the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group mean scores. An independent samples t-test was used to calculate the differences between the experimental and the control groups' mean gain scores on the pre and post-tests of writing. The study found that significant differences existed in favor of the experimental group’s mean gain scores.

2.4.2 An Overview of Studies on Written Corrective Feedback in Teaching Writing to EFL Learners

Maleki and Eslami (2013) conducted a study that aimed to investigate the impact of WCF on students' grammatical construction. The participants were 90 intermediate Iranian EFL students. They were separated into three groups, and then they randomly received direct, indirect, or no correction feedback. They created three pieces of writing and the instruments were a pre-test, an immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test. The researcher provided feedback focused on simple past tense errors. The results showed that the recipients of WCF achieved more than those in the control group. As a result, the study suggested the effectiveness of both kinds of WCF. Overall, the provision of WCF should be regarded as a potentially valuable technique in instructing writing to EFL learners.

In another conducted by Mubarak (2013) at the University of Bahrain, aimed to investigate the feedback and teaching practices of L2 writing through classroom observation. The study was also aimed to investigate the effectiveness of two types of WCF (direct and indirect) in improving the writing performance of 46 Bahraini media students using a quasi-experimental design (Mubarak, 2013). The study assigned participants randomly into three groups: two experimental groups and one control group. They received three types of
treatments over a period of 12 weeks (Mubarak, 2013). The first experimental group received direct CF while the other received indirect CF. The students in the control group received no CF but rather simple, summative comments on their performance. The data for this study were collected through pre-, post- and delayed post-tests. Mubarak’s (2013) study also aimed to investigate teachers’ and students’ beliefs about feedback through interviews and questionnaires. The results of the study through classroom observations found that there were several problems in the teaching of L2 writing and feedback methods at the University of Bahrain. Moreover, using a t-test, the study found that neither type of feedback had a significant effect on the students' accuracy, their grammatical complexity, and lexical complexity in writing. Additionally, the study found through interviews and a questionnaire that the students preferred direct CF to indirect CF. It also found that, even though the teachers used a variety of feedback methods, they did not follow up with students after the first draft was produced.

Similarly, Alajmi (2015) conducted a study that lasted for seven weeks to investigate the effect of WCF on Omani students’ accuracy in the use of ten English preposition. The researcher employed a quasi-experimental study. The participants were 50 EFL Omani students who were studying at an Omani college. The students were assigned randomly into two groups. The data were collected from three tests: pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test and an open-ended questionnaire. The experimental group received WCF on their writing, oral meta-linguistic tutorials, and a treatment task for their pre-test. For both the immediate post-test and the delayed post-test, they only received WCF on their writings. The control group only received general comments, like “good organization of the story events.” The study results found that the experimental group outperformed the control group
on the target features. The analysis of the questionnaire data also showed the benefits of WCF for improving preposition use.

In a recent study, Alkhatib (2015) aimed to investigate the beliefs and practices of writing tutors regarding WCF at a Saudi Arabian University and the factors that prevented teachers from putting their beliefs into practice. The participants were 10 writing tutors and 30 students. The study was carried out in the English language and Literature Department at the University of Dammam over a period of one term (i.e. 14 weeks). The secondary aim of her study was to compare students’ preferences with their teachers’ actual practices. The method that Alkhatib (2015) adopted was a triangulated approach to collect the data using multiple instruments. The research instruments were pre-observation interviews with teachers and students, classroom observations, think-aloud protocol, feedback analysis, and stimulated-recall interviews. The results of the study showed both congruence and tensions between teachers' beliefs and practices. In addition, it found congruence between students’ preferences and teachers’ practices.

Similarly, AlHarbi (2016) conducted a study over a period of ten weeks at king Saud University in Riyadh, aimed to investigate the impact of teachers’ WCF on male Saudi EFL university students’ writing achievements. It explored how Saudi EFL students recognize their teachers’ CF. The participants were 50 male students. They were assigned randomly into two groups: one experimental group and one control group. The data for this study were collected through pre-, and post-tests. The results revealed that the students in the experiment group outperformed the students in the control group, indicating that teachers’ written CF had a great proven impact on participants’ writing achievements. The results also displayed that the participants revealed positive attitudes toward teachers’ WCF.
Yaseen (2016) conducted a study lasted for twelve weeks at Pakistan International School in Taif, Saudi Arabia. It aimed to examine the impact of Corrective Feedback on Writing Accuracy of secondary school level. The participants were fifty-nine EFL students randomly selected. The study employed quasi-experimental design and assigned the participants into experimental and control groups equally. This study investigated five types of errors: punctuation marks, preposition, subject-verb agreement, verb form, and spelling. The findings of the study indicated a significant positive impact of written corrective feedback on the writing accuracy of the experimental group related to the selected types of errors. The experimental group achieved better than the control group. It also found that the participants pay attention to the corrected errors but do not re-draft their compositions.

Another related study is a quasi-experimental study on the effectiveness of CF on L2 writing conducted by Wang (2017) over a period of ten weeks at an Eastern Chinese University, aimed to examine the effectiveness of CF in facilitating or improving students’ writing accuracy and it also aimed to examine students’ expectations and preferences for CF. The participants were three EFL teachers who were teaching three intact classes for 105 college level EFL learners. The first class was assigned to the control group, which did not receive any corrective feedback, but did receive comments on the content and organization of their writing. The other two classes were then assigned into two experimental groups, which received different types of CF: indirect feedback or direct feedback (Wang, 2017). The study employed a mixed-method approach to address three research questions. The researcher collected the quantitative data through student text/error analysis, treatments, examination of tests, and questionnaires. The study analyzed its quantitative data using SPSS including both descriptive and inferential statistics. Moreover, the study collected its
qualitative data through interviews, surveys, and classroom observations. The study found that CF was not significant enough to be observable on student writing accuracy, because the control group that did not receive CF also improved. The study found that students and teachers believed feedback was important and beneficial, but there is a contradiction between what the teachers believed and their actual practices in the classroom. In addition, the study indicates that students’ attitudes and the EFL learning context suggest a clear and decisive relationship between students’ perception of the difficulty in understanding and correcting the errors and their eventual improvement in writing accuracy.

2.5 Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the related literature and relevant studies to the current study. In conclusion, by reviewing the literature of the previous studies, it can be clearly assumed about the positive role of computer-mediated feedback. However, studies on CF have resulted in a variety of findings. Some studies found that CF can help students improve their accuracy in writing. On the other hand, there are studies which found that CF had no significant effect on accuracy in writing. Overall, studies on CF have conflicting findings. Therefore, the aim of this study is to contribute to the literature by investigating the effectiveness of CF mediated via a computer on writing accuracy on Saudi learners. Keeping in view the limited number of studies, the present study will add valuable contributions in general and particularly in the context of Saudi Arabia.

Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

In this chapter, the methods followed in collecting and analyzing the data of this study are described. The chapter provides an in-depth description of the research method and
design, research participants, research variables, research instruments, research procedure, validity and reliability of the research instruments, data analysis, and statistical analysis.

3.1 Research Method and Design

Experimental studies collect data quantitatively (Creswell, 2014). The type of experimental design in this study is a quasi-experimental one. A quasi-experimental design assigns participants randomly into two groups (the experimental group and the control group) to investigate the impact of treatment that is administered to the experimental group but withheld from the control group. This design is one of the generally utilized designs in educational research (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). The experimental phase of the present research was based on a pre-test and post-test. The pre-test was administered before the study to both the control group and the experimental group. The researcher herself carried out the experiment. The control group did not receive any feedback, while the experimental group received both positive feedback on the content and organization of their writing and CF on all the grammatical structures using a combination of WCF strategies.

The experimental group received the treatment via Showbie for seven weeks whereas the control group neither joined the group via Showbie nor did they receive the treatment. After seven weeks, the post-test was given to each group to assess the students’ performance after the treatment. The students in the experimental group were also asked to respond to 25-items questionnaire

The components of the quasi-experimental study are explained in the next section.

3.1.1 Experiment Variables

3.1.1.1 The Dependent Variable
The dependent variable is the effect of the treatment on students’ writing accuracy, which was the predicted outcome of computer-mediated positive feedback, WCF on students’ writing performance related to all the grammatical structures using a combination of WCF strategies via Showbie.

3.1.1.2 The Independent Variable

This study had two conditions: (a) treatment and (b) no feedback. The independent variable is the type of treatment given to students. The two independent variables in this study were:

- Positive feedback and CF using a combination of WCF strategies
- Showbie as a medium to provide feedback

3.1.2 Participants

The participants of this quasi-experimental study were 24 undergraduate students randomly selected from the Languages and Translation College studying at Al-Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud Islamic University in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. They were female students from the 5th level. The participants’ ages ranged from 20 to 22 and they were Saudi EFL students. They were informed about the conditions of the study and the details of their participation. The participants were assigned randomly into two groups of 12: (a) the experimental group and (b) the control group. Each group had the same number of participants.

Although the participants were randomly assigned into two groups, it was important to ensure that their language backgrounds were similar. All of the participants were English majors. Thus, all of the participants had received formal instruction on grammar and writing
in college. In addition, they had a common L1 (i.e. Arabic) background and had studied English for at least 11 years before participating in the experiment.

3.1.3 Instruments

The purpose of the study was to examine the impact of positive, CF using a combination of WCF strategies via Showbie (i.e., the independent variable) on the students’ performance in the English writing posttest (i.e., the dependent variable). To attain the purposes of the study, the researcher utilized two tools for collecting the data in this study: (a) a pre-test and post-test and (b) a questionnaire.

3.1.3.1 Essay Writing Pre-Test and Post-Test

Obtaining writing samples by the researcher can reveal students' levels of English at the beginning of the experiment and help to track their improvement at the end of the experiment. In this study, this was accomplished through a pre-test and a post-test. Each student was given a sheet of paper which had the following question in both the pre-test and the post-test: “In no less than 120 words, write an essay about healthy lifestyle habits.” The students were given 60 minutes to write the essay (Appendix A).

The experimental group and the control group were given a pre-test in English writing before conducting the experiment. The pre-test aimed to prove that both groups were equivalent and equal in terms of their English writing performance to start conducting the study. They were also given a post-test in writing at the end of the experiment. The post-test aimed to identify any possible progress in and differences between the writing performances of both groups. Thus, the posttest was used to measure the students’ writing performance in comparison to the pretest results.

3.1.3.2 A Questionnaire
3.1.3.2.1 Aims of the Questionnaire

Questionnaires are defined as “any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or selecting them among existing answers” (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 6). The questionnaire was designed to answer two research questions using an attitude scale. The attitude scale aimed to reveal students’ attitudes towards receiving both computer-mediated positive and CF on their English writing via Showbie and to identify the WCF strategies that had a positive impact on their performance. It was administered after the experiment for the experimental group as a post-study assessment.

3.1.3.2.2 Items of the Questionnaire

The type of statement format employed in this study was the Likert format, which provides five responses to each statement (Strongly Disagree – Disagree – Neutral – Agree – Strongly Agree). The questionnaire comprised 25 closed-ended items (Appendix B).

3.2 Procedure

3.2.1 Procedure for Conducting the Study

The researcher prepared the instruments of the study: the pre- and post-tests and the questionnaire. These instruments were validated and certified by a jury of members consisting of five EFL professors (Appendix E). The test and the questionnaire were piloted on 17 randomly selected students from the same level.

Before conducting the study, a letter was written to the Dean of Academic Research and then to the head of Languages and Translation College at Al-Imam Muhammed Ibn Saud Islamic University asking for permission to conduct the study in the College of Languages and Translation. After receiving their approval, the letter was submitted to the Deputy of the
College and the fifth level teachers asking permission to use their students as participants in the study (Appendix F).

3.2.2 Procedure for Conducting the Experiment

Before starting the experiment, the researcher informed the experimental group students that they were going to be part of an academic study. In addition, the researcher explained to the students what Showbie is and presented the aim of the study. The researcher asked the students to download the Showbie application from the App Store. Then the researcher created a class on Showbie for the experimental group participants.

After the pretest, the researcher distributed the code of the class. The participants immediately became members of the English writing class and started to interact with the researcher. Each student had her own page from which she could load assignments onto Showbie pages. The experimental group worked with Showbie to upload their English writing assignments given by their teachers and receive feedback on them.

3.2.3 Obtaining Writing Samples and Administering the Questionnaire

Before conducting the experiment, the researcher administered the essay writing pre-test to the two groups to ensure equivalence between the two groups. The researcher examined the pre-test for both the experimental and the control group and found that most of the errors committed by the EFL students were grammatical. As a result, the researcher provided WCF on all grammatical errors.

After the experiment, the researcher administered the post-test to both groups. However, the questionnaire was administered to the experimental group only at the end of the experiment. Table 1 shows the definitions and examples of all grammatical errors corrected in their pre-test and post-test.
### Table 1. Definitions and Examples of Grammatical Errors Corrected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auxiliary Verb</strong></td>
<td>Missing auxiliary or wrong use of auxiliary.</td>
<td>Exercise (is) one of the most important healthy lifestyle habits. The most important habits of a healthy lifestyle is (are) taking exercise and eating healthy food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article/Determiner</strong></td>
<td>Missing article or wrong use of an article, including 'zero article'.</td>
<td>I drink the water every day. Learning the habits of a healthy lifestyle from childhood is an important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparative Forms</strong></td>
<td>Wrong use of comparative form.</td>
<td>Using sun power makes our life more healthy (healthier) than before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conjunction</strong></td>
<td>Missing conjunction or wrong use of conjunction.</td>
<td>You should eat meat, eggs, (and) fruit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part of Speech or Word Form</strong></td>
<td>Wrong use of parts of speech (e.g. adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and verbs).</td>
<td>It makes you more focus (focused). They are very benefit (beneficial) for your body and your mental state. Healthy (Health) is the most important thing in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possession</strong></td>
<td>Wrong use of possessive.</td>
<td>Eating healthy food is important to students success (students’ success).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepositions</strong></td>
<td>Missing preposition or wrong use of a preposition.</td>
<td>We have to take care about (of) our health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pronoun</strong></td>
<td>Lack of subject or redundant use of pronoun.</td>
<td>Some of us have a good life and that is based on (his) him/her healthy lifestyle. Everyone should follow good habits to make them (their) body healthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relative Clause</strong></td>
<td>Wrong structure of a relative clause.</td>
<td>There are many people (who) want to be healthy. Eating healthy food and taking exercise are two important elements (that) help your body in various ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular/Plural</strong></td>
<td>Wrong use of singular or plural.</td>
<td>Every adults (adult) should sleep at least 7 hours at night. Every morning we should eat breakfast that contains protein, calcium, and some vitamin (vitamins).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject-Verb Agreement | Wrong structure of subject-verb agreement. | It enhances (enhances) our work quality. Many people don’t (don’t) know the benefits of water.
---|---|---
Tense | Wrong use of a tense. | If you organized (organize) your day, you will have a healthy lifestyle.
Verb Form | Wrong use of main verb (after modal verbs) or redundant use of main verb. | Healthy food can prevent (can prevent) many diseases. A healthy lifestyle is begins (begins) with sleeping well and early.

### 3.2.4 Feedback Procedure

To make sure that the participants were familiar with the WCF strategies, a file that contains definitions of WCF strategies and examples of them was uploaded to the Showbie English writing class for the experimental group who received treatment on their English writing. Another file that contained the codes or abbreviations of metalinguistic CF was also uploaded. The researchers set a title and a due date for each assignment every week on Showbie. The students had to submit one assignment every week to receive feedback on it. The students uploaded seven essays in seven weeks. The researcher used Microsoft Word’s comments and its track changes function to provide CF to the students, and the assignments were returned to the students electronically via Showbie. The experimental group were given various types of treatment: direct CF, indirect CF, metalinguistic CF, electronic CF, and reformulation along with positive feedback to motivate them, and to encourage them by telling them their points of strength (see Appendix D). The students were asked to study their errors and edit them before submitting the assignments to their teachers. The students received feedback on all the grammatical errors found in their texts.

### 3.3 Instruments’ Validity
The researcher used referee validity in order to prove that the instruments were valid to be applied in the study. The test and the questionnaire were introduced to a jury of members consisting of five EFL professors in English language and methodology at Al-Imam Muhammed Ibn Saud Islamic University. The pre-test/post-test was accepted, but some items on the questionnaire were modified according to their recommendations.

3.4 Instruments’ Reliability

After validating the apparent truthfulness of the research instruments, the researcher applied the questionnaire on a pilot sample of 17 randomly selected students from the same level at Al-Imam Muhammed Ibn Saud Islamic University to assess the reliability of the instruments. The students who participated in the sample study were not included in the study. The results were recorded and analyzed statistically to measure the scale of the reliability of the instruments.

The Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire. It was found that the correlation coefficient values between the degree of the paragraph and the total degree of the axis to which the paragraph belongs are medium and high values, which are positive and statistically significant at a mean level (0.01). This reveals a high degree of internal consistency reflecting a high degree of truth to the resolution paragraphs.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated to test the stability of the study instrument and the general stability coefficient of the questionnaire (0.978). This indicated that the questionnaire has a high degree of stability that can be relied upon in the field of the study.

3.5 Data Analysis
The researcher corrected all errors that were found in their texts. Most of the errors that were found in the pre-test and post-test were grammatical. The researcher classified the grammatical errors into types, counted them, and then counted the total. Then she listed them in a table. Another EFL teacher who is experienced in the field did the same process. This process was also done for both the pre-test and post-test. The researcher compared the newly collected data from the post-test of the experimental group with those of the control group and also with the pre-test of the experimental group, which enabled the researcher to determine the differences between the writing of the two groups and identify the findings of the study (Appendix C).

3.6 Statistical Analysis

Students’ responses to the questionnaire items were collected, computed and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program that is used for statistical calculations. The SPSS program was also used to calculate Cronbach’s Alpha for testing the stability of the questionnaire and to calculate frequencies and percentages of the questionnaire. Then a set of statistical methods were conducted to extract the results and comment on them. Moreover, an independent sample t-test which is a type of SPSS analysis was carried out to calculate the results of students’ English writing performance of both the pre-test and the post-test. In addition, a paired sample t-test which is another type of SPSS analysis was employed to compare the results of the experimental group pre-test and post-test.

3.6.1 Statistical Processing Methods
To achieve the objectives of this study and the analysis of the collected data, appropriate statistical methods were employed using SPSS. After the data was encoded and computed, the researcher determined the length of cells of the 5th scale (minimum and maximum limits), which has been used in this study. The researcher calculated the range (5-1 = 4), and then divided it by the number of the scale's cells to get the correct cell's length (4 / 5 = 0.80). After that, the researcher added this value to the lowest value in the scale in order to determine the upper limit of this cell, and thus the length of the cells became as follows:

- From 1 to 1.80 represents Strongly Disagree
- From 1.81 to 2.60 represents Disagree
- From 2.61 to 3.40 represents Neutral
- From 3.41 to 4.20 represents Agree
- From 4.21 to 5 represents Strongly Agree

The frequencies and percentages were calculated to identify the personal and functional characteristics of the items of the study sample and to identify responses to the items on the main axes. After that, the weighted mean, mean, and standard deviation which are statistical measures were calculated.
Chapter Four

Data Analysis and Results of the Study

This chapter shows the results of the data analysis using the SPSS programs to answer current study’s three research questions.

1. Does providing computer-mediated positive, written corrective feedback on students' English writing make a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of writing development?

2. What are the written corrective feedback strategies that have a positive impact on the development of students' writing performance?

3. What are the experimental group students' attitudes toward receiving computer-mediated positive and corrective feedback on their English writing assignments using the Showbie application?

4. 1 Results of the Study

4. 1.1 Results Related to the First Research Question

To answer the first research question an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the means of the experimental group and those of the control group on the pre-test. The t-test was utilized to ensure that the experimental and the control group were equivalent and comparable. The results of the comparison are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Independent Sample T-test Comparing the Means between the Experimental Group and the Control Group on the Pre-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Significant at α ≤ 0.05**

It is clear from the results shown in Table 2 that the value of the significance level is 0.47 which is higher than 0.05 indicating that there are no statistically significant differences between the control group and the experimental group. This indicates the equivalence and equality of the two groups before conducting the study.

After conducting the study, the independent samples t-test was also conducted to compare the scores of the experimental group and the control group on the post-test. The t-test was employed to detect any statistically significant differences between the performance of the experimental group and that of the control group on the post essay writing test. The results of the analysis of the post-test scores are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. Independent Sample T-test Comparing the Means between the Experimental Group and the Control Group on the Post-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>*0.01</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at α ≤ 0.05

Table 3 shows that the experimental group outperformed the control group since the average number of errors of the experimental group is 10.67 while the average number of errors of the control group is 20.08. It is evident from the table that there is statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups in favor of the experimental group since the level of significance is *0.01 which is less than 0.05.

In addition, a paired sample t-test was conducted to compare the means of the experimental group on the pre-test and post-test. The t-test was employed to detect any
statistically significant differences between the performance of the experimental group on the pre-test and the post-test. The results of the analysis of the experimental pre-post-test scores are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Paired Sample T-test Comparing the Means of the Experimental Group on the Pre-Test and the Post-Test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std.</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.92</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>*0.04</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that the average number of errors of the experimental group on the pre-test is 17.92 while the average number of errors on the post-test is 10.67. It is evident from the table that there are statistically significant differences between the means of the experimental group on the pre-test and post-test since the level of significance is *0.04, which is less than (0.05). Consequently, it can be concluded that providing positive feedback, WCF on students’ English writing seems to be effective via the LMS Showbie as a medium.

4.1.2 Results Related to the Second Research Question

To answer the second question of the study, the researcher distributed a questionnaire to collect data related to the second question. The results of the WCF strategies that have a positive impact on the development of the students' English writing performance are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. *Means and Standard Deviations of the Experimental Group Students’ Responses on the WCF Strategies that had a Positive Impact on their Performance*
Table 5 shows that there is a variation in the responses of the participants on the axis (the WCF strategies that have a positive impact on the development of the students' writing performance). The general mean of the study respondents on this axis is 3.40 out of 5 and this mean is placed at the third class of the five scale that refers to the (neutral) degree.
Accordingly, Saudi students differed in prioritizing the WCF strategies that were utilized by the researcher to provide CF on their writing. Thus it has been noticed that the statements concerning this axis can be arranged from the perspectives of the respondents themselves regarding their use in a degree in a descending order as the following:

1. The responses of the participants to Statement 1 (“I prioritize that the teacher provides me with correction of my writing errors”) appear in the 1st position with the (strongly agree) degree. The mean is 4.33 and the standard deviation is 0.65, which means that the students strongly prioritize receiving direct CF on their English writing. Direct CF obtains the highest priority.

2. The responses of the participants to Statement 4 (“I prioritize that the teacher numbers the errors and then writes a grammatical explanation for each numbered error”) appear in the 2nd position with the (agree) degree. The mean is 3.83 and the standard deviation is 0.83, which means that students prioritize receiving grammatical explanation on their errors, which is one type of metalinguistic CF.

3. The responses of the participants to Statement 5 (“I prioritize that the teacher indicates my errors and then provides me with a hyperlink to a concordance file showing examples of correct usage”) are at the 3rd position with the (agree) degree. The mean is 3.67 and the standard deviation is 0.98. This means that the students prioritize receiving electronic CF.

4. The responses of the participants to Statement 6 (“I prioritize that the teacher reworks the students' entire sentence to make the language sound as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact”) are at the 4th position with the
(agree) degree. The mean is 3.50 and the standard deviation is 0.67. This indicates that the students prioritize receiving reformulated CF.

5. The responses of the participants to Statement 3 which states that “I prioritize that the teacher uses error codes that indicate the error (e.g. art. = article)” come at the 5th position with (neutral) degree. The mean is 3.17 and the standard deviation is 1.11. This shows that the students were neutral towards receiving metalinguistic CF using error codes.

6. The responses of the participants to Statement 2 (“I prioritize that the teacher only underlines the errors without correcting them”) are at the 6th position with the (disagree) degree. The mean is 1.92 and the standard deviation is 0.67.

The results of the second question indicate that the WCF strategies that have a positive impact on the development of the students' English writing performance and that are prioritized by the students are direct CF, metalinguistic CF using grammatical explanation, electronic CF, and reformulation. On the other hand, the WCF strategies that obtain the least priorities represent metalinguistic CF using error codes and indirect CF.

### 4.1.3 Results Related to the Third Research Question

In order to answer the third question of the study, the researcher utilized a questionnaire to collect data. The results, mean scores, standard deviations, rank, and degree of the responses from the students in the experimental group for each statement in the questionnaire are displayed in Table 6.

| Table 6. Means and Standard Deviations of the Experimental Group Students’ Responses |
towards Receiving Computer-mediated Positive and Corrective Feedback on their English Writing via Showbie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I like to have computer-mediated positive and written corrective feedback from the teacher on my English writing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I prefer to receive no feedback from my teacher.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive feedback motivates me to be a better writer.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positive feedback shows me my progress in writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My English writing has improved after receiving both positive and corrective feedback.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Showbie helps me to obtain useful and essential feedback from my teacher.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I think that getting computer-mediated feedback on my writing assignments is very useful and interesting.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Computer-mediated feedback helps me to write my papers better.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Getting computer-mediated feedback has motivated me to become better at English writing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Showbie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application makes teacher-student feedback more effective.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>17 Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to discuss my errors with my teacher via computer.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very easy to get feedback via Showbie because of the mobile use.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12 Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I have learned more about writing in English in this class than in other English classes where the teacher provides feedback traditionally.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer the traditional way of submitting assignments and receiving feedback to being engaged in educational applications, such as Showbie.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18 Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it is a good idea to incorporate computer-mediated feedback into English writing classes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have positive attitudes toward receiving feedback on my English writing assignments via Showbie.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I got more individual attention from the teacher in Showbie application.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that I received adequate feedback on my English writing assignments through Showbie.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed using Showbie to submit my assignments and receive feedback on them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clearly, Table 6 shows that there is a variation in the responses of the participants on the axis (the experimental group students' attitudes towards receiving computer-mediated positive feedback and CF on their English writing assignments using the Showbie application). Additionally, the general mean on the statements of the axis is (3.97), and the mean is placed at the fourth class on the five scale, whose average ranges from (3.41 to 4.20), which refers to the (agree) degree and implies that the students agree that receiving computer-mediated positive feedback and CF have an impact on their English writing using the Showbie application.

It is evident from Table 6 that the students prefer receiving positive feedback on their English writing. These results are derived from statements 3 and 4. Statement 3 (“Positive feedback motivates me to be a better writer”) has the first rank with the (strongly agree) degree. The mean is 4.75 and the standard deviation is 0.62. Moreover, Statement 4 (“Positive feedback shows me my progress in writing”) has the second rank with the (strongly agree) degree. The mean is 4.58 and the standard deviation is 0.51.

In addition, another considerable result towards using Showbie to receive computer-mediated feedback is confirmed in Statements 25, 13, and 23. Statement 25 (“I enjoyed using Showbie to submit my assignments and receive feedback on them”) has the third rank with (strongly agree) degree. The mean is 4.50 and the standard deviation is 0.67. Besides, Statement 13 which states that “I think that getting computer-mediated feedback on my writing assignments is very useful and interesting” has the fourth rank with (strongly agree) degree. The mean is 4.42 and the standard deviation is 0.79. Statement 23 (“I felt that I got more individual attention from the teacher in Showbie application”) has the fifth rank with
the (strongly agree) degree. The mean is 4.33 and the standard deviation is 0.78.

It is obvious that students preferred receiving computer-mediated positive feedback and WCF on their English writing. This is conveyed in Statements 5 and 1, ("My English writing has improved after receiving both positive and corrective feedback") and ("I like to have computer-mediated positive and written corrective feedback from the teacher on my English writing"). Statements 5 and 1 are ranked sixth and seventh and with high means 4.33 and 4.17. Besides the standard deviations are 0.78 and 0.94. This means that students strongly agree that their English writing has improved after receiving both positive and CF.

The results in Table 6 also show that computer-mediated feedback via Showbie is effective. This is emphasized in Statements 12, 24, 14, 15, 18, 16, 22, 19, and 21. The responses of the participants to Statement 12 ("Showbie helps me to obtain useful and essential feedback from my teacher") have the 8th rank with the (agree) degree. The mean is 4.17 and the standard deviation is 0.94. The responses of the participants to Statement 24 ("I felt that I received adequate feedback on my English writing assignments through Showbie") have the 9th rank with the (agree) degree. The responses of the participants to Statement 14 ("Computer-mediated feedback helps me to write my papers better") have the 10th rank with the (agree) degree. The means of Statements 24 and 14 are 4.17 and the standard deviations are 0.58. The responses of the participants to Statement 15 ("Getting computer-mediated feedback has motivated me to become better at English writing") rank 11th with the (agree) degree. The mean is 4.08 and the standard deviation is 0.51. The responses of the participants to Statement 18 ("It is very easy to get feedback via Showbie because of the mobile use") rank 12th with the (agree) degree. The mean is 4.08 and the standard deviation is 0.79. The responses of the participants to Statement 16 ("The Showbie application makes teacher-
student feedback more effective”) rank 13th with the (agree) degree. The mean is 4.00 and the standard deviation is 1.04. The responses of the participants to Statement 22 (“I have positive attitudes toward receiving feedback on my English writing assignments via Showbie”) rank 14th with the (agree) degree. The mean is 4.00 and the standard deviation is 0.43. The responses of the participants to Statement 19 (“I feel I have learned more about writing in English in this class than in other English classes where the teacher provides feedback traditionally”) rank 15th with the (agree) degree. The mean is 3.75 and the standard deviation is 0.87. The responses of the participants to Statement 21 (“I think it is a good idea to incorporate computer-mediated feedback into English writing classes”) rank 16th with the (agree) degree. The mean is 3.75 and the standard deviation is 0.62.

The responses of the participants to Statement 17 (“I prefer to discuss my errors with my teacher via computer”) rank 17th with the (neutral) degree. The mean is 3.33 and the standard deviation is 0.49. The responses of the participants to Statement 20 (“I prefer the traditional way of submitting assignments and receiving feedback to being engaged in educational applications, such as Showbie”) rank 18th with the (neutral) degree. The mean is 3.17 and the standard deviation is 0.83. The results of these statements indicate that computer-mediated feedback via Showbie should be used as a supplement to the traditional classroom not as a replacement of it. The responses of the participants to Statement 2 (“I prefer to receive no feedback from my teacher”) rank 19th with the (strongly disagree) degree. The mean is 1.67 and the standard deviation is 0.78. This indicates that students prefer to receive feedback from their teacher rather than no feedback.

Chapter Five
Summary and Discussion of the Findings, Pedagogical Implications, Limitations, and Recommendations

This chapter consists of five sections: (a) summary and discussion of the study main findings in the light of the literature review; (b) conclusion; (c) pedagogical implications for EFL teachers; (d) limitations of the current study; and (e) recommendations for further studies.

5.1 Summary and Discussion of the Study Key Findings

The main objective of the study was to investigate the impact of providing computer-mediated positive feedback, WCF via Showbie on Saudi EFL students’ English writing. It also aimed to explore the WCF strategies that had a positive impact on students’ writing performance. The third objective was to examine students’ attitudes towards receiving computer-mediated positive feedback and CF on their English writing via Showbie. The researcher used quantitative instruments to gather the data.

To achieve its aims, the study addressed three research question.

The findings regarding the first question, “Does providing computer-mediated positive, written corrective feedback on students' English writing make a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of writing development?”, showed statistically significant differences between the performance of the experimental group and the control group in favor of the experimental group. The findings of this study were consistent with the findings of some previous studies: AbuSeileek (2013); Alajmi (2015); AlHarbi (2016); Llanos Bultrón (2014); Maleki and Eslami (2013); Saadi and Saadat (2015); Seiffedin and El-Sakka (2017); Soltanabidi Farshi and Khalili Safa (2015); Yaseen (2016). Therefore, the results of the current study in conjunction with the findings of these
previous studies demonstrate that using WCF and computer-mediated WCF promote the process of English writing. Accordingly, using Showbie as a medium to provide feedback had a significant impact on creating an interactive environment and raising outcomes.

The quantitative data showed that WCF is effective as it helped students overcome their errors and learn to be more accurate writers of English. In addition, the quantitative findings have implications for the study context where WCF should be given importance to help students improve their English writing. These findings also provide more evidence to the lately existing research in support of the effectiveness of WCF (e.g., Beuningen et al, 2011; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009, 2010; Ferris, 2010; Ferris et al, 2013; Guénette & Lyster, 2013; Vyatkina, 2011).

As for the second research question “What are the written corrective feedback strategies that have a positive impact on the development of the students' writing performance?”, the findings pointed out that the participants differed in their priorities of the WCF strategies as classified by Ellis (2009) that they received to improve their English writing when using Showbie as a medium. The type of strategy that obtained the highest priority and helped them to perform better is direct CF. This finding was in conjunction with the finding of the following studies: Maleki and Eslami (2013), and Saadi and Saadat (2015).

In addition, the findings showed that the participants prioritized receiving metalinguistic CF using grammatical explanation, electronic CF and reformulation. However, the findings indicated that they were neutral towards receiving metalinguistic CF using error codes and that indirect CF is the least prioritized strategy compared to the other types.

Concerning the third research question, “What are the experimental group students' attitudes towards receiving computer-mediated positive and corrective feedback on their
English writing assignments using the Showbie application?”, the findings showed that computer-mediated positive feedback is potentially useful when integrated into teaching and learning English writing. This finding was confirmed by AlKhatib (2015). The results of this study recommend that it is practical and promising to integrate computer-mediated WCF via CALL technologies in the EFL writing curriculum. This finding was in agreement with those of AbuSeileek (2013), Llanos Bultrón (2014), Saadi and Saadat (2015), Seiffedin and El-Sakka (2017), and Soltanabidi Farshi and Khalili Safa (2015). The findings revealed that the participants valued their teachers’ feedback and placed great importance on it. They perceived the significant role that computer-mediated feedback plays in improving their English writing. This finding was in accordance with Llanos Bultrón’s study (2014). Furthermore, the results of the study showed that the participants appreciated receiving both WCF and positive feedback on their English writing. In addition, the findings revealed that computer-mediated feedback is useful and interesting and it helped and motivated the participants to be better at English writing which was in congruent with the finding of Llanos Bultrón’s study (2014). Therefore, the students had positive attitudes towards using Showbie as they enjoyed using it due to its easy access via mobile devices. This finding was in accordance with Saadi and Saadat’ study (2015). Showbie helped them receive useful and essential feedback, which helped enhance their English writing. Similarly, the findings of the present study showed that students felt that Showbie created an effective environment for teacher-student feedback, as it helped them receive more individual attention and adequate feedback from their teacher. They also felt that they have learned more about writing in English in this class than in other English classes where the teacher provides feedback traditionally.
The results of the current study along with the findings of the previous studies prove that students have positive attitudes towards receiving computer-mediated feedback and towards using Showbie as a medium to receive positive feedback and WCF. Moreover, the findings of the study showed the effectiveness of positive feedback, WCF in enhancing and improving students’ English writing. Showbie as a medium is significant due to its ease of implementation, accessibility and simplicity. Besides, students had positive attitudes towards using Showbie in English writing classes because they received essential and adequate feedback, got more individual attention from the teacher, and it promoted student-teacher interaction. Also, identifying unique individual students’ needs and preferences when implementing technology, discussing errors, and providing feedback is crucial to their success.

5.2 Conclusion

The results of the current study showed the significant effect of both positive feedback and WCF on the students’ English writing performance via Showbie in using grammatical structures. Based on the analysis of findings, the researcher concluded that:

1. Teachers’ positive feedback and WCF are essential for learning English and help improve students’ English writing.

2. EFL students consider receiving feedback on their English writing to be important to their academic success.

3. EFL students have positive attitudes towards implementing CALL technologies into the educational process.

4. The educational environments in which CALL technologies are implemented are highly motivating for students who are learning to write in English.
5. Computer-mediated feedback could be greatly encouraging and supportive for learning writing skills.

6. Computer-mediated feedback should be utilized as a practical and effective tool in the educational process of language learning and teaching.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications for EFL Teachers

In the light of the findings of the current study, the following pedagogical implications are suggested:

1. When providing feedback, EFL teachers need to consider factors related to language proficiency, SLA, and writing skill improvement as demonstrated in teachers’ guides.

2. EFL teachers need to consider that the effectiveness of feedback may depend on students’ individual differences, such as their motivation, proficiency level, cognitive style, age, noticing and interpretation and attitudes towards feedback.

3. EFL teachers also need to consider other factors that contribute to influencing L2 learners’ writing accuracy such as the clarity of the feedback, the way the feedback is provided, the amount of feedback, and when the feedback is provided.

4. EFL teachers should provide both positive feedback and CF, as this helps EFL students identify their strengths and weaknesses in English writing.

5. EFL teachers should use a variety of styles (e.g. praise, criticism, suggestion, etc.) to provide feedback based on individual student’s needs. For example, criticism could encourage some students to work harder and discourage others who become less careful when criticized.
6. EFL teachers should take into consideration the needs and preferences of the students when choosing a feedback strategy or a combination of feedback strategies in order to make appropriate selection.

7. Teachers should be aware of the effectiveness of Showbie as a medium for providing feedback, and as a result, improving students’ English writing.

8. EFL teachers should implement technology as a supplement to their traditional ELT classroom.


10. The use of computer-mediated feedback via Showbie creates a social collaborative learning experience and positive attitudes towards learning English writing.

11. The use of Showbie helps teachers to have a paperless class by submitting assignment and receiving feedback electronically, saves students assignments over time, helps to track their improvement and helps students to be organized.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

This study had a number of limitations:

1. The study was restricted to female students in the 5th level at Al-Imam Muhammed Ibn Saud Islamic University in the academic year 1438/1439_2017/2018.

2. The results are based on a small number of participants. The sample included 24 participants.

3. The researcher looked only at the effect of WCF and the study lasted for a short period of time, only seven weeks, for logistical reasons.
4. The participants of this study included only advanced level students majoring in English language. Hence, the results cannot be generalized to other proficiency levels and other majors.

5. The study was limited to using Showbie as a medium to provide positive feedback and WCF on students’ English writing.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Studies

In light of the findings and conclusions of this study, the researcher presents the following recommendations for future studies:

1. There is a need for research that utilizes a long-term study design and includes more participants. Future research should cover the duration of a whole academic semester or a whole academic year. It should use a pre-test, a post-test, and a delayed post-test in the design. These should be different tests versus similar ones.

2. A research that combines both qualitative and quantitative data will lead to findings that are more reliable and which help to get a complete picture about the writing of L2 learners (Hyland, 2016).

3. It is recommended to carry out a research that investigates the impact of CF on students’ writing when the students are asked to re-draft a piece of writing and not doing so to measure the difference between writing a second draft of an essay and just a first draft. This might also assist the researcher to distinguish between students’ errors that need to be corrected and which are made due to lack of knowledge and mistakes which are made due to lack of attention and are likely to disappear in the second draft.
4. The current research focuses mainly on WCF. There is a need for research that incorporates oral conference feedback with WCF to achieve better effects.

5. Students’ English proficiency levels may correspond with their capacity to benefit from CF, so there is also a need for research that has two experimental groups: one of a lower English proficiency level and the other of a higher English proficiency level. Both groups should be given similar treatment.

6. There is also a need for research that compares the effectiveness of two or more types of WCF strategies. For example, a study should have two experimental groups that receive different types of treatment.

7. Individual students’ variation in their response to CF should be investigated. Corrective feedback might work with one student, but not with another.

8. There is also a need for research that investigates the effectiveness of peer CF due to its importance in language learning.

9. A research that includes male participants may yield additional reliable findings.

10. There is a need for research that compares the use of teacher-written corrective feedback and computer-mediated corrective feedback.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Pre-Post-test
Appendix A

Pre-Post-test

Name ........................................... Age ............

Nationality ......................

The pre-post-test question was the following:

In no less than 120 words, write an essay about healthy lifestyle habits.

..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
..................................................................................................................
Wish you All the Best

Appendix B

Students’ Questionnaire
Appendix B

The Questionnaire of the Study

The Impact of Corrective Feedback via Showbie on Students' English Writing

Dear Participant,

I am conducting a study whose aim is to identify the impact of computer-mediated positive and corrective feedback on Saudi students' English writing using Showbie in partial fulfillment of the MA degree in Linguistics at Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University. I should be grateful if you would kindly complete the questionnaire below. Your participation will involve responding to 25 statements. Responses will be only used for the purpose of this study. This research study would benefit from your input. Your co-operation, time and effort are highly appreciated. Please, respond to each statement and put a check (√) in the space that represents your opinion.

The researcher,

Najat Al-Saleh

E-MAIL: najatalsaleh@gmail.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I like to have computer-mediated positive and written corrective feedback from the teacher on my English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I prefer to receive no feedback from my teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Positive feedback motivates me to be a better writer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Positive feedback shows me my progress in writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My English writing has improved after receiving both positive and corrective feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I prioritize that the teacher provides me with correction of my writing errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I prioritize that the teacher only underlines the errors without correcting them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I prioritize that the teacher uses error codes that indicate the error (e.g. ww = wrong word).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It prioritize that the teacher numbers the errors and then writes a grammatical explanation for each numbered error.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I prioritize that the teacher indicates my errors and then provides me with a hyperlink to a concordance file showing examples of correct usage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I prioritize that the teacher reworks on the students' entire sentence to make the language sound as a native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Showbie helps me to obtain useful and essential feedback from my teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I think that getting computer-mediated feedback on my writing assignments is very useful and interesting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Computer-mediated feedback helps me to write my papers better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Getting computer-mediated feedback has motivated me to become better at English writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Showbie application makes teacher-student feedback more effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I prefer to discuss my errors with my teacher via computer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It is very easy to get feedback via Showbie because of the mobile use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel I have learned more about writing in English in this class than in other English classes where the teacher provides feedback traditionally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I prefer the traditional way of submitting assignments and receiving feedback to being engaged in educational applications, such as Showbie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I think it is a good idea to incorporate computer-mediated feedback into English writing classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I have positive attitudes toward receiving feedback on my English writing assignments via Showbie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I felt that I got more individual attention from the teacher in Showbie application.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I felt that I received adequate feedback on my English writing assignments through Showbie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I enjoyed using Showbie to submit my assignments and receive feedback on them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND CO-OPERATION
Appendix C

Pre- Post-test Error correction
Appendix C1

Errors corrected in the Pre-test for the Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Code</th>
<th>Length of Essay (per-word)</th>
<th>Auxiliary Verb</th>
<th>Article / Determiner</th>
<th>Comparative / Superlative Forms</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Part of Speech OR Word Form</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Relative Clauses</th>
<th>Singular vs. Plural</th>
<th>Subject-Verb Agreement</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C2
Errors corrected in the Pre-test for the Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Code</th>
<th>Length of Essay (per-word)</th>
<th>Auxiliary Verb</th>
<th>Article / Determiner</th>
<th>Comparative / Superlative Forms</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Part of Speech OR Word form</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Relative Clauses</th>
<th>Singular vs. Plural</th>
<th>Subject-Verb Agreement</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C3

Errors corrected in the Post-test for the Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Code</th>
<th>Length of Essay (per-word)</th>
<th>Auxiliary Verb</th>
<th>Article / Determiner</th>
<th>Comparative / Superlative Forms</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Part of Speech OR Word form</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Relative Clauses</th>
<th>Singular vs. Plural</th>
<th>Subject-Verb Agreement</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C4

Errors Corrected in the Post-test for the Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Code</th>
<th>Length of Essay (per-word)</th>
<th>Auxiliary Verb</th>
<th>Article Determiner</th>
<th>Comparative Superlative Forms</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Part of Speech OR Word Form</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Relative Clauses</th>
<th>Singular vs. Plural</th>
<th>Subject-Verb Agreement</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Samples of Students’ English Writing and researcher’s Feedback
Appendix D1

Sample of Students’ Writing using Direct Correction and Positive Feedback

- Your essay has an engaging title.
- The first two lines of your essay grabbed my attention. (Language is a very important means of communication. It is very difficult to think of a society without a language).
- The thesis statement is clear.
- Most of the sentences are clear and make sense.
- Your essay is free of punctuation errors.
- The topic sentence of the second body paragraph is clear.
- This line (A long trip will face the learner until being confident of their second language) is good to conclude with because you wrote about the challenges of learning English.

The Challenges of Learning English Language as a second language

Language is a very important means of communication. It is very difficult to think of a society without a language. English language is one of the most popular language languages to learn. Many people choose to learn the language simply to place them in a better position to secure work, and to communicate with more people around the globe. In addition, English language is not easy to learn. It has a lot of challenges that any learner should pass.
To learn English as a second language, you should learn 4 basic skills which are listening, reading, speaking, and writing. The first challenge that English learners will face is being confident while speaking. The solution is to try record their voices and listen to the recordings to work on their mistakes.

Learning vocabulary plays an important role in every language that cannot be ignored. Learners should take vocabulary into consideration because learning vocabulary is the only way that speakers can speak! Learners might face with a word which does not have any specific meaning in their mother tongue language.

In conclusion, according to the previous reasons I think learning a new language is never easy and it has many difficulties. A long trip will face the learner until being confident of their second language.

Appendix D2

Sample of Students’ Writing using Indirect Correction
Appendix D3

Sample of Students’ Writing using Error Codes
Appendix D4

Sample of Students’ Writing using Grammatical Explanation
1. Your essay has a very good introduction and the thesis statement is clear to
   the reader.

2. The topic sentence of the second body paragraph is clear and makes sense.

3. Each paragraph carries one main idea.

4. Your essay is free from spelling mistakes.

5. Your essay is coherent and focused.

6. I like that you used direct quotes which strengthen your essay quality. Doing
   this shows the connections between ideas, giving greater cohesion and clarity
   to your writing.

7. I like this line in your conclusion “Everyone also should know how, why,
   and when to use them.” Which really makes sense.

   **The Impact of Cell Phones on Our Social Lives**

   Cell phones have become a staple of our society, with everyone from elementary
   school kids to senior citizens owning at least one. **In these days** nowadays, everyone
   needs cellphones to contact with the people, and to know the world news. Using cell
   phones are different in use from one person to another. Cellphones can be used
   differently by different people. They have some advantages and disadvantages in our
   social lives, and also everyone should know how to minimize their negative impact.
Cellphones are good tools to keep in touch with friends and relatives; for example, Todd Starkweather, General Studies program director at South University, says "If a friend went on vacation you probably wouldn’t hear from them while they’re away, but now you often receive frequent updates of their journey from the road". Although having the ability to connect with anyone, at almost anytime, is convenient. Cell phones made our lives easier to stay in touch with the people you can care about, and also to plan and schedule our daily routine. They also respond positively to the notion that their phone helps them be connected with others, schedule their lives, and be productive. Cell phones also can save our times, because they allow us to find information easily.

There are many disadvantages in using cellphones. Some of them are: eyes pain, and wasting time. Some of cell phones owners are addicted, they are sleeping next to their phones; to check their phone frequently for messages or alerts even though they didn’t hear a notification. Saunders Medlock, the Psychologist in the University of South Carolina, said says: "The use of texting and Facebook and Twitter and other sites as a form of communication is eroding people’s ability to write sentences that communicate real meaning and inhibit the art of dialogue", and she said states: "It also allows people to communicate without ever seeing each other or hearing a voice, and this has a huge impact in that much communication is done nonverbally or in inflection and tone of voice. We will have a generation that has no clue how to read any of these cues."

To make cell phones useful in our everyday lives, everyone should use them in a good way. The problem here is not using the cellphones, but how can we put some limited in using them, otherwise the people will be addicted to them. Saunders Medlock advises mobile phone users to set rules and practice good phone etiquette. She believed this constant reliance on mobile phones is having a negative impact on people's interpersonal skills. Cell phones should be using in balance to avoid the negative things that impact our personal life effects on our personal life.

In conclusion, cell phones are a good invention in our lives these days, a cell phone is a good invention and it has become an important part of our daily lives. They have Cellphones have some advantages and disadvantages. We should focus on the advantages and avoid the bad things their bad usage to keep these smart phones helpful and useful in our daily lives. Everyone also should know how, why, and when to use them.
Appendix D5

Sample of Students’ Writing using Reformulation

- Your essay has an engaging introduction that really grabbed my attention and title.
- Each paragraph has logical organization, coherence and contains clear topic sentences.
  1. Introduction of cellphones positive and negative impact
  2. Positive impact of cellphones
  3. Negative impact of cellphones
  4. How to reduce the negative impact of cellphones
- Conclusion that summarizes the whole essay.
- Your essay reflects comprehension of the topic and expresses original ideas.
- All sentences are clear and make sense; you used interesting vocabulary.
- Your essay is free of spelling errors.
- Your essay is focused.
- Your used transition words which make your essay coherent such as first, also, in addition, etc.
- Your conclusion is interesting as it summarizes the whole essay.
- Great use of comma and conjunction to join independent clauses.
- There are no run on sentences.

Good job!

Cellphones have become essential in our society. Cellphones have become an essential instrument (tool) in our modern society OR cellphones have become a staple of our society.

OR Cellphones have become an essential part (tool) of everyday life. It is with everyone whether he/she is a child or an old people. OR Nowadays almost everyone has a cellphone.

Whether in the mall, driving down the road, or just standing on the line there is a great possibility that a cell phone will be seen. Most people have them either in the pocket, on the hip, or attached to the ear. When cell phones were not as prevalent, society was very different. Cell phones are cheaper than ever, smaller than when they first surfaced, and have become very advanced technologically. Cell phones have a huge effect positively and negatively positive and negative effects on Saudi society today. We should avoid the negative effects of cellphones. However, we should look for ways to reduce the negative effects of cellphones on our social life.
No matter where your family or your friends are in the world, with one touch you can communicate with them through voice calls or texting or (text messaging) or even live chatting! This is one of millions benefits impact of cellphones. Either this is one of the million beneficial (positive) effects of cellphones OR this is one of the million benefits of cellphones. Nowadays with the high technology on the cellphones, you could even do your work and print it with one touch. A lot of applications nowadays make our life easier, you can now manage your bank accounts without stepping out your home door and even manage your government work such as Absher. Also, if you get lost on the road, one google map application can guide you wherever you want. If you're hungry and you are too lazy to drive, one touch can get you thousands of food choices. That is how cellphones have positive impact on our lives.

However, the use of cell phones can be dangerous sometimes. Most of the accidents that happen daily arise because of cellphones usage while driving. The cellphones have resulted in distracted driving, whose direct impact can be seen in increasing number of accidents. Apart from accidents, cellphones have bad impact on health as well. Several researches conducted by the health experts have proved the bad impact of cellphones on health.

As I mentioned earlier, cellphones have positive and negative impacts on our lives. These are the positive and negative impacts of cell phones on our lives. These is no doubt using mobile is The use of cellphones or Cellphone usage has become a necessity these days, but we should take care of the negative points too and use this technology accordingly. First, governments should ban using phones while driving. This may reduce the number of accidents every year. Also, people who are addicted to their phones should get a healthy social life. Try to talk to people around you and open conversations that interest you. By the time, you will get used to be away from your phone. In addition, take a break away from your devices, travel overseas with your phone off. This will enhance the human mood, and make you more productive at work!

To sum up, the use of modern smart-phones can be both freeing and enslaving at the same time. The cell-phone allows us the freedom to gather information, communicate, and socialize in ways only dreamed of before the discovery of cellular technology. At the same time, however, cell-phones can lead to addiction, car accidents and unsocial lifestyle.
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Sample of Students’ Writing using Electronic Feedback

- I enjoyed reading your essay.
- The way you write is very interesting.
- Your introduction really grabbed my attention.
- The thesis statement is clear and the topic sentence of the second body paragraph is also very clear.
- Your writing is focused and there is a logical sequencing of information.
- Great use of commas and conjunction to join independent clauses.
- Most of the sentences are clear and make sense.
- Your conclusion is very nice.

My mom and I

My mom and I seem to be very similar to each other in our appearances or and Link hobbies. When you see us, you will say that they look like each other. However, when you compare us and focus Link currently, you will find the differences in our look and hobbies.

There are many differences between me and my mom. Unlike me, my mom has a long brown hair Link. She has a beautiful brown eyes Link. In contrast, my eyes are Link small and black. When we talk about the height Link, she is taller than
Link small and black. When we talk about the height, Link is taller than me. She is 169 cm, but I am 169 cm. For me, it is fine with me if my mom looks more beautiful than me.

Although we have a lot of differences in our look, we have a lot in our hobbies. My mom likes to stay in at home in the weekend. Unlike me, she prefers to spend her time reading, Link poetry or novel, Link. We love to watch Link movies, but everyone has her own kind. I like to watch Korean movies, Link In contrast, my mom likes to watch American movies, Link.

In conclusion, these differences between me and my mom did not interrupt our life or make us be more isolated from each other. We can learn from each other and we can affect each other.
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Appendix F1

Formal Request to Conduct the study

To investigate the effectiveness of providing both positive and corrective feedback on students' English writing using a language-learning platform that is called Showbie.

To identify the written corrective feedback strategies that have had a positive impact on students' English writing.

To investigate the effectiveness of integrating Showbie into English writing classes to provide both positive and corrective for the students.
**Appendix F1**

**Formal Request to Conduct the Study**

---

### Table: Formal Request to Conduct the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>منحة عدلعزيز الساحل</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>السماح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of the Researcher</td>
<td>د. علي بن نايف الراطي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification Grade</td>
<td>د. محمد بن نايف الأحديب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Submission</td>
<td>٢١/٧/٣٧</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Supplementary Note:

1. An informal request to the university to conduct the study is made, specifying details about the study and the relevance of the topic to the university's academic mission.
2. A formal request is submitted to the university administration for approval.
3. The study's objectives and methodology are outlined, emphasizing the importance of the research in addressing specific educational challenges.
4. A detailed plan is provided for the implementation of the study, including timelines and resource allocation.
5. The expected outcomes and the significance of the findings are discussed, highlighting the potential impact on the university's academic programs and student outcomes.

---

### Conclusion:

The request is presented with a strong rationale, backed by academic and practical justifications, ensuring its alignment with the university's strategic goals and research priorities.
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The Dean of Scientific Research Letter with the Student’s Affiliation and Purpose of the Study
Appendix F3

The Dean of Languages and Translation College Letter with the Student’s Affiliation and Purpose of the Study