2023. április 20. (csütörtök) / Thursday, 20 April 2023

Language education (chair: Anita Habók)

T-1

MOROCCAN EFL UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS AND REPORTED PRACTICES OF PRODUCT- AND PROCESS-BASED WRITTEN FEEDBACK

Abderrahim Mamad*, Tibor Vígh**

*University of Szeged, Doctoral School of Education
**University of Szeged, Institute of Education

Keywords: written feedback; perceptions; reported practices

Currently, written feedback (WF) is divided into product- and process-based perspectives. According to Bowen et al. (2022), product-based WF is provided on completed drafts, whereas process-based WF refers to specific activities (e.g., goal setting, planning, revising) occurring in pre-, while-, and post-writing. Because students' perceptions have often been regarded as a key element indicating the success of writing development, many studies (Liu & Wu, 2019; Mahmood, 2021; Yenus, 2020; Zhu & Carless, 2018) explored them in relation to the preferences and the usefulness of WF in improving EFL, ESL, and academic writing. These studies revealed that perceptions are often associated with and are in mis/alignment with practices. However, they lacked the investigation of WF from both perspectives due to their focus on product-oriented written corrective feedback (WCF). Therefore, this study aimed to explore Moroccan EFL students' perceptions of product- and process-based WF in terms of their preferences and reported practices of instructors' WF. The research questions were: (1) What are students' perceptions of product- and process-oriented WF? (2) How frequently were instructors' WF practices reported by students? (3) Are there any similarities between students' perceptions and their perceived practices? A questionnaire was designed and used to collect data from 468 Moroccan EFL university students. Since it aimed to compare perceptions and practices, items covered the same nine subscales within the two WF perspectives. The questionnaire was validated using four principal component analyses. In each case, the data and sampling were suitable for factor analysis (.78 ≤ KMO ≤ .93). Reliability values (.71 ≤ Cronbach's alpha ≤ .95) were acceptable. (1) Students perceived the four process-oriented WF subscales (Content-based WF related to macroaspects of writing, Effective WF modes in the writing process, Content-based WF related to the standards of textuality, and Developing evaluative judgement) to be more important than the remaining five subscales. This indicated that students found process-oriented WF more valuable than product-oriented WF. (2) Regarding practices, students reported that the three subscales of product-based WF (WF modes on the written text, WCF, and Judgmental WF on the written text) were used more frequently by their instructors than the six process-based WF practice subscales. (3) Based on comparison, students' perceptions matched their reports regarding their instructors' practices described in the WCF subscale. However, there was no match in the other subscales because students considered the techniques covered in them to be effective, but they reported that their instructors utilized these less frequently. This mismatch has to be addressed theoretically and pedagogically by improving teachers' knowledge of WF perspectives and encouraging effective practices for enhancing students' writing based on frequent use of process-based WF modes.