THE EFFECT OF FEEDBACK STYLE ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE OF FIFTH PRIMARY CLASS

MAHDI NADHIM BAQER[1], SUN YUEMEI[2], MA'ALY SATTAR NAMUQ[3] and MOHAMED HASAN SAMEN[4]

[1]School of foreign languages, Shanghai University, China; Ministry of Education, Kirkuk General Education Directorate, Iraq. E-mail: mahdinadhim94@gmail.com
[2]Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia.
E-mail: 2472828523@qq.com
[3] Department of English language, College of Art, Imam Jaafar AL-Sadiq University, Baghdad, Iraq.
E-mail: maeali.star@sadiq.edu.iq
[4]Faculty of Educational Sciences, Islamic Azad University (Isfahan Khorasgan), Iran.
E-mail: mohammedhasan1777@gmai.com

Abstract

The present research investigates the effect of using two feedback styles, immediate and delayed, on the achievement of fifth primary school pupils in English. It is argued here that there are no significant statistical differences between the mean scores of the degrees of the first experimental group taught by using immediate feedback and the second experimental group taught by using delayed feedback on achievement in the English language. The study population consisted of fifth-grade male pupils at the primary stage in Kirkuk province during the academic year (2020-2021). The researcher selected the sample of the study intentionally from among male schools. The sample consisted of (59) male pupils selected from two schools and divided into two experimental groups. The first experimental group consisted of (31) pupils taught by immediate feedback. The second experimental group consisted of (28) pupils and was taught by delayed feedback. The researcher prepared an achievement test to verify the research hypothesis. To check its external validity, the researcher presented the test items to several experts in teaching English and methodology. The reliability was also ensured by using Kuder-Richardson's formula (20). The researcher used the post-test equivalent groups as an experimental design. After the treatment of the statistical data by using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) of the two groups, the results showed the following: There is a significant statistical difference between the mean scores of the degrees of the first experimental group, which was taught by using immediate feedback and the mean scores of the degrees of the second group which was taught by using delayed feedback in the achievement test in English in favour of the second experimental group. In light of the results, the researcher recommends that feedback should be used as a strategy both in teaching and training courses.

Keywords: Feedback Style, English Language, Fifth Primary Class, achievement, English

Introduction

Language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by employing voluntarily produced symbols (Lyons, 1999). English is one of the major languages of the world. At the beginning of the 19th century, it was the native speech of nearly 15 million people. Currently, English is the most widely studied language in areas where it is not native, and it is the dominant foreign language taught in the schools of Latin American and European countries.

English is widely used in international trades, international scholarships and scientific research (Capel, 2003). In addition, learning the English language enables people to speak, write, read and understand what they hear. Teaching a language allows the learner to behave in such a way that he can participate to some degree and for specific purposes as a member of a community other than his own (Corder, 1982). However, the problems of teaching the English language, in most cases, are similar worldwide. One of these problems is creating the necessary interest and enthusiasm for the learner (Somaratne, 1963). Such a wish is achieved by using methods or styles which are part of the success or failure of the teacher to achieve his educational message, and it has an apparent effect on the pupils' desires towards the course and the teacher. So, the pupils may like or hate the course depending on the teaching methods and styles the teacher uses to achieve outstanding teaching (Al-Amin, 1985). One of the methods and styles which can develop students' efficiency in English and enable the teacher to identify pupils' mistakes and correct them is feedback which has become a better teaching method and an educational practice in the classroom because it is a critical way to achieve interaction between the teacher and the students. It helps improve learning and good academic achievement (Jawad & Abood, 2001).

Feedback is not limited to providing information about the correctness of a response, and it can be rewarding and informative. It tells learners they are right and that being right has been or will be associated with favourable consequences. In both motor and verbal learning, an immediate report on the result of each trial is necessary if learners are to adjust their behaviour to improve their performance on the subsequent test (Silverman, 1978). However, Feedback doesn't function independently; rather, it's a part of a well-planned system with well-defined goals and predetermined consequences. In the context of such a system, feedback functions to aid in the control of the system by identifying any systemic deviation that, if left unchecked, might prevent the system from achieving its needed goals or yielding the expected results. The goals and products that the system must produce must be clearly specified, and the feedback that is given to the system must match these current goals and results for feedback to operate successfully in process control systems (Doig, 2004). The information a teacher provides a student on their performance is known as feedback in a school environment.

One of two approaches is used by theorists to describe how feedback works. According to some theorists, who relate feedback to a reward and explain how it works in terms of reinforces, feedback offers corrective information. This argument is most evident when comparing feedback latency, development, and expectancy (Bardwell, 1981). Some theories emphasize the value of providing learners with rapid feedback, while others emphasize the value of providing learners with delayed feedback. Because of the inverse link between feedback latency and the learning process, some researchers have believed that feedback must come just after the response. There are also specific circumstances when performing the exam in which the immediate feedback is better than the delayed feedback. The learning operation is more difficult when the time between the response and knowing the results is getting longer (Toshi, 1991). Some teachers do not take individual differences among pupils into consideration. They do not give pupils a chance and time to recognise their mistakes and thus make a significant gap in learning. During his job as a teacher in an intermediate school, the researcher noticed

that this subject does not receive enough attention, and the teachers do not point clearly to the pupils' mistakes. Sometimes, they do not ask the pupils to correct their mistakes, but they give marks for each question. The research problem is crystallised through the following questions: a) what is the effect of immediate and delayed feedback on the achievement and retention of learning tasks? b) What are the developmental differences between immediate and delayed feedback? c) Which style is the best, immediate or delayed feedback? d) Is there a similar effect on pupils' achievement in English?

Literature review

Feedback

The term feedback has a recent history. It had come into noted usage in the 1930s to describe a function of process-control systems. Such systems may be defined as "deliberate guidance or manipulation is used to achieve a prescribed value of a variable" (Doig, 2004). However, some psychologists like Eysenck and Smith, cited in Marzook (1989), view knowledge of the results as a confirmation of either correct or incorrect response. They also used the terms feedback and knowledge of results interchangeably. Since knowledge of results may work as a prize in addition to its function in reporting information, many theorists regard feedback as a kind of report. Many researchers emphasise the importance of a learner's knowledge of results of the learning process and the degree of his development to master his learning in quantity, speed and quality. In this case, the learner uses the self-activity principle, relying on himself in searching, thinking and correcting his mistakes (Rajeh: 1970; Othman & Al-Sharkawy, 1978).

Butler and Winne (1995) in Florida, Bardwell (1981) in Hovestour University, Susan (2003 in New York, Al-Fayath (1983) in Egypt, Sawalha (1985) in Jordan, and Al-Deliemy (1991) in Iraq show that all the experimental groups which received feedback were better than those which did not receive feedback cited in Al-Rubaiey (1999). Mohamad and Mahir (1990) noticed that learning increases when the learner is told about every step he achieves in learning. Likewise, learning is much easier when the learner is told about his correct responses and mistakes, as this will correct his behaviour. Al-Jaml (1978) studied the efficiency of feedback in changing the teacher's teaching style during his years of profession. Stearwitz concluded that students who received feedback could remember as compared to their colleagues who received a teaching technique that did not depend on feedback (Razak, 2004). Kulhavy and Anderson (1972) show that delayed feedback was more effective on long-term retention than immediate feedback. Also, Blank Ship (1978), cited in Ruth (1982), suggests using demonstration plus feedback to remedy errors. Immediate feedback is preferable than delayed feedback. The majority of behavioristic theories of learning (e.g., Al-Liqani, Ahmed Hussin (1980), which contend that learning occurs most effectively when feedback or reinforcement is given right away after the appropriate response, are in conflict with this conclusion. As a result, Kulik and Kulik (1988), referenced in Kasim (1997), examined 53 earlier research examining the impact of feedback kinds (immediate and delayed) on learning.The results showed that immediate feedback was more effective than delayed feedback.

Educational Advantages of Feedback:

Feedback is very important in studies relevant to the process of education. It is one of the commonest practices done by teachers in classrooms as an educational apparatus through which desired education results are achieved. Due to feedback, the pupil realises clearly after the end of doing a job how successful was his performance of that job. This knowledge does an important job in many practices, such as helping the student overcome some learning difficulties (Jawad & Mahdy, 2001); feedback also polishes and develops the learner's performance and directs his responses toward the goal during the teaching situation (Shalash, 1994). Also, it may direct the movement of the learning process towards the desired goals where the learner knows in each step of his learning process the right or wrong results in a way where correct results are stressed and inaccurate results are neglected (Darooza, 1995). Supplying feedback after an error is probably far more critical than providing confirmation. However, when a mistake is made, the goal is to not only replace the incorrect information but also to erase the incorrect response. According to this analysis of feedback studies, the corrective function is most likely the most significant aspect of feedback (Bloom & Bourdan, 1980).

Educational researchers have long recognised the important role of feedback in improving students' performance (Doig, 2004). Adding to this, feedback develops the learner's performance and directs the responses towards the goal during a consecutive teaching situation. Therefore, in every form of evaluation, it is essential to provide feedback to students as rapidly as possible. Many situations can be arranged so that students can evaluate their achievements (Jerman & Edward, 1978). The Educational advantages of feedback can be summarised as follows:

1. Feedback helps us learn because it lets us correct mistakes quickly and avoid building on faulty expectations. It also stimulates attention and serves as a reinforcement in the learning process (Evans & Ron, 1978)

2. Feedback is obviously important in verbal learning, but in motor learning it is critical (Vernon, 1974).

3. Feedback improves the results of the performance. It increases learning (Whetton & Childs, 1981)

4. Feedback is also useful over a much longer period (months, years) as a record, ready to hand for pupils in a similar language situation (Draper, 1999).

5. Feedback during a test would increase the utility of that test as a means of instruction (Whetton & Childs, 1981).

6. Feedback gives diagnosis and remedial suggestions for changing future actions (Draper, 1999).

7. Feedback can also furnish an incentive for learning (Morgan et al., 1979).

8. Feedback increases the probability of directing the learner towards the right answer after his initial incorrect performance (Hatab, 1984).

9. It can be very important to learners' morale (Confidence, pleasure), which itself can be a powerful determinant of learning outcomes (Draper, 1999).

10. Feedback gives children frequent, immediate and clear information about the degree of adequacy in their performance.

Types of Feedback:

Holding 1970, cited in Toshi (1991), classifies feedback into two kinds: Internal and External feedback: Internal feedback is performed by the students themselves, while external feedback is by a person other than the student (Butler &Winne, 1995; Draper, 1999).

Syndrome and final feedback: In syndrome feedback, the students get feedback information that is simultaneous with the learning operation. It can be used when the subject is divided into parts, making it easy to follow the steps. Final feedback is the information provided to the pupils when they finish a practice or skill (Al-Azerjawy, 1991).

Pronounced and written feedback: The correct answers are written on the blackboard repeating the questions, which helps the students to correct their answers (Al-Azerjawy, 1991). Any English language writing instruction must include written comments as a necessary component. This is particularly true now given the prevalence of the process approach to writing, which calls for some second-party comment on student drafts—typically from the teacher (Fregeau, 1999; Williams, 2003). Positive and negative feedback are used with mistakes correction because the pupils realise the correct answers through the given feedback information. This kind of feedback can also be significant to learner confidence and enjoyment, which can be a powerful determinant of learning outcomes (Draper, 1999; Falchikov, 2002).

Positive feedback resulted in much greater performance for boys with high 10s, according to certain theorists, whereas negative feedback resulted in significantly higher performance for boys with low 10s, according to Moor and Holmes (1974). Feedback that has been collected and separated: Separated feedback refers to feedback that is connected to the topic of each class (Al-Azerjowy, 1991).

Immediate and delayed feedback

The recent research focuses on the time between the happening of the response and introducing feedback (immediate and delayed feedback) because of variation in opinions of educational theorists on when to introduce feedback. Some ideas support the importance of giving the learners immediate feedback, but others support the importance of delayed feedback. Some researchers adopt the position that feedback must follow the answer as immediately as possible because of the reverse relationship between the delays of the learning operation. There are specific circumstances when performing the exam in which immediate feedback is better than delayed feedback. The learning operation is more difficult when the time between the response and knowing the results is getting longer (Toshi, 1991).

Treferz (1979) refers to the difficulty the learners find in using the given information in achieving a mission before a period. Hence, it confirms the importance of immediate feedback for the learners, because feedback is usually most effective when given during or immediately after the performance. When the teacher is continuously observing the child's performance, he should, if necessary, give encouragement and praise or correct it while the child is performing the task and immediately after it is completed. When he cannot observe the child continuously, he must establish a structure and routine which allow feedback to be given after task completion.

Sources of Feedback Information:

The information supplied by feedback may come from various possible sources. There are three main categories of potential sources:

1. The learners themselves.

2. The environment.

3. A human teacher.

1) Learners generate a lot of feedback by internal judgements of success. Our internal criteria for understanding and adequate argument and explanation do it. For instance, we often know we have typed the wrong letters or thrown a poor ball before seeing the result. At the conceptual level, most people learn a lot from writing a paper or essay without any feedback from anyone else. That is because learners have internalized many relevant standards and can judge the quality of their output quite well. This internalized standard is one of the main aims of learning and teaching, whether or not it gets explicitly mentioned. A given individual may have a better internalization of some types of information than others, e.g., be better at judging that the essay is poorer than justifying it.

2) Environment itself is very diverse. On one end, it includes seeing directly whether you missed the target and how much; on the other, a sophisticated machine may give you a lot of diagnoses.

3) The reason for distinguishing a human teacher from the otherwise heterogeneous environment category is simply because of the practical importance of whether all feedback could be given by computers dispensing with the need for teachers to perform this function. It is easy to see how, in principle, to automate types 1-4 of feedback information, but type 5 is probably very difficult or impossible to automate because it depends on (mistaken) links by the learner between the subject matter and some other knowledge and that is too open-ended a set to predict easily. However, it is possible and probably desirable to automate the most common cases of type 5: common misconceptions. A human teacher is often used to provide feedback of all types. Indeed, that is one of their chief functions (Draper, 1995).

Method

The researcher depended on experimental design for its appropriateness for the research aims (Vandalin, 1985) and because of its extreme reliability upon other designs in explaining the

relation between variables, especially design relations which have to be studied without experiment (Dawood & Rahman, 1990). Since the current research aims to compare the impact of two feedback strategies on academic achievement, the research design is based on two equivalent experimental groups (Vandalin, 1985). The first experimental group was taught by immediate feedback and the second experimental group has been taught by delayed feedback. The design also contains an achievement post-test for the two groups at the end of the experiment to measure the effect of the two independent variables (immediate feedback and delayed feedback) on the dependent variable (academic achievement) for the pupils in the English language. The population of the present study consisted of 119 male pupils from Al-Ghafoor and Ameer Al-Mu'mineen Primary Schools. The sample consisted of (59) male pupils divided into two groups, the first group consisted of (31) pupils taught by immediate feedback, and the second was (28) male pupils taught by delayed feedback. The researcher chose two primary schools in Kirkuk Governorate during the second term of the academic year 2020-2021. The two schools were in the same area to eliminate the social, economic and cultural differences among groups of pupils; both schools were for males to eliminate sex variables and both schools were situated near the researcher's living place. The teachers of English in both schools were similar in their teaching experience. Thus, the two primary schools, Al-Ghafoor and Ameer Al-Mu'mineen for boys, were intentionally chosen. To achieve co-equivalence between all the fifth primary classes in both schools, a class from each school was randomly selected so that all classes could represent the population. After filling the data obtained from the achievement test used as a tool of research, she applied it on the sample consisting of (59) pupils divided in to (31) pupils in the first experimental group taught by immediate feedback and (28) pupils in the second experimental group taught by delayed feedback. Data were dealt with by the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

Findings

Pupils' Age

To find out the differences between groups in the variable of age measured in months, the researcher used the t-test for independent samples. The result showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups in age, where the calculated t-value was (0, 467), which was less than the tabulated t-value (2.000) at (0.05) level of significance and (57) degree of freedom as shown in table (1). Table 1 shows that both groups are equivalent in age variable.

Table 1: Results of t-test for the Significance of Differences Between the Two Groups in Age Variable

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	t-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	152.613	7.706	0.467	2.00	N.S.
Second	28	151.607	8.846			

Parent's educational level

The differences in parent's educational levels for the two groups were accounted for and analysed by using frequency and Chi-square as follows:

A. Father's Educational Level:

The frequency of each level of the father's education was computed. Then the researcher used the Chi-square to test the statistical differences. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in father's level of education, where the calculated Chi-square value was (2.110) which was less than the tabulated Chi-square value (7.82) at (0.05) level of significance and (3) degree of freedom as shown in table (2).

Table 2: Chi-square Test results for the Significance of Differences Between the Groups in Father's Level of Education.

Groups	N	Level of Education				Chi-square value	Sig. Level	
		Primary and Less	Intermediate	Secondary	Diploma and Bachelor	Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	10	8	5	8	2.11	7.82	N.S.
Second	28	6	5	6	11			
Total	59	16	13	11	19			

It is shown here that both groups are equivalent in parents' academic achievement.

B. Mother's Educational Level:

The frequency of each level of mother's education was computed. Then the researcher used the Chi-square to test the statistical differences between the two groups in mothers' level of education, where the calculated Chi-square value was (3.576) which was less than the tabulated Chi-square value (5.99) at (0.5) level of significance and (2) degrees of freedom as shown in table (3).

Table 3: Results of Chi-square for the Significance of Differences between the Groups in Mother's Level of Education

Groups	N	Level of Education			Chi-square value		Sig. Level
		Primary and Less	Intermediate	Secondary	Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	16	9	6	3.576	5.99	N.S.
Second	28	8	10	10			
Total	59	24	19	16			

C. Pupils achievement in English in the preceding year:

The researcher depended on information from the school records about the final examination of English for each pupil in the two groups. After applying t-test of independent samples, the

results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in pupils' achievement in English, where the calculated t-value was (0.659) which was less than the tabulated t-value (2.000) at (0.5) level of significance and (57) degrees of freedom as shown in table (4).

Table 4: Results of t-test for the Significance of Differences Between the Two Groups in English in the Preceding Year.

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	t-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	73.065	12.979	0.609	2	N.S.
Second	28	75.107	10.553			

Pupils' grades in the preceding year of all subjects. (Total achievement).

To find out the differences between the two groups in total achievement measured by scores of each pupil in English in the preceding year (2019-2020), the researcher used the t-test of independent samples. The results showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups in the total achievement where the calculated t-value was (0.769) which was less than the tabulated t-value (2.000) at (0.05) level of significance and (57) degrees of freedom as shown in table (5). This result indicates that the two groups are equivalent in total achievement rate.

Table 5: Results of t-test for the Significance of Differences Between the Two Groups in Total Achievement.

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	t-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	77.548	12.261	0.769	2.00	N.S.
Second	28	79.714	8.898			

Intelligence Test Scores:

After collecting data about intelligence variable using the non-verbal intelligence test prepared by Salih (1964) and applied by Al-Qazaz (1989), the researcher applied t-test of independent samples. The results showed that there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups in intelligence where the calculated t-value was (1.131) which was less than the tabulated t-value (2.000), at (0.05) level of significance and (57) degrees of freedom as shown in table (6).

Table 6: Results of t-test for the Significance of Differences Between the Two Groups in Intelligence.

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	t-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	33.613	5.661	1.131	2	N.S.
Second	28	35.071	4.009			

Distinguishing Factor

After correcting the answers of the pre-practice sample, the researcher organised the degrees in descending order; the sample was then divided into two equal groups. The first group represents the higher degree group and the second lower degree group because distinguishing ability means the ability of the item to distinguish between the individuals of high and low degrees (Awda, 1999). The researcher used the following equation to calculate the distinguishing factor for each item.

$$\text{Distinguishing Factor} = \frac{\text{No. of correct answers in high group} - \text{No. of correct answers in low group}}{\text{Number of members of any group}} \times 100$$

By applying the above formula to each item, the result was that all items' distinguishing factors were (0.22-0.56) because studies indicate that the lowest acceptable distinguishing factor is (0.25) (Al-Rosan et al., 1995). No item was dropped from the test items (see table 6 below).

Table 7: Distinguishing factors for achievement test

No. of the Item	Distinguishing coefficient	No. of the item	Distinguishing coefficient	No. of the item	Distinguishing coefficient
1	0.46	13	0.38	25	0.42
2	0.39	14	0.52	26	0.32
3	0.46	15	0.42	27	0.39
4	0.5	16	0.26	28	0.46
5	0.29	17	0.054	29	0.36
6	0.59	18	0.62	30	0.44
7	0.38	19	0.57	31	0.4
8	0.51	20	0.43	32	0.54
9	0.43	21	0.38	33	0.31
10	0.54	22	0.29	34	0.5
11	0.47	23	0.46		
12	0.36	24	0.38		

Hypothesis Testing

The study tests one hypothesis:

H1: No significant statistical differences between the mean score's degrees of the first experimental group using immediate feedback and the second experimental group using delayed feedback in English language.

The total degree of each student in both experimental groups was calculated. The degrees of the first experimental group, which included (31) pupils were (5-31) with an average of (15) and a standard deviation of (7.443). The degrees of the second experimental group of (28) pupils were (11-33) with an average of (23.893) degrees with a standard deviation of (5.971).

A comparison was made between the averages of two groups using a T-test for two independent groups. It showed significant statistical differences between the mean scores of the two experimental groups. The calculated value was (5.027), which is bigger than the tabulated t-value of (2.000) (5) at the level of (0.05) and (57) degree of freedom, as shown in table (13). The result indicated a significant statistical difference in favour of the second experimental group using delayed feedback. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept variable one states that (there is a significant statistical difference between the mean scores of the first experimental group, which was taught by using immediate feedback and the mean scores the second experimental group using delayed feedback in the achievement of English language (See Table 7).

Table 8: Results of T-test for the Significance of Differences between the Two Groups in Achievement Variable

Groups	Number	Mean	SD	t-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
First	31	15	7.443	5.027	2.00	0.05
Second	28	23.893	5.971			

Discussion

The results shown in table (13) indicate that delayed feedback is better than immediate feedback, which is in contrast with the previous studies (Peek & Tillema, 1979), Pitcher (1987), Toshi (1991) and Kasims (1995), which showed no differences between the two groups as all groups were effected in achievement. Also, Kanakaraj (1977) showed that using immediate feedback increased pupils' achievement more than using delayed feedback. The cause of the difference is thought to lie in the samples and the nature of subjects studied more than the method. The researcher attributes the superiority of the experimental group that used delayed feedback to the chance the pupils have in reviewing the subject because delaying feedback leads to repetition after a while and consequently increases the level of achievement in learning the English language. It is a common fact that the more we use linguistic terms and expressions, the more achievement levels increase.

Conclusions:

The statistical analysis has shown that delayed feedback is more effective than immediate feedback in increasing pupils' academic achievement. It gives pupils opportunities to identify and avoid mistakes in the next performance. However, not all mistakes are of equal value. Some mistakes are acceptable, while others are not acceptable. The acceptable once are those which do not interfere with communication. The non-acceptable once should be corrected for the sake of communication. All in all, feedback is effective in many cognitive aspects like remembering and understanding the material.

Recommendations

The study suggested that it is necessary to instruct English language teachers to correct pupils' answers to know their mistakes, and the teachers follow up with pupils to know the degree of their awareness of the correct answers, whether in a test or school teaching application. It is necessary to inform the pupils about their performance because this will motivate them to master learning using delayed feedback in teaching and learning in general and in teaching English to fifth primary pupils in particular, and adopting feedback as a type of methodology in colleges of Basic Education, and teachers' institutes. The necessity to various methods used in schools rather than restricting to memorisation and retention. Conducting other studies dealing with the effects of feedback on other variables like decreasing forgetfulness and increasing motivation for learning.

References

1) Abdul-Razaq, Salah A. (2003) "Teacher and Styles of Teaching" Wahat Tarbaweya, www.e.wahat.com (Internet) (in Arabic).

2) Abu Al-Futuh, Radhwan Fathi (1985) Teaching Social Science, Cairo: Dar Al-Maarif.

3) Abu-Hatab, Fuad and Amaal Sadiq (1984) Educational Psychology, 3rd ed. Cairo: Angelo Library Egyptian (in Arabic).

4) Abu-Jadoo, Saleh Mohammad Ali (2000) The Educational Psychology, 2nd ed. Amean: Dar Al-Masara for Publishing and Printing Press (in Arabic).

5) Aitken, Lauea Tapia (1982) "Effects of Codability of Referents and Type of Feedback on Referential Communication Proficiency in Young Children" Dissertation Abstracts International – A, Vol.43, No.1, p.60.

6) Alam, Salah Al-deen Mahmod (2000) Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluations: Basics, Applications and Current Attitudes, Cairo: Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi (in Arabic).

7) Al-Amin, Shakir Mohammed (1985) Basic of Teaching Social Materials for Teachers Institutions, 6th ed. Baghdad (in Arabic).

8) Al-Azerjawy, Fadhil Mohsin (1991) Principles of Educational Psychology, 1st ed. Mosul: Dar Al-Kutb (in Arabic).

9) Al-Dhahir, Zakareya Mohamad, Jackleen tamrjean and Jawdat Ezat Abdul-Hadi (2002) Principles of Measurement and Evaluation in Education, 1st ed. Amman: Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distributing (in Arabic).

10) Al-Gareeb, Ramzia (1971) Learning: Psychological, Comprehensional and Constructive Study. Angelo-Egyptian Library (in Arabic).

11) Al-Hamash, Khalil I. and Badeel Hammo (1993) The New English Course for Iraq-Book 2, Teachers Guide, 4th ed. Baghdad.

12) Al-Jamal, Najah Yaqbo (1978) "The Effective Feedback in Changing Teachers Style during the Service Using Flanders Decimal System" Journal of Humantrain Science, Vol.2, No.5, pp.145-70 (in Arabic).

13) Al-Khateeb, Mohammad Ibrahim (1985) "Educational Objectives" Journal of Teachers Message, Vol.26, No.5, p.23.

14) Al-Kubaysi, Waheeb Majeed and Saleh Hassan Al-Daheri (2000) The Educational Psychology. Jordan, Irbid: Dar Al-Kindi for Publishing and Printing (in Arabic).

15) Al-Liqani, Ahmed Hussin (1980) Social Science and Developing Thinking, Cairo: Alm-AlKutub.

16) Al-Rosan, Salim Salama et al. (1995) Principles of Measurement and Evaluation and its Educational and Humantarian Applications. Amman: Cooperation Publishing Society.

17) Al-Rubaiey, Jumah Rasheed (1999) "The Effect of Using Feedback on the Achievement of the Secondary Stage Students in Arabic Language Grammar" Teacher's College Journal, No.16, pp.167-89 (in Arabic).

18) Al-Zawbai, Abdul-Jalil and Al-Ghanam Mohammad (1981) Approaches of Research in Education, 1st ed. Baghdad: Baghdad University Press.

19) Aurayfig, Sami, Khalil Hussein and Mufeed Najeeb Hawasheen (1987) Curriculums and Styles of Educational Research, Amman: Dar Al-Amal (in Arabic).

20) Awda, Ahmed Sulaiman. (1999) Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. Irbid: Dar Al-Amal.

21) Bardwell, R. (1981) "Feedback: How Does it Function?" The Journal of Experimental of Education, Vol.50, No.1.

22) Bloom, Benjamins (1971) Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning. New York: McGraw Hill.

23) Bloom, R. B. and Bourdon, L. (1980) "Types and Frequencies of Teacher's Written Instructional Feedback" The Journal of Educational Research, Vol.74, No.1.

24) Butler, D. and Winne, P. (1995) "Feedback and Self-Regulated Learning: A Theoretical Synthesis" Review of Educational Research, Vol.65, No.3, pp.245-281.

25) Butler, R. and Mordecai Nisan (1986) "Effects of No Feedback, Task-Related Comments, and Grades on Intrinsic Motivation and Performance" Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.78, No.3, pp.210-216.

26) Capel, Susan (2003) Learning to Teach in the Secondary School, 3rd ed. USA: Routledge Taylor and Pracis Group.

27) Corder, S. Pite (1982) Introducing Applied Linguistics. England" Penguin Books Ltd.

28) Darooza, Afnan Nazeer (1995) Procedures in Designing Curriculums, 2nd ed. Napels, Al-Nasr House for Publishing.

29) Davidson, G. W ,M.A.Seaton and J.Simpson (1988) Chambers Concise Dictionary. Great Britain: The Bath Press, Avon.

30) Dawood, Aziz Hana and Anwar H. Abdul-Rahman (1990) Curriculums of Educational Research, Baghdad: Dar Al-Hikma for Publishing.

31) Dawood, Mahir and et al. (1990) Approaches of Educational Research, Baghdad: Dar Al-Hikma for Publishing (in Arabic).

32) Doig, Shani M. (2004) "Developing an Understanding of the Role of Feedback in Education" TEDI Conferences (Internet).

33) Draper, Stephen W. (1999) "Feedback", University of Glasgow, Department of Psychology (Internet).

34) Evans, Idella M. and Ron Murdoff (1978) Psychology for a Changing World, 2nd ed. USA: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

35) Falchikov, Nancy (2002) "Improving Learning through Critical Peer Feedback and Reflection" Higher Education Research and Development Society (Internet).

36) Freqeau, L. A. (1999) "Preparing English Second Language Students for College Writing: Two Case Studies" The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.5, No.10 (Internet).

37) Gagne, Ellen D,J.William Moore,William E.Hauck and Robert V.Hoy (1979) "The Effect on Children's Performance of a Discrepancy between Adult Expectancy and Feedback Statements" The Journal of Experimental Education, Vol.47, No.4, pp.300-324.

38) Gold, Ruth F. (1982) Educating the Learning Disabled, USA: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

39) Good, Carter V. (1973) Dictionary of Education, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.

40) Grounlund, N. E. (1981) Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching, 4th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

41) Guralnik, David B. (1975). Webster's New World Dictionary. USA: William Collins and World Publishing Co., Inc.

42) Hamdan, Mohammad Zeyad (1980) Evaluating Learning Basics and Applications, Beirut: Dar Al-Alm Lilmalayeen.

43) Hendrix, William H. and Arthur L. Dudycha (1980) "Feedback Forward and Feedback Multiple Cue Probability Learning Facilitating or Debilitating?" The Journal of Experimental Education, Vol.50, No.1, pp.5-9.

44) Hornby, A. S. (2004) Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 8th ed. Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

45) Ibrahim, Amr et al. (1989) Principles of Measurement and

46) Evaluation in Education, Amman: Dar Aman (in Arabic)

47) Jawad, Ali Saloom and Mahdy Alwan Abood (2001) "The Effect of Diagnosing Achievement and Feedback on Scientific Achievement". The Journal of Qadissya for Educational Science, Vol.1, No.2 (in Arabic).

48) Jerman, Max E. and Edward C. Beardslee (1978) Elementary Mathematics Methods, 1st ed. USA: McGrow-Hill, Inc.

49) Joseph, C. H. and Thomas O. Mqauire (1980) "The Interaction between Time and Feedback and Academic Self-concept on Level of Performance in Arithmetic Skill" The Journal of Educational Research, Vol.75, No.6, pp.360-365.

50) Kanakaraj, D. (1977) "Effects of Immediate and Delayed Feedback on Verbal Interaction Analysis Ratios of Student Teachers in Agriculture at Missouri" Dissertation Abstracts International-A, Vol.38, No.2, pp.594.

51) Kasim, Thanaa Yahea (1997) "The Effect of using Two Style of Feedback on the Achievement Students Females Second Intermediate Class on Geography". Al-Tarbiya and Al-Alim, Vol.24, University of Mosul, College of Education, 164-184 (in Arabic).

52) Kulhavy, R. W. and R. C. Anderson (1972) "Delay-retention Effect with Multiple Choice Tests" Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.63, pp.505-512.

53) Longman (1984) Longman Dictionary of American English. Lebanon: Longman, Inc.

54) Lyons, John (1999) Language and Linguistics, 2nd ed. Britain: Cambridge University Press.

55) Marzook, Marzook A. A. (1989) "Level of Learner Performance on the Light of Using Feedback and Objective Clearing" The Journal of Arab Gulf Message, Vol.31, pp.31-57 (in Arabic).

56) Mismar, Basam Abdullah (1992) "The Effect of Pronounced Feedback Immediate and Delayed on the Learning of Adult and Children A Simple Motional Movement" The Journal of Dirasat (Human Science), Vol.20 A, No.2, pp.220-31.

57) Mohammad, Majeed Mahdy (1990) Curriculums and Their Educational Applications, Mosul: Dar Al-Kutb.

58) Mohammad, Majeed Mahdy and Dawood Mahir (1990) Basics in General Methodology, University of Mosul, Dar Al-Hikma for Publishing and Printing (in Arabic).

59) Mola, Hameed Majeed (1999) "The Effect of Using Two Styles of Feedback on the Achievement of the First Class Material". Teachers College Journal, Vol.18, pp.47-63 (in Arabic).

60) Morgan, Clifford T, King Richard Austin and Robinson Nancy M.(1979) Introduction to Psychology, 6th ed. London: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

61) Moore, I. W. and S. E. Holmes (1974) "The Effects of Verbally Controlled Success and Failure Conditions or Persistent Behavior" Journal of Experimental Education, Vol.43, pp.70-4.

62) Othman, Saeid Ahmed and Anwar M. Al-Sharqawi (1978) Learning and its Applications, 2nd ed. Cairo: Dar Al-Thaqafa for Publishing and Distributing.

63) Pearsall, Judy (1999) The New Oxford Dictionary of Education. London: Oxford University Press.

64) Peeck, J. and Tillema, H. H. (1979) "Delay of Feedback and Retention of Correct and Incorrect Responses" The Journal of Experimental Education. Vol.47, No.2, pp.171-177.

65) Pitcher, S. E. (1987) "A Comparison of Three Modes of Feedback Presented during the Instruction of Time Telling" Dissertation Abstract International-A, Vol.47, No.12, pp.42-48.

66) Rajeh, Ahmad Ezat (1970) Basic Psychology, 8th ed. Cairo: Modern Egyptian Library.

67) Ramaprased, A. (1983) "On the Definition of Feedback" Behavioural Science, Vol.28, pp.4-13.

68) Samara, Aziz and Isam Al-Namr (1989) Principles of Measurement and Evaluation in Education. Amman: Dar Al-Fiker for Publishing and Distributing.

69) Schunk, Dal H. (1984) "Sequential Attribution a Feedback and Children's Achievement Behaviors". Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.76, No.6, pp.1159-1169.

70) Schunk, Dal H. and Paula D. Cox (1986) "Strategy Training and Attributional Feedback with Learning Disabled Students" The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol.78, No.3, pp.201-209.

71) Shalash, Najah Mahdy and Akram Mohamad Subhy (1994) Movement Learning. Basrah: Dar Al-Kutb for Printing and Publishing.

72) Silverman, Walter M. (1978) Psychology, 3rd ed. USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

73) Somaratne, W. R. P. (1963) Aids and Tests in the Teaching of English, 4th ed. London: Oxford University Press.

74) Sovik, Nils (1980) "Development Trends of Visual Feedback Control and Learning in Children's Copying and Tracking Skills" The Journal of Experimental Education, Vol.49, No.2, pp.106-112.

75) Steel, R. G. and Torrie, J. H. (1984) Principles and the Procedures of Statistics: A Biometrical Approach. 2nd ed. Singapore: McGraw Hill, Inc.

76) Toshi, Basimah Jameel (1991) The Effect of Using Immediate and Delayed Feedback on the Achievement of Second Intermediate Pupils in Chemistry (Unpublished M.A. Thesis), University of Mosul, College of Education (in Arabic).

77) Trevers (1979) "The Educational, Translation Mowafaq and Al-Hamdani and Hamdy Al-Karboli" Journal of Baghdad University, Baghdad University (in Arabic).

78) Trotter, Robert J. and James V. McConnell (1978) Psychology the Human Science. USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

79) Tuckman, Brunce W. and Dorit Yates (1980) "Evaluating the Student Feedback Strategy for Changing Teacher Style" The Journal of Educational Research, Vol.74, No.2, pp.74-77.

80) Vandalin, Deaboled B. (1985) Approaches of Research in Education and Psychology, Translated by Mohammad Nabil et al., 3rd ed. Cairo: Angelo-Egyptian Library.

81) Vernon, Walter M. (1974). Introductory Psychology. USA: Rand McNally and Company.

82) Webster, S. (1985) New Collegiate Dictionary. USA: Merrian Company.

83) Whetton, C. and R. Childs (1981) "The Effects of Item-by-Item Feedback Given During An Ability Test" The Journal of Education Psychology, Vol.51, pp.336-346.

84) Williams, Jason Gordon (2003) "Providing Feedback on English Second Language Students Written Assignments" The Internet TESL Journal, Vol.IX, No.10 (Internet).