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Abstract: Researchers working in educational settings are increasingly paying attention to the role students’ thoughts and beliefs play in the learning process. Teacher/student feedback and students self-efficacy, as key elements of social cognitive theory, appear to be an important variable because it affects students’ motivation and learning. This article investigates empirical literature about the role of student and teacher feedbacks in EFL writing performance. It also explored the relationship between learners’ self-feedback and increasing their self-efficacy. Ninety advanced Iranian EFL learners were chosen as the participant of this study based on their performance on Oxford Quick Placement Test. After pretest 48 students were randomly divided into two groups: control group received teacher-feedback for their writings and the experimental group received self-feedback on their performance. The results of parametric statistics suggested no difference in writing ability of the participants receiving self or teacher-feedback, but the results showed that applying self-feedback strategies increased learners’ self-efficacy. The results also indicated that educational programs have the possibility to enhance students’ self-efficacy, and programs based on self feedbacks proved to be particularly successful. Several factors appeared to influence students’ self-efficacy and provided evidence of the potency of the main sources of self-efficacy. Directions for future research are indicated.
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1. INTRODUCTION

As EFL education enrollment increases, (Allen & Seaman, 2011), innovative practices are needed to improve quality instruction. One area that needs further exploration is that of promoting students’ self-efficacy and responsibility for correct use of feedback. There has been a continuous debate among scholars and teachers regarding the role of corrective feedback in helping students learn effectively, and error feedback are still considered a questionable issue (Ferris, 2004; Truscott, 2007). Although many researchers have been done about this issue, but still there is a lot of confusion in what kind of error feedback – self-feedback or teacher-feedback – helps which learners to improve which parts of their performance.

Because of this point, many foreign language (EFL) teachers are often confused about helping the students. Some teachers still provides explicit grammatical feedback however, there is a questions as to the usefulness of direct feedback treatment. Error feedback may not help students’ improvement regardless of the teachers ‘time and effort (Truscott, 2007). For this reason some researchers are not sure about the effectiveness of error feedback offered in classroom instruction (Truscott, 2007). However, EFL students whose inter-language isn’t completely developed need and expect grammar feedback on their errors from the teacher (Ferris, 2004).
The learners can do the feedback individually, or in groups. Self-feedback and teacher-feedback are the methods that are used in the more learner-centered approaches these days. Both seem to be promising and effective. The students’ Self-feedback can have a long-lasting effect on their memory, because they are involved in the process directly and actively, and this can activate the operations necessary for long-term retention. Walz, (1982) found that advanced learners could correct 95% of their errors (p. 56). This method, too, can be informative, because it comes from someone who has had the same experience. Furthermore, it is less threatening, because no scoring is involved.

Lyster (1998) found that corrective sequences involving negotiation of form (i.e., feedback types that provided clues for self-repair rather than correct reformulations) were more likely than recasts and explicit feedbacks to lead to immediate repair of lexical and grammatical errors, whereas recasts were found to be effective in leading to the repair of phonological errors. Later on, three studies were conducted in Iran, an EFL context, to investigate the impact of feedback on writing or accuracy. Yeganehfar (2000) compared the effect of teacher-feedback versus self-feedback on Iranian students’ writing proficiency. The participants were 20 advanced Iranians students. At the end, she reached the conclusion that the experimental group who received feedback from the teacher performed much better than the self-feedback group in the post-test. Bahrami (2002) investigated the effect of three different types of feedback on the writing ability of 30 female advanced Iranian students. She studied three methods of teacher-feedback, self-feedback (underlining), and minimal marking (indicating the type of errors). The results showed that minimal marking and self feedback were more effective strategies than the traditional teacher feedback. Erfanian (2002) studied the efficacy of self-feedback strategy on the development of Iranian EFL learners’ linguistic competence. He compared self-feedback with the traditional teacher-feedback. The study came to the point that self feedback was a good way of providing feedback on written work, and led to the development of linguistic competence of Iranian learners.

Learner’s accuracy is one of the most complicated aspects of becoming proficient in second language. Consequently there are many variables that can affect the effectiveness of giving feedback and teachers should be aware of all of them. The teacher should consider all of these aspects when complementing error feedback (Baleghizadeh & Gordani, 2012). Ferris (2004) defines self-feedback as a strategy of monitoring when some of the errors are noticed by the learners themselves and it appears to be scaffolding within the realm of learning by providing learners with cues or hints about the errors by the teachers. Linguistic knowledge of learners who are capable of correcting their own errors will be activated. Self-feedback demonstrates comprehension and responsibility for the language. It builds awareness of the language, in return leading to more self-sufficient learners. With the large effect of these positives, teachers should want to attempt towards students who can correct themselves. Students who can self-correct obviously understand the errors, catch it, and make the necessary adjustments to their language production. Therefore as a result of this comprehensive learning he or she can apply the target language in real situation (Baleghizadeh & Gordani, 2012).

With self-feedback, the awareness of the language is increased. Learners are able to notice better and correct their problems. In fact self-feedback and increased awareness are support each other, as consideration of one activates the other. In other words, if students focus on accuracy and feedback, then they monitor their learning. This improves awareness and makes the students to have greater chance to perceive their mistakes. It’s important to note that self-feedback comes from individual. Therefore feedback can occur during a speaking or writing activity. Students who have a great deal of target language awareness can immediately provide feedback for their production. They can use strategies and skills to compensate for their using of the target language and their performance. Teachers can also provide a minor prompt to promote self-feedback (Baleghizadeh & Gordani, 2012).

Despite the benefits, there are a number of shortcomings. Self-feedback requires a great deal of time, especially if learners struggle to identify the mistake. They may even wrongly identify a correct sentence or phrase, spending time on an
area that does not need feedback. They may even be absolutely unable to spot the mistake. The most important shortage of self-feedback is that if students try to correct too much, then fluency suffers as they solely focuses on accuracy, monitoring all language produced. Despite the few negatives, self-feedback addresses a valuable need in the language classroom. Again we should mention that it raises awareness of the language, as well as forces students to take a more active and responsible role. Confidence in their language ability also results, as students catch and correct mistakes serve as one means to measure progress (Baleghizadeh & Gordani, 2012).

A teacher’s role in the language classroom is to give feedback on errors as a teacher-feedback. Learners’ errors should be corrected if learners cannot correct themselves, and teachers should apply feedback strategies in order to avoid confusion in their learners. Baleghizadeh and Gordani (2012) argued that language teachers are under pressure from their learners’ expectations for error treatment. Learning situation, learners’ type, purpose of lessons, and the nature of particular errors should be taken into consideration by teachers. Teachers should decide whether to correct error, which errors to correct, and how to correct them most effectively. There are many strategies and styles of error feedback that teachers use. Selecting the appropriate method lies in the hands of the teachers. Teachers can provide two types of feedback direct and indirect. In direct feedback teacher presents the correct form and in indirect one teacher indicates the existence of error without providing the feedback.

Bandura (1997) defined self-efficacy as a person’s beliefs about his/her abilities to complete specific actions. Thus, self-efficacy is a major factor in how a person approaches a particular task or challenge, especially one that is new. With that in mind, it is important to examine the factors that influence an individual’s sense of self-efficacy. Bandura explains how physiological factors influence self-efficacy. In a classroom signs of nervousness or confusion can be sensed by the instructors and they can provide extra encouragement and support. Instructor can focus on this area by taking a very proactive approach in decreasing student stress and anxiety. By calling a student at the start of a course, an instructor can create a sense of rapport, lower the levels of anxiety, and gauge where the student’s comfort level is with the course material. Providing clear instructions for assignments, and adding examples or templates, can also be a proactive approach to create a more positive mood for the students. A safe environment can be further created by encouraging students to ask questions to seek clarification when they feel tense or in doubt. Furthermore, instructors can openly share their past feelings regarding learning new concepts. By empathizing with students, the instructor demonstrates a high level of care while promoting the students’ overall sense of self-efficacy.

Some research studies have investigated the relationship between self-feedback and teacher–feedback on learners’ achievement of other skills rather than writing. But this study compares the effects of self-feedback and teacher-feedback on writing skill and self-efficacy of Iranian EFL Learners. This study seeks answers to the following research questions:

1: Does EFL learners’ self-feedback and teacher-feedback strategies compatible?

2: Does engagement of EFL learners in using self-feedback strategies significantly affect their self-efficacy in language learning?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Participants

Ninety advanced EFL learners learning English as a foreign language in Zanjan university with age ranges of 12 to 15 participated in this study. After language proficiency and pretests they were divided into two groups: experimental and control. Majority of the learners were taking English classes for one consecutive year. But, due to their level of proficiency, they had received little serious instruction in writing essays. Majority of the learners were taking English classes for one
consecutive year. In addition, due to their level of proficiency, they had received little serious instruction in writing essays. They followed the method in their curriculum for a term – the aim of which was to improve their communicative skills in four macro-skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking). As part of their course, they have to achieve competency in writing essays.

2.2. Procedure

In order to investigate the effect of teacher or self-feedback on EFL learners’ writing ability and their self-efficacy a structured procedure was designed to collect data. The treatment procedure was conducted in 14 sessions during the winter semester in 2014. The research method used in this study to collect data was a true experimental one.

At the beginning of the study, Oxford Quick Placement Test (2001) was administered in order to manifest the participants’ homogeneity in terms of English language proficiency. To ensure the homogeneity of the participants a writing test was administered. Forty eight homogenized EFL learners were randomly divided into 2 groups: Control group which their writings were corrected by the teacher (n=24) and the experimental group that their writings were corrected by themselves (n=24). Both groups received the same amount of instruction and the same amount of time was spent teaching writing in each class. Then in an early separate session a self-efficacy inventory was given to the learners and they were asked to answer all of the questions according to the instruction, in addition a composition test was given to the students to elicit evidence in order to compare the post test with prior to receiving any kind of feedback. To ensure reliability, the performance of each participant on pre-test was scored by two raters, including the researcher.

To follow the curriculum, the teacher taught a writing point every four session and after the treatment she wanted the learners to write an essay and she wanted them to be careful about the taught points in their writings, although every time she taught a new writing tip she reviewed the previous points, too and of course she asked the learners to pay attention to previous points in addition to newly taught points.

The learners in control group received teacher feedback in their essays. In this group the teacher corrected the learner’s writings, but the learners in experimental group should correct their essays themselves. The teacher wanted them to correct their own papers based on the points she taught them. The papers were re-corrected by another scorer and the average of the scores was calculated. This process continued for 16 sessions, and every four session the teacher asked the learners to write a composition. In total, they were taught 4 writing points and they were asked to write four essays with certain titles.

In the last session as a post-test the teacher wanted the learners to write a composition and pay attention to all of the points were taught. Again all of the papers were corrected by teacher herself and by another scorer. At the end of the last session another self-efficacy inventory was given to learners and they were asked to answer the questions in order to see the effects of self-feedback or teacher-feedback on learners’ self-efficacy. Finally, parametric statistics were used to analyze the data.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Construct Validity

A factor analysis through the Varimax rotation was run to probe the construct validity of the tests employed in this study. Before discussing the results it should be mentioned that the present sample size was enough for running the factor analysis (KMO = .60 => .60)
Besides sampling adequacy, the correlation matrix used to extract factors should not suffer from multicollinearity – too high or too low correlations among all variables. The significant chi-square value of 103.23 (p < .05) (Table 1) indicated that the correlation matrix was appropriate for running the factor analysis.

The SPSS extracted three factors which accounted for 63.36 percent of the total variance.

As displayed in Table 1 the four summative tests formed the first factor which can be called “summative writing ability”. The pre-test and post-test of writing and proficiency test loaded on the second factor which can be labeled as “English knowledge or ability” factor. The pre-test and post-test of self-efficacy formed the last factor which can be named as “self-efficacy”.

Table 1

Rotated Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test3</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test4</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test2</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test1</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostWR</td>
<td></td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreWR</td>
<td></td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSelfeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PostSelfeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KR-21 Reliability Indices

The KR-21 reliability indices for the proficiency test and pretest and posttest of self-efficacy were .91, .76 and .76.

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability for Four Writing Tests

The Cronbach’s Alpha reliability for the four writing tests was .74.

Inter-Rater Reliability (Pretest and Posttest of Writing)

The results of the Pearson correlations indicated that there were significant agreements between the two raters who rated the subjects’ writings on the pretest ($r (46) = .89$, $P < .05$ representing a large effect size) and posttest of writing ($r (46) = .87$, $P < .05$ representing a large effect size).
Testing Assumptions

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of the teacher and self-feedback strategies on the improvement of the self-efficacy and writing ability of Iranian EFL learners. The data were analyzed through the independent t-test and multivariate ANOVA (MANOVA) both of which assume normality of the data.

Proficiency Test

At the beginning of the study, all participants took part in a proficiency test called Oxford Quick Placement Test (2001). This exam contains 60 multiple choice questions and the total score of it is 60. The purpose of administrating this exam was to be sure of the homogeneity of the participants. An independent t-test is run to compare the experimental and control groups’ mean scores on the general proficiency test in order to prove that both groups enjoyed the same level of general proficiency prior to the administration of the treatment. As displayed, the control group (M = 19.33, SD = 3.72) had a slightly higher mean than the experimental group on proficiency test (M = 17.83, SD = 2.07).

The results of the independent t-test (t (46) = 1.83, P > .05, r = .29 representing an almost moderate effect size) (Table 2) indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ mean scores on the proficiency test. Thus it can be concluded that they enjoyed the same level of general language proficiency prior to the main study.

Table 2

Independent Samples Test, Proficiency Test by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>4.882</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>36.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene’s F = 4.88, P > .05). That is why the first row of Table 4, i.e. “Equal variances assumed” was reported.

Analysis of the pre-test of self-efficacy

Yavus Erkan (2004) self-efficacy scale and Pajares, Hartley & Valiant (2001) self-efficacy scale was used. First before the treatments at the beginning of the study, Yavus Erkan (2004) self-efficacy scale was used and this is the pre-test of self-efficacy. Then after the treatments and at the last session the Pajares, Hartley & Valiant (2001) self-efficacy scale and this is the post-test of self-efficacy.

An independent t-test is run to compare the experimental and control groups’ mean scores on the pretest of self-efficacy in order to prove that both groups enjoyed the same level of self-efficacy prior to the administration of the
treatment. As displayed, the experimental (M = 61.04, SD = 6.44) and control (M = 61.67, SD = 8.61) groups showed almost the same means on the pretest of self-efficacy. The results of the independent t-test (t (46) = .27, P > .05, r = .041 representing a weak effect size) indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ mean scores on the pretest of self-efficacy. Thus it can be concluded that they enjoyed the same level of self-efficacy prior to the main study.

Table 3

Independent Samples Test, Pre-test of Self-Efficacy by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>2.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene’s F = 2.66, P > .05). That is why the first row of Table 3, i.e. “Equal variances assumed” was reported.

Analysis of the pre-test of writing

The learners were asked to write a short essay about how was their last summer, to make sure that there is no significant difference between their writing abilities. An independent t-test is run to compare the experimental and control groups’ mean scores on the pretest of writing in order to prove that both groups enjoyed the same level of writing ability prior to the main study. As displayed, the experimental (M = 10.63, SD = 2.66) and control (M = 11.38, SD = 3.87) groups had close means on the pretest of writing.

The results of the independent t-test (t (46) = .76, P > .05, r = .11 representing a weak effect size) indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ mean scores on the pretest of writing. Thus it can be concluded that they enjoyed the same level of writing ability prior to the main study.
Table 4

*Independent Samples Test, Pretest of Writing by Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>2.557</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>45.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene’s $F = 2.55, P > .05$). That is why the first row of Table 4, i.e. “Equal variances assumed” was reported.

**Research Question 1**

The first research question was as follows:

Does EFL learners’ self-feedback and teacher-feedback strategies compatible?

An independent t-test is run to compare the experimental and control groups’ mean scores on the posttest of writing in order to investigate the effect of types of error feedbacks (teacher feedback vs. self-feedback) on the improvement of the writing ability of the Iranian EFL learners. As displayed, the control group ($M = 13.96, SD = 3.05$) had a higher mean than the experimental group ($M = 12.54, SD = 3.23$) on the posttest of writing.

The results of the independent t-test ($t (46) = 1.65, P > .05, r = .22$ representing a weak effect size) (Table 5) indicated that there was not any significant difference between the two groups’ mean scores on the posttest of writing. Thus it can be concluded the first null-hypothesis was supported. The types of error feedback did not have any significant effect on the improvement of the writing ability of the Iranian EFL learners.
Table 5
Independent Samples Test, Posttest of Writing by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met (Levene’s $F = 1.99$, $P > .05$). That is why the first row of Table 5, i.e. “Equal variances assumed” was reported.

Research Question 2

Does engagement of EFL learners in using self-feedback strategies significantly affect their self-efficacy in language learning?

An independent t-test is run to compare the experimental and control groups’ mean scores on the posttest of self-efficacy in order to probe the effect of types of error feedback on the improvement of the self-efficacy of the Iranian EFL learners. As displayed, experimental ($M = 65.13$, $SD = 3.83$) had a higher mean than the control group ($M = 58.67$, $SD = 8.54$) on the posttest of self-efficacy. The results of the independent t-test ($t (31) = 3.65$, $P < .05$, $r = .41$ representing a large effect size) (Table 7) indicated that there was a significant difference between the two groups’ mean scores on the posttest of self-efficacy. Thus it can be concluded the second null-hypothesis was rejected. The experimental group after receiving self-feedback had a significantly higher improvement in the self-efficacy than the control group.

Table 6
Independent Samples Test, Posttest of Self-Efficacy by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>8.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not met (Levene’s $F = 8.77$, $P < .05$). That is why the second row of Table 6, i.e. “Equal variances not assumed” was reported.
Four Formative Assessments

The writing ability of the two groups was assessed at four time intervals in order to measure their improvement during the treatment phase of the study. Two separate repeated measures were run to compare the two groups’ means on the four tests in order to show the improvement of each group. It should be noted that if compare the two groups, then their trends cannot be studied because there is not statistical test which enable users both compare groups and at the same time examine the overall trend of scores for each group separately.

Experimental group

The results of multivariate test ($F = .183, p > .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .028$ representing a weak effect size) (Table 6) indicated that there were not any significant differences between the experimental groups’ means on the four writing tests.

As displayed in Table 7, the experimental group showed a slight improvement for the first three tests; however they had a negligible downward movement on test four.

Control group

The results of multivariate test ($F = 5.675, p < .05, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .52$ representing a large effect size) (Table 4.20) indicated that there were significant differences between the control groups’ means on the four writing tests.

As displayed in Table 8, the control group showed the highest mean on the first test and then gradually showed a falling trend in means until the last test when they got the lowest mean.
### Table 9

**Tests of Within-Subjects Contrasts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source (Tests)</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
<th>η² Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T 1 vs. T 2</td>
<td>8.167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.167</td>
<td>1.517</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2 vs. T 3</td>
<td>24.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.000</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 3 vs. T 4</td>
<td>121.500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.500</td>
<td>6.491</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Tests)</td>
<td>123.833</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 2 vs. T 3</td>
<td>174.000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.565</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 3 vs. T 4</td>
<td>430.500</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

The present study set out to investigate the effect of self-feedback or teacher feedback on Iranian EFL learners writing ability and at the same time the effect of self-feedback on learners’ self-efficacy. In this section the findings with reference to two research questions and previous research findings are provided.

Since participants were not randomly selected at first, due to the small number of students and FEL classes. The low number of students might not allow us generalizability across other contexts. Last, but not least, was that writing proficiency was defined as EFL writing. Nevertheless, the study provides the writing teachers with effective information of giving feedback, and allows them to have a much more relaxed, motivating, and lively atmosphere in their classes. Some of what teachers do can be informed by research, and a lot of what they do also needs to be informed through critical examination of their practices.

To be successful in writing undertakings: The student self-efficacy should be improved by employing critical thinking skills in relation to course work and other EFL experiences; the students should set aside time and space to study and work on writing skills and they glean as much value from the course tasks as possible. These experiences can be pursued through the implementation of learning strategies, build confidence in the student towards writing. This confidence, in turn, should then indicate actual proficiency in EFL writing. By the time the students graduate, they should be able to exhibit excellent EFL writing skills and grammar use (Bahrami, 2002).

Taking the results of this study into consideration, based on the statistical results of the two groups T-test there was not any significant difference between the results of writing pre-test and post-test in both groups but with regard to the results of two groups T-test in self-efficacy pre-test and post-test significant difference was found. The findings of the present study supported a number of previous studies such as Kepner (1991) and Sheppard(1992) who claimed that error feedback does not have a significant effect on improving L2 students’ writing. Also there are other researches which suggested that while making errors is an important part of the learning process, systematic feedback does not improve written language.
The present study found that the type of feedback (teacher-feedback or self-feedback) did not have a significant effect on improving writing ability. From this finding, one could easily jump to the conclusion that Truscott (1996) was right when he claimed that the provision of corrective feedback on L2 writing is ineffective.

But the findings of this study are against the findings of Lalende (1982). He compared the effects of self-feedback versus teacher-feedback on compositions of the students. The self-correcting group had statistically fewer errors at the end of the experiment than did the control group who received teacher feedback and re-wrote their work. Lalende concluded that the combination of one’s errors and rewriting with problem solving techniques was significantly beneficial for developing writing skills in German. This research study found that the type of feedback provided had a significant effect on the self-efficacy of the participants. It showed that when the participants were given the chance of correcting their mistakes, they could improve their self-efficacy. The findings of this survey support many other researches which investigated the effect of corrective feedback on the different aspects of language (Gass, Mackey, & Ross-Feldman, 2005).

5. CONCLUSION

The study demonstrated that Teacher-feedback or self-feedback do not make any difference in improving the writing performance and accuracy of students. It is suggested that teachers employ more effective techniques in their writing courses, and make their classes much more active and fruitful. Furthermore, it was shown that students could be trained to appreciate revision, and develop a global approach to writing. Therefore, teachers need to be made aware of, and experiment with a wider range of feedback and error-feedback strategies appropriate for different levels and students. In addition it shows that the group which received self-feedback had a significantly higher improvement in the self-efficacy than the other group which received teacher-feedback.

It is necessary for EFL teachers to let their students correct their own errors, because learners’ motivation and self-efficacy can improve when they are given the chance to contribute to the process of error feedback. The results of this study gave credit to the usefulness of self-feedback in improving the self-efficacy of EFL learners. This success might be due to two remarkable reasons: firstly, its effectiveness in learning process of language, and secondly, its role in creating in different and innovative context of language learning in comparison with traditional (teacher-feedback) ones, both for learners and teachers.

The results of this research can make other researchers motivated to go through other dimensions of efficacy and error-feedback. It can be inferred from the results of this study that correcting the errors by a teacher or let learners to correct their own errors doesn’t have any benefit in improving their writing ability. On the other words, from this study it was found that EFL learners ‘writing ability wasn’t significantly improved after they had received self-feedback or teacher-feedback on their writings.

To sum up, self-feedback or teacher-feedback on learners ‘writing have the same amount of benefit but self-feedback help the learners to improve their self-efficacy. Hopefully, this paper is not an ending, but a beginning of further inquiry. To understand the nature of feedback better and further, the teachers should carefully and systematically scrutinize their commentatory practices, and share their findings with each other. Further research can explore in greater depth how the teacher and student factors such as teachers’ prior grammatical knowledge, training and experience, attitudes regarding feedback, and students’ motivation and attitudes toward feedback can be suitable choices for future research.
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