

Feedback expectancy and EFL learners' Achievement in English

SEYYED MOHAMMAD ALAVI AND SHIVA KAIVANPANAH

*English Department,
Faculty of Foreign Languages,
University of Tehran*

Received: 17 October 2007 / Accepted: 20 April 2008

ISSN: 1697-7467

ABSTRACT: This study aims to explore the relationship between feedback expectancy of Iranian learners of English and their level of education, achievement in English, and attitude toward peer and teacher feedback. To fulfil the purpose of this study, a sixty-item questionnaire focusing on issues related to feedback expectancy, peer feedback, teacher feedback, and cultural factors was developed. 533 junior and high school students participated in the study. The results showed that (1) feedback expectancy in higher levels of education is stronger; (2) a positive and moderate correlation exists between feedback expectancy and learners' English achievements; high achievers of English expect more feedback; (3) feedback received from teachers is more expected than from peers; (4) female learners sought more feedback from their peers and teachers than male learners. As providing language learners with clear feedback plays a crucial role in developing learners' language abilities and helping them direct their learning, this study suggests language program developers and teachers to motivate learners to seek feedback from several sources.

Key words: feedback, feedback expectancy, language proficiency

La retroalimentación (feedback) y éxito comunicativo de los estudiantes de en inglés LE.

RESUMEN: La retroalimentación (feedback) es considerada como una de las formas de colaboración más importantes entre el profesor y el estudiante en el aula. En este estudio ha sido tratada y enfocada la retroalimentación (feedback) en las aulas del Curso de Idioma Inglés, nivel 2 y su relación con «el filtro afectivo del estudiante» (¿a qué se refieren con esta frase?) en los niveles secundario y bachillerato. Las investigaciones realizadas indican una alta retroalimentación (feedback) y una relación directa y positiva entre las vertientes retroalimentación (feedback) y «el filtro afectivo». El porcentaje de éxito y el nivel educativo son proporcionales a la retroalimentación (feedback) y le añaden un efecto positivo. Los estudios y análisis realizados a las pruebas muestran que la retroalimentación (feedback) en los estudiantes del 3º grado de la escuela secundaria y del bachillerato es más notable, comparada con los de otros niveles. Por otra parte, uno de los objetivos de este estudio es analizar la perspectiva y la retroalimentación (feedback) de los maestros y sus respectivos condiscípulos. Según estos estudios los estudiantes están más adaptados a recibir la retroalimentación (feedback) a través de sus propios maestros que de otros. El análisis de las variantes

multivertientes es una muestra de la efectividad del plan curricular educativo y es una mirada hacia la retroalimentación (feedback). También ha sido observada la necesidad de recibir más retroalimentación (feedback) por parte de los maestros en el caso de los exámenes finales. Por último, en esta investigación fueron estudiados los factores culturales actuantes en este tipo de enfoque, así como fue propuesto el método de Enseñanza por Grupo, para modificar tales enfoques.

Palabras clave: retroalimentación, resultados de la retroalimentación, enseñanza por grupos.

1. INTRODUCTION

Interaction and involvement of learners in language classes has been regarded as one of the most important factors leading to the development of communicative competence. As Pica *et al.* (1996) suggest interaction addresses language learners' need for feedback focused on form. Feedback plays an important role in motivating further learning as it informs learners about the degree of their learning or their needs for improvement. It enables them to distinguish between accepted and unaccepted forms of communication in the target language.

Kessler *et al.* (1992) argue that learning takes place when students express their ideas, interact with others, and get feedback from them. Brown (1994) considers feedback as one of the keys to successful learning and in a similar vein Gipps (1994) regards feedback as a critical feature of teaching and learning process.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Feedback is essential for improving both teaching and learning; the feedback teachers receive from students, tests, and observers is an invaluable source of information that enables them to find out what extent they have been successful in their teaching and what they need to do to make their teaching more effective. Feedback also influences learning in that it provides an opportunity for learners to know what they need to do in order to improve. Chaudron (1988) elaborates feedback from teacher's and learner's perspectives.

In any communicative exchange, speakers drive from their listeners information on the reception and comprehension of their message.... From the language teacher's point of view, provision of feedback ...is a major means by which to inform learners of the accuracy of both their formal target language production and their other classroom behavior and knowledge. From the learners' point of view, the use of feedback in repairing their utterances, and involvement in repairing their interlocutors' utterances may constitute the most potent source of improvement in both target language development and other subject matter knowledge (p. 132-133).

Gipps (1994: 129-130) believes that feedback is important for two reasons: «it contributes directly to progress in learning through the process of formative assessment, and indirectly through its effect on pupils' academic self-esteem». Having received feedback from teachers, students are encouraged to adopt appropriate strategies to improve their learning. Also by influencing students' self-concept and self-esteem feedback indirectly impacts learning (Craven *et al.*, 1991). Gipps argues that the feedback students receive includes messages about their effectiveness and self-esteem that influences the benefits they might get from feedback.

Educators provide various accounts of feedback. Richards et al. (1992: 137) perceive feedback as «information which provides a report on the result of behavior». Ur (1996: 242) considers feedback as «information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance». Feedback as Ur (1996) explains includes two major components: assessment and correction. The assessment component informs learners of the quality of their performance. Grades and general comments are examples of assessment component of feedback. The correction component provides learners with specific information on particular aspects of performance or behavior. Providing explanations, elicitation of correct response from the learners themselves, or elicitation of correct response from other learners constitute examples of this component of feedback.

2.1. Sources of feedback

Feedback that improves learning comes either externally or internally: External feedback comes from teachers and peers. Ellis (1991: 71) maintains «teachers have a traditional right to supply the learners with feedback regarding the correctness or appropriateness of their responses». Teachers' feedback seems to be necessary for learners as it helps them to notice the gap in their linguistic performance. According to Carnell (2000) teachers' feedback clarifies goals, gives a sense of direction, identifies mistakes, and provides advice. However Nunan (1989) refers to a number of studies that consider teacher feedback inconsistent and inaccurate. Ellis (1991) reasons that the inconsistency in teacher feedback is related to the complex nature of teaching task and the differences in learner proficiency.

Students can also benefit from peer feedback. Peer feedback is usually solicited in cooperative classrooms where students have more opportunity to interact with each other. In this regard, Murphy (1986) suggests that without the presence of the teacher, students learn how to give feedback in communication tasks. Interviews of Carnell (2000) with students showed that they like to receive feedback from their peers. They indicated that it was easier to talk with friends than with a teacher; with friends they felt more freedom and could say whatever they wanted. Considering the usefulness of peer feedback, Ur (1996: 323) argues «students appreciate being consulted and usually make serious efforts to give helpful feedback». It is suggested that peer feedback in language learning can be more powerful than teacher feedback because its concern is with topics of interest and relevance to the learners (Kessler et al, 1992).

Feedback can also be internal as self-regulated learners assess their present state and adopt appropriate techniques. They generate feedback through monitoring process which according to Buttler and Winne (1995: 11) is a «cognitive process that assesses states of progress relative to goals and generate feedback that can guide further action». Internal feedback is based on knowledge and information that is only accessible to learners; hence internal feedback learners generate through monitoring their own behavior is more accurate than externally provided feedback.

2.2. Feedback expectancy

Recent studies demonstrate that student achievement can be affected by their teachers' expectations of their ability (Good & Brophy, 1991). Students whose teachers have higher expectation of them usually have greater achievements. Learner expectations also influence

learning. Griffee's (1997) study showed that students who set specific goals for themselves perform better than others because they have realistic expectations about what they are supposed to do. Realistic classroom expectations increase student involvement and learning as well. One such expectation is feedback expectancy. Barnes (1999) defines feedback expectancy as expectations for giving and receiving feedback. Feedback expectancy maximizes students' involvement during the class time, minimizes misunderstanding, and at the same time signals areas in which learners have difficulty. He suggests that feedback expectancy can be reinforced by setting deadlines, calling students by name to provide feedback, regarding feedback as the compulsory component of classroom activities, taking appropriate actions in the light of received feedback, and telling students in advance what they are supposed to discuss, write, or present in the next session.

Depending on the initiative or expertise of teachers, expectation for feedback can be conveyed in different ways, but the strength of the expectations varies depending on the way teachers behave and how those expectations are perceived by students. Barnes (1999: 60) states that strong feedback expectancy exists where «there is no possible doubt that feedback will be required of the pupil» and weak feedback expectancy prevails in classes where students are not sure that their teacher will require them to provide feedback and where only a few students volunteer to respond. It exists in classes where feedback is infrequently demanded, is not discussed or followed by appropriate action, and no deadlines are set by the teacher.

The role of feedback expectancy among factors such as planning, gradation and presentation of materials, learner preparation, and motivation of students in learning should not be overlooked. It is hoped that by examining feedback from different perspectives, we might gain a better understanding of what aspects of feedback constitutes conditions for improved language learning. Therefore, this study is undertaken to address the following questions related to feedback:

1. Is there any relationship between feedback expectancy and the achievement of Iranian EFL learners?
2. Do males and females from different educational levels and levels of achievement show different degrees of feedback expectancy?
3. What type of feedback, i.e., peer or teacher, do Iranian EFL learners prefer to receive?
4. Do gender and educational level have any significant effect on preference for peer feedback or teacher feedback?
5. Do cultural factors influence Iranian EFL learners' acceptance of peer feedback produced in cooperative learning?

3. METHOD

3.1. Subjects

158 junior high school and 375 high school students participated in this study. The participants studying at high school were nearly of the same age range. They were studying humanities, math, and science. A descriptive statistics of participants' performance appears in Table 1.

Table 1: *Subject Distribution*

	Males	Females	Total
Junior second grade	45	20	65
Junior third grade	52	41	93
First grade high school	27	93	120
Second grade high school	72	130	202
Third grade high school	20	33	53
Total	216	317	533

3.2. Instrumentation

To achieve the objectives of this study a five-point Likert questionnaire was developed by the present researchers. The questionnaire was written in Farsi to ensure that participants had no difficulty in understanding the items. After consulting with experienced university professors, the questionnaire was pretested. Three typical high school students representing the population were asked to complete the questionnaire. They were especially requested to judge choices of words and comprehensibility of the questionnaire prompts.

The piloted questionnaire consisted of four major parts. The first set of items (N=21) aimed at eliciting students' attitudes towards the feedback they receive from their teacher. This part included items such as «my teacher's suggestions help me learn better, I try to incorporate what my teacher says in my future work»; the second group of items (N=21) addressed the attitudes of students towards the feedback they receive from their classmates and consisted of items such as «I understand my classmates' suggestions better in comparison to suggestions made by my teachers,-- I allow my classmates make judgments about the quality of my work»; the third section (N=12) comprised of items such as «those students who participate actively in class receive better grades, I am sure my English teacher asks for my idea» to address the existence of feedback expectancy in English classes; the fourth part (N=6) consisted of items such as «my classmates are not precise in addressing my difficulties, my classmates will not concentrate on all my problems» to look into the effect of cultural factors on acceptance of peer feedback. Since the number of items in the four sections of the questionnaire was not equal, the standardized scores were used in different data analyses.

The students' final scores in English class were also collected in order to see whether they correlate with feedback expectancy or not. Finally, participants were presented with 60 questionnaire prompts in the written form and were asked to read them and render scalar (1-5) acceptability judgments. They were asked to make their judgments along the following scale:

1 2 3 4 5
 «strong agreement», «agreement», «moderate agreement», «disagreement» or «strong disagreement»

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: PSYCHOMETRIC REQUIREMENTS

The data elicitation instrument was submitted to internal consistency reliability analysis and confirmatory factor analysis as a means of explaining the underlying variables of the

questionnaire. The reliability coefficient of the present study measure, as estimated by Cronbach's Alpha, turned out 0.83. This implies that a high degree of consistency exists in subjects' responses to questionnaire prompts.

A four-factor solution of the data was performed, as there were four types of items (see Appendix A). Items clustering under factor one are those aiming at finding out the attitude of students towards the feedback they receive from their peers. Both teacher feedback and peer feedback items loaded under this factor. Since the greater portion concerns peer feedback, it can be inferred that factor one tends to account for students' attitude towards peer feedback in general. Items loading under factor two are related to questions eliciting respondents' attitude towards teacher feedback. Items clustering under factor three are related to feedback expectancy and account for feedback seeking behavior of students. The majority of items concerned with cultural issues loaded under factor four that explains a cultural construct. The descriptive statistics of the four sets of items in the questionnaire is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: *Descriptive statistics of Peer, Teacher, Culture, and Feedback expectancy*

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
Peer Feedback	533	37.14	99.05	77.2429	11.3253
Teacher Feedback	533	43.00	100.00	81.1595	10.2844
Feedback Expectancy	533	25.00	95.00	67.6048	12.4162
Culture	533	16.67	100.00	56.5166	16.9567

As Table 2 shows, a higher mean score of items dealing with feedback expectancy (67.60) indicates that a fair degree of feedback expectancy exists at schools. This shows that English teachers have been partially successful in requiring students to participate actively in class.

In order to find out whether there is any relationship between feedback expectancy and students' achievement in English class, a correlation analysis was performed. The correlation coefficient of the two variables, participants' final scores in English class and feedback expectancy, was 0.50 ($p < 0.000$). This moderate correlation implies that feedback expectancy is positively correlated with students' achievement. In other words, students who have stronger feedback expectancy are generally more successful than others, probably because they spend more time for preparation and participation in classroom activities.

To find out the relationship between feedback expectancy and the level of learners' achievement it was necessary to assign learners to different groups. Based on the mean (68.75) and the standard deviation (21) of final standardized scores in English participants were classified as high achievers, intermediate high, intermediate low, and low achievers. Frequency of subjects in different groups is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Frequency of participants in Different Levels of Achievement Based on Final Score in English Class

Level of Achievement	Score range	Male	Female	Total
High achievers	+ 89.75	24	125	149
Intermediate high	68.75-89.75	43	75	118
Intermediate low	47.75-68.75	93	82	175
Low achievers	26.75-47.75	57	34	91

To find out the differences that might exist between different groups of learners from different educational and achievement levels in terms of their expectation for feedback and to see whether males and females are different in their expectation a uni-variate analysis of variance was run. The results are presented in the table below.

Table 4: ANOVA results for sex, educational level, and level of achievement

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Sex	158.077	1	158.077	1.468	.226
Level	1253.906	4	313.477	2.911	.021
Level of Achievement	6686.648	3	2228.883	20.694	.000
Sex* Level	752.688	4	188.172	1.747	.138
Sex * Level of Achievement	161.205	3	53.735	.499	.683
Level*Level of Achievement	1610.126	12	134.177	1.246	.248

Table 4 shows that the level of achievement has a significant main effect ($p < 0.000$) on expectation for feedback. In other words, learners recognized as high achievers are different from others in terms of their expectation for receiving feedback.

Table 4 suggests that gender variable does not play a significant role in determining the strength of expectation for feedback interchange. That is, males and females have roughly the same degree of expectations for feedback interchange. It can be seen that learners from different educational levels exhibit different degrees of feedback expectancy. To see where the differences lie, Scheffe tests for level of achievement (Table 5) and educational level (Table 6) were conducted.

Table 5: Scheffe tests for levels of achievement

(I) Level of Achievement	(J) Level of Achievement	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.
High	Intermediate high	4.8133*	.003
	Intermediate low	7.4171*	.000
	Low	19.7307*	.000
Intermediate high	Intermediate low	2.6039	.219
	Low	14.9174*	.000
Intermediate low	Low	12.3136*	.000

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 6: *Scheffe test for educational level.*

(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference	Sig.
Junior2	Junior3	-4.6570	.105
	High 1	-2.1624	.767
	High2	-5.7031*	.005
	High3	-8.6676*	.001
Junior3	High 1	2.4946	.554
	High 2	-1.0461	.958
	High3	-4.0106	.285
high 1	High2	-3.5407	.069
	High3	-6.5052*	.008
High2	High3	-2.9645	.490

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

Table 5 shows that feedback expectancy varies across different achievement levels. The results demonstrate that the greatest difference lies between those recognized as high achievers and low achievers with a mean difference of 19.73. Table 6 shows that the greatest difference exists between second year juniors and third grade high school students implying that expectation for feedback in the third grade high school is strongest.

A closer examination of the data shows that the sharpest increase in feedback expectancy exists at third grade junior high school and high schools, indicating that at these levels students are more interested in giving and receiving feedback. This might be attributable to the educational system of the country that requires students at these levels to go through difficult exams to proceed to higher levels. Therefore, from the beginning of academic year, teachers adopt techniques and methods that require students to participate actively in classroom activities. Trying to increase learning opportunities in class teachers attempt to maximize feedback expectancy. However, this increase does not stem only from educational system; students' beliefs may have an impact on guiding their attempts to learn. Awareness that participation in final exams demands greater preparation moves students to work harder.

A paired T-test was conducted to see which type of feedback, peer or teacher, is more favorable to EFL learners. The learners were significantly different ($t = 9.601$, $p < 0.5$) in seeking teacher ($\bar{x} = 81.15$) and peer feedback ($\bar{x} = 77.24$). The higher mean of teacher feedback implies that Iranian learners favor teacher feedback. This corroborates the results of the study of Zhang (1995) which Roskams (1999) reports. Zhang found that in ESL contexts students prefer to receive teacher feedback more often. This finding also reinforces the arguments raised by those ESL teachers who have questioned the effectiveness of peer feedback for students in Asian countries. The finding of this study, indirectly, attests to the fact that cooperative learning has not received proper attention. In order to have a clearer picture, the mean score of items dealing with teacher feedback and peer feedback is presented below.

Table 7. Mean Scores for Teacher Feedback and Peer Feedback

		Mean	Std. D
1	IT20_Teacher feedback	4.43	1.04
2	IT4_Teacher feedback	4.38	1.14
3	IT25_Teacher feedback	4.31	1.23
4	IT33_Teacher feedback	4.30	1.10
5	IT37_Teacher feedback	4.29	1.27
6	IT9_Peer feedback	4.24	1.24
7	IT32_Teacher feedback	4.20	1.22
8	IT2_Peer feedback	4.19	1.19
9	IT5_Teacher feedback	4.18	1.21
10	IT26_Teacher feedback	4.14	1.20
11	IT23_Peer feedback	4.09	1.07
12	IT27_Peerfeedback	4.07	1.25
13	IT15_Peer feedback	4.04	1.36
14	IT3_Peer feedback	4.04	1.25
15	IT21_Peer feedback	4.03	1.19
16	IT19_Peer feedback	4.00	1.33
17	IT13_Teacher feedback	3.98	1.28
18	IT44_Teacher feedback	3.96	1.29
19	IT34_Peer feedback	3.96	1.26
20	IT22_Peer feedback	3.93	1.15
21	IT35_Peer feedback	3.90	1.38
22	IT38_Teacher feedback	3.89	1.31
23	IT48_Teacher feedback	3.89	1.37
24	IT16_Teacher feedback	3.85	1.46
25	IT18_Peer feedback	3.85	1.39
26	IT8_Peer feedback	3.82	1.38
27	IT11_Peer feedback	3.75	1.32
28	IT41_Peer feedback	3.75	1.34
29	IT10_Peer feedback	3.74	1.37
30	IT47_Peer feedback	3.73	1.51
31	IT29_Peer feedback	3.72	1.36
32	IT7_Teacher feedback	3.70	1.34
33	IT28_Teacher feedback	3.68	1.31
34	IT30_Teacher feedback	3.62	1.31
35	IT6_Teacher feedback	3.61	1.40
36	IT17_Teacher feedback	3.60	1.23
37	IT14_peer feedback	3.57	1.36
38	IT1_Peer feedback	3.48	1.55
39	IT12_Teacher feedback	3.32	1.42
40	IT46_Peer feedback	3.21	1.43
41	IT24_Teacher	3.01	1.42
42	IT31_Teacher	2.81	1.58

A glance at Table 7 items tells that teacher feedback have higher means indicating that Iranian learners are inclined to receive teacher feedback more often. This finding is in line with the assertions of Ellis (1991) who maintains that providing feedback is considered as one of

the primary responsibilities of teachers by students. Possible reasons for such a trust in teacher feedback might lie in cultural factors and the lack of familiarity of students with cooperative language learning which offers more opportunities for giving and receiving feedback from peers. Also learners' inclination to receive teacher feedback may derive from their past experiences which might not necessarily be beneficial to them. To get a better understanding, items addressing the role of cultural factors are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *EFL Learners' belief about group work.*

	Mean	SD
39- I prefer to work alone.	3.03	1.48
42-It is not important for my classmates to help me to overcome my difficulties.	2.96	1.53
36-My classmates are not precise in addressing my difficulties.	2.94	1.51
43-My classmates will not concentrate on all my problems.	2.72	1.46
40-While working in groups, every body is thinking about his/her own specific problems.	2.71	1.53
45-Due to conservative nature of Iranians, group work will not function properly.	2.60	1.46

Being asked their opinion about precision of their classmates in addressing their difficulties (item number 36), students expressed their doubts. It was found that students do not show much concern for helping their classmates. Although the mean of some of these items imply a moderate acceptance of peer feedback and the benefits of group work by Iranian EFL learners, a closer look at item 39 that has attracted the greatest amount of agreement(=3.03) indicates that the majority of students prefer individual learning and think that by working alone they can get better results. Considering these items, it can be suggested that Iranian students tend to be individualist and do not show much interest towards cooperative learning. This finding is in line with the results of the research done by Ahmadzadeh (2001) that revealed even at university level Iranian EFL learners have the least favorable attitudes towards group work. In order to advance our understanding of how belief system and cultural issues affect EFL learners' approach to learning and attitudes towards feedback they receive, several high school students were interviewed. They were asked questions such as:

Do you like to study with your classmates?

How can your classmate help you to learn?

What do you do when your teacher requires you to work in groups?

The participants' answers varied greatly and showed certain degrees of discrepancy. Those who had high scores and were regarded as high achievers by their teachers admitted that group work does not have much benefit to offer them. They expressed their preference to work alone because in this way they do not have to spend their time working with slow classmates. Low achievers, surprisingly, did not indicate their eagerness to work in groups either. They indicated that the main reason for their lack of participation in group work is the reluctance of high achievers to help. The researchers assume that that the negative attitude of students towards group work can also be a reflection of teachers' lack of success in creating appropriate environment for learning. Generally speaking, it seems that language teachers have not been able to follow grouping criteria and task structuring properly.

To find out the effects of gender and educational level on peer and teacher feedback and to see whether the effect of cultural factors on the acceptance of peer feedback remains the

same across different educational levels or not a multivariate analysis of variance, MANOVA, was carried out. The results are presented in tables below.

Table 9: *MANOVA results for gender and educational level.*

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SEX	Peer Feedback	776.215	1	776.215	6.594	.011
	Teacher Feedback	996.235	1	996.235	10.192	.001
	Cultural Factors	431.068	1	431.068	1.542	.215
LEVEL	Peer Feedback	4385.192	4	1096.298	9.314	.000
	Teacher Feedback	2697.787	4	674.447	6.900	.000
	Cultural Factors	1863.274	4	465.819	1.667	.156
SEX * LEVEL	Peer Feedback	363.616	4	90.904	.772	.544
	Teacher Feedback	267.386	4	66.846	.684	.603
	Cultural Factors	3484.390	4	871.097	3.117	.015

The results of MANOVA show that both sex and level of education influence expectation for teacher and peer feedback. The case is not true regarding cultural factors. It was also found that females show more positive attitudes towards peer and teacher feedback than males. The summarized results of Scheffe test for level are presented in Table 10.

The Scheffe test revealed that students' attitude towards peer and teacher feedback differs at different educational levels. The results demonstrates that second grade juniors are different from the rest of students in that they do not exhibit as much positive attitudes towards peer and teacher feedback as students at higher levels do. The sharpest difference is found between the attitudes of second grade juniors and third grade high school students. The mean scores for peer feedback and teacher feedback (second grade juniors' for peer feedback=69.62, for teacher feedback= 74.73, third grade high school students' for peer feedback=80.89, for teacher feedback=84.26) clearly shows that third grade high school students show more positive attitudes towards both peer and teacher feedback. Table 10 also reveals that males and females are different from each other in that females have more positive attitudes towards both peer and teacher feedback (see figures 2&3).

The increase in the demands of students at third grade junior high school and high school for peer and teacher feedback once again echoes the role of educational system that requires students at these grades to take graduation tests which are, admittedly, more difficult in comparison to teacher-made tests. Hence students try to prepare more and for the sake of this preparation welcome any help, whether it comes from peers or teachers.

Table 10: *Scheffe test for educational level.*

Dependent Variable	(I) LEVEL	(J) LEVEL	Mean Difference (I-J)	Sig.	
Peer feedback	Junior2	Junior3	-7.7008	.001	
		High 1	-7.3101	.001	
		High2	-9.2515	.000	
		High3	-11.2721	.000	
	Junior 3	High 1	.3907	.999	
		High2	-1.5507	.861	
		High3	-3.5713	.455	
	High 1	High2	-1.9414	.661	
		High3	-3.9620	.299	
	High2	High3	-2.0206	.834	
Teacher feedback	Junior2	Junior3	-6.5089	.003	
		High 1	-6.4615	.001	
		High2	-7.6081	.000	
		High3	-9.5257	.000	
	Junior3	High 1	4.731E-02	1.000	
		High2	-1.0992	.940	
		High3	-3.0168	.535	
	High 1	High2	-1.1465	.908	
		High3	-3.0642	.474	
	High 2	High3	-1.9176	.812	
	Culture	Junior2	Junior3	-5.3047	.427
			High 1	-3.4444	.774
			High2	-3.6634	.670
High3			-.9434	.999	
Junior 3		High 1	1.8602	.957	
		High2	1.6413	.961	
		High3	4.3613	.681	
High1		High2	-.2189	1.000	
		High3	2.5010	.935	
High2		High3	2.7200	.892	

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level

5. CONCLUSIONS

The most important aim of educational research is to identify and investigate the role of factors involved in learning. To shed light on one of the important factors influencing learning and to satisfy the objectives of educational research, the present study was carried out. It investigated the relationships between feedback expectancy and the achievement of students in English classes. The aim was to show whether in classes where feedback expectancy is high student achievement is greater. It was found that a fair degree of feedback expectancy exists in language classes and it is positively related to student achievement, but it varies across

educational levels and different classes indicating that there may be numerous variables related to educational system, teachers, students' character, their beliefs about the usefulness of feedback, their background, and academic status that might influence the strength of expectation for feedback.

Furthermore, this study aimed at comparing the attitude of Iranian students towards teacher feedback and peer feedback and investigating the effect of cultural factors and students' belief system on acceptance of peer feedback. The main incentive for investigating this factor is to be found in Zhang's observations (1995) of L2 classes that led him to conclude that ESL students overwhelmingly prefer to receive feedback from their teachers rather than peers. Jacobs *et al's* study (1998) that addressed the Taiwanese university students' attitude towards peer feedback and teacher feedback in writing courses also indicated that, on the whole, L2 learners prefer to receive teacher feedback.

Their observations point to the role of belief system and cultural issues in foreign language learning. Teachers have to deal with students who interpret the feedback they receive through a complex system of beliefs and attitudes. They seem to consider one type of feedback more effective than the other and consequently show certain degree of favor or disfavor. These attitudes influence the benefits they get from feedback. The results of the present research indicated that Iranian students do not fail to appreciate the value of the feedback they receive from their peers, but they believe that teacher feedback is more accurate, precise, and reliable. They indicated that their peers do not possess linguistic skills necessary for addressing their difficulties. Therefore, it is hoped that by re-examination of teaching approaches and the use of cooperative learning teachers can increase opportunities for the use of feedback.

6. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmadzadeh, Z. (2001). *On the use of Metacognitive strategies by Iranian EFL learners in different educational settings*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Tehran.
- Barnes, R. (1999). *Positive teaching positive learning*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Butler, D. L., & Winnie, P. H. (1995). «Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis», in *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245–281.
- Carnell, E. (2000). «Dialogue, discussion and secondary school students on how others help their learning», in Askew (ed.), *Feedback for Learning*. London: Routledge, 46-61.
- Chaudron, G. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Craven, R., Marsh, H. W., & Debus, R. (1991). «Effects of internally focused feedback and attributional feedback on enhancement of academic self-concept», in *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83,1:17- 27.
- Ellis, R. (1991). *Instructed second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Gipps, C. (1994). *Beyond testing: Towards a theory of educational assessment*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Good, T. L. & Brophy, J. E. (1991). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Griffee, D. T. (1997). «Using goals and feedback to improve student performance on vocabulary homework», in *The Language Teacher*, 21,7: 19-25.
- Jacobs, G., Curtis, A. Braine, G. & Huang, S. (1998). «Feedback on student writing: taking the middle path», in *Journal of second language writing*, 7,3: 307-317.

- Kessler, C. Quinn, M.E. & Fathman, A. k. (1992). «Science and cooperative learning for LEP students», in Carolyn Kessler (ed.), *Cooperative learning: a teacher's resource book*. NJ: prentice Hall, 65-83.
- Murphy, D. F. (1986). «Communication and correction in the classroom», in *ELT Journal*, 40,2 : 146-151.
- Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Panions, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). «Language Learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners?», in *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 30,1: 59-69.
- Richards, J. C. & Nunan, D. (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. (2nd ed.). Essex: Longman.
- Roskams, T. (1999). «Chinese EFL students' attitudes to peer feedback and peer assessment in an extended pairwork setting», in *RELC Journal*, 30,1: 79-109.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A

Rotated Component Matrix

a

	Component			
	1	2	3	4
IT21_P	.587			
IT27_P	.537			
IT19_P	.522			
IT23_P	.510			
IT20_T	.476			
IT10_P	.475			
IT22_P	.474			
IT9_P	.473			
IT32_T	.471			
IT33_T	.468			
IT34_P	.454			
IT16_T	.448			
IT41_P	.429			
IT15_P	.424			
IT35_P	.415			
IT14_P	.412			
IT37_T	.406			
IT2_P	.405			
IT8_P	.378			
IT26_T	.376			
IT4_T	.370			
IT3_P	.365			
IT13_T	.362			
IT29_P	.352			
IT6_T	.351			
IT25_T	.346			
IT38_T	.342			
IT5_T	.331			
IT11_P	.311			
IT18_P	.304			
IT17_T		.550		
IT28_T		.503		
IT50_E		.454		
IT44_T		.440		
IT48_T		.440		
IT30_T		.425		
IT51_E		.399		
IT24_T		.398		
IT7_T		.346		
IT49_E		.331		
IT52_E		.330		
IT1_P				
IT47_P				
IT12_T				
IT59_E			.581	
IT57_E			.576	
IT56_E			.562	
IT55_E			.554	
IT54_E			.510	
IT58_E			.440	
IT53_E			.417	
IT60_E				
IT40_C				.548
IT42_C				.538
IT36_C				.508
IT43_C				.501
IT31_T				-.497
IT46_P		.347		-.452
IT39_C				.418
IT45_C				.344

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
 a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

APPENDIX B

