

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNERS' DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND  
LEARNERS' ORIENTATION TOWARD CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK**

**BY  
LI HEJING**



**Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment as the Requirement for the Master of  
Arts in Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages by Coursework in  
The Faculty of Arts, Communication and Education**

**IUKL**

**2018**

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur  
in fulfilment of the requirement for the Master of Art in Teaching of English to  
Speakers of Other Languages

Relationship between Learners' Development Goals and Learners' Orientation  
Toward Corrective Feedback

By

**LI HEJING**

**June 2018**

Chair : Ms. Suraya Amirrudin, M. Edu

Faculty of Arts, Communication and Education

The major mission of ESL writing teachers is to help L2 learners improve their writing skills in accordance with learners' needs and course objectives. Providing feedback is viewed as important too. Therefore, this study answered all three research questions by the end of the study. This study employed quantitative research that uses descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation coefficient analysis to analyse the data collected from 130 participants who are currently undergoing various bachelor programmes in a private university in Malaysia. The finding of first research question showed that learning goals are the most employed by the students with the mean of 3.9667 compare to performance goals with the mean of 3.9667. The finding for second research question showed that most of the Bachelor degree students tend to be positive towards corrective feedback. The last finding of the research question is, the relationship between learners' language learning development goals and learners' orientation towards corrective feedback is significant at 0.000 where correlation is significant at the 0.00 level. Whereas, the  $r$  value of the correlation is 0.420. As a conclusion, the study has come up with two kinds of implications; theoretical and pedagogical implications. In other words, the study has managed to contribute to the theories used underpinning the study and to teaching and learning.

DECLARATION

I declare that the thesis is my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously, and is not concurrently, submitted for any other degree at Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur or at any other institution.

(Signature) *Hejrn*

Name: LI HEJING

Date:



## APPROVAL

This project paper was submitted to the Senate of Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur (IUKL) and has been accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Masters of Arts in Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages. The members of the project paper Examination Committee were as follows:

**Suraya Amirrudin**

Faculty of Arts, Communication and Education  
Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur (IUKL)  
(Supervisor)

**HAROLD POONG WAN HING**

Faculty of Arts, Communication and Education  
Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur (IUKL)  
(Internal Examiner)

*Assoc. Prof. Dr. Manal Mohsen Abood  
Director  
Centre for Postgraduate Studies  
Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur (IUKL)*



**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Manal Mohsen Abood**

Director

Centre for Postgraduate Studies

Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur (IUKL)

Date: 4/7/18



<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>		<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>		<b>iii</b>
<b>DECLARATION</b>		<b>iv</b>
<b>APPROVAL</b>		<b>v</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>		<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>		<b>x</b>
<b>CHAPTER</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
	Introduction	1
	Background of the Study	2
	Problem Statement	3
	Purpose of the Study	5
	Research Objectives	6
	Research Questions	6
	Research Hypothesis	6
	Significant of the Study	7
	Limitations of the Study	8
	Definition of Terms	8
	Conclusion	9
<b>2</b>	<b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>10</b>
	Introduction	10
	Language Learning Development Goals	10
	Learning Goals	10
	Performance Goals	11
	Learners' Orientation towards Corrective Feedback	13
	Theory Underpinning the Study	16
	Dweck's Implicit Theories of Intelligence (1986)	16
	Conceptual Framework	18
	Conclusion	19

<b>3</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>20</b>
	Research Design	20
	Quantitative Research Design	20
	Correlational Design	21
	Population and Sample	21
	Setting	21
	Population	22
	Sample	22
	Instruments	23
	Questionnaire	23
	Pilot Study	24
	Research Framework	25
	Reliability and Validity	26
	Validity of the Study	26
	Reliability of the Study	27
	Data Collection	27
	Data Analysis	27
	Conclusion	28
<b>4</b>	<b>FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION</b>	<b>29</b>
	Introduction	29
	Findings based on the Demographic Background	30
	Participants' Age	30
	Participants' Gender	31
	Findings for Research Questions	32
	Research Question 1	32
	Research Question 2	33
	Research Question 3	34
	Conclusion	35
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>37</b>
	Introduction	37

Discussion for Findings	37
Implications of the Study	41
Theoretical Implications	41
Pedagogical Implications	43
Recommendations for Future Research	44
Conclusion	45

<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>46</b>
-------------------	-----------

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>56</b>
-----------------	-----------



**LIST OF TABLES**

**Page**

Table 4.1	Participants' Age Distribution	30
Table 4.2	Gender Distribution	32
Table 4.3	Descriptive Statistics of Learning Development Goals	34
Table 4.4	Descriptive Statistics of Orientation Towards Corrective Feedback	35
Table 4.5	Person Correlation results for significant relationship	36

UNIVERSITY KUALA LUMPUR - REPOSIT

**LIST OF FIGURES**

**Page**

Figure 2.1	Conceptual Framework	19
Figure 3.1	Research Framework	25
Figure 4.1	Participants' Range of Age	31
Figure 4.2	Participants' Gender	32

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Introduction

Academic writing is one of the most important role players in higher education. It fosters learners to express themselves by using language and to communicate. It is the only window to learners' thoughts, especially during the writing exams. Teachers' point of view points that academic success mostly depends on the quality of individual written work (Hicks, 2017). Thus, the capacity to write well academically in English is expected for every university student, especially for ESL learners.

We cannot easily say that ESL learners with a general knowledge of English grammar rules will perform well in their academic written works in the university. They are often facing challenges in writing accurately, such as, fail to use linguistic forms or choose an appropriate article. Because at the university level, both language accuracy and usage of correct articles are crucial.

The major mission of ESL writing teachers is to help L2 learners improve their writing skills in accordance with learners' needs and course objectives. Providing feedback is viewed as one of the ESL writing instruction because L2 teacher is the only person that students can rely on of whether they are doing correctly or wrongly. According to Ferris (2004) mentioned that teachers' corrective feedback may be the most important element that will contribute to learners' success in L2 writing. So that L2 teachers spend a good deal of time responding, correcting and commenting on learners' written works. Unfortunately, it is not always done in proper ways.



## REFERENCES

- Akira, N., Heffernan, N., Matsumoto, H. & Hiromori, T. (2012). The Influence of Goal Orientation, Past Language Studies, Overseas Experiences, and Gender Differences on Japanese EFL Learners' Beliefs, Anxiety, and Behaviors. *Journal of Applied Language Studies* Vol. 6, 2, 2012, 19-39.
- Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum*, 38(4), 20-24.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 166-182.
- Bitchener, J. (2012) A reflection on 'the language learning potential' of written CF. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 348-363.
- Blackwell, L. S. & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit Theories of Intelligence Predict Achievement Across an Adolescent Transition: A Longitudinal Study and an Intervention. *Child Development*, January/February 2007, Volume 78, Number 1, Pages 246 - 263
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Changing conceptions of feedback. In D. Boud and E. Molloy (eds.), *Feedback in Higher and Professional Education: Understanding It and Doing It Well* (pp. 11-33). Oxon: Routledge.
- Bouffard, T., Boisvert, J., Vezeau, C., & Larouche, C. (1995). The impact of goal orientation on self-regulation and performance among college students', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65, 3, 317-330.

- Bouffard, T., Vezeau, C., & Bordeleau, L. (1998). "A developmental study of the relation between combined learning and performance goals and students' self-regulated learning". *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68, 309-319.
- Brdar, I., Rijavec, M. & Loncaric, D. (2006). "Goal orientation, coping with school failure and school achievement", *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 21, 1, 53-70.
- Cardelle, M., & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on Second Language Learning of Variations in Written Feedback on Homework Assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15(3), 251-261.
- Chakrabarti, R., Barnes, B.R., Berthon, P., Pitt, L. & Monkhouse, L.L. (2014) Goal orientation effects on behavior and performance: evidence from international sales agents in the Middle East. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25 (2). pp. 317-340. ISSN 0958-5192
- Chen, S.-B., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language*, 1(5), 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>
- Conrad, S. M., & Goldstein, L. M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher written comments: Text, contexts and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 147-179. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80126-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80126-X)
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (4th ed., p. 304). *Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications*.



Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist*, 41, 1040-1048.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset*. New York: Random House.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256.

Dweck, C. S., Chiu, C. Y., & Hong, Y. Y. (1995). Implicit theories and their role in judgments and reactions: A word from two perspectives. *Psychological Inquiry*, 6(4), 267-285.

Dweck, C. S., Mangels, A. J., & Good, C. (2004). Motivational effects on attention, cognition, and performance. In D.Y. Dai, & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *Motivation, emotion, and cognition: integrated perspectives on intellectual functioning* (pp. 41-55). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dweck, C.S. (1991). Self-theories and goals: Their role in motivation, personality, and development. In R.A. Dienstbier (Ed). *Perceptions on motivation: Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Vol 38. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Earley, P. C., Northcraft, G. B., Lee, C., & Lituchy, T. R. (1990). The impact of process and outcome feedback on the relation of goal setting to task performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 87-105



Elbelazi, S. (2013). Negotiation for meaning and feedback in ESL writing class. *Arab World English Journal*, 4(2). 223 – 234. IUP PUBLICATIONS.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.

Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Tuioti, E. A. (2010). Written Corrective Feedback: Practitioners' Perspectives. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 47-77.

Farrell, E. W. & Dweck, C. (1985). The role of motivational processes in transfer of learning. *Doctoral dissertation*, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Ferris, D. (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(1), 49-62.

Ferris, D. R. (1996). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-10.

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181–201.

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

Fukuda, Y. (2004). Treatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes. *Master's thesis*, California State University, San Francisco.

Geitz, G., Joosten-ten Brinke, D., & Kirschner, P. A. (2016) Goal Orientation, Deep Learning, and Sustainable Feedback in Higher Business Education, *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 26:4, 273-292, DOI: 10.1080/08975930.2015.1128375

Gong, Y., Wang, M., Huang, J.C., & Cheung, S. Y. (2014) Toward a Goal Orientation-Based Feedback-Seeking Typology: Implications for Employee Performance Outcomes. *Journal of Management*. v. 43, (4), 1234-1260

Hanrahan, M. U (2014). The effect of learning environment factors on students' motivation and learning. *International Journal of Science Education* 20 (6) p 737-753.

Hicks, T. (2017). Achieving Writing Proficiency: *The Research on Practice, Feedback, & Revision*. *Writable*. [https://www.writable.com/2017/12/research-synopsis-and-pedagogy\\_writable.pdf](https://www.writable.com/2017/12/research-synopsis-and-pedagogy_writable.pdf).

Isogai, H., Brewer, B.W., Cornelius, A.E., Etnier, J., Tokunaga, M. (2003). 'A cross-cultural analysis of goal orientation in American and Japanese physical education students', *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 34, 1, 80-93

Janssen, O. & Prins, J. (2007). Goal Orientations and the Seeking of Different Types of Feedback Information, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 80, 235-249.



- Kadioglu, C., & Uzuntiryaki-Kondakci, E. (2014). Relationship between learning strategies and goal orientations: *A multilevel analysis. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 56, 1-22, <http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2014.56.4>
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46 (01), 108-119.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college---level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218.
- Martin, A. J., Nejad, H., Colmar, S., & Liem, G. A. D. (2013). Adaptability: How students' responses to uncertainty and novelty predict their academic and non-academic outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 728-746. doi: 10.1037/a0032794.
- Meece, J.L. & Holt, K. (1993). A pattern analysis of students' achievement goals, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 26, 399-427
- Mueller, C. M., & Dweck, C. S. (1998). Praise for intelligence can undermine children's motivation and performance. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(1), 33.
- Newstead, S.E., Franklyn-Stokes, A. (1996). 'Individual differences in student cheating', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88, 2, 229-241
- Niemivirta, M. (1996). Individual differences in motivation and cognitive factors affecting self-regulated learning: A pattern-oriented approach', Nenninger, P., Jäger, A., Frey, A. & Wosnitza, M. (Eds.): *Advances in motivation*, 23-42, Landau: Verlag Em-pirische Pädagogik



Noels, K. A., & Lou, M. (2015). Mindsets, Goal Orientations and Language Learning: What We Know and What We Can Do. *Contact*, 41(2), 41-52. VOLUME 41, ISSN # 0227-2938. *Teachers of English as a Second Language Association of Ontario*. [www.teslontario.net/publication/contact-magazine](http://www.teslontario.net/publication/contact-magazine)

Park, G. (2010). Preference of Corrective Feedback Approaches Perceived by Native English Teachers and Students. *The Jour Al Of Asia Tefl*. vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 29-52.

Rahimi, Mohammad (2015). "The Role of individual differences in L2 learners' retention of written corrective feedback." *Journal of Response to Writing*, 1(1): 19-48.

Roebken, H. (2007). Multiple Goals, Satisfaction, And Achievement in University Undergraduate Education: A Student Experience In The Research University (Seru) *Project Research Paper. Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.2.07*, University of California, Berkeley. <http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>

Shao, X. (2015). On written corrective feedback in L2 writing. *English Language Teaching*, 8(3), 155-168. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n3p155>.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2007.tb00059.x>

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Singleton, R. A. and Straits, B. C. (2010). *Approaches to Social Research*, 5th Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Snijder, M.A. (2015). Goal Orientation and Feedback-Seeking Behavior of Equestrian Athletes. Master Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences Theses. (*Master thesis*).

Soler, S. O. (2015). EFL Students' Attitudes and Preferences towards Written Corrective Feedback. *MA DISSERTATION*. Departament d'Estudis Anglesos. Universitat Jaume

Soler, S. O. (2015). EFL Students' Attitudes and Preferences towards Written Corrective Feedback. *Universitat Jaume* <http://hdl.handle.net/10234/134705>

Sopin, G. (2015). Teachers' beliefs and perceptions of grammar teaching in EFL/ ESL classroom at Misurata University, Libya. *International Journal of English Language, Literature in Humanities*, 3(10), 467-481.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on Writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303-334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990532>

Sung, K. & Tsai, H. (2014). Exploring student errors, teachers' corrective Feedback, learner uptake and repair, and learners' preferences of corrective feedback. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 37-54.

Tavakol, M. & Dennick, R. (2011). Making Sense of Cronbach's Alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, Pp.53-55



Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003>

Twycross, A. and Shields, L. (2004). Validity and reliability - What's it all about? Part 2 Reliability in quantitative studies. *Paediatric Nursing Journal*, 16 (10) p. 36

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waller, L. (2015). Motivation and written corrective feedback: How students' implicit theories of writing intelligence influence their writing motivation and orientation to written corrective feedback. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages - Master of Arts*. PDF <https://d.lib.msu.edu/etd/3447/datastream/OBJ/download>

Waller, L., & Papi, M. (2017). Motivation and feedback: How implicit theories of intelligence predict L2 writers' motivation and feedback orientation. *Original Research Article*. Pages 54-65

Winne, Philip H., Krista Muis, and Dianne L. Jamieson-Noel, (2003), "The Stability of Goal Orientation as a Function of Feedback and Calibration of Achievement in a Multi-Assignment Undergraduate Course", (American Psychological Association; Chicago, IL).



Yang, Y.-J. (2016). An investigation of Chinese junior high school teachers' and teachers' attitudes towards EFL writing. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education*, 5(2), 59-75. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2015.1209>

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist*, 47, 302-314.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78-93. doi:10.2167/la429.0

Zaman, M., & Azad, A. K. (2012). Feedback in EFL Writing at Tertiary Level: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions. *ASA University Review*, 6(1), 139-156.

Zhang, J. (2014). Chinese Students' Goal Orientation in English Learning: A Study Based on Autonomous Inquiry Model. *English Language Teaching*. Vol. 7, No. 2; 1916-4750.

Zhu, H. (2010) An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 3, 127-130.

LIBRARY INFRASTRUCTURE UNIVERSITY KUALA LUMPUR - RED SPOT