

The Relationship among Self-Regulated Writing Strategies, Feedback Seeking Behavior, and Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Learners

¹Pardis Rezaei

²Zahra Amirian*

³Mansoor Tavakoli

Research Paper

IJEAP- 2410-2089 DOR: [20.1001.1.24763187.2024.13.4.7.8](https://doi.org/20.1001.1.24763187.2024.13.4.7.8)

Received: 2024-10-25

Accepted: 2024-12-20

Published: 2024-12-30

Abstract: The main objective of this research was to assess the degree to which EFL students' self-regulated writing habits predicted their writing grades and the frequency of their feedback requests. The correlation between feedback-seeking behavior and writing scores was analyzed. To achieve this goal, 35 intermediate EFL learners (15 men and 20 females) were selected from the University of Isfahan. The data was gathered via the Feedback Seeking Behavior Questionnaire developed by Papi et al. (2020), the Self-Regulatory Writing Strategies Scale formulated by Feng et al. (2022), and several writing tasks. For further investigation, the obtained data was encoded and input into SPSS. According to traditional multiple regression analysis, the main factors determining EFL students' writing scores were their practices for self-regulation of writing. Moreover, the findings indicated that EFL students' propensity to solicit feedback forecasted their self-regulated writing approaches. According to the Pearson product-moment correlation data, participants' feedback-seeking behavior did not correlate significantly with their writing scores. The findings of the hierarchical multiple regression demonstrated that self-regulated writing styles predicted writing scores via the mediation of feedback-seeking behavior. Therefore, material producers and textbook writers are suggested to include activities in course books that improve learners' understanding of self-regulated writing processes and feedback-seeking behaviors. Teachers are suggested to provide a friendly social context for learners to seek feedback. Decreasing foreign language classroom anxiety and enhancing learners' self-efficacy can be suitable strategies to promote learners' self-regulation.

Keywords: Feedback, Feedback Seeking Behavior, Self-regulated Writing Strategies, Writing

Introduction

Writing, as a fundamental medium of communication (Khalavi & Zeraatpishe, 2023), facilitates interaction among people across many temporal and spatial contexts. The ability to write has been regarded as one of the vital requirements of different communication models (Syahban, 2019). It is considered a primary determinant of academic achievement (Ahamed, 2016) and a significant indication of learners' professional progress (Rahmatipasand et al., 2022). Writing could be considered a "socio-cognitive activity which involves skills in planning and drafting as well as knowledge of language, contexts, and audiences" (Hyland, 2003).

However, EFL learners perceive writing as the most challenging language skill (Nihal, 2017). This may be due to insufficient attention paid to students' writing ability (Sadeghi & Farzizadeh, 2012), the complicated nature of this skill (Patience, 2020), difficulty in organizing ideas (Khalavi &

¹ MA of TEFL, paradise.rezaei1078@gmail.com; Department of English Language and Literature, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

² Associate Professor (Corresponding Author), z.amirian@fgn.ui.ac.ir; Department of English Language and Literature, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

³ Professor, mr.tavakoli14@gmail.com; Department of English Language and Literature, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

Zeraatpishe, 2023), or receiving limited input (Teng et al., 2022). Reynolds and Teng (2021) argued that one of the main reasons for this issue is paying too much attention to the exam-oriented methods of teaching writing. They add that teachers consider the products of learners' writings as indicators of their ability and ignore the processes involved in producing coherent and accurate texts.

Over the decades, researchers have attempted to discover practical approaches to improve language learners' writing ability and solve their problems. One of the effective strategies for solving learners' challenges is using a self-regulated writing strategy. Self-regulation as a psychological construct refers to self-generated behaviors (Zimmerman, 2000) that enable learners to be autonomous and responsible (Eslami & Sahragard, 2021). Research indicates that SRL strategies are significantly correlated with proficiency levels (Pintrich & Zusho, 2002), vocabulary knowledge (Zarei & Hatami, 2012), reading comprehension (Amini et al., 2020), academic writing (Zhang & Zou, 2022), motivation (Bai et al., 2024), self-efficacy (Eivazi & Khoshnevis, 2016), and non-academic outcomes (Anthonysamy et al., 2020).

Applying SRL methodologies in writing signifies the "cognitive processes involved in writing, the understanding of writing, and the varied requirements of distinct genres" (Wong, 1999, p. 184). These are designated as Self-Regulated Writing (SRW) approaches. SRW approaches are deliberate, objective-driven strategies aimed at improving pleasure, minimizing difficulty, and augmenting the effectiveness of writing (Teng & Zhang, 2023, p. 680). SRW methodologies are competencies that empower learners to articulate and convey their thoughts proficiently in writing, which is essential for success in many academic endeavors.

Another factor that is beneficial for developing language learners' writing ability is feedback-seeking behavior. It involves searching for feedback from peers or teachers to gain more information or validate one's ideas (Bouckenooghe, 2022). Papi et al. (2019, p.4) defined it as "individuals' actions and strategies to gather such feedback information from various sources to determine the appropriateness of their behavior about the goals they pursue." Students can be informed about various aspects of an issue through it. It enables the learners to acquire fresh insights and new knowledge.

Bai et al. (2020) posited that these behaviors in writing provide language learners with valuable insights for improving their compositions, fostering a more profound understanding of topics, assisting in goal formulation, and augmenting self-awareness. Bouckenooghe et al. (2022) asserted that it highlights learners' skills that require improvement, provides them with new opportunities, and improves their professional skills. Individuals demonstrate a commitment to personal and professional growth by actively seeking feedback.

In sum, the review of the related literature indicates that feedback seeking behavior can be regarded as an effective strategy to make learners aware of their strengths and weakness and improve their major skills. Moreover, it made us aware of the efficacy of self-regulated writing strategies. What has so far been left for little attention is investigating the relationship between feedback seeking behavior, self-regulated writing strategies, and writing performance.

Literature Review

Many studies have looked at how SRW techniques affect writing. Alanazi (2020), for example, investigated how SRW techniques affected the writing abilities of 202 college students. The SRL Questionnaire and a writing test were utilized. Through independent-sample t-tests and multiple regression analyses, the study demonstrated SRW strategies substantially impacted writing performance. The results showed that the tactics used by high and poor writing performers differed significantly. However, they did not consider the potential effects of learning styles on the writing scores.

In an alternative research context, Sun and Wang (2020) investigated the connection between SRW approaches, self-efficacy, and writing competence. They gathered information from 319 college students through a writing exam and the English Writing Self-Efficacy and SRW technique

questionnaire. Their results indicated a substantial association between SRW methods, self-efficacy, and writing proficiency. One of the shortcomings of their study was ignoring the role of feedback or feedback seeking behaviors.

Balaman (2021) investigated self-efficacy in writing abilities and how EFL students' self-regulated writing styles may be related. Data were collected from 50 EFL learners utilizing two questionnaires. The correlation analysis and descriptive statistics results demonstrated a robust link between the variables and their subcomponents. In another study, Inan-Karagul and Seker (2021) examined how students' SRW methods may be enhanced by screencast feedback, emphasizing feedback. They used mixed methods and gathered data from 135 undergraduate language learners. Their results showed that screencast feedback had significant effects on SRW strategies used by the participants. However, these studies did not pay attention to the role of gender, personality types, and learners' characteristics.

Similarly, Uyen et al. (2022) investigated the Correlation between SRW strategies, corrective feedback, and writing of 200 university students. To gather and evaluate information, they used qualitative and quantitative methods. Written corrective feedback was shown to connect with SRW practices. They claimed that the utilization of SRW strategies improved writing quality. One of the positive points of their study was implementing a mixed method. However, the number of their sample was small.

The efficacy of self-regulated learning techniques on culturally specific EFL writing in Iran has been the subject of many prior investigations. Research by Eivazi and Khoshnevis (2016) examined how second language writers fared after receiving instruction in self-regulated learning techniques. Half a hundred (EFL) students participated in the investigation. After implementing these strategies, the analysis of pretest and posttest outcomes indicated a significant improvement in students' writing abilities. They recommended that while teaching languages, instructors use self-regulated learning techniques. Additionally, Rahimi and Katal (2018) investigated how these strategies affected Iranian EFL students' writing proficiency. The research of 150 high school students found that self-regulated learners performed better in writing tasks. This supports the findings of Eivazi and Khoshnevis (2016), who also reported significant improvements in writing ability through the teaching of SRL strategies. Many Iranian researchers have focused on self-regulated learning techniques. However, self-regulated writing strategies have received little attention.

Sadeghi and Farzizadeh (2019) examined how self-regulated learning strategies helped Iranian EFL learners become better writers. Data from 180 students indicated that self-regulated learning techniques significantly improved writing skills. But the authors just implemented a questionnaire to gather data. This result corresponds with Mallahi's (2020) findings, which demonstrated that while the correlation is small, self-regulated learning approaches are crucial for writing performance, underscoring the need for enhanced use and understanding of these strategies among learners. The addition of different methods to collect the data seems to increase the generalizability of such studies.

In the same vein, Eslami and Sahragard (2021) examined the impact of the SRL strategy on students' metadiscoursal writing skills. They gathered data from 50 intermediate EFL students through SRL strategy questionnaires and writing pretests and posttests. They found that SRL strategies improved students' metadiscoursal writing skills. They suggested that teachers effectively use these techniques to assist pupils in developing their writing skills. The link between students' L2 motivational self-system and communication preparedness and EFL instructors' self-efficacy, emotional experiences, and attitudes was investigated by Amirian et al. (2021) within the framework of the L2 motivational self-system. They gathered information from 100 EFL instructors and 501 EFL students. They found a significant link between all variables. Besides, Amirian et al. (2021) claimed that motivation had the most significant predictive power in predicting students' willingness to communicate. One of the significant points about their study was gathering data from a large group of the participants.

The connection between SRW techniques and cognitive, social, and emotional characteristics has been the subject of several research. However, the connection between writing abilities, feedback-

seeking activities, and self-regulated writing processes should be further studied. Therefore, this study aims to address the following questions:

Research Question One: Is the primary factor influencing the writing scores of Iranian EFL learners their skills for self-regulation?

Research Question Two: How well do Iranian EFL learners' self-regulated writing styles predict their conduct while requesting feedback?

Research Question Three: Do Iranian EFL learners' feedback-seeking behavior and writing scores correlate?

Research Question Four: Does feedback-seeking behavior mediate between self-regulated writing strategies and writing scores?

Methodology

Design of the Study

The association between Iranian EFL learners' writing skills, feedback-seeking behavior, and SRW methods was shown in this study using a correlational approach. To find out which way the variables were correlated and to what extent, the researcher used a quantitative approach based on a correlational framework to examine numerical data. Besides, the predictive power of SRW strategies in predicting learners' feedback-seeking behavior and writing scores was explored through a quantitative approach.

Participants

This study encompassed 35 Iranian EFL learners, comprising 15 men and 20 females. The participants were selected via convenient sampling from available BA teaching students at the University of Isfahan, Iran, during the first semester 2023. Their proficiency level was intermediate, as established by their performance on the Oxford Placement Test (OPT). Their ages ranged from 18-24. Their native language was Persian.

Instruments

The following instruments were used to gather the needed data to answer the research questions.

Feedback Seeking Behavior Questionnaire

Papi et al. (2020) developed a survey to measure how often and how actively students seek feedback. See Appendix A for a list of the 15 elements that comprise this scale, which consists of 3 subscales.

There are five elements in each subscale. The subscales are peer feedback inquiry, teacher feedback inquiry, and feedback monitoring. Using a five-point Likert Scale, where 1 suggests "strongly disagree" and 5 "strongly agree," the participants voiced their opinions. Scores higher on each subscale indicate a greater inclination to seek input. Its reliability was evaluated at .76, using Cronbach's Alpha. Two experts on the subject also confirmed its validity.

Self-regulatory Writing Strategies Scale

Feng et al. (2022) created the self-regulatory writing techniques scale, which was used to collect the data. Part of Appendix B is a scale that asks thirty questions. The six components of this framework are as follows: writing planning, goal-oriented evaluation, goal-oriented monitoring, emotional control, memorization procedures, and metacognitive judgment, all of which are important for second-language

writing. On a seven-point Likert scale, 1 signifies a strong disagreement, and 7 means a strong agreement, and this was employed to rate each question.

This research found that the scale's reliability was .79 on Cronbach's Alpha scale, and two experts in the field validated its validity. Results from the six subscales of the self-regulatory writing approach scale demonstrated that second language learners used that particular self-regulatory strategy more.

Writing Performance Test

The students were supposed to write essays to measure participants' writing ability. Accordingly, various topics such as education, technology, health, and the environment were selected based on the writing tasks of the IELTS Cambridge book. The participants were given six topics and asked to choose one to write about. It should be noted that the topics were selected based on experts' comments.

Yeşilçınar (2021) developed the writing evaluation scale to test participants' writing skills. This measure was designed to assess the writing assignments of EFL students. The participants' compositions were evaluated based on four main criteria: objective achievement, cohesion and coherence, lexical density, and structural accuracy.

Data Collection Procedures

First, the participants were given a print version of the feedback-seeking behavior questionnaire. This questionnaire discussed participants' inclination to get criticism from professors, classmates, or other sources to enhance their writing. The researcher provided them with the Persian equivalents of the unknown words or statements. The responses to this questionnaire were collected and coded.

Their next assignment was to fill out the SRW tactics form. This questionnaire included writing-related planning, goal-setting, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation questions. The researcher translated the items that the participants needed help understanding into Persian. The responses to this questionnaire were gathered and coded. The researcher eventually evaluated writing proficiency. The university students were assigned six topics and asked to choose one for their essay. The six subjects were studying English, traveling, health, technology, and education. The participants' writing abilities were evaluated using these examinations. The written essays were gathered in four meetings, with 25 students in each meeting. The essay writing period for the participants was forty-five minutes.

The works of every student were assessed by two assessors using Yeşilçınar's (2021) writing evaluation scale. The assessors were PhD students who had the experience of teaching English as a foreign language for more than 14 years. Besides, they had published some articles about writing ability. The evaluations from two assessors for each participant were entered into SPSS for further examination.

Results

Reliability Statistics of the Questionnaires

The results of the determination of the reliability of the SRW strategy questionnaire via the utilization of Cronbach's alpha are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Results of Reliability Analysis for SRW Strategy Questionnaire

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach alpha
SRW strategy questionnaire	30	.79

The SRW strategy questionnaire's reliability index in this research is .79, as shown in Table 4.1, indicating that its use in this investigation is appropriate.

Table 2 illustrates the reliability statistics for the feedback-seeking behavior measure.

Table 2

Results of Reliability Analysis for Feedback-seeking Behavior Scale

Scale	Number of items	Cronbach alpha
Feedback-seeking behavior scale	15	.76

Table 2 indicates that the dependability index of the feedback-seeking behavior scale is .76, demonstrating its appropriateness for this study.

Inter-rater Reliabilities

Table 3 provides an illustration of the results of the inter-rater reliability performed by the examiners.

Table 3

The Outcomes of the Inter-rater Reliability

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Rater two	
				Sig (2tailed)	R
Rater one	35	6.40	.91	.00	.81
Rater two	35	6.27	1.02	.00	1

Table 3 demonstrates that the inter-rater reliability coefficient between the two evaluators is .81.

Research Hypothesis One

H01: Iranian EFL students' self-regulating writing practices do not significantly predict their writing outcomes.

We used conventional multiple regression. This table summarises the results of the statistical analysis that was performed.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for SRW Strategies, FSB, and Writing Performances

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
SRW strategies	35	4.97	1.08
FSB	35	2.79	.39
Rater one	35	6.40	.91
Rater two	35	6.27	1.02

The students' SRW approaches had a standard deviation of 1.08 and a mean of 4.97. Moreover, the two assessors rendered congruent assessments of the student's writing, averaging 6.40 and 6.27, respectively. The mean for FSB is 2.79, accompanied by a standard deviation of 1.08. Table 5 presents the outcomes of the model summary.

Table 5

Summary of the Model

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.75a	.56	.54	.61

a. Predictors: (Constant), feedback, SRW

Writing performance is the dependent variable, and Table 5 reveals that the model is responsible for 75% of the variation in the dependent variable. Table 4.6 presents the variance analysis (ANOVA) results, which may be used to evaluate the relevance of the data.

Table 6

The Anova Outcomes

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	16.12	2	8.06	21.02	.00*
	Residual	12.27	32	.38		
	Total	28.40	34			

According to Table 6, the model reached statistical significance (F= 21.02, df=2, P=.00).

Table 7 presents the coefficient results to assess the degree of each variable's contribution to predicting the dependent variable.

Table 7

Coefficient Degree of the Contribution of Each Variable in Predicting the Dependent Variable

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	5.11	.86		5.89	.00		
	SRW	.60	.09	.72	6.19	.00	.99	1.00
	feedback	-.62	.26	-.27	-2.33	.02	.99	1.00

Based on Table 7, SRW strategies have the most extensive beta coefficient (Beta=.72), Which means that SRW strategies make the most substantial contribution in explaining the dependent variable. Besides, Table 7 shows that this contribution is significant (Beta=.72, t= 6.19, p=.00). Therefore, the first hypothesis is rejected.

Research Hypothesis Two

H02: Iranian EFL learners' self-regulated writing strategies do not predict their feedback-seeking behavior to any extent.

Standard multiple regression was employed to evaluate the second hypothesis. Table 8 presents the descriptive data outcomes of the FSB and SRW programs. Table 8 illustrates the model summary findings.

Table 8

Model Summary for FSB and SRW Strategies

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.06 ^a	.004	-.02	.40

a. Predictors: (Constant) SRW strategies

See Table 9 for the ANOVA findings, which might help you determine the data's significance.

Table 9

A Comparison of FSB and SRW Methods Using ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.02	1	.02	.14	.70 ^a
	Residual	5.41	33	.16		
	Total	5.43	34			

Table 9 shows that the model did not reach statistical significance (F= .14, df=1, P=.70). Table 10 presents the outcomes of the SRW techniques' contribution to forecasting FSB.

Table 10

Coefficients of FSB and SRW Strategies

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.67	.32		8.22	.00		
	SRW	.02	.06	.06	.38	.70	1.00	1.00

According to Table 10, the beta coefficient for SRW strategies is .02. Nevertheless, it did not reach a significant level (p = .70). Consequently, it may be inferred that SRW tactics partially forecast FSB to a degree of .06. Consequently, the second hypothesis is rejected

Research Hypothesis Three

H03: No correlation exists between the feedback-seeking behavior of Iranian EFL learners.

The Pearson product-moment correlation examined the relationship between EFL learners' Feedback-seeking Behaviors (FSB) and their writing outcomes.

In Table 11, you can observe the outcomes of the statistical analysis.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for FSB and Writing Performances

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
FSB	35	2.79	.39
Rater one	35	6.40	.91
Rater two	35	6.27	1.02

Table 11 shows that the mean score of EFL learners' FSB is 2.79, and Std. Deviation is .39. The results of the correlation study are shown below:

Table 12

Pearson Product-moment Correlation for FSB and Writing Ability

Feedback Seeking Behaviors (FSB)			
	N	Sig. (2-tailed)	R
Writing performances	35	.19 ^a	-.22

a. Statistically, the Correlation does not hold up at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It indicates that the third hypothesis is confirmed since there is no significant relationship between FSB and the writing performance of Iranian EFL learners ($p_1=.19$, $p_2=.29$).

Research Question Four

The fourth hypothesis of this research is:

H04: Self-regulated writing processes do not predict writing scores via the mediation of feedback-seeking behavior.

Hierarchical multiple regression analysis seems to be employed to assess this theory. See Table 13 for the overall result.

Table 13

Summary for FSB and SRW Strategies to Predict Writing Performance

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change
1	.22 ^a	.05	.02	.90	.05	1.73	1	33	.19
2	.75 ^b	.56	.54	.61	.51	38.34	1	32	.00

a. Predictors: (Constant), FSB

b. Predictors: (Constant), FSB and SRW strategies

c. Writing performance

Table 7 reveals that SRW strategies can predict students' writing scores significantly ($\text{Beta}=.72$, $t= 6.19$, $p=.00$). Table 13 indicates that FSB's predictive power is not significant ($R=.22$, $df= 33$, $p=.19$). However, after adding the FSB to the original model the predictive power of SRW strategies increased ($\text{Beta}=.75$). To analyses the data' significance, Table 14 contains the ANOVA findings.

Table 14

ANOVA Results for FSB and SRW Strategies' Predictive Power

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
2	Regression	16.12	2	8.06	21.02	.00*
	Residual	12.27	32	.38		
	Total	28.40	34			

As Table 14 shows, the model reached statistical significance ($df=2$, $F=21.02$, $p=.00$). Table 15 presents the coefficients that evaluate the degree of each variable's contribution to projecting the dependent variable.

Table 15

Coefficients of SRW Strategies through FSB

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients		
1	(Constant)	7.82	1.09		7.15	.00
	feedback	-.51	.38	-.224	-1.31	.19
2	(Constant)	5.11	.86		5.89	.00
	feedback	-.62	.26	-.27	-2.33	.02
	SRW	.60	.09	.72	6.19	.00

According to Table 15, SRW strategies can predict 72 percent of the variance of writing scores (Beta=.72, $t=6.19$, $p=.00$), and FSB can predict nearly 3 percent of the variance of writing scores (Beta=.27, $t=-2.33$). The data demonstrated that SRW techniques forecast writing scores by mediating feedback-seeking behavior. Consequently, the fourth hypothesis was rejected.

Discussion

This study aimed to analyze how Iranian EFL students' writing improved after they started using self-regulated writing (SRW) strategies (FSB). The study examined how students' gender affected their tactics for self-regulating writing and how often they sought feedback. Based on the results of the first study question, the ability of Iranian students of English as a foreign language to self-regulate their writing is the primary factor determining their writing scores. Teng et al. (2022) validated these findings, claiming that language learners with higher competence used a broader variety of SRW strategies. This signifies that SRW approaches are crucial for improving writing proficiency, as they aid learners in effectively organizing, monitoring, and assessing their writing processes. Self-regulating allows learners to set specific goals, employ appropriate strategies, and reflect on their progress, which are crucial components of successful writing.

The results of this study correspond with those of other scholars, such as Sun and Wang (2020), Mallahi (2020), Alanazi (2020), Shen and Bai (2022), and Zhou and Hiver (2022), all of whom demonstrated that SRW techniques significantly influenced students' writing scores. Eslami and Sahragard (2021) also found that implementing SRW strategies improved students' metadiscoursal writing skills. Sun and Wang (2020) supposed that the use of SRW methods may enhance learners' self-efficacy and writing competence, while Shen and Bai (2022) argued that language instructors may utilize these strategies to improve their students' writing skills. This research strongly supports the effectiveness of SRW strategies in enhancing students' writing abilities.

Consequently, engaging language learners in writing assignments is essential to improve their writing skills. By familiarizing them with various SRW strategies, students are better equipped to express their thoughts effectively. Empowering learners to use different SRW strategies enables them to communicate their ideas through diverse forms and structures, improving their written work's coherence and organization. Ultimately, using such strategies enhances EFL learners' writing skills and introduces them to new methods of composing written text that are clear and impactful.

We observed that the usage of SRW methods by Iranian EFL students had a modest predictive association with their skill in offering and receiving written feedback (FSB). This was discovered while answering the second study question. This prediction may have been more robust. This aligns with Inan-Karagul et al. (2021). Another research that found a strong association between SRW methods and FSB Uyen et al. (2022). According to researchers who discovered that it significantly improved students' SRW methods, students already adept at self-regulating may benefit more from FSB.

Additionally, Taheri and Heidar (2019) asserted that SRW strategies were predictive of the type and effectiveness of written corrective feedback received by students. The overall findings illustrate the significance of SRW methodologies in assessing the quality and effectiveness of feedback in language learning. The outcomes of this research may be influenced by several aspects associated with students' personality qualities, such as extroversion, reflectiveness, or field independence. Additionally, anxiety experienced within language classes may influence learners' FSB. The overall classroom environment and the quality of interactions among students and between students and instructors may impact the study's findings. It was observed that students with higher levels of extroversion performed better in seeking feedback. Besides, friendly class environment facilitates the overcome of barriers for self-regulation.

The FSB and writing scores of EFL students did not exhibit a statistically significant association, as indicated by the results of the third research question. These findings contradict Taheri and Heidar's (2019) assertion that written corrective feedback significantly improved students' writing proficiency. Similarly, the study conducted by Xu and Wang (2024) showed that FSB greatly influenced the quality of learners' writing. According to their findings, learners' feedback volume might be predicted by developing a holistic understanding of their ideal second language (L2) writing self. The varied results show a complicated link between FSB and writing performance, which different instructional circumstances and learner characteristics may influence. Additional study is required to clarify the processes affecting the effect of FSB on EFL writing competence.

Similarly, Zhang et al. (2017) argued that FSB did not significantly determine students' writing scores. They contended that factors such as power distance and delegation substantially impacted learner performance, while FSB did not have a significant effect. Their research suggested that other variables hold more weight in influencing students' writing abilities. This highlights the need for a holistic strategy to understand and improve writing ability, including individual and environmental factors. Overall, the absence of a relationship between Iranian EFL learners' feedback seeking behavior and their writing scores could be attributed to various factors related to the quality of feedback, individual differences, motivation, engagement, and external influences. Additional research and investigation may be needed to further explore and understand the dynamics of feedback seeking behavior and its impact on writing performance among Iranian EFL learners.

Conclusion and Implications

In conclusion, numerous factors such as learning style, personality type, emotional support, familiarity with writing, and educational background could influence students' writing scores. Understanding and addressing these various influences is crucial in enhancing students' writing skills and ultimately their academic success. Further research is warranted to delve deeper into the intricate interplay of these factors and how they shape students' writing proficiency. Ultimately, a holistic approach that considers these various influences is essential in supporting students' growth and development as writers.

Additional study is necessary to explore the complex interactions of these elements and their influence on students' writing skills. An inclusive approach to recognizing these influences is essential for promoting students' growth and development as writers. Educators should cultivate a balanced pedagogical approach integrating SRW strategies with efficient feedback mechanisms to provide a supportive learning environment. The fourth research question found that SRW methods might better predict students' writing results.

However, when FSB was added as a mediator between SRW strategies and writing performances, the predictive power of SRW strategies did not increase significantly. In a similar study, Oktaria and Soemantri (2018) found a significant place for FSB in enhancing the implementation of effective writing strategies to improve writing scores. They considered reluctance and fearfulness of receiving negative comments as determining factors that significantly affect students' FSB, resulting in less effective writing performance. Zhou and Hiver (2022) contended that language learners prioritized using SRW strategies to improve their writing proficiency. Similarly, Abadikhah et al. (2018)

determined that using SRW approaches, pre-writing, and self-evaluation surpassed FSB in authoring academic publications.

Learners of a self-regulated language may take charge of their education and seek constructive criticism to improve their writing abilities. To consistently raise the bar for their writing, they are driven to seek criticism from various sources, including language instructors, classmates, and internet tools. The findings demonstrated that SRW approaches are the main factors influencing students' writing scores. Moreover, the self-regulated writing strategies of EFL learners somewhat predicted foreign language speaking behavior, although with a negligible impact size. Furthermore, no substantial correlation was observed between learners' FSB and writing scores. Moreover, the findings indicated that FSB is not an effective mediator between SRW techniques and writing performance.

Recognizing that a fundamental benchmark of effective writing lies in the adept application of SRW strategies (Balaman, 2021), it becomes pivotal for language educators to acquaint language learners with these strategies. Equipping learners with the ability to employ these strategies proficiently across diverse contexts is elevated to a principal objective of language teaching (Bigverdi & Khalili Sabet, 2024). Furthermore, accurate utilization of different SRW strategies stands prominently as a decisive determinant distinguishing the written compositions of proficient writers from those less skilled (Forbes, 2019).

Likewise, the implementation of SRW strategies in language classes enhances students' critical thinking (Zhang & Qin, 2018), enables them to manage their learning (Zhou & Hiver, 2022), and enhances their capabilities to write successfully (Teng & Zhang, 2023) and creatively (Tajiki & Negari, 2022). Besides, incorporating such strategies improves learners' writing performance (Shen & Bai, 2022). This study has some implications. Language teachers and learners should become familiar with SRW strategies and FSB concepts and how to implement them effectively in educational contexts to suit their needs. Moreover, teachers are suggested to provide a friendly social context for learners to seek feedback. Decreasing foreign language classroom anxiety and enhancing learners' self-efficacy can be suitable strategies to promote self-regulation. Similarly, material developers and textbook writers are suggested to design course books that familiarize students with SRW strategies and develop goal-oriented activities to implement these activities in the classrooms.

However, there are several ways in which this study may be enhanced. The use of convenience sampling was the main drawback of this study. We chose these college students because we needed someone to participate in our research easily. More beneficial findings may be obtained by selecting the participants using a random sample method. It should be mentioned that this research only included BA teaching students as participants. The second limitation is that the research is limited to the University of Isfahan Bachelor of Arts in Education majors. The involvement of students from various universities may impact the outcomes. The third limitation of this investigation was the temporal constraint. Extended study may provide varied outcomes. Future research should include an experimental investigation to evaluate the impact of SRW methodologies and FSB on the writing proficiency of language learners and examine the Correlation between learning styles, personality characteristics, and SRW techniques.

Acknowledgement

The authors appreciate the colleagues and participants who cooperated in the data collection process.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors of this article did not have any conflict of interest.

Funding Details

There was no funding available for this study. All rights belong to the University of Isfahan.

References

- Abadikhah, S., Aliyan, Z., & Talebi, S. H. (2018). EFL students' attitudes towards self-regulated learning strategies in academic writing. *Issues in Educational Research*, 28(1), 17-29. <https://search.informit.org/doi/epdf/10.3316/ielapa.437737151804355>
- Ahamed, Y. E. F. (2016). An investigation of writing errors of Saudi EFL university students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 4(2), 189-211. www.researchpublish.com
- Alanazi, M. H. (2020). The predictive effects of self-regulated writing strategies on writing performance of Saudi EFL university students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies [JEPS]*, 14(4), 668-678. DOI:668-678. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jeps>
- Amirian, Z., Shayanfar, M., Rezazadeh, M. (2021). Structural equation model of teachers' mindsets self-efficacy and emotional experiences and Iranian EFL learners' willingness to communicate and L2 motivational self-system. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning*, 13(28), 1-17. Doi: 10.22034/ELT.2021.48218.2448
- Bai, Y., Wang, J., Chen, T., & Li, F. (2020). Learning from supervisor negative gossip: The reflective learning process and performance outcome of employee receivers. *Human Relations*, 73(12), 1689-1717.
- Balaman, S. (2021). Investigating the relationship between the perception of self-efficacy and self-regulated learning strategies in the English writing skill. *RumeliDE Dil ve Edebiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (23), 768-796. DOI: 10.29000/rumelide.949696.
- Bigverdi, A., & Khalili Sabet, M. (2024). The effect of online teacher feedback and online peer feedback on writing development and language mindset of the EFL learners. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13(3), 1-17.
- Bouckenooghe, D., De Clercq, D., Naseer, S., & Syed, F. (2022). A curvilinear relationship between work engagement and job performance: the roles of feedback-seeking behavior and personal resources. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 37(2), 353-368.
- Eivazi, T., & Khoshnevis, I. (2016). The effect of self-regulated strategy instruction on Iranian EFL learners' writing ability. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 9(19), 21-36.
- Eslami, M., & Sahragard, R. (2021). Investigating the effect of self-regulatory strategy development on Iranian EFL learners' metadiscoursal writing skill. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 21, 54-65. doi:10.32038/ltrq.2021.21.04
- Florian, E. (2016). *The Influence of Digital Writing on Writing Development and Instruction in Traditional Paper-Based Curriculum* (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York College at Fredonia).
- Forbes, K. (2019). The role of individual differences in developing and transferring writing strategies between foreign and first language classrooms. *Research papers in education*, 34(4), 445-464.
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy, and L2 writing instruction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 148-164. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.07.005>
- Hyland, K. (2012). ESP and writing. *The Handbook of English for specific purposes*, 95-113.
- Inan-Karagul, B., & Seker, M. (2021). Improving language learners' use of self-regulated writing strategies through screencast feedback. *Sage Open*, 11(4), 1-14. DOI: 10.1177/21582440211064895.

- Inan Karagul, B., Seker, M., & Aykut, C. (2021). We are investigating students' digital literacy levels during online education due to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 13(21), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132111878>
- Khalavi, S. K., & Zeraatpishe, M. (2023). On the relationship of Iranian EFL learners' vocabulary depth with their writing vocabulary use, fluency, and organization. *Journal of Contemporary Language Research*, 2(1), 9-15. DOI: 10.58803/JCLR.2023.168992
- Mallahi, O. (2020). Examining the extent of Iranian EFL learners' self-regulatory strategy use and writing competence. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 4(3), 13-23.
- Nihal, G. Ö. Y. (2017). Action research on developing self-regulated writing strategies of Turkish EFL students. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 191-204. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oktaria, D., & Soemantri, D. (2018). Undergraduate medical students' perceptions on feedback-seeking behavior. *The Malaysian journal of medical sciences: MJMS*, 25(1), 75-83. <https://doi.org/10.21315/mjms2018.25.1.9>
- Papi, M., Rios, A., Pelt, H., & Ozdemir, E. (2019). Feedback-seeking behavior in language learning: Basic components and motivational antecedents. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(1), 205-226.
- Patience, I. O. (2020). Teaching writing in Nigerian secondary schools: Teachers' attitude toward the teaching of writing and their writing self-efficacy. *Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, 8(1), 39-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12785/jtte/080105>
- Pintrich, P.R. & Zusho, A. (2002). The development of academic self-regulation: The role of achievement motivation (pp. 249-284). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Rahmatipasand, S. Z., Afraz, S., & Razmjoo, S. A. (2022). Iranian EFL learners' writing problems: developing a context-sensitive framework to practice writing. *Journal of Foreign Language Research*, 12(1), 49-73. DOI: 10.22059/JFLR.2021.320697.822
- Rahimi, M., & Katal, M. (2018). The impact of self-regulated learning strategies on EFL learners' writing performance in Iran. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 21 (1), 45-62.
- Reynolds, B. L., & Teng, M. F. (2021). Introduction to the special issue on teaching English reading and writing to young learners. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 11(3), 325-330. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2021.11.3.1>
- Sadeghi, K., & Farzizadeh, B. (2012). The relationship between multiple intelligences and writing ability of Iranian EFL learners. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 136-142. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n11p136>
- Sadeghi, K., & Farzizadeh, M. (2019). The role of self-regulated learning strategies in enhancing writing skills among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 12 (4), 78-95.
- Schunk, D. H. & Zimmerman, B.J. (1998). *Self-regulated learning: From teaching to self-reflective practice*. New York: Guilford.
- Shen, B., & Bai, B. (2022). Chinese university students' self-regulated writing strategy use and EFL writing performance: Influences of self-efficacy, gender, and significant. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 22(25), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0103>
- Sun, T., & Wang, C. (2020). College students' writing self-efficacy and writing self-regulated learning strategies in learning English as a foreign language. *System*, 90, 102221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102221>

- Taheri, M., & Heidar, D. (2019). The effect of focused written corrective feedback on high/low self-regulated EFL learners' English writing ability. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 9(4), 93-103.
- Tajiki, Z., & Negari, G. (2022). Fostering pre-intermediate EFL learners' writing confidence and writing fluency through creative writing: Investigating the role of personality. *Iranian Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(4), 39-52. <https://dori.net/dor/20.1001.1.24763187.2022.11.4.2.9>
- Teng, M. F., & Yue, M. (2023). Metacognitive writing strategies, critical thinking skills, and academic writing performance: A structural equation modeling approach. *Metacognition and Learning*, 18(1), 237-260.
- Teng, M. F., & Zhang, L. J. (2023). Assessing self-regulated writing strategies, working memory, L2 proficiency level, and multimedia writing performance. *Language Awareness*, 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2023.2300269>
- Teng, M. F., Wang, C., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Assessing self-regulatory writing strategies and their predictive effects on young EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessing Writing*, 51, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asw.2021.100573>
- Uyen, B. P., Tong, D. H., & Ngan, L. K. (2023). Online project-based learning for teacher education during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Contemporary Educational Technology*, 15(3), 433-447. <https://doi.org/10.30935/cedtech/13238>
- Wang, I. K. H., & Cohen, A. D. (2023). Self-access strategy instruction for academic writing vocabulary: What learners actually do? *Applied Linguistics*, 44(6), 976-1009. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amac056>
- Xu, J., & Wang, Y. (2024). The impact of academic buoyancy and emotions on university students' self-regulated learning strategies in L2 writing classrooms. *Reading and Writing*, 37(1), 49-67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-023-10411-9>
- Zarei, A. A., & Hatami, M. (2020). Effects of feedback-seeking behavior on writing performance among Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 11(3), 456-467.
- Zhang, L. J., & Qin, T. L. (2018). Validating a questionnaire on EFL writers' metacognitive awareness of writing strategies in multimedia environments. In *Metacognition in language learning and teaching* (pp. 157-178). Routledge.
- Zhang, X., Qian, J., Wang, B., Jin, Z., Wang, J., & Wang, Y. (2017). Leaders' behaviors matter: The role of delegation in promoting employees' feedback-seeking behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00920>
- Zhou, S. A., & Hiver, P. (2022). The effect of self-regulated writing strategies on students' L2 writing engagement and disengagement behaviors. *System*, 106, 1-48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102768>
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary educational psychology*, 25(1), 82-91.
- Zimmerman, B.J. & Martínez-Pons, M. (1986). Development of a structured interview for assessing student use of self-regulated learning strategies. *American Educational Research Journal*, 23(4), 614-628.
- Zimmerman, B.J. & Schunk, D. H. (Eds.). (1989). *Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: Theory, research, and practice*. Springer-Verlag.

Appendixes

Feedback-seeking behavior questionnaire (Papi et al., 2020)

Dear students,

By circling the corresponding number, kindly indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each of the below statements, allowing us to understand your perspective.

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3= slightly disagree, 4=neutral,

5= slightly agree 6= agree, 7=strongly agree

Check the scales below to guarantee your questions are answered. Please choose the correct number.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7					
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree	Strongly agree					
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. I attentively follow instructors' corrections on my pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary in my second language.											
2. I sensibly consider criticisms about the use of (L2).											
3. When my instructors identify errors in my second language, I endeavor to avoid repeating them.											
4. I focus when instructors rectify my errors during oral communication in a second language.											
5. I strive to incorporate ideas from my professors' remarks on my competency(L2).											
6. I recall my professors pointing out my speech mistakes. (L2).											
7. I listen to my professors' corrections of other pupils (L2) and try not to repeat their errors.											
8. I seek advice from my instructors on how to improve my speaking skills in my second language.											
9. I request that my teachers model effective speaking approaches. (L2)											
10. I ask my teachers to point out my speaking weaknesses(L2).											
11. I ask my professors to point out any errors I make in my speech. (L2).											
12. I want feedback from others on my proficiency (L2).											
13. I like others to correct my mistakes when I speak in a second language (L2).											
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. I want suggestions from others to improve my L2 speaking abilities.

15. I want fluent English speakers to correct me when speaking incorrectly. (L2). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix B

Self-regulatory writing strategies scale (Feng et al., 2022)

Dear students,

To indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement, please put a checkmark next to the corresponding number. 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = Neutral, 5 = slightly agree, 6 = agree, 7 = strongly agree.

Please mark '7' if you "strongly agree" that "English writing is important":

- | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I consider the suitable time allocation for each paper component. (Wp) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. I seek appropriate vocabulary and words before writing. (WP) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. I outline the key themes or details prior to writing. (WP) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. I gather pertinent materials and first read the writing subject. (WP). | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. assess my writing according to peer evaluations. (WP) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. I structure my writing according to the instructor's comments. (WP) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. I establish objectives to evaluate my writing tasks or exercises (GOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. I adjust writing strategies to improve their efficacy in attaining my goals. (GOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. I evaluate my educational approach to develop solutions for my writing goals. (GOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. I monitor my writing progress to achieve my writing objectives. (GOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. I analyze the knowledge acquired from English lessons and its significance to writing. (GOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. I often hesitate to contemplate the most effective phrasing for my writing. (GOM) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 13. I assess my learning from the writing tasks or exercises. (GOE) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 14. I assess the extent to which I have accomplished my previously established writing objectives. (GOE) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 15. I assess my proficiency in the information and abilities acquired in English classes. (GOE) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 16. I review and edit sentences post-composition to guarantee substance and grammatical precision. (GOE) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

17. I collected all the incorrectly typed terms for further examination. (GOE)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Upon completing my essay, I solicit input from another individual. (GOE)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I calmed down and finished the writing exercise despite not wanting to. (EC)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I reassure myself not to be anxious during a writing examination. (EC)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I regulate my emotions when I have uncertainty overwriting. (EC)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I continue my English writing despite facing challenges or difficulties. (EC)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I remember crucial phrases for my writing. (MS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I often examined the course material to enhance my recall. (MS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I express words and phrases learned in English classes to aid retention. (MS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Words with images help me remember them. (MS)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Conducting the writing activities by itself is essential. (MJ)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Comprehending strengths and shortcomings in English composition helps enhance writing proficiency. (MJ)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Comprehending the significance of certain words in texts is crucial for effective writing. (MJ)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. You may improve your writing skills by studying several tactics. (MJ)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7