

Effectiveness of Online Feedback Practice on Self-Regulation, Self-Efficacy and Writing Performance

Mohammadreza Farsinejad

M.A Student

Department of English Language
Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University
Kerman, Iran

E-mail: farsinejad77@gmail.com

Neda Fatehi Rad*

Assistant Professor

Department of English Language
Kerman Branch, Islamic Azad University
Kerman, Iran

E-mail: nedafatehi@yahoo.com

Abstract. This quasi-experimental, quantitative, pre-test post-test control group design study was carried out to examine the influence of online feedback on self-efficacy and self-regulation of Iranian English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners and writing performance. Using convenience sampling, two groups of female intermediate learners at Kerman's Bahar language institute (control and experimental groups) took part in this study. A variant of the Oxford Placement Test (OPT), the Self-regulation Questionnaire, the Self-efficacy Questionnaire, and two writing tasks were utilized to collect data. Normality tests, descriptive and analytical statistics were employed to analyze data. Results indicated that online corrective feedback considerably affected the writing skills of EFL students. Furthermore, as the findings show, online corrective feedback seems to have a considerable impact on EFL students' self-efficacy. Last but not least, the study discovered that online corrective feedback had a considerable effect on self-regulation. The study's findings have ramifications for EFL teachers, students, and curriculum developers.

Received: June 2022; Accepted: August 2022

*Corresponding author

Keywords: Corrective feedback, self-regulation, online corrective feedback, self-efficacy

1. Introduction

English learning is a necessity in today's globalized world. One aspect of English learning is writing based on the formal register of English. No one can deny the importance of writing and writing skill as one of the main components of the English language. What adds to this importance is the increased significance of communication as an inevitable element of human life in today's global village (Ahmed, 2016). However, learning to write academically is considered a difficult and challenging task for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners (Ofte, 2014). Apparently writing is a difficult language skill for EFL learners because acquiring it requires much time and effort; writing is considered a reflective activity requiring ample time to think about the topic; it also involves analysis and classification of background knowledge (Rassouli & Abbasandi, 2013). In this vein, teaching/ learning how to write plays a crucial role in language learning classrooms. Furthermore, a concept the importance of which has been acknowledged in language learning is corrective feedback (Kartchava, 2016). It may even be considered an inseparable component of language learning because when learning a language, learners' making errors and teachers' correcting learners' errors are inevitable (Zarei & Rahnama, 2013). However, debate on the notion of errors and corrective feedback is a controversial issue, and research in this area has a long history. One of the main reasons is that these two terms are ambiguous and have been defined in different ways (Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014).

Another reason is that findings of the research on the effect of corrective feedback on the learning process have been conflicting, mainly due to the widely varying learner populations, types of writing and feedback types provided and various research designs used (Hyland, 2006). Over the last few years, the role played by corrective feedback in language acquisition has become a highly important issue. From an interactionist view, corrective feedback is an important means of establishing the significance of reader responses in shaping meanings and it is seen as an important developmental tool moving learners through multiple drafts

towards the capability for effective self-expression (Probst, 1989, as cited in Hyland, 2006).

Following the advancement of technology in the field of English language education, online or electronic forms of corrective feedback have become increasingly prevalent. Electronic kinds of corrective feedback have made their way into the ELT system, specifically with the emergence of online and web-based educational forms. Face-to-face teacher-student engagement has indeed been replaced with online communication in these sorts of corrective feedback delivery. The (interconnectedness) of corrective input seems to be a key feature of these ways of providing corrective feedback. The simultaneous corrective feedback provision approach, as the name implies, provides corrective feedback to individuals when both educators and students are together. The teacher will deliver the documents of the trainees' writing including error corrections utilizing technological means within (a)synchronous corrective feedback supply approach (Shaqaqi & Soleimani, 2019). Furthermore, various affective elements influence the language teaching process in adding to English language ability. Self-efficacy of learners is the key affective characteristic that might affect the language acquisition process. Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy concepts for academic circles might be used to investigate the origins of learner self-efficacy (Marashi & Azizi-Nassab, 2018).

Self-regulation is another important aspect of the learning process and the subject of study by researchers in various domains, namely English Language Teaching (ELT). Pupils' ideas and activities that are self-generated and methodically directed into academic objectives are referred to as self-regulation, and it requires educators' active role in the learning procedure (Zimmerman & Bandura, 1994).

Computerized corrective feedback (in both synchronous and asynchronous versions) has become prevalent in educational settings, particularly in an effort to pave the way for the use of technologies in writing workshops. However, the research found that, while electronic corrective feedback has been studied in certain studies, as far as the authors know, there is no Iranian study on the influence of online corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing, self-regulation, or self-efficacy. This is despite

the fact that writing fluently and properly at an appropriate level of complexity is a difficult undertaking for many Iranian students, and affective elements like self-efficacy and self-regulation have a significant impact on EFL acquisition. This study looks into the effects of online corrective feedback upon Iranian EFL students' self-regulation, writing performance, and self-efficacy. The study tries to answer:

RQ1: Does online corrective feedback significantly affect Iranian EFL learners' writing performance?

RQ2: Does online corrective feedback significantly affect Iranian EFL learners' self-efficacy?

RQ3: Does online corrective feedback significantly affect Iranian EFL learners' self-regulation?

The necessity of the study is emphasized by the necessity of corrective feedback as an unavoidable aspect of English instruction. Another important section of this research seems to be that corrective feedback is seen as an indivisible component of language education, since learners' errors and teachers' corrections of learners' errors are unavoidable when learning a language (Zarei & Rahnama, 2013). Furthermore, it is notable in that it uses technology in the giving of remedial feedback, a practice that has been increasingly popular in recent years. Furthermore, this research fills a vacuum in the literature since, as far as the authors know, there is a paucity of studies in Iran on the impact of instructor online corrective feedback upon Iranian EFL learners' writing performance, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. The outcomes of the research may enlighten EFL teachers as to the possibilities of virtual corrective feedback and could rise to meaningful results in helping Iranian students write more effectively.

2. Literature Review

Corrective feedback is a reaction to a learner's wrong language structures in order to help them identify and correct them under a methodological paradigm known as form-focused instruction (FFI) which has grown in the past decade (Tomita & Spada, 2013). "Teachers' or learners' answers

towards foreign or 2nd language learners' mistaken or unsuitable performance, by restructuring the forms or providing corrective indications" is what corrective feedback refers to (Yoshida, 2008, p. 525). As a result, corrective feedback is an evidence-based technique that demonstrates the existence of inaccurate grammatical structures (Russell & Spada, 2006) as well as a complicated instructional-interactive phenomenon of interest (Ellis, 2009) in relation to teachers' methodological approaches in theory-practice contexts (Russell, 2009). The current studies in the setting of instructed foreign/2nd language learning have seen growing attention to corrective feedback, which might be because of the learners' decipherable proficient oral production throughout conversational interventions, while their linguistic precision is still being overlooked (Ammar & Spada, 2006). Numerous studies show that corrective feedback has a favorable influence on learning new languages. Many of these researches have looked into the differences between direct (explicit) and indirect (implicit) feedback mechanisms, as well as the amount to which these approaches lead to better correctness in learners' abilities.

Bandura (1997) argued that people with problems generally know exactly what actions are needed to do the things they want to do. Yet, knowing what to do is not enough. People also need to be confident about their ability to carry out the desired behavior. This perceived ability to produce a desired action is what Bandura terms self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy plays a key role in the etiology and/or maintenance of affective disorders.

Zimmerman and Schunk (2008) provided a lexical definition for self-regulation: "the control of one's present conduct based on motives related to a subsequent goal or ideal that an individual has set for him or herself" (p. 1). More simply put, self-regulation relates to controlling and directing one's behavior in order to achieve a goal. One important context where learners need to take the advantage of self-regulation is EFL classrooms, where they are required to pay attention, follow instructions, and inhibit inappropriate reactions in order to achieve their personal goals (Artino, 2008). These skills, known as behavioral regulation (McClelland et al., 2007) or simply self-regulation, are critical for learners' success. Research has shown that learners entering EFL classes

with low levels of behavioral self-regulation are at risk for peer rejection and lower achievements (Ladd, Birch, & Buhs, 1999; McClelland, Morrison, & Holmes, 2000).

Six English language learners were studied by Zahidi (2012) in terms of employing self-regulated learning (SRL) tactics to perform language learning activities and ESL use in a qualitative study using the multiple case studies method. The participants' self-regulation was also studied in terms of the personal as well as contextual characteristics that acted as facilitators and limitations. Their findings indicated that the subjects used SRL strategies in their own unique ways and that personal and environmental circumstances had a substantial impact on SRL strategy utilization.

Quince investigated the impact of self-regulated learning strategies on academic achievement and self-regulated learning of students in a mixed methods study (2013). Goal formulation, activities, monitoring, and assessment of self-regulated instructional strategies were among the study's self-regulated techniques. Using the strategies of self-regulated learning had a considerable influence, according to the findings. Self-regulated learning strategy intervention, according to the participants' perceptions, helped them develop metacognitive awareness and self-regulated learning ability levels.

As a result, their effectiveness for academic success grew. The multivariate validity of a writing self-regulation measure was investigated by Khodadady and Yassami (2012), (WSRS). They gave that to 125 EFL students in Tehran to achieve this goal. The following five components were found using Principal Axis Factoring plus Varimax Rotation: Guidelines, Formatting, Semantic Reconstruction, Obtaining Examples, and Syntactic Revision. The WSRS's reliability was proved using reliability and correlational tests, which revealed a good correlation between extracted components. As a result, the researchers suggested that the WSRS be used in future studies as a beneficial tool. The relationship of self-regulated studying elements and reading comprehension and vocabulary skills in Iranian EFL students was studied by Zarei and Hatami (2012). A substantial link across self-regulated learning components was discovered using Pearson product-moment correlation. Furthermore, it

was discovered that self-regulated learning aspects & vocabulary skills are strongly linked. Additionally, a link was discovered between self-regulated study parts and reading comprehension.

Mizumoto (2013) looked at how EFL students' self-efficacy was affected by self-regulated vocabulary learning. The results supported a significant link between self-efficacy in learners and self-regulated learning. It was also discovered that self-regulated studying and vocabulary development are strongly linked.

Liu, Lan, and Ho (2014) examined the role of Web-based self-regulation on EFL learners' vocabulary development using Google Docs as just a Web-based platform. The study's findings revealed that Web-based self-regulation had a major impact on lexical acquiring knowledge. This outcome was linked in part to learners' enhanced autonomy, confidence, and enthusiasm as a result of their enhanced awareness of how the language system operates. Amirian et al. (2015) looked at the relationship between self-regulation capacity for learning vocabulary and vocabulary size in Iranian EFL students. The findings of this study revealed no link between self-regulation capability for vocabulary learning as well as vocabulary size among Iranian EFL students. Furthermore, the metacognitive control was found a better indicator of learners' vocabulary size.

Shaqaqi and Soleimani (2019) examined the effects of two types of written corrective feedback (WCF) (asynchronous computer-mediated and conventional paper-and-pen metalinguistic feedback) on the use of verb tense among intermediate L2 learners. The ANOVA results revealed that although both types of WCF contributed to significant enhancement of the learners' verb tense accuracy, the effect of computer-mediated asynchronous feedback was more dominant.

Akbar (2017) investigated the effect of asynchronous and synchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) corrective feedback on learner uptake. An introductory task and a video-prompted discussion task via an online chat program were used as synchronous tasks. A 3-day travel plan via email was taken as the asynchronous task. According to the findings, asynchronous and synchronous computer-mediated communication (CMC) corrective feedback had a significant effect on learner uptake.

Sarandi and elik (2018) investigated the effects of explicit recasts and

output-only prompts on learning English third person '-s'. To this aim, a quasi-experimental design was used. Data analysis showed the significant and positive effect of explicit recast on the participants' learning English third person '-s'.

Zhai and Gao (2018) investigated the effect of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity. According to the findings, clarification quest, metalinguistic feedback and recast proved to be more effective in improving EFL speaking task complexity than the other types of corrective feedback.

The review of the conducted studies shows that the literature on corrective feedback, self-regulation, and self-efficacy is relatively rich since several studies have investigated these variables in an attempt to investigate the relationship between these variables and the other variables or to investigate their effect on different variables. However, the researcher noticed that up to now, no study, as far as she knows, has touched on the effect of online corrective feedback on EFL learners' self-regulation, self-efficacy, and writing performance. This gap is the main focus of the present study.

3. Method

The study included 60 female intermediate-level EFL students who were studying English at some Language Institutes. The study used convenience sampling as its sampling technique. The participants were divided into two 30-student classes. For data gathering, four instruments were employed. The uniformity of the volunteers was checked at the beginning of the study using a previously validated brief sample of the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). The participants' self-efficacy was examined by using the Schwarzer and Jerusalem Self-efficacy Questionnaire, which had already been validated (1995). Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) estimated the device's reliability to be .95. Its validity was also examined using factor structure. Pinrich and DeGroot (1991) created and designed the Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SLQ) to examine the participants' self-regulated education. The questionnaire reliability was determined to be .89 by Kajbaf, Molavi, and Shirazi Tehrani (2003), who also verified its validity within Iran.

The written pretest was indeed a researcher-created writing test that was used to assess participants' writing abilities prior to treatment sessions. The participants were given 30 minutes to write a 10-line paragraph about their favorite job. The test has a .95 intra-rater reliability. The post-test was a writing test created by the researcher to assess the respondents' writing abilities following therapy. The participants were given 30 minutes to prepare a 10-line essay about their favorite sport. The test has an intra-rater reliability of .82. The holistic rubric was used to score the post-test (taken from Testing and Assessment Webinar, 2013).

In order to do the study, the researchers followed the following procedures. For the purpose of data collection, first, the sample was selected through convenience sampling and homogenized using OPT. Following the sampling and homogenization procedure, the two classes were randomly assigned into two groups called experimental and control groups. Then, the writing pre-test was administered in 30 minutes. After that, the two groups were asked to fill Self-regulated Questionnaire (SLQ) and Self-efficacy Questionnaire through social networks. Next, both groups participated in eight regular class sessions at Bahar Institute. In these sessions, called treatment sessions, the experimental group benefited from online feedback on sample writings submitted in each class session. In this group, the participants were provided with corrective feedback while they were in class, through text and voice chats. Moreover, the teacher sent the students the files of the learners' writing containing error corrections through the track changes option of Word Microsoft Office. However, no corrective feedback was provided to the control group. In a more specific expression, the control group just participated in the pre-test, post-test, and writing tasks. The writing tasks which were assigned to both groups during treatment sessions included writing a mini-essay consisting of 300 words on different topics from the textbook taught at the intermediate level in the Bahar institute. After the treatment period, both groups participated in the writing post-test to measure their writing performance. Both pre-test and post-test were scored using a holistic rubric taken from the Testing and Assessment Webinar (2013). Moreover, intra-rater reliability was calcu-

lated. Moreover, the two groups were again asked to fill Self-regulated Questionnaire (SLQ) and Self-efficacy Questionnaire through social networks.

4. Results

The descriptive statistics for the variables writing, self-efficacy and self-regulation are presented.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Writing

Writing	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	60	2	4	3.56	1.914
Post-test	60	3	5	4.10	2.004

As listed in Table .1, totally, 60 participants participated in the writing pre-test with a mean score of 3.56 ± 1.91 . The same number of participants participated in the writing post-test. The obtained mean and standard deviation values were 4.10 and 2.40.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	60	31.00	69.00	52.30	3.16
Post-test	60	44.00	90.00	71.33	2.10

As listed in Table 2, the pre-test mean of self-efficacy was 52.30 ± 3.16 . The mean score of the self-efficacy post-test was 71.33 ± 2.10 .

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for Self-regulation

Self-regulation	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-test	60	28.00	85.00	82.00	1.56
Post-test	60	33.00	120.00	90.03	.90

Table 3 lists the mean scores of self-regulation in the pre-test and post-test (82.00 ± 1.56 and 90.03 ± 0.90).

The results of independent samples t-tests to compare the pre-test and post-test scores of the three variables namely, writing, self-efficacy, and self-regulation with each other.

Table 4: Independent Samples t-test for Writing Pre-test

		t	df	Sig.	Std. Error Difference	
Sig. (2-tailed)						
Equal variances assumed	.17	.68	.20	1	.83	.39

As indicated in Table 4, there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the control and the experimental groups ($t = .20, p > .05$). Therefore, the experimental and control groups' writing scores in the pre-test were not significantly different. An independent t-test was used to examine the difference between the writing scores of the two groups in the post-test.

Table 5: Results of Independent Samples t-test for Writing Post-test

	F	Sig.	t	df (2-tailed)	Difference
Equal variances assumed	1.40	.24	5.92	1	.00 .41

Showing the writing post-test independent samples t-test, Table .5 indicates a significant difference between the control and experimental groups in terms of writing scores ($t = 5.92, p < .05$) in the post-test. This shows the significant effect of online corrective feedback on the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners.

As indicated in Table .6, there is no significant difference in terms of the mean score of self-efficacy pre-test in the control and experimental groups ($t = -.31, p > .05$). Independent t-test was used to investigate the difference between the control and experimental groups in terms of self-efficacy.

Table 6: Independent Samples t-test for Self-efficacy Pre-test

Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Std. Error Difference
Equal variances assumed				
.20	.68	-31	1	.60

Table 7: Independent Samples t-test for Self-efficacy Post-test

	F	Sig.	t	df	(2-tailed)	Difference
Equal variances assumed	7.90	.39	3.25	1	.00	.50

There was a significant difference in the post-test in terms of self-efficacy between the experimental and control groups ($t = 3.25, p < .05$) (Table 7). Accordingly, online corrective feedback had a significant effect on the self-efficacy of the participants.

Table 8: Independent Samples t-test for Self-regulation Pre-test

	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Std. Error Difference
Equal variances assumed	.05	.72	.22	1	.42

The observed difference between the two groups was insignificant ($t = .22, p > .05$) (Table 8). That is, the experimental and control groups were not significantly different in terms of self-regulation. An independent samples t-test was used to test if the self-efficacy scores of the two groups were significantly different in the post-test (Table 9).

Table 9: Independent Samples t-test for Self-regulation Post-test

	F	Sig.	t	df	(2-tailed)	Difference
Equal variances assumed	30.65	.01	6.62	1	.00	1.91

As demonstrated in Table 9, the experimental and control groups were significantly different ($t = 3.25, p < .05$) in terms of self-regulation in the post-test. Thus, online corrective feedback was significantly effective in Iranian EFL learners' self-regulation.

5. Discussion

Data analysis indicated that online feedback training has a considerable effect on EFL learners' self-regulation. The results also showed that online feedback practice had a substantial effect on the self-efficacy of EFL learners. Furthermore, it was found that online feedback practice had a considerable impact on EFL learners' writing. With major changes between both the control and experimental groups inside the pre-test of writing, self-efficacy, as well as self-regulation, the two sides were considerably different inside this post-test of the same parameters, indicating the findings. Because learners have a favorable attitude regarding websites and electronic instructional practices, this has led to improvements in their self-efficacy, writing, and self-regulation. This rationalization is consistent with previous research, such as Celik (2013), Cheok, Wong, Ayub, and Mahmud (2017), Mohsen and Shafeeq (2014), Shin and Son (2007), and Yunus et al. (2013), which showed that EFL learners had hopeful expectations and feelings toward technology use. Another rationale is that, as a technical technique of providing feedback, online feedback may boost learners' drive to acquire language, resulting in higher levels of composition, self-regulation, and self-efficacy in them (Kamalaian & Sayadian, 2014).

Another possible explanation for the successful effect of online feedback discipline on educators' writing, self-efficacy, as well as self-regulation, according to the scholar, would be that this way of providing corrective feedback increases learners' independence, which leads to substantial improvements in the identified factors. The argument made by Radia (2019) that technology can assist students to track their development can also be used to support the conclusions of this study. Furthermore, his explanation that technology reduces student unhappiness and grade disputes is a valid justification for the conclusions. Bishop and Verleger (2013) argued that using technology motivates the processes of higher

order cognitive such as critical analysis, decision making, and problem-solving in people to benefit so much from technology is yet another point worth mentioning in rationalizing the results of this study. Furthermore, the outcomes can be rationalized by referencing the concept that employing technology greatly increases student engagement in classroom activities, which might improve their cognitive (i.e., writing) and affective (i.e., motivation) (i.e., self-efficacy and self-regulation). The value of time spent inside a technology-integrated classroom could also be related to the results (Davies, Dean, & Ball, 2013). To be more precise, typical classrooms dedicate a large portion of class hours to instructor presentations and justifications, leaving little opportunity for student interaction (Davies, Dean, & Ball, 2013). Another justification claim is that using the technology may have boosted individuals' sense of control, resulting in improvements in writing, self-regulation, and self-efficacy. Last but just not least, the enormous impact of technology on student self-esteem might be used to justify the results (Jan, Soomro, & Ahmad, 2017). That seems to be, it is plausible that students' use of technologies has boosted their self-esteem, leading to increased writing, self-efficacy, and self-regulation.

Barber, Bagsby, Grawitch, and Buerck (2011) discovered that students' self-regulation improves when they use technology. Dettori and Persico (2014) made the same point when they demonstrated a considerable improvement in participants' self-regulation as just a result of being educated by utilizing technological teaching. Nguyen and Ikeda both came to the same conclusion (2015). Furthermore, Desouky (2016) studied the role of webcast video feedback on EFL learners' writing and showed that screencasting had a substantial impact on EFL learners' writing ability, which is similar to the current study. Ene and Upton (2018) looked explored the impact of asynchronous and synchronous professor technological feedback (TEF) on second or foreign language writing in both face-to-face and web ESL writing programs. TEF had a considerable impact on second language writing, according to the data. Furthermore, Shaqaqi and Soleimani (2019) studied the impacts of two forms of written corrective feedback (WCF) on EFL learners' English achievement (asynchronous computer-mediated and traditional

sheet metalinguistic feedback). Even though both types of WCF contributed to considerable improvements in learners' English achievement, the influence of computer-mediated asynchronous feedback was much more prominent, according to the ANOVA findings.

Odo and Yi (2014) found that computer-mediated electronic feedback or Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) including Skype seemed to have a favorable influence on academic papers, which is in agreement with a study. Correspondingly, Al-Olimat and AbuSeileek (2015) researched computer-mediated corrective feedback and its role in the performance of grade 10 EFL learners in essay writing and found important differences in the experimental and control groups, and between instructors' and educators' feedback. This result is indeed similar to Chauhan (2015), who investigated if trainees' writing ability enhanced as a consequence of using email and discovered that students' writing increased as a result of using email. Niazi and Pourgharib (2013) studied the role of email in boosting EFL learners' writing skills in another study. Similar to the current study, the experimental group showed considerable improvement, which was linked to the role of email.

Finally, the findings of research question one, "Does online corrective feedback affect Iranian EFL learners' writing performance?" Revealed that online corrective feedback would have a substantial effect on EFL learners' academic achievement in favor of the experimental group. Concerning question two, "Does web-based corrective feedback affect Iranian EFL learners' self-efficacy?" The experimental group used to have a considerably higher entail upon that post-test of self-efficacy than that of the control group, as divulged by the outcomes of the independent-samples t-test. As a result, online corrective feedback appears to have had a considerable effect on EFL learners' self-efficacy. The results indicated that online corrective feedback had a substantial impact on self-regulation among Iranian EFL learners.

6. Conclusion

Online corrective feedback might help EFL students improve their writing skills. Consequently, it is determined that, in addition to writing accomplishment, online corrective feedback has an influence on perceived

traits like self-regulation and self-efficacy. In addition, despite earlier studies arguing for the usefulness of corrective feedback, online corrective feedback seems worthwhile to try until negative outcomes outnumber favorable outcomes. The results can help EFL teachers understand the value of using online corrective feedback for improving EFL students' writing skills and the need to incorporate it into writing sessions. Furthermore, the findings will inform EFL teachers about the impact of online corrective feedback on improving EFL learners' self-regulation and self-efficacy, and the importance of using it to improve students' emotional qualities. Another implication of these results is that, because previous studies have shown a link between variables like self-regulation as well as self-efficacy or other variables like encouragement, autonomy, and self-esteem, EFL teachers should use online feedback through writing classrooms to help students are becoming more inspired and improve their autonomy and self-esteem. Furthermore, based on the findings, curriculum planners should organize upcoming writing courses in such a manner that the use of online feedback is much more incentivized.

References

- Akbar, F. S. (2017). Corrective feedback in written synchronous and asynchronous computer-mediated communication. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in Applied Linguistics & TESOL*, 17 (2), 9-27.
- Ahmed, M. A. S. (2016). The effect of a flipping classroom on writing skill in English as a foreign language and students' attitude towards flipping. *US-China Foreign Language*, 14(2), 98-114.
- Al-Olimat, S. I. and Abu Seileek, A. F. (2015). *Using computer-mediated corrective feedback modes in developing students' writing performance*. Retrieved from file:///E:/weblogs%20and%20writing/bgsu1151331882.pdf.
- Amirian, S. M. R., Mallahi, O., and Zaghi, D. (2015). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' self-regulatory vocabulary strategy use and their vocabulary size. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(2), 29-46.

- Ammar, A. and Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543-574.
- Artino, A. R. (2008). Motivational beliefs and perceptions of instructional quality: predicting satisfaction with online training. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24, 260-270.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barber, L., Bagsby, P., Grawitch, M., and Buerck, J. (2011). Facilitating self-regulated learning with technology. *Teaching of Psychology*, 38(4), 303-308.
- Bishop, J. L. and Verleger, M. A. (2013). *The flipped classroom: A survey of the research*. Paper presented at the 120th ASEE Annual & Exposition, Atlanta, USA.
- Celik, S. (2013). Internet-assisted technologies for English language teaching in Turkish universities. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 26(5), 468-483.
- Chauhan, K. (2015). The development of writing ability through the use of weblog among the undergraduate students of engineering. *ELT VIBES: International E-Journal for Research in ELT*, 1(1), 54-60.
- Cheok, M. L., Wong, S. L., Ayub, A. F., and Mahmud, R. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of e-learning in Malaysian secondary schools. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 5(2), 20-33.
- Davies, R. S., Dean, D. L., and Ball, N. (2013). Flipping the classroom and instructional technology integration in a college-level information systems spreadsheet course. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 61(4), 563-580.
- Desouky, A. (2016). Effectiveness of using screencast feedback on EFL students' writing and perception. *English Language Teaching*, 9(8), 106-121.
- Dettori, G. and Persico, D. (2014). *Influence of task nature on learner self-regulation in online activities*. London: IGI Global.

- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18.
- Ene, E. and Upton, T. A. (2018). Synchronous and asynchronous teacher electronic feedback and learner uptake in ESL composition. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 41, 1-13.
- Jan, M., Soomro, S., and Ahmad, N. (2017). Impact of social media on self-esteem. *European Scientific Journal*, 13(23), 329-341.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *Feedback on second language students' writing*. Retrieved from <http://ltr.sagepub.com>.
- Kajbaf, M. B., Molavi, H., and Shirazi-Tehrani, A. (2003). Relationship between motivational beliefs and self-regulated learning strategies with high school students' academic performance. *Adv Cognitive Sci*, 5, 27-33.
- Kamalian, A. and Sayadian, S. (2014). The role of short text messaging in Iranian EFL vocabulary learning and motivation. *Science*, 2(4), 101-107.
- Kartchava, E. (2016). Learners' beliefs about corrective feedback in the language classroom: perspectives from two international contexts. *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(2), 19-45.
- Khodadady, E. and Yassami, S. (2012). Factorial validation of a writing self-efficacy scale: With and without acceptably cross loading items. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(3), 386-394.
- Ladd, G. W., Birch, S. H., and Buhs, E. S. (1999). Children's social and scholastic lives in kindergarten: *Related spheres of influence?* *Child Development*, 70, 1373-1400.
- Liu, S. H. J., Lan, Y. J., and Ho, C. Y. Y. (2014). Exploring the relationship between self-efficacy and web-based collaboration. *Educational Technology & Society*, 17(4), 404-419.
- Marashi, H. and Azizi-Nassab, F. (2018). EFL teachers' language proficiency, classroom management, and self-efficacy. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching & Research*, 6(22), 89-102.
- McClelland, M., Cameron, C., Connor, C., Farris, C., Jewkes, A., and Morrison, F. J. (2007). Links between behavioral regulation and preschoolers' literacy, vocabulary, and math skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 947-959.

McClelland, M. M., Morrison, F. J., and Holmes, D. L. (2000). Children at-risk for early academic problems: The role of learning-related social skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15, 307-329.

Mizumoto, A. (2013). Effects of self-regulated vocabulary learning process on self-efficacy. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 7(3), 253-265.

Mohsen, M. A. and Shafeeq, C. P. (2014). EFL teachers' perceptions on Blackboard applications. *English Language Teaching*, 7(11), 108-118.

Nguyen, T. and Ikeda, M. (2015). The effects of e-Portfolio-based learning model on student self-regulated learning. *Lap*, 6(3), 197-209.

Niazi, F. and Pourgharib, B. (2013). The effect of using email on enhancing Iranian intermediate EFL learners writing proficiency. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(11), 3531-3539.

Ofte, I. (2014). English academic writing proficiency in higher education: Facilitating the transition from metalinguistic awareness to metalinguistic competence. *Acta Didactica Norge*, 8(2), 1-15.

Odo, D. and Yi, Y. (2014). Engaging in computer-mediated feedback in academic writing. *English Teaching*, 69(3), 129-150.

Pintrich, P. R. and De Groot, E. V. (1991). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 33-40.

Probst, R. E. (1989). Transactional theory and response to student writing. *Writing and response*, 68-79.

Quince, R. B. (2013). *The effects of self-efficacy on students' self-regulated learning conduct and academic success in online community-college general education courses*. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from <http://repository.usfca.edu/diss>

Radia, B. (2019). Approaching a reading course via Moodle-based blended learning: EFL learners' insights. *MJLTM*, 9(11), 700-721.

Rassouli, M. and Abbasvandi, M. (2013). The effects of explicit instruction of grammatical cohesive devices on intermediate Iranian learners' writing. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 15-22.

Russell, J. and Spada, N. (2006). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar: A meta-analysis of the research*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Sarandi, H. and elik, M. (2018). The effects of explicit recasts and output-only prompts on learning L2 grammar. H. U. *Journal of Education*, 1-18.

Schwarzer, R. and Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.

Shaqaqi, M. and Soleimani, H. (2019). Effects of asynchronous and conventional paper-and-pen metalinguistic feedback on L2 learners' use of verb tense. *Journal of Modern Research in English Language Studies* 5(3), 55-72.

Shin, H. J. and Son, J. B. (2007). EFL teachers' perceptions and perspectives on Internet-assisted language teaching. *Computer-Assisted Language Learning Electronic Journal (CALL- EJ)*, 8(2), 90-110.

Tomita, Y. and Spada, N. (2013). Form-focused instruction and learner investment in L2 communication. *The Modern Language Journal* 97(3), 591-610.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 525-550.

Yunus, M. M., Nordin, N., Salehi, H., Embi, M. A., and Salehi, Z. (2013). The use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in teaching ESL writing skills. *English Language Teaching*, 6(7), 1-8.

Zahidi, A. B. M. (2012). *Self-regulation in English language learning: Case studies of six Malaysian undergraduates*. Doctoral thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Zarei, A. and Hatami, G. (2012). On the relationship between self-efficacy and L2 vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(9), 1939-1944.

Zarei, A. A. and Rahnama, M. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback modes on EFL learners' grammatical and lexical writing accuracy: From perceptions to facts. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 1(3), 1-14.

Zhai, K. and Gao, X. (2018). Effects of corrective feedback on EFL speaking task complexity in China's university classroom. *Cogent Education*, 5, 1-14.

Zimmerman, B. J. and Bandura, A. (1994). Impact of self-regulatory influences on writing course attainment. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(4), 845-862.

Zohrabi, K. h. and Ehsani, F. (2014). The role of implicit and explicit corrective feedback in Persian- speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 2018-2024.