The New Approaches in Humanity
Journal Homepage: www.Nahq.ir

Research Paper

The Effect of Written Feedback on the Structural Accuracy and the Writing Mechanics of Iranian Junior High School Students' Assignments

Mahmoud Hadinezhad [a], Seyyed Abdorreza Fathi Kachapi [b*], Reza Hadinezhad [c]

a. *Master of Art in TEFL, SR.C, Islamic Azad University, Sari, Iran.*
b. *PhD student in TEFL, Faculty of Humanities, IKIU, Qazvin, Iran.*
c. *English Language and Literature, Literature and Humanities, Hakim Sabzevari University, Sabzevar, Iran.*

ARTICLEINFO **ABSTRACT**

Keywords:

Written feedback
Writing Mechanics
Parental Supervision

Received:
10 October 2023
Received in revised form:
24 November 2023
Accepted:
5 January 2024
Published:
March 2024
pp.43-60

Background and Objectives: This study sought to observe the effect of written feedback on the structural accuracy and writing mechanics of Iranian junior high school students' assignments.

Methodology: A total of fifty students from three intact classes in two junior high schools, taught by the same teacher, were studied. Two classes were selected as experimental groups, while the third served as the control group. All three classes covered the same materials as outlined in the class textbook and were homogeneous in terms of gender, age, socio-economic status, as well as educational background. The researcher used nonparametric tests to analyze the results. To compare the performance of the three groups in pretests and posttests, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used. For further pairwise comparisons, the Mann-Whitney U test was applied. the SPSS21 was used to analyze the data.

Results: The results revealed that, in terms of writing accuracy, the provision of teachers' written feedback on students' homework assignments is significantly more effective than general oral feedback. Moreover, the effectiveness of written feedback is considerably enhanced when combined with parental follow-up supervision.

Conclusion: The findings highlight that written feedback significantly improves writing accuracy more than oral feedback, with parental supervision further enhancing its effectiveness. Combining written feedback with parental follow-up is recommended for optimal student progress in writing.

Citation: Hadinezhad, M. , Fathi Kachapi, S. A. and Hadinezhad, R. (2024). The Effect of Written Feedback on the Structural Accuracy and the Writing Mechanics of Iranian Junior High School Students' Assignments. *The New Approaches in Humanities*, 1(4), 43-60. doi: NAHQ/nahq.2025.529071.1005
http:// NAHQ/NAHQ.2025.529071.1005

* . Corresponding author (Email: Neyestan65@gmail.com)

Introduction

The early 1970s marked a significant shift in language teaching approaches, with the rise of the communicative method as a departure from traditional structural approaches that focused on isolated linguistic features and grammar rules. Rooted in Canale and Swain's (1980) theory of communicative competence, this new paradigm aimed to develop learners' ability to use the second language in realistic and meaningful communication. Among the key elements of this approach are providing learners with comprehensible input and opportunities for meaningful use of the language. Within this context, writing is often regarded as a demanding skill for second language learners. Teachers, therefore, must assist students in improving their writing proficiency and reducing errors. When students struggle with writing, corrective feedback becomes essential to guide them toward more accurate language use.

Correcting errors effectively is central to any writing course, and written corrective feedback (WCF) has become a widely researched tool in this process. While some argue that pointing out linguistic errors may be discouraging, others maintain that it fosters grammatical accuracy and improves writing over time. Much of the existing research has focused on the extent to which WCF enables students to become more autonomous and proficient writers (e.g., Chandler, 2003). Effective feedback encourages learner autonomy by helping students self-monitor and revise their work. When feedback highlights weaknesses in structure or mechanics and includes guidance for revision, it allows students to develop better proofreading habits and greater independence. Learners who become self-directed tend to be more resilient, confident, and ultimately more successful.

In addition to shaping language performance, feedback also has a strong influence on learners' motivation and self-esteem. Vague, overly critical, or poorly worded comments can discourage students and damage their confidence. In contrast, constructive and clearly written feedback can enhance self-perception, promote a more objective response to criticism, and increase overall engagement. As a result, effective feedback contributes not only to writing improvement but also to academic success more broadly. Nevertheless, students often report that the feedback they receive is inconsistent or insufficient to help them progress. Effective feedback typically includes making expectations clear, comparing current and target performance, offering detailed and practical suggestions for improvement, responding in a timely manner, using language that students can understand, and treating feedback as part of an ongoing dialogue between student and teacher. When feedback incorporates these elements, it is more likely to be

constructive and impactful.

Despite the considerable amount of research conducted on WCF, findings remain inconclusive. Teachers frequently respond to student errors in inconsistent ways, and a clear, agreed-upon framework for effective feedback has not yet emerged. Ferris (2004) noted that even after decades of study, the field lacks comprehensive conclusions and continues to grapple with unresolved questions. As a result, both educators and researchers are still seeking practical methods to help second language students become more accurate and independent writers. Understanding how students perceive and respond to various types of feedback and identifying which types they find most useful is essential for refining teaching practices.

This study aims to examine the impact of teacher-written feedback on the writing of Iranian junior high school students, focusing on structural accuracy and writing mechanics. It investigates whether written feedback, both with and without follow-up parental monitoring, leads to greater improvement compared to general oral feedback. By comparing the performance of students in three groups—one receiving only oral feedback, another receiving written feedback from the teacher, and a third group receiving both written feedback and parental follow-up—the study seeks to determine whether these interventions contribute to long-term gains in writing accuracy.

Although many researchers support the use of WCF, particularly in helping students revise and improve drafts, its long-term effectiveness on new pieces of writing remains a subject of debate. While oral corrective feedback is widely acknowledged for its role in language development, the sustained impact of written error correction continues to be questioned. Feedback is generally viewed as essential at every educational level, in both first and second language contexts, but there is little consensus on which types are most effective or what kinds of learning gains they realistically produce. This study contributes to the ongoing discussion by presenting evidence from a context that has received relatively little attention in prior research.

Although writing is often overshadowed by other language skills such as speaking and listening, it remains fundamental to language development. Writing reinforces grammar awareness, encourages individual reflection, and provides visible evidence of learning. Despite its value, writing has sometimes been overlooked in instructional practice, especially after the introduction of oral-focused teaching methods. However, recent pedagogical models increasingly emphasize the interconnectedness of writing with other language skills and recognize its contribution to learner autonomy.

Several researchers have discussed the importance of feedback in writing instruction, especially within second language contexts. According to Hyland

(2003), one of the chief concerns of L2 writers is achieving grammatical accuracy, primarily due to the evaluative pressures of academic environments. This accuracy, however, is not easily attained without external support, and teachers play a crucial role in helping students improve their writing through feedback. Yet, uniform feedback strategies rarely suit all learners, particularly when they differ in readiness, background, or learning preferences. As such, many educators have called for a more student-centered and context-aware approach to feedback, emphasizing individual needs over standardized methods.

From a theoretical perspective, feedback is deeply rooted in models of instructional design and learning psychology. Merrill (1994, 2002) and Reigeluth (1999) positioned feedback as a fundamental instructional tool, one that fosters both cognitive engagement and learning improvement. Feedback is understood not only as a means of error correction but also as a mechanism for reinforcing correct responses and enhancing student understanding. The cognitive information processing model, introduced by Atkinson and Shiffrin (1968), supports this view by describing learning as a progression from sensory input to short-term and ultimately long-term memory. Within this framework, feedback helps learners bridge performance gaps, solidify recall, and reflect on areas for improvement. Driscoll (2007) noted that feedback plays two key roles: it confirms whether a learner's response is correct and, when necessary, offers corrective insight that can guide future performance. As such, effective instructional design incorporates feedback not just as evaluation but as formative guidance throughout the learning process.

Feedback in the ESL/EFL writing classroom functions as both a diagnostic and developmental tool. Numerous studies have indicated that it enables students to identify problematic areas in their writing and apply appropriate corrections. By making students aware of what went wrong and guiding them toward revision, feedback becomes a crucial element in the writing process. Carless (2006) observed that feedback enhances learners' understanding of their own work, while Schwartz and White (2000) emphasized its role in helping students bridge the gap between current performance and learning goals. When learners receive timely and relevant feedback, they are more likely to internalize language rules and improve their writing over time. Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994), along with Williams (2005), argue that feedback stimulates learners' metalinguistic awareness—their understanding of how language works—which, in turn, enhances their ability to revise and edit effectively.

The type of feedback provided by teachers significantly influences the extent of learning outcomes. One key distinction is between direct and indirect feedback. Direct feedback occurs when a teacher supplies the correct form of an error, often

written near or above the mistake. This approach has the advantage of being immediately clear and particularly useful for beginners or for untreatable errors that are not easily self-corrected due to complexity or ambiguity. Indirect feedback, by contrast, involves signaling the presence of an error without offering the correct answer, thereby encouraging learners to think critically and self-correct. Studies by Ferris and Roberts (2001), Lee (2008), and Bitchener (2008) have explored both approaches. Ferris (2003) suggested that indirect feedback, while slower in producing results, can lead to deeper learning and longer-lasting improvement, especially when paired with targeted instruction and student motivation.

Contextual variables also shape the effectiveness of feedback. According to Evans et al. (2010), these variables include learner characteristics such as first language background, motivation, learning style, and goals, as well as environmental factors like classroom setting and teacher practices. Instructional methodology, including the sequence and pacing of activities, also plays a critical role. Guénette (2007) emphasized the importance of delivering feedback at the right time and in the right manner, suggesting that even well-designed feedback can fail if students are not motivated or prepared to act on it. Teachers should, therefore, adapt their feedback strategies to fit the instructional context and the needs of individual learners.

In fulfilling their instructional roles, writing teachers may act as responders, guides, grammarians, and evaluators. Keh (1990) and Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) outlined these roles, noting that a balanced approach often yields better outcomes than adopting a single perspective. For instance, teachers may provide positive, reader-oriented comments to support content development, suggest revisions based on logic or coherence, correct grammatical errors, or evaluate the final product against specific criteria. Arndt (1992) and others have argued that when feedback covers both content and form, and when it is presented as a dialogue rather than a judgment, it is more likely to be accepted and applied by students.

Another critical issue in the feedback debate is whether feedback should be focused or unfocused. Focused feedback targets specific linguistic forms—such as verb tense or article usage—while unfocused feedback addresses all detectable errors in a student's writing. Ferris (2003) noted a pedagogical shift from narrowly grammar-focused feedback to more holistic approaches that include content, structure, and mechanics. Research by Ellis et al. (2008) and Sheen et al. (2009) has shown that focused feedback can be particularly effective in improving grammatical accuracy, as it directs students' attention toward a limited set of errors, making it easier for them to process and internalize corrections.

Studies investigating indirect feedback consistently show its potential to foster

higher-order thinking and long-term gains. When students are required to interpret feedback—such as underlined or coded errors—they are more likely to develop strategies for editing and revising their work. Research by Chandler (2003), Lalande (1982), and Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) supports the claim that indirect feedback can improve both accuracy and fluency over time. However, such benefits are often contingent on the presence of multiple drafts and the expectation that students revise their work based on the feedback received.

In contrast, direct feedback is frequently favored by both teachers and students for its clarity and efficiency. Chandler (2003) found that students preferred direct correction because it helped them revise faster and more accurately. Similarly, Bitchener and Knoch (2010) demonstrated that direct feedback—whether paired with written or oral metalinguistic explanation—led to significant accuracy improvements in ESL writing. However, earlier studies by Robb et al. (1986) and Semke (1984) found minimal differences in outcomes between feedback types, suggesting that feedback effectiveness may also depend on instructional design and student engagement.

In more interactive contexts, recasts and elicitation have been used to facilitate learner response and self-correction. Recasts involve reformulating a student's erroneous output into a correct form without overtly pointing out the error. Elicitation, on the other hand, encourages learners to reflect on their output and generate the correction themselves. Lyster (2004) viewed both techniques as opportunities for learners to test their language hypotheses and engage in meaningful negotiation of form. Ferris (2002) and Jonassen (1991) also emphasized that such indirect techniques stimulate reflection, a process central to language development. According to Ellis and Sheen (2008), these feedback types fall under broader categories of focused and unfocused corrective feedback, both of which can be effective when implemented with attention to learner needs and instructional goals.

Perhaps the most intensive form of feedback is written corrective feedback combined with explicit metalinguistic comments. In this model, teachers not only indicate that an error has occurred but also provide explanations, grammatical rules, or examples to support student understanding. Bitchener and Knoch (2010), Ellis et al. (2006), and Nagata and Swisher (1995) found that explicit feedback leads to significant gains in accuracy, particularly when students are given sufficient time and support to act on it. Additional studies by Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen (2009) and Rassaei and Moinzadech (2011) further support the role of metalinguistic feedback in fostering long-term grammatical development. However, not all researchers agree. Truscott and Hsu (2008) argued that the benefits of feedback may be short-lived, and Truscott (2007) went as far as to

suggest that correction could be counterproductive in some contexts. In contrast, Bitchener (2008) found evidence of lasting improvement when feedback was delivered with clarity and consistency.

A critical concern raised by multiple studies is how feedback should be distributed. Teachers must balance local errors—such as grammar and mechanics—with global concerns like organization and clarity. Overcorrection can overwhelm students and reduce the effectiveness of feedback. Matsumura and Hann (2004) reported that while teachers believed they were addressing global concerns, most of their feedback focused on local issues. Lee (2008) emphasized the need for explicit feedback that matches students' proficiency levels and supports their goals. At the same time, Hyland and Hyland (2001) cautioned against softening criticism excessively, as it may lead to confusion. For feedback to be meaningful, it must be appropriately challenging, clearly expressed, and delivered in a timely manner. Frantzen (1997) and Guénette (2007) concluded that feedback is most effective when it is tailored to the learner's developmental stage and accompanied by appropriate support and scaffolding.

To address the aims of this study and evaluate the impact of teacher-written feedback and parental follow-up on the writing accuracy of Iranian junior high school students, the following research questions were posed:

1. Does the classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring affect the structural accuracy of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments?
2. Does the classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring affect the spelling accuracy of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments?
3. Does the classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring affect the punctuation and capitalization accuracy of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments?
4. Does the classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring affect the penmanship of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments?

Based on these questions, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. The classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring does not affect the structural accuracy of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments.
2. The classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring does not affect the spelling accuracy of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments.
3. The classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students'

parents' follow-up monitoring does not affect the punctuation and capitalization accuracy of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments.

4. The classroom teacher's written feedback with and without the students' parents' follow-up monitoring does not affect the penmanship of Iranian junior high school students' written assignments.

Methodology:

This quasi-experimental study, conducted in 2023, investigated the effects of different feedback methods on the writing performance of 57 third-grade junior high school students in Iran's Mazandaran Province. The research employed a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative analysis of writing accuracy with qualitative observations of student progress. The participants were selected through convenience sampling from three intact classes taught by the researcher, ensuring consistent implementation of the intervention. The sample consisted of demographically similar students from upper-middle-class backgrounds, minimizing extraneous variables. The classes were divided into Control group (receiving only general oral feedback), Experimental Group 1 (receiving structured written feedback) and Experimental Group 2 (receiving written feedback plus parental supervision. The study was conducted in ten weeks (20 sessions) using students' weekly writing assignments as the primary data source. Teacher feedback focused on five key areas: spelling, grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and penmanship. Feedback was provided in Farsi to ensure clarity for students and parents. The control group recieved standard instruction with minimal, unstructured oral feedback, the Experimental Group 1 received detailed written feedback with error corrections and Experimental Group 2 received written feedback supplemented by parental monitoring (parents reviewed corrections and discussed improvements with their child). Pre- and post-test writing samples (from sessions 2 and 20) were independently scored by five English teachers using a standardized rubric. Due to non-normal data distribution, nonparametric tests were applied. Kruskal-Wallis H test compared overall group differences and Mann-Whitney U test identified specific between-group variations. This design allowed for a robust examination of how written feedback, with and without parental involvement, influences writing accuracy compared to traditional oral feedback methods. The SPSS21 was used to analyze the data.

Results:

The results of this study are presented in line with the four research questions, each of which explored the impact of teacher-written corrective feedback—with and without parental supervision—on a different component of students' writing: spelling, structure, punctuation and capitalization, and penmanship. Prior to examining the treatment effects, the normality of the data was assessed using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. All significance values fell below the standard alpha level of .05, indicating that the dataset did not meet the assumption of normal distribution. This justified the use of nonparametric statistical tests throughout the analysis.

Table 1. SPSS output for the normality test of the data

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
	statistic	**df**	**Sig.**
Spelling pretest	.137	57	.009
Structure pretest	.151	57	.003
Punctuation and capitalization pretest	.145	57	.004
Penmanship pretest	.140	57	.007
Spelling post test	.134	57	.013
Structure post test	.161	57	.001
Punctuation and capitalization post test	.173	57	.000
Penmanship post test	.106	57	.046

As clearly shown, the data collected in the pretests and posttests did not meet the assumption of normality. The sig values are all smaller than the cut-off value of .05, and therefore, the hypothesis saying that there is no difference between the sample and the population in terms of the normality of the distribution is rejected. To explore whether written feedback, with or without parental involvement, significantly influenced spelling accuracy, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare the three groups' pretest and posttest scores.

Table 2. Kruskal Wallis results for spelling pretests and posttests

	Spelling Pretest	Spelling Post test
Chi-square	.800	25.098
df	2	2
Asymp. Sig	.670	.000

The pretest results showed no statistically significant difference among the groups, confirming their initial homogeneity (Asymp. Sig = .670). However, the posttest scores revealed a significant difference (Asymp. Sig = .000), suggesting a differential effect of the treatment across the groups. To determine which groups differed significantly, Mann-Whitney U tests were conducted for all pairwise comparisons.

Table 3. Results of Mann-Whitney U Comparing the Spelling Posttest Results of the Three Groups

	Groups 1 and 2	**Groups 1 and 3**	**Groups 2 and 3**
Mann-Whitney U	29.500	82.500	72.000
Wilcoxon W	219.500	272.500	262.000
Z	-4.432	-2.886	-3.212
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.001
Mean rank	Group1: 11.55 Group 2: 27.45	Group1: 14.34 Group 3: 24.66	Group2: 25.21 Group 3: 13.79

Results showed that the group receiving both teacher feedback and parental monitoring (Group A) significantly outperformed both the group that received only teacher feedback (Group B) and the control group. Group B also performed significantly better than the control group, indicating that written feedback alone was more effective than general oral feedback.

The second research question examined the effect of feedback on structural accuracy. The results are given in the following table.

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis results for structure pretests and posttests

	Structure Pretest	Structure Post test
Chi-square	.530	31.245
df	2	2
Asymp. Sig	.767	.000

As with spelling, no significant difference was found in the pretest scores (Asymp. Sig = .767), confirming initial similarity among the groups. However, posttest analysis again revealed significant differences (Asymp. Sig = .000), with Mann-Whitney U comparisons showing that Group A achieved the highest gains, followed by Group B and then the control group. To see where exactly the difference lied, the researcher had to run three separate Mann-Whitney U tests to compare the performance of the three groups two by two.

Table 5. Results of Mann-Whitney U Comparing the Structural Posttest Results of the Three Groups

Mann-Whitney U Used to compare Structural Posttest results of the three groups			
	Groups 1 and 2	**Groups 1 and 3**	**Groups 2 and 3**
Mann-Whitney U	7.000	43.500	104.500
Wilcoxon W	197.000	233.500	294.500
Z	-5.083	-4.013	-2.238
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.025
Mean rank	Group1: 10.37 Group 2: 28.63	Group1: 12.29 Group 3: 26.71	Group2:23.50 Group 3:15.50

In analyzing punctuation and capitalization accuracy, the same pattern emerged. The groups were statistically similar at the outset (Asymp. Sig = .756), but the posttest revealed highly significant differences (Asymp. Sig = .000). Once more, students in Group A outperformed all others, and Group B again surpassed the control group. These results further confirmed the advantage of teacher feedback, particularly when reinforced by parental support.

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis results for punctuation and capitalization pretests and posttests Test Statistics

	Punctuation and capitalization accuracy Pretest	Punctuation and capitalization accuracy Post test
Chi-square	.559	42.001
df	2	2
Asymp. Sig	.756	.000

To see where exactly the difference lied, the researcher had to run three separate Mann-Whitney U tests to compare the performance of the three groups two by two.

Table 7. Results of Mann-Whitney U Comparing the punctuation and capitalization Posttest Results of the Three Groups

	Groups 1 and 2	**Groups 1 and 3**	**Groups 2 and 3**
Mann-Whitney U	.000	10.500	55.000
Wilcoxon W	190.000	200.500	245.000
Z	5.285	-4.984	-3.698
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Mean rank	Group1: 10.00 Group 2: 29.00	Group1: 10.55 Group 3: 28.45	Group2:26.11 Group 3:12.89

Considering the sig values which are all smaller than the cut-off .05 and the magnitude of the mean ranks of the groups, we can say that group 2 was better than groups 1 and 3, and group 3 was better than group 1. Having said this, we can conclude that the classroom teacher's written feedback combined with the parental supervision of the students' homework was statistically significantly more effective than the teacher's written feedback alone and both of them were more effective on the punctuation and capitalization accuracy of the learners' homework than the teacher's general oral feedback. Therefore, we can safely reject the null hypothesis and say with confidence that the classroom teacher's written feedback with the students' parents' follow-up monitoring affects the punctuation and capitalization accuracy of the Iranian junior high school students' written assignments better than the teachers' written feedback alone and both of them are better than the mere oral feedback. The final research question focused on the students' penmanship the results of which are given in the following table.

Table 8. Kruskal Wallis results for Penmanship pretests and posttests

Test Statistics a, b		
	Penmanship Pretest	Penmanship Post test
Chi-square	2.665	43.756
df	2	2
Asymp. Sig	.264	.000

The pretest scores did not show significant group differences (Asymp. Sig = .264). To see where exactly the difference lied, the researcher had to run three separate Mann-Whitney U tests to compare the performance of the three groups two by two.

Table 9. Results of Mann-Whitney U Comparing the Penmanship Posttest Results of the Three Groups

	Groups 1 and 2	**Groups 1 and 3**	**Groups 2 and 3**
Mann-Whitney U	.000	49.000	7.500
Wilcoxon W	190.000	239.000	197.500
Z	-5.331	-3.971	-5.085
Asymp. Sig (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000
Mean rank	Group1: 10.00 Group 2: 29.00	Group1: Group 3:	Group2:28.61 Group 3:10.39

Considering the sig values which are all smaller than the cut-off .05 and the magnitude of the mean ranks of the groups, we can say that group 2 was better than groups 1 and 3, and group 3 was better than group 1. Having said this, we can conclude that the classroom teacher's written feedback combined with the parental supervision of the students' homework was statistically significantly more effective than the teacher's written feedback alone and both of them were more effective on the penmanship of the learners' homework than the teacher's general oral feedback. Therefore, we can safely reject the null hypothesis and say with confidence that the classroom teacher's written feedback with the students' parents' follow-up monitoring affects the penmanship of the Iranian junior high school students' written assignments better than the teachers' written feedback alone and both of them are better than the mere oral feedback.

These quantitative findings were further supported by qualitative data gathered through classroom observations and informal interviews with students and their

parents. Students in the experimental groups were consistently more engaged with their homework and demonstrated a stronger sense of responsibility compared to the control group. Teachers noted that students exposed to written feedback developed greater metalinguistic awareness, enabling them to recognize and correct errors more independently. In Group A, parental involvement amplified these effects by creating a supportive environment for the feedback to be reviewed and internalized. Many parents not only expressed satisfaction but also extended their involvement to other academic areas and siblings, reflecting a broader educational impact.

An unintended but telling outcome was observed in the control group. Students, perceiving the teacher's greater involvement with other classes, felt disadvantaged, prompting the teacher to eventually provide written feedback to them as well. Perhaps most noteworthy, both students and parents in the experimental groups requested the continuation of written feedback even after the study concluded. The teacher, initially overwhelmed by the extra workload, ultimately recognized the pedagogical value of the strategy and voluntarily chose to continue using it. These observations demonstrate that teacher-written feedback, especially when paired with parental engagement, has a transformative and lasting impact on students' writing development.

Discussion and Conclusion:

This study investigated the effects of teacher-written feedback, with and without parental supervision, on the writing accuracy of Iranian junior high school students. The findings revealed that teacher-written feedback significantly improved students' writing performance across dimensions such as spelling, sentence structure, punctuation, capitalization, and penmanship. Students who received written corrective comments demonstrated heightened awareness of their errors, increased motivation to revise their work, and greater engagement with their assignments. These results underscore the transformative potential of written feedback as both an instructional tool and a motivator for learners.

The study further highlighted the amplified benefits of combining teacher-written feedback with parental supervision. In the experimental group where parents actively reviewed teacher comments and monitored assignments, students exhibited more consistent progress and engagement compared to those in unsupervised feedback groups. Parental involvement fostered a supportive home environment that reinforced classroom goals, creating a collaborative dynamic between teachers, students, and families. Parents expressed appreciation for the

strategy, noting its positive impact not only on the participating child but also on siblings and other academic subjects. This enthusiasm persisted beyond the study, with requests to continue the feedback system, indicating its long-term value in shaping a culture of learning.

The implications of these findings are profound for EFL teaching practices, particularly in resource-constrained contexts like Iranian public schools. Teachers are encouraged to embrace written feedback despite its time demands, recognizing its lasting impact on student learning. Minimal yet targeted feedback can yield measurable improvements, while parental involvement can bridge gaps in teacher workload and enhance learning outcomes outside the classroom. Policymakers and administrators might consider employing teacher assistants to support feedback processes, making them more feasible and sustainable.

While the study provides valuable insights, its scope was limited to a specific geographical area and sample size, which may affect the generalizability of the results. Future research could explore diverse contexts, proficiency levels, and the long-term effects of feedback systems, including technology-based tools, to further refine and expand these findings.

Referemces

Arndt, V. (1992). Response to writing: Using feedback to inform the writing process. In M. N. Brock & L. Walters (Eds.), *Teaching composition around the Pacific Rim: Politics and pedagogy* (pp. 90–116). Multilingual Matters.

Atkinson, R. C., & Shiffrin, R. M. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In K. Spence & J. Spence (Eds.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 2, pp. 89–195). Academic Press.

Battaglia, M. P. (2008). Nonprobability sampling. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (Vol. 1, pp. 524–526). Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412963947.n337

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 102–118.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(2), 193–214.

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(2), 219–233.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 267–296.

Driscoll, M. P. (2002). Psychological foundations of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (pp. 57–69). Pearson.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 62*(2), 97–107.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System, 36*, 353–371.

Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(4), 445–463.

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 49–62.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161–184.

Frantzen, D. (1997). Explaining the effects of grammar explanation and error correction: A reanalysis of data from two studies. *The Modern Language Journal, 81*(2), 200–213. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb01174.x

Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(1), 40–53.

Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(2), 141–163.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*, 217–230.

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 185–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00038-8

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.

Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm? *Educational Technology Research and Development, 39*(3), 5–14.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal, 44*(4), 294–304.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal, 66*(2), 140–149.

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 69–85.

Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 26*(3), 399–432.

Matsumura, S., & Hann, G. (2004). Computer anxiety and students' preferred feedback methods in EFL writing. *The Modern Language Journal, 88*(3), 403–415.

Merrill, D. M. (1994). *Instructional design theory*. Educational Technology Publications.

Nagata, N., & Swisher, M. V. (1995). A study of consciousness-raising by computer: The effect of metalinguistic feedback on second language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(3), 337–347.

Rassaei, E., & Moinzadeh, A. (2011). Investigating the effects of three types of corrective feedback on the acquisition of English Wh-question forms by Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching, 4*(2), 97–106.

Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory* (Vol. 2). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 83–95. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586370

Schwartz, F., & White, K. (2000). Making sense of it all: Giving and getting online course feedback. In K. W. White & B. H. Weight (Eds.), *The online teaching guide: A handbook of attitudes, strategies, and techniques for the virtual classroom* (pp. 167–182). Allyn & Bacon.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System, 37*, 556–569.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(4), 255–272.

Varnosfadrani, A. D., & Basturkmen, H. (2009). The effectiveness of implicit and explicit error correction on learners' performance. *System, 37*, 82–98.

Williams, J. (2005). *Teaching writing in second and foreign language classrooms*. McGraw-Hill.