

The Relationship Between Iranian EFL Learners' Feedback Seeking Behavior (FSB) and writing Ability among Second Language Writing Students

Mehri Farzaneh*

Faculty Member of Payame Noor University
English Department, Payame Noor
University, Isfahan Branch, Isfahan, Iran
Mehri.farzaneh@gmail.com

Mehdi Vaez Dalili

Associate Professor Department Of English,
Isfahan (khorasgan)Branch ,Islamic Azad
University, Isfahan, Iran
dalili@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to explore the relationship between second language writers' feedback-seeking behavior (FSB) and the students' writing ability. Sixty subjects were non-randomly from the intermediate level chosen from among EFL learners of Payam-e Noor University. The researcher was used feedback setting behavior scale and writing scale. The feedback setting scale was used to measure the motives for feedback-seeking, that composed of four subscales each measuring different motives that may affect the feedback-seeking behaviors of people. The writing scale including two topics that were taken to the students. They were required to choose one of the topics and start to write and two raters were corrected analytically. The results were calculated in SPSS version 22 and then analyzed and reported. The design of the present research was Ex Post Facto design. The Pearson product correlation was conducted to

investigate the performances of two groups in writing ability and feedback-seeking behavior tests. After data analysis, the null hypothesis is rejected. Findings indicated that feedback-seeking behavior (FSB) has a significant effect on the enhancement of the writing ability of EFL learners.

Keywords: Written Corrective Feedback, Feedback –Seeking Behavior, Motives, Desire

1. Introduction

Written corrective feedback (WCF) has been considered as an important issue of empirical and theoretical interest in the scope of writing performance among second language (L2) writing students over the last two decades (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1999, 2010; Krashen, 1984; Truscott, 1996). Research has provided various evidence for the relative effectiveness of WCF in improving second language writing performance (Kang & Han, 2015; Russell & Spada, 2006). Generally speaking, research has shown that WCF is viewed as a useful process when it is *explicit* (e.g., Ferris, 2006), *direct* (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Manchón, 2011), and *focused* on specific linguistic features (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Sheen, 2007).

However, research on WCF remains inconclusive and controversies over the topic linger to date (e.g., Liu & Brown, 2015; Truscott & Hsu, 2008). Because of

inconsistent findings in the literature, scholars have attributed them to methodological problems (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Liu & Brown, 2015) or mediating factors such as second language proficiency or the genre of writing (Kang & Han, 2015). Nevertheless, there is another remarkable issue which might have contributed equally, if not more strongly, to the current state of research on WCF. This gap is the lack of careful consideration of individual learner characteristics as they perceive, process, and apply WCF (Ferris, Liu, Sinha, & Senna, 2013). Shortage of attention to the learner's role in the feedback process in second language writing can be devoted to researchers' preoccupation with investigating how teachers' application of various kinds of WCF (e.g., direct vs. indirect; explicit vs. implicit) affects the accuracy of written products. This key concept of WCF as a teaching resource has overshadowed research in this area at the expense of attention to learners' engagement in the feedback process, casting second language writers as passive recipients of various kinds of feedback in terms of proactive agents in learners' learning (Bitchener, 2017; Ferris, 2010; Ferris et al., 2013; Hyland, 2011; Kormos, 2012). In order to bridge this significant gap in our comprehending of the process of feedback, a basic change in perspective is required. Such a shift would recast feedback as a *learning resource*, the value of which is driven by its instrumentality in learners' pursuit of their goals. Therefore, the aim of the study is to explore the relationship between second language writers' feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and students' writing ability. The following research question was posed:

RQ1: Is there any statistically significant relationship between Iranian EFL Learners'

Feedback Seeking Behavior (FSB) and writing ability?

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Definition of Corrective Feedback

According to Schachter's (1991), the most common terms for feedback are corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback. Schachter (1991) maintains that corrective feedback is the term most often used instead of feedback in the scope of second language teaching and learning. It is broadly defined as "information following an error produced by the learner and is part of the learnability problem of language acquisition" (p.25). Lightbown and Spada (1999) considered CF as any indication to the learners which their use of target language is incorrect. It includes different responses which the learners receive after making errors. As Ellis (2006) notes, CF involves an attempt to supply negative evidence which draws the learner's attention to the errors they have made.

Ur (1996) supports this claim and believes that correction is one of the two main components of corrective feedback, another main component is assessment by which the learner is simply informed how well or badly he or she has performed and by means of it some specific information is provided on various dimensions of the learner's performance via explanation, provision of better or other alternatives or through elicitation of them from the learner.

According to Ross-Feldman (2007), there are two main reasons why the researchers in SLA are interested in CF. The first reason is that there is an obvious need for it. Many English teachers are under wide pressure to correct learners' errors with the tacit assumption which the correction will be informed by the learner and subsequently make a difference in the learner's language

competence. The second reason, in his words, is the renewed interests in error analysis (EA) in SLA research.

2.1.1 Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

Written corrective feedback (WCF) can be defined as written feedback given by the teacher on a student paper with the purpose of developing grammatical accuracy (including spelling, capitalization, and punctuation) and written feedback on idiomatic usage such as word order and word choice. Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), which is also called *error correction* or grammar correction, refers to the “correction of grammatical errors for the purpose of improving a student’s ability to write accurately” (Truscott, 1996, p. 329).

WCF has been regarded as a normal way of improving students’ writing accuracy and a necessary part of the writing curriculum (Hendrickson, 1978; Truscott, 1996). It originated from the field of second language acquisition (SLA).

2.2 The Concept of Feedback-Seeking Behavior

Ashford and Cummings (1983) defined feedback-seeking behavior as the conscious contribution of endeavor toward determining the correctness and adequacy of actions for obtaining valued end states. Previous research has considered FSB as a useful resource in different fields including job performance (Ashford & Tsui, 1991), learning (Yanagizawa, 2008), and creativity (De Stobbeleir, Ashford, & Buyens, 2011), but has only recently been investigated in the field of second language acquisition (Papi, et al. 2019).

Ashford and Cummings (1983) introduced the concept of FSB as “the conscious devotion of effort toward determining the correctness and adequacy of behaviors for attaining valued end states” (Ashford, 1986, p. 466). Applied to

second language writing, FSB can be defined as learners’ intentional, calculated, and strategic attempts to collect feedback information on their second language writing performance. It is worth noting that changing the attention from the quality and quantity of WCF itself to the learner’s FSB can draw the long-needed attention to the learners’ engagement in the feedback process, which is an important element in the success or failure of L2 writing instruction.

Ashford (1983) also believes that when an individual obtains feedback, s/he can decide to devote additional efforts towards the objectives which may earn him or her the greatest probable gains or the goals which seem to be only achievable with an extra effort. Feedback seeking behavior at an early age helps learners to become feedback seekers at the workplace. Feedback seeking students and workers normally performed higher compared to non-feedback seekers. After an assortment of evidence from different researchers that delved into researching about the current topic.

A controversial relationship exists between *feedback-seeking behavior* (FSB) and *writing performance* for language learners. Feedback seeking behavior is a useful tool not only in the learning process but also in workplaces. Students who develop feedback-seeking behavior early in their education processes end up becoming high efficacy employees who use different strategies to seek feedback from not only their educators but also their supervisors (Tayfur, 2012). Therefore, the aim of the present study is to investigate the relationship between feedback seeking behavior and writing performance among writing students.

2.3 Related Studies

Papi et al. (2019) examined feedback-seeking behavior in second language writing: motivational mechanisms. They

collected questionnaire data from 128 foreign language writers from a major public university in the United States. Multiple regression and mediation findings demonstrated that a development language mindset predicted the value of feedback, which, in turn, was a positive predictor of both feedback monitoring and feedback inquiry. A fixed language mindset, on the other hand, predicted the cost of feedback seeking, which, in turn, negatively predicted feedback monitoring. The findings of the results provide new venues for language writing research and teaching.

Papi et al. (2019) covered a learning situation in which international learners enrolled for foreign language courses at a university in the United States. In particular, 287 students taking courses in foreign languages like Spanish (107), French (113), and Arabic (67) at Florida State University participated in the study (Papi et al., 2019). The questionnaire data from the 287 students studying different languages revealed that learners could make calculated decisions concerning whether to seek feedback and the strategy that they intend to use in seeking feedback, as well as the source of their feedback. Their perceptions about the values and costs associated with different feedback-seeking strategies affect their decisions most (Papi et al., 2019).

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The participants of this study were 60 EFL learners from the faculties of foreign languages at Payam-e Noor University, Isfahan branch. They were females and males with the age range between 19 to 25, and were chosen based on non-random sampling. The students enrolled in second writing courses at Payam-e Noor University, Isfahan branch participated in the present study.

3.2 Instrumentations

3.2.1 Feedback Seeking Behavior Scale

The scale developed by Tuckey et al. (2002) was used to measure the motives for feedback seeking. This scale is composed of four subscales each measuring different motives that may affect the feedback seeking behaviors of people. More specifically, the subscales are related to desire for useful information, desire to protect one's ego, assertive impression management, and defensive impression management motives, and all items were rated on a 6-point scale (1 = agree, 5 = Extremely disagree).

3.2.2 Writing Scale

It including two topics which were taken from TOEFL CBT book (2006) and administered to the students. They were required to choose one of the topics and start to write. The writing of students shouldn't be less than 250 words, based on the instructions given and it should be clear, concise and well organized. 70 minutes were given to the students to write the writing.

3.3 Data Collection Procedures

Before administering the questionnaires, permission was obtained by professors to use their class time for the purpose of data collection. Also, before administering the questionnaires, participants were informed that filling the tests are completely optional and were convinced that the purpose, and process of completing the two questionnaires, namely Writing test and feedback seeking Scale, respectively. Then, ambiguities and misunderstanding about the questions were cleared by the researcher, if there was any. Therefore, to conduct the research 60 EFL learners from the faculties of foreign languages at Payam-e Noor University, Isfahan branch. The participants were selected non-randomly.

The selected participants were all from the intermediate category. A writing test (Longman Complete Course TOEFL Test) was administered to the 60 selected students. Both groups were given the same two topics to choose one of them to write in 70 minutes and the tests were scored by 2 raters which were corrected analytically. The test of feedback seeking behavior was given to the students the same day. The participants were supposed to answer the test in 90 minutes. The results were calculated in SPSS version 22 and then analyzed and reported.

3.4 Design

The design of the present research was the Ex Post Facto design. In this design the researcher appears on the scene after all the events have occurred. In other words, the researcher has no control over the events. The variables are not manipulated, controlled, or modified (Mackey & Gass, 2000). In the present study, the researcher had no control over whatever the students had learned and they answered the feedback seeking behavior tests based on their prior knowledge.

3.5 Data Analysis

The Pearson product correlation was conducted to investigate the performances of two groups in writing ability and feedback seeking behavior tests. The participants' age was not considered significant in the study, though. All the subjects and their teachers were also informed that the tests were going to be administered.

4 Results and Discussion

This study aimed at exploring the relationship between second language writers' feedback seeking behavior (FSB) and students' writing ability. The data collection procedure was carefully run and the raw data was entered into SPSS (version 22) to compute the required statistical analyses and deal with the research question and hypothesis of the present study.

4.1. Analysis of the Research Question

In order to answer this null-hypothesis, two independent sample *t*-tests were conducted on both pre-test and post-test. Before presenting the results of the first *t*-test, the related descriptive statistics are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistic

4.1: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
FSB	73.05	18.407	60
Writing	60.74	13.245	60

As it can be seen, table 1 shows the results of variables of FSB and Writing ability, respectively. The mean and standard deviation of FSB are 73.05 and 18.407, respectively. Also, another variable; the mean and standard deviation of Writing are 60.74

and 13.245, respectively. Therefore, it should be noted that the difference between these two variables was not significant at the beginning of the term. In order to find the difference, the researcher conducted Pearson Correlation Test between these two variables.

Table 2: Pearson Correlation Test between FSB and Writing

		tarjomeh	TA
FSB	Pearson Correlation	1	.327*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.035
	N	60	60
Writing	Pearson Correlation	.327*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	
	N	60	60

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above table indicates Pearson Correlation Test between these two variables. In fact, in the above table Pearson Correlation Test between these two variables are given. The correlation coefficient may range from -1 to 1 , where -1 or 1 indicates a “perfect” relationship. The further the coefficient is from 0 , regardless of whether it is positive or negative, the stronger the relationship between the two variables. For example, a coefficient of $.453$ is exactly as strong as a coefficient of $-.453$. Positive coefficients tell us there is a direct relationship: when one variable increases, the other increases. Negative coefficients also tell us that there is an inverse relationship: when one variable increases, the other one decreases. Therefore, as the table shows, the level of significance is $.035$ and less than 0.05 . Therefore, the Pearson coefficient for the relationship between FSB and Writing is $.327^*$, and it is positive. This tells us that, just as we predicted, as FSB increases, Writing increases. FSB appears to be an important predictor of Writing. The correlation matrix also gives the probability of being wrong if we assume that the relationship we find in our sample accurately reflects the relationship

between education and occupational prestige that exists in the total population from which the sample was drawn (labeled as Sig. (2-tailed)). The probability value is $.327^*$, which is well below the conventional threshold of $p < .05$. Thus, our hypothesis is supported. There is a relationship (the coefficient is not 0), it is in the predicted direction (positive), and we can generalize the results to the population ($p < .05$).

5. Conclusion

In summary, from theoretical and practical perspectives, the results of this study shed new light on the scope of feedback seeking behavior and writing ability. The researcher can assume that the mean difference is significant and the learners have developed in their performance. In other words, the null hypothesis to this research question is **rejected**. That is to say, feedback seeking behavior (FSB) has a significant effect on the enhancement of the writing ability by EFL learners.

As a teaching resource, feedback is seen as corrective messages that are transmitted to a recipient concerning his or her linguistic

knowledge or skills. Perceived as a learning resource, feedback is personally-relevant information that students seek in any information environment, inside or outside the instructional settings, to meet their valued second language writing goals. Such feedback can include referent information about what goals are valuable and appraisal information about how learners are progressing toward achieving those goals. This change in perspective opens a wide range of research venues and extends the attention from teachers and the type of feedback they provide to the process of feedback and learners' involvement in that process, that is their FSB. It also highlights the importance of exploring ways to promote such behavior through different personal and contextual adaptations such as goal setting, improving classroom relationships, task requirements, and evaluation standards to decrease the perceived cost of feedback seeking and increase its associated value. This view of feedback can complement the mainstream WCF research by investigating how FSB can lead to the success or failure of the feedback process.

5.1 Pedagogical Implications

Improving a development second language learning goals can develop the value and decrease the cost of feedback seeking, thereby contributing to learners' FSB. Research has shown that teachers can improve learning goals in their classes through setting learning rather than performance standards of progress, make the process of writing development rather than product of writing the focal point of their teaching, treat errors as signs of development rather than symptoms of weakness, establish an atmosphere of collaborative learning, minimize the sense of competition and social comparison, and

evaluate learners with respect to their intra-individual instead of normative progress.

Improving FSB's value and declining its cost can be done via different means including but not confined with producing feedback seeking behaviors (e.g., Williams, Miller, Steelman, & Levy, 1999), improving the feedback seeker–source relationships (e.g., Levy, Cober, & Miller, 2002; VandeWalle et al., 2000), and producing a FSB-friendly setting via promoting intellectual stimulation, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills among students (Anseel et al., 2015).

References

1. Anseel, F., Beatty, A. S., Shen, W., Lievens, F., & Sackett, P. R. (2015). How are we doing after 30 years? A meta-analytic review of the antecedents and outcomes of feedback-seeking behavior. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 318–348.
2. Ashford, S. J. (1986). Feedback seeking in individual adaptation: A resource perspective.
3. Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32, 370–398.
4. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A
5. ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 193-214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
6. 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, 267–296.

7. De Stobbeleir, K. E., Ashford, S. J., & Buyens, D. (2011). Self-regulation of creativity at work: The role
8. Development: A Ten Month Investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214, doi:10.1111/modl.12538
9. Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996).
10. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-11. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80110-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6)
11. Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term
12. effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland, & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
13. Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and writing corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181-201. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S027226310999049>
14. Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 307-329.
15. Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice.
16. *Modern Language Journal*, 62, 387-398. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263118000153>
17. Hyland, F. (2011). The language learning potential of form-focused feedback on writing: Students' and
18. teachers' perceptions. In R. M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language* (pp. 159-179). Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
19. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101.
20. Organizational behavior and human performance, 32(3), 370-398. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 307-329.
21. Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A
22. meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1-18.
23. Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 390-403.
24. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
25. *Psychological Research*, 50(3), 137-144. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-5884.2008.00370.x
26. Levy, P. E., Cober, R. T., & Miller, T. (2002). The effect of transformational and transactional leadership
27. perceptions on feedback-seeking intentions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32(8), 1703-1720.
28. Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
29. *International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(6), 92-101.
30. Liu, Q., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback
31. in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 66-81.
32. Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive implicit negative feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22, 471-497.
33. *Management Journal*, 29, 465-487

37. Manchón, R. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Learning-to-write and writing-to-learn in an additional language*. Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Of feedback-seeking behavior in creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 811–on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37, 556-569.Oxford University Pres
38. Papi, M., Rios, A., Pelt, H., & Ozdemir, E. (2019). Feedback-seeking behavior in language learning: basic potential for L2 development? *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 167(2), 111–131.Research,
40. 7(2), 89–102.
41. Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language*
42. *Research*, 7(2), 89–102
43. Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language*
44. *Research*, 7(2), 89–102
45. Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language*
46. *Research*, 7(2), 89–102
47. Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language* ,*Research*, 7(2), 89–102
48. Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>
50. Tayfur, O. Z. G. E. (2012). Antecedents of feedback seeking behaviors: Review of the feedback seeking research: The 2 ×2 model of L2 self-guides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition research: The 2 × 2*
52. model of L2 self-guides. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
53. Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
55. Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. P. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(4), 292–305.
57. Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
58. Vancouver, B. C
59. VandeWalle, D., Ganesan, S., Challagalla, G. N., & Brown, S. P. (2000). An integrated model of feedback-seeking behavior: Disposition, context, and cognition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 996–1003.
61. Williams, J. R., Miller, C. E., Steelman, L. A., & Levy, P. E. (1999). Increasing feedback seeking in public contexts: It takes two (or more) to tango. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(6), 969–976.writing classes. Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, *Writing*, 17(4), 292–305.writing.
64. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
65. Yanagizawa, S. (2008). Effect of goal difficulty and feedback seeking on goal attainment and learning. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 50(3), 137–144.

Appendix A
MOTIVES SCALE
by
TURKEY, BREWER, & WILLIAMSON (2002)

ALTINCI BÖLÜM

Aşağıdaki ifadeler, insanların geribildirimle ilgili olarak hissettiklerini veya düşündüklerini yansıtmaktadır. Lütfen verilen ölçeği kullanarak, bu ifadelere ne ölçüde katıldığınızı belirtiniz. Her ifade için katılım derecenizi belirten rakamı, o ifadenin sağındaki kutuya işaretleyiniz

.1	Performansım hakkında faydalı bilgiler edinmek benim için önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	İşteki iyi performansımı, diğer insanların duyması hoşuma gider.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Performansım hakkında geribildirim almak, becerilerimi geliştirmeme yardım eder.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Olumsuz geribildirim kişisel değerimi düşürmez, bu yüzden ondan kaçınmaya çalışmam.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Geri bildirim istediğimde, insanların hakkımda ne düşünecekleri konusunda endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Amirimden geri bildirim istemek performansımı arttırmak istediğimi göstermenin bir yoludur.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Nasıl performans gösterdiğimi bilmek için daha fazla bilgi edinmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Olumsuz geri bildirim almak, gerçekte kendim hakkındaki hislerimi değiştirmez.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Eğer geri bildirim istersem, nasıl bir izlenim bırakacağım hakkında endişelenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Geribildirim istediğim zaman, insanların bunu bilmesini isterim ki sorumluluk sahibi kişiliğimi gösterebileyim.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Performansım hakkında daha fazla yararlı bilgi edinmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Olumsuz geri bildirim aldığımda kendimi iyi hissetmem.	1	2	3	4	5

13.	İnsanların, bana verilen olumlu geribildirimini duyup duymadıklarıyla ilgilenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Performansım hakkında faydalı bilgi edinip edinmediğim konusunda endişe duymuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Kendimi hâlâ değerli hissedeceğim için, olumsuz geri bildirim almak hakkında gerçekten endişelenmem.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Aldığım geri bildirim içeriğini insanların bilmesini umursamam.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Övüldüğüm zaman diğerlerinin bunu duymasını gerçekten istemem.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Geribildirim performansımı geliştirmek için yararlı değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Kendim hakkında kötü hissettirdiği için, olumsuz geribildirimden kaçınmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Amirimden geribildirim isterken insanların görüp görmemelerini umursamam.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Yararlı geribildirim edinmek benim için önemli değildir.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Olumsuz olabilecek geribildirimler konusunda endişe duyarım çünkü eleştirilmek bana acı verir.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Diğer insanların aldığım bireysel geribildirim içeriğini duymaları hakkında sıklıkla endişe duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Performansım hakkındaki olumlu geribildirim, diğerleri üzerinde olumlu izlenim yaratmasını umut ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	Nasıl performans gösterdiğimi bilmek için, daha fazla geribildirime ihtiyaç duymuyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Bir konuda nasıl performans gösterdiğimin insanlar tarafından bilinmesi beni endişelendirmez.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Başkalarını performansım hakkında aldığım olumlu geribildirim öğrenmelerini sağlayarak etkilemeye ihtiyacım yoktur.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B

Scores			
	Name	FBS	Writing

1	Mrs. Kamrani zاده	6	6
2	Mrs. Ghanbari	5	6
3	Mr. Rasouli	4	6
4	Mr. Rahimi	3	5
5	Mr. Vahdani	3	4
6	Mr. Ravahi	2	5
7	Mr. Fathi	4	2
8	Mrs. Roshani	5	5
9	Mrs. Bahadori	3	3
10	Mrs. Vahi	3	3
11	Mrs. Shahlahi	2	4
12	Mrs. Valizadeh	4	5
13	Mrs. Sootedeh	5	3
14	Mrs. Tashakoori	5	5
15	Mrs. Nahidi	5	2
16	Mr. Vahidi	6	4
17	Mr. Akbari	4	5
18	Mr. Taebi	5	3
19	Mr. Setayesh	6	3
20	Mr. saeedi	4	2
21	Mr. Fakhimi	5	4
22	Mr. Fathemi	4	4
23	Mr. Shakohi	6	4
24	Mr. SABORI	5	4
25	Mr. Parvazi	5	4
26	Mr. Mohammadi	3	4
27	Mr. Karimi	6	4
28	Mr. Mashakeyi	6	2
29	Mr. Saedi	5	3
30	Mr. Mohammadi	5	3

Scores			
	Name	FBS	Writing
31	Mrs. Karimi	3	4
32	Mrs. Sootedeh	3	5

33	Mr. Fatahi	2	5
34	Mr. Shakori	4	6
35	Mrs. Rostami	5	3
36	Mrs. Ranjabr	3	3
37	Mrs. Azadeh	3	6
38	Mrs. Akbari	3	6
39	Mrs. somayeh	3	6
40	M. Hamidi	3	4
41	Mr Shabazi	2	5
42	Mrs. Vahid niya	4	3
43	Mrs. saeedehi	5	3
44	Mrs. Askari	2	2
45	Mrs. Nahadi	4	1
46	Mr. Binazi	3	6
47	Mr. Vahdinian	4	5
48	Mr. Tina Sakhari	5	5
49	Mr. setayeshi	3	4
50	Mr. Gholami	4	5
51	Mr. Tashakoori	6	5
52	Mr. Keysan	6	6
53	Mr. Ramai	5	3
54	Mr. Karmani	3	3
55	Mr. Solamzi	5	6
56	Mr. Kazaemi	5	6
57	Mr. kazemi	6	1
58	Mr. Shavasri	3	3
59	Mr. Barish	3	3
60	Mr. alavi	6	6