L2 Writing Feedback Preferences and Their Relationships with Entity vs. Incremental Mindsets of EFL Learners

Shima Vaghei, Ph.D. Candidate, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran
shima.vaghei@yahoo.com
Fariba Rahimi*, Assistant Professor, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran
rahimi_fariba@yahoo.com
Sajad Shafiee, Assistant Professor, English Department, Shahrekord Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shahrekord, Iran
s.shafiee@iaushk.ac.ir

Abstract
The present study was aimed at investigating intermediate Iranian EFL learners' feedback preferences on their L2 writing and examining the possible differences between learners with entity and incremental language mindsets with respect to their feedback preferences. To this end, 150 EFL learners were recruited from several language institutes in Isfahan, Iran, and their language proficiency level was measured through a proficiency test. The learners were then given the Language Mindsets Questionnaire and the Feedback Preferences Scale to fill out. Frequency counts, mean scores, and chi-square for independence were employed to analyze the collected data. The results of the study indicated that teacher-student conferencing, self-correction, peer correction, and correction using prompts were the types of feedback that the learners preferred to receive, and the difference between entity and incremental mindset holders reached statistical significance for teacher correction with comments, self-correction, and teacher-student conferencing. Regarding the strategies the learners utilized to handle feedback, the two groups of learners were significantly different just in terms of asking for teacher explanation. Finally, thinking prompts received priority in the following order, L1/L2, word, and rule, while goal and fit were not favored by the learners; thinking prompt did not turn out to cause significantly different preferences in the EFL learners with entity or incremental mindsets. The significance of the obtained results are discussed and the implications of the study are then proffered.

Keywords: Entity Mindsets, feedback preferences, Incremental Mindsets, L2 writing

Introduction

The concept of mindsets, or implicit theories, refers to people's fundamental beliefs about whether human attributes, such as intelligence, personality, and abilities, is fixed or malleable (Dweck, 2007). Fixed mindsets (or entity theories) are the beliefs that one's abilities or attributes are predetermined and thus cannot change, whereas growth mindsets (or incremental theories) are the beliefs that one's qualities can be cultivated through hard work and strategies. These mindsets can guide students to set goals and to act differently in learning situations, thus leading them to different achievement outcomes (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Specifically, students who hold a strong fixed mindset are more likely to set performance goals (i.e., to prove one's ability through performance); they view criticisms as evidence of a lack of ability and challenges as "risks" of threatening their sense of competence. To prevent their self-worth from negative performance and feedback, they avoid challenging tasks, even tasks that can improve their ability. In contrast,

students who hold a strong growth mindset are more likely to set learning goals (i.e., to focus on improvement and learning process); they view overcoming challenges as ways to develop talents and utilize negative feedback as information to improve. Compared to those with strong fixed mindset, students who hold a strong growth mindset are more likely to approach challenges and respond to failure situations more positively. Thus, growth mindsets are argued to be a key to students' persistence and long-term success (Yeager & Dweck, 2012).

The construct of mindsets and their influences have been studied extensively in the past 20 years in many educational domains such as math and science, which provided important implications for academic achievement and positive education (see Brunett, O'Boyle, VanEpps, Pollack, & Finkel, 2013 for a meta-analysis). Recent research in the field of language learning has started to study the conceptualization and motivational influences of language mindsets (See Lou & Noels, 2016; Mercer & Ryan, 2009). Considering that mindsets are domain- specific beliefs, language mindsets, or the beliefs about whether language learning ability is fixed or can be developed, are found only moderately correlated with mindsets in other domains, such as abilities to learn math and sports (see Lou & Noels 2017). These findings support the idea that most students are likely to have a mixture of fixed and growth mindsets in different areas (Dweck, 2019).

Consistent with mindset research in other education domains, language mindsets are found to predict FL learners' learning goals in the classrooms and ESL students' language anxiety communicating with native speakers (Lou & Noels, 2016, 2017). However, to the researchers' knowledge, no study has investigated the links between language mindsets and EFL students' feedback preferences. Although mindsets are often conceived as a trait, students can develop growth mindsets through the learning environment and teachers play a critical role in shaping students' mindsets (Blackwell, Trzesniewski, & Dweck, 2007; Rissanen, Kuusisto, & Tirri, 2018). Expectedly, students are more likely to develop growth mindsets when teachers provide support for students to develop their ability and encourage students to set learning goals (Lou & Noels, 2016). While psychological feedback has been found to relate to mindsets, it is not clear whether students' language mindsets relate to their preferences for receiving feedback in their writing (Cimpian, Arce, Markman, & Dweck, 2007). In the language learning domain, although some studies found that language mindsets are malleable (Lou & Noels, 2016), few studies have examined the contextual antecedents or factors that relate to language mindsets. Accordingly, the aims of this study were (a) to examine the L2 writing feedback preferences of Iranian EFL learners and (b) to find out whether these feedback preferences relate to the entity vs. incremental mindsets of the learners or not.

Literature Review

Corrective feedback (CF) has been basically conceptualized as reactions and responses to students' utterances including an error (Ellis, 2006). It is also as a compound phenomenon with several functions (Chaudron, 1988). As noted by Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006), CF receives the form of answers to learner utterances that have an error. The answers can contain an indication that an error has been made, delivery of the correct target language item, or metalinguistic information about the essence of the error, or any mixture of these.

Corrective feedback is defined as "responses to learner utterances containing an error" (Ellis, 2006, p. 26) and a complex phenomenon that serves several functions (Chaudron, 1988). The aim of presenting feedback is to help L2 student recognize a problem in their production, resulting in the correct use of the form. Corrective feedback has a crucial role in the kind of

scaffolding that teachers need to create for language learners to promote their L2 (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013).

Theoretical perspectives, from cognitive to social-oriented ones, suggest corrective feedback to be not only helpful but also necessary for pushing students forward in their L2 growth (Lyster et al., 2013). Past research has shown that giving feedback effectively contributes to grammatical, morphological, and phonological development (Lyster et al., 2013).

Corrective feedback in an ESL classroom context differs in terms of being implicit or explicit (Lyster et al., 2013). Students may receive explicit corrective feedback usually in the form of metalinguistic information and explicit correction. Moreover, implicit corrective feedback may be given in the form of recasts. Previous research studies indicated that implicit (e.g., Lyster & Ranta, 1997, 2002; McDonough & Mackey, 2006) and explicit corrective feedback (e.g., Carroll, Roberge, & Swain, 1992; Ellis, 2012) had a positive influence on the acquisition of different phonological, grammatical and morphosyntactic forms.

The concept of mindset (MS), or implicit theories, dates back to Kelly's (1955) work, which presented some lay theories of the way people perceive the self and others. Recently, in the area of education, more concepts have been engendered via the construct of MS, in which the assumptions and beliefs of certain human traits have largely been connected to Carol Dweck and her associates' works (e.g., Blackwell et al., 2007; Chiu et al., 1997; Dweck, 2006; Dweck & Molden, 2007; Dweck et al., 1995; Hong et al., 1999). Additionally, mindsets have a close association with a number of second language learning's theoretical and empirical studies (e.g., Barcelos, 2003; Benson & Lor, 1999; Cotterall, 1995, 1999; Horwitz, 1998; White, 2008) where the relationship between mindsets and language learning behavior has been investigated.

Within the context of language learning, the fixed MS (alternatively referred to as entity MS) belief in language learning depends on a fixed and inborn talent, while the growth MS (alternatively called incremental MS) belief depends on controllable factors such as hard work and continuous training. Even though there are entity and incremental MS in the field of psychology, people tend to have an entity MS in the area of foreign language teaching and learning (Mercer & Ryan, 2010). It is common for people to possess the belief that some people are born with a special talent in a certain domain. As for foreign language learning, there is a belief that those who are naturally born to be language learners or good at languages prevalently become language teachers or researchers. In the domain of second language learning, such 'talent' is called aptitude and its development in language learning is significant (Robinson, 2005; Sternberg, 2002). People with an entity MS may hold the belief that having a 'gift' for languages is important in learning a language; therefore, it is a waste of effort to attempt to improve the language in question since it is impossible for poor language learners to develop as a linguist by any means (Mercer, 2012). In this regard, the aptitude of individuals with an entity or incremental MS could be observed to have different learning outcomes.

Lou (2014) contended that most people probably hold mindsets, or beliefs, about language learning. Some attribute successful L2 learning to a natural talent or an innate ability that cannot be further nurtured (i.e., an entity mindset), whereas other people believe that learning an L2 is a malleable ability that can be further improved (i.e., an incremental mindset). The mindsets that people hold orient their approach to the learning task at hand. Lou's study utilized Dweck's (1999) implicit theories framework in an L2 context to figure out the causal relationships among L2 students' mindsets, goal orientations (that is, learning goals, performance-approach goals, and performance-avoidance goals) and responses to failure situations (that is, mastery responses, helpless responses, anxiety, and fear of failure). A total number of 150 L2 university students were randomly assigned to two experimental conditions in

which different mindsets were induced; afterwards, they filled out a questionnaire on their L2 goals and responses in failure situations. The results of the study indicated that after being primed for an incremental mindset, irrespective of their perceived L2 ability, participants set higher learning goals and, in turn, expressed more mastery-orientated responses in failure situations. On the other hand, L2 learners who were exposed to priming for an entity mindset, in case they perceived of themselves as highly proficient L2 users, set higher performance-approach goals and, in turn, were more fearful of failure situations.

Albalawi's (2017) study intended to examine the complex dynamism of L2 demotivation. The study was an attempt to modify and reform previous conceptualizations about demotivation and move the L2 demotivation mainstream research into a new phase that underscored the complexity of its process as well as its development. The demotivational, motivational, and remotivational triad of L2 learners was studied through the lens of several key psychological and theoretical constructs, which included language mindsets, personality hardiness, learner helplessness, as well as L2 motivational self-system. The study was conducted in two phases that examined the demotivation of female L2 university students in Saudi Arabia by using a range of research methodologies such as qualitative in-depth interviews, quantitative surveys, and SEM (structural equation modelling).

First, an exploratory qualitative study was conducted, which intended to examine the L2 learners' different perspectives on their language learning experiences and their perceptions of different demotivating factors. Qualitative semi-structured interviews were planned and conducted with 13 English language learners, and analysis of the qualitative data unearthed that language learning mindsets played an important part in the language learner's motivation, demotivation, remotivation, and in their resilience/vulnerability. Nonetheless, the relationships among the variables that emerged in the qualitative data needed further investigation in order to be corroborated and generalized to larger populations of L2 learners.

In the second phase of the study, confirmatory quantitative analysis was performed aiming to examine the impacts of holding a particular language learning mindset on the learners' L2 demotivation. While making use of the key variables that emerged in the qualitative phase of the study, the researcher designed and administered a questionnaire to 2044 foundation-year university students. In fact, several tests were conducted to investigate (a) the relationships between the variables, (b) the possible differences between the growth mindset l2 learners and the fixed mindset L2 learners, and (c) the putative differences between the resilient and vulnerable L2 learners. The results obtained from the quantitative phase of the study confirmed all the hypothesized relationships, and served to establish an empirical link between L2 learning mindset and both L2 demotivation and L2 resilience.

Finally, a structural model that posited that L2 demotivation could be predicted by the fixed language learning mindsets was hypothesized. Structural equation modelling (SEM) was conducted to empirically test and examine the hypothesized model. A series of causal relationships was simultaneously examined in this model. The SEM analysis confirmed all the hypothesized causal relationships and indicated that L2 demotivation could be accounted for and predicted positively and directly by the fixed L2 learning mindset. The results also revealed that the fixed L2 learning mindset could indirectly end in L2 demotivation via lowering the ability to manifest a positive ideal L2 self and augmenting L2 disappointment.

Roy's (2019) study investigated multilingual writers' preferences for audio and/or written feedback, and examined the effect of feedback format on their revision processes. To meet the aims of the study, eight multilingual writers were chosen to be interviewed, and their first drafts as well as revised drafts of the final research papers for which they had received audio and

written feedback were compared by means of the 'Compare' option in Microsoft Word Software. Additionally, an early-semester participatory survey as well as a reflection survey were administered among the multilingual writers of the composition course. The obtained results revealed that multilingual writers expected to receive directive explicit feedback from their course instructors. They mentioned that audio feedback was far better for global commentary, while written feedback was a better option better for local commentary. The participants' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of audio vs. written feedback on their revision process differed depending on their self-efficacy. No significant effect was observed for the feedback format on the participants' revision process. A positive correlation was found, however, between their preferred type of feedback and their self-perceived English listening proficiency. Those who enjoyed higher self-efficacy and were confident about their English listening proficiency preferred to be given audio feedback rather than written feedback. The obtained results could have immediate implications for L2 writing instructors: This study proposes that L2 writing instructors ought to adopt the approach of providing an amalgamation of feedback formats consisting of both audio and written feedback in order to promote multilingual writers' overall writing skills. It could also be suggested that L2 writing instructors ought to think about providing some relevant grammar lessons for their students in L2 writing courses. Finally, this study recommended a further investigation of the potential of audio feedback in arousing student-teacher connections and relationships, especially in online composition courses. To capture the nature of the Iranian EFL learners' language mindsets and the relationship between mindset and feedback preferences, the following research questions were formulated:

Q. What preferences do Iranian EFL learners have with regards to written corrective feedback?
Q. Are there any differences in feedback preferences for learners' with entity and incremental language mindsets?

Methodology

Participants

The population of the study included intermediate EFL learners in Isfahan, Iran, from whom a sample of 150 learners was recruited as the participants in this study. The researchers accessed and selected the available EFL learners in several private language institutes in Isfahan, Iran, who volunteered to take part in the study. They were chosen from among homogeneous (in terms of language proficiency) EFL learners, whose proficiency levels had been assessed through the administration of an Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT). Moreover, the participants were native speakers of Persians and included both female and male language learners. Their exposure to English language in language institutes ranged from 2 to 5 years, and they were aged between 14 and 22.

Instrumentation

The following instruments were employed in this study: OQPT, language mindsets inventory, and feedback preferences scale. OQPT is an internationally-recognized, standardized test of language proficiency developed to help place students in different proficiency levels It includes 60 multiple-choice questions assessing the knowledge of vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension of English language learners. This test had been widely used and its reliability and validity were assured by previous researchers. Based on the OQPT scoring rubric, learners who score between 30 and 37 out of 60 are lower intermediate and those who obtain a score between 40 and 47 could be considered upper intermediate. As intermediate EFL learners

were the participants of this study, they included those learners who had received a score ranging from 30 to 47 on the OQPT.

The language mindsets inventory (LMI) employed in the current study was an 18-items developed by Lou and Noels (2017), which intended to assess learners' language mindsets. This scale measures language mindsets on a 6-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). It includes items related to entity mindsets (e.g., *you have a certain amount of language intelligence, and you can't really do much to change it*) and items related to incremental mindsets (e.g., *no matter what you are, you can significantly change your language intelligence level*) across the three aspects of language mindsets, including general language intelligence beliefs, second language aptitude beliefs, and age sensitivity beliefs about language learning. Thus, each dimension of language mindsets included three incremental and three entity items. The reliability of the questionnaire was checked through Cronbach's formula and it turned out to be .73; to make sure about the validity of the questionnaire, it was handed to three experts in the areas of second language learning, education, and psychology. The experts unanimously approved of the validity of the questionnaire.

The feedback preferences scale by Saito (1994) was used to assess the participants' preferences for teacher feedback. The scale assesses feedback preferences in several categories including teacher correction, comment, teacher correction with comment, error identification, peer correction, and correction using prompts. The scale includes twenty-three items on a Likert-type scale as well as a place for writing further suggestions. The scale is among the highly used and highly cited scales for measuring learners' preferences for corrective feedback.

Data Collection Procedure

Prior to the commencement of the study, the researcher met a few language institutes heads to ask for their permission. In each of the institutes, intermediate classes were listed and the researcher arranged for a placement test to be administered among the intermediate EFL learners who were willing to take part in this study. Among the whole population of intermediate students in those language institutes, which exceeded 800, a total number of 150 learners met the criteria of volunteering and proficiency level (as assess by the OQPT). The learners in the selected sample were given the LMI and the feedback preferences scale to fill out. They were given the hard copies of the questionnaires and were asked to return them in a week. The data analysis of the data was done through frequency counts and mean scores for the first research question, and for the other research question, in addition to frequency counts, chi-square for independence was also conducted.

Results

EFL Learners' Feedback Preferences in L2 Writing

The first research question of the study asked "What preferences do Iranian EFL learners have with regards to written corrective feedback?" The data needed to answer this research question were collected from the feedback preferences questionnaire, and the results of the analyses are presented in what follows.

Table 1. *Results for the Feedback Types*

No.	Statements	Very Useful	Useful	Neither Useless nor	Useless	Totally Useless	Mean

				Useful			
1	Teacher correction (Teacher corrects all the grammatical errors)	16	20	34	50	30	2.61
2	Commentary (The teacher gives feedback by making comments. No error correction)	21	18	43	56	12	2.86
3	Teacher correction with comments	11	13	38	65	23	2.49
4	Error identification (The teacher indicates the place where the errors occur by underlining or circling it).	20	27	17	55	31	2.66
5	Peer correction (Students evaluate each other's work in pairs or with a whole class)	22	50	23	38	17	3.14
6	Self-correction (Students evaluate their own work)	22	51	21	48	8	3.20
7	Teacher-student conferencing (The teacher discusses the writing of the students)	32	51	13	36	18	3.28
8	Correction using prompts	29	30	33	40	18	3.08

Since this section of the feedback questionnaire had five-point Likert-scale items, the average value of the choices was 3.00, and mean scores above 3.00 indicated preferences of feedback types, while mean scores lower than 3.00 meant that the EFL learners investigated in this study did not favor a feedback type. In Table 1 four types of feedback had mean scores above 3.00, which included teacher-student conferencing (M = 3.28), self-correction (M = 3.20), peer correction (M = 3.14), and correction using prompts (M = 3.08); these were the types of feedback that the learners preferred to receive. On the other hand, other types of feedback such as teacher corrections and comments (M = 2.49), teacher correction (M = 2.69), error identification (M = 2.66), and commentary (M = 2.86) were not well liked by the learners. The second section of the questionnaire concerned the extent to which the learners were inclined to use different feedback strategies; the results for these feedback strategies are shown in Table 2:

Table 2. *Results for the Feedback Strategies*

No.	**Statements**	**Frequently**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Mean**
1	Making a mental note	78	35	37	2.27
2	Writing down points by type	83	33	34	2.32

3	Identifying points to be explained	64	34	52	2.08
4	Asking for teacher explanation	78	35	37	2.27
5	Referring back to previous compositions	83	33	34	2.32
6	Consulting a dictionary or a grammar book	64	34	52	2.08
7a	Reviewing: Only incorporating teacher's comments	83	33	34	2.32
7b	Reviewing: Revising and expanding	64	34	52	2.08
8	Not doing anything	78	35	37	2.27

Since this section of the questionnaire had three-point Likert-scale items, the average value of the choices was 2.00, and mean scores above 2.00 would mean that the EFL learners had inclinations to use those feedback strategies more often than not. A quick look at Table 2 reveals that all the items listed there received mean scores larger than 2.00, implying that the learners would like to use all those feedback strategies rather frequently. However, the feedback strategies could be more clearly presented based on the following descending order: (a) writing down points by type, referring back to previous compositions, and reviewing by incorporating teacher's comments (M = 2.32), (b) making a mental note, asking for teacher explanations, and not doing anything about the errors (M = 2.27), and (c) identifying the points to be explained, consulting a dictionary or a grammar book, and reviewing by revising and expanding (M = 2.08). The learners were also asked to give their opinions about the types of prompts they preferred to receive, and the results of the third section of the questionnaire, as presented in Table 3, address this issue.

Table 3. *Results for the Thinking Prompts*

No.	**Statements**	**Very Useful**	**Useful**	**Neither Useless nor Useful**	**Useless**	**Totally Useless**	**Mean**
1	Goal	21	29	21	50	29	2.75
2	Fit	21	43	20	45	21	2.98
3	L1/L2	27	53	23	40	7	3.35
4	Word	26	52	13	42	17	3.18
5	Rule	33	32	32	34	19	3.17

Here again, the average value of the choices is 3.00, and mean scores above 3.00 indicate the usefulness of (or the learners' preferences for) a certain type of prompt. Among the five types of prompts listed here, the learners regarded L1/L2 (*M* = 3.35), word (*M* = 3.18), and rule (*M* = 3.17) as the useful (or preferred) types of prompts, while they did not care for goal (*M* = 2.75) and fit (*M* = 2.98) as other types of prompts.

Feedback Preferences of Learners With Different Mindsets

The second research question of the study asked whether there were any significant differences in feedback preferences for learners' with entity and incremental language mindsets or not. To this end, the frequencies of the responses to the feedback preferences questionnaire by the entity mindset learners and incremental mindset learners were juxtaposed and chi-square for independence was employed to find out whether there were any significant differences between these two groups of learners or not.

Table 4. *Different Mindsets and Feedback Types*

No.	**Statements**	**Mindsets**	**Very Useful**	**Useful**	**Neither Useless nor Useful**	**Useless**	**Totally Useless**	**Sig.**
1	Teacher correction (Teacher corrects all the grammatical errors)	Entity Incremental	15 11	16 10	12 22	10 30	6 18	.00
2	Commentary (The teacher gives feedback by making comments. No error correction)	Entity Incremental	10 11	8 10	16 27	18 38	7 5	.34
3	Teacher correction with comments	Entity Incremental	14 7	12 7	9 23	15 40	9 14	.00
4	Error identification (The teacher indicates the place where the errors occur by underlining or circling it).	Entity Incremental	9 11	11 16	9 8	15 40	15 16	.38
5	Peer correction (Students evaluate each other's work in pairs or with a whole class)	Entity Incremental	8 14	15 35	14 9	16 22	6 11	.34
6	Self-correction (Students evaluate their own work)	Entity Incremental	10 17	16 41	8 12	22 16	3 5	.009
7	Teacher-student conferencing (The teacher discusses the writing of the students)	Entity Incremental	14 18	22 31	11 5	7 23	5 14	.03

8	Correction using prompts	Entity Incremental	9 20	16 14	11 22	14 26	9 9	.93

To conduct chi-square for independence, the two groups of entity mindset learners and incremental mindset learners were compared with respect to their responses to the feedback preferences questionnaire. To do so, the frequencies for very useful and useful were added up and formed the *useful* category, while the frequencies for useless and totally useless were added up to form the category of *useless.* Having two categorical variables of language mindsets (i.e., entity and incremental) and feedback preference/usefulness (i.e., useful and useless) enabled the researchers to run chi-square for independence and make comparisons between the two groups of learners. The results of chi-square are reported under the rightmost column, labeled Sig., under which, a *p* value less than .05 shows a significant difference, while a *p* value larger than .05 indicates a difference that did not reach statistical significance. A quick glance at the *p* values lined up in Table 4 reveals that the *p* values for items # 1, 3, 6, and 7 were smaller than the significance level of .05, leading us to the conclusion that regarding the feedback types mentioned in these four items, learners with entity mindsets were different from those with incremental mindsets. In fact, regarding teacher correction (i.e., teacher corrects all the grammatical errors), the majority of entity mindset holders (31 out of 59) sound it useful, while a small portion of incremental mindset holders (21 out of 91) considered it to be useful. Likewise, with respect to teacher correction with comments, 46% of entity mindset holders believed in its usefulness, whereas 23% of the incremental mindset holders deemed it was useful to them and the difference between these two groups of learners was significant.

On the other hand, as for self-correction, about two-thirds (63%) of the learners with incremental mindsets and less than half (44%) of the learners with entity mindsets expressed that it was useful, and here again the difference between them reached statistical significance. Another significant difference between the learners in these two groups related to teacher correction with conferencing, which was more favored by entity mindset holders. Whether these two groups of EFL learners were significantly different from one another with respect to the frequency of use of feedback strategies could be determined in Table 5. Here again, chi-square for independence was conducted to capture any possible differences and the results were reported under the Sig. column.

Table 5. *Different Mindsets and Feedback Strategies*

No.	**Statements**	**Mindsets**	**Frequently**	**Sometimes**	**Rarely**	**Sig.**
1	Making a mental note	Entity Incremental	28 50	13 22	18 19	.19
2	Writing down points by type	Entity Incremental	36 47	11 22	12 22	.42
3	Identifying points to be explained	Entity Incremental	24 40	14 20	21 31	.75

4	Asking for teacher explanation	Entity Incremental	38 40	13 29	8 22	.03
5	Referring back to previous compositions	Entity Incremental	36 47	11 22	12 22	.42
6	Consulting a dictionary or a grammar book	Entity Incremental	24 40	14 20	21 31	.75
7a	Reviewing: Only incorporating teacher's comments	Entity Incremental	36 47	11 22	12 22	.42
7b	Reviewing: Revising and expanding	Entity Incremental	24 40	14 20	21 31	.75
8	Not doing anything	Entity Incremental	28 50	13 22	18 19	.19

Except for item # 4, which related to teacher explanation (and was significantly more welcome by entity mindset holders), the *p* values under the Sig. column for the rest of the items were greater than the significance level of .05, revealing that EFL learners with entity mindsets were not significantly different from EFL learners with incremental mindsets with respect to the following feedback strategies: making a mental note, writing down points by type, identifying points to be explained, referring back to previous compositions, consulting a dictionary or a grammar book, reviewing by incorporating teacher's comments, reviewing by revising and expanding, and the strategy of not doing anything. Finally, Table 6 presents the comparison of EFL learners with entity and incremental mindsets with respect to the type of prompts they preferred:

Table 6. *Different Mindsets and Thinking Prompts*

No.	**Statements**	**Mindsets**	**Very Useful**	**Useful**	**Neither Useless nor Useful**	**Useless**	**Totally Useless**	**Sig.**
1	Goal	Entity Incremental	9 12	12 17	10 11	14 36	14 15	.45
2	Fit	Entity Incremental	4 17	14 29	12 8	22 23	7 14	.06
3	L1/L2	Entity Incremental	13 14	21 32	7 16	17 23	1 6	.64
4	Word	Entity Increme	11 15	14 38	7 6	20 22	7 10	.10

		ntal						
5	Rule	Entity Increme ntal	11 22	18 14	11 21	11 23	8 11	.33

Thinking prompt did not turn out to cause significantly different preferences in the EFL learners with entity mindsets or incremental mindsets due to the fact that all the *p* values under the Sig. column in Table 6 were larger than the significance level of .05.

Discussion

As it was found out above, teacher-student conferencing, self-correction, peer correction, and correction using prompts were the types of feedback that the learners preferred to receive. On the other hand, other types of feedback such as teacher corrections and comments, teacher correction, error identification, and commentary were not well liked by the learners.

In a study by Saito (1994), the students also preferred to receive teacher-student conferencing (and other types of teacher-led correction such as teacher correction with comments, error identification, and commentary) probably because many EFL/ESL students trust teacher feedback more than peer feedback and do not consider peers reliable sources for providing feedback. However, what was interesting in this study was that the participants, in addition to teacher-student conferencing, valued self-correction, peer correction, and correction with prompts. The reason behind this could be the EFL learners in this study, who were at an intermediate level of proficiency, had been partially successful in learning an L2 as they had climbed several rungs of success in foreign language learning, and they probably thought they could assume the role of a rater who can pass judgements and provide feedback on peers' writings or on their own written productions.

Besides, as it was mentioned above, the respondents in this study did not care for teacher correction and comments, teacher correction, error identification, and commentary probably because of the fact that, as Johansson (2018) found it in his study, research participants perceived feedback that is not commonly used by teachers or was used differently by different teachers difficult to interpret for students. That is, students struggle with interpreting feedback when there are variations in teachers' practices in applying feedback. On the other hand, teacher-student conferencing seems to be a favorable feedback type because both parties are present while providing feedback, and misunderstanding of feedback is not likely to happen. Studies done by Alkhatib (2015) and Hannum (2016) also give empirical corroboration to the fact students may experience difficulties understanding some of teachers' feedback, and that previous experience with receiving feedback affects they wat students prefer to be given feedback and the way they interpret it.

Regarding teacher correction, teacher correction with comments, self-correction, teacher correction with conferencing, the difference between entity and incremental mindset holders reached statistical significance. It is no surprise that teacher correction with comments and teacher-student conferencing were welcome by that stratum of the sample that held entity mindsets since these types of people, according to Yeager and Dweck (2012) see criticisms as evidence of a lack of capability and view challenges as threats to their sense of achievement. The criticism could be more tolerable for them if it originates from an authority such as their teacher, but more debilitating in case it is provided by a peer. In order to preclude their self-esteem from negative performance and feedback from peers, they shun demanding tasks, even tasks that are

likely to ameliorate their ability (Yeager & Dweck, 2012). On the other hand, about two-thirds (*n* = 91, 60.66%) of the participants in the current study turned out to have incremental mindsets, while around one-thirds (*n* = 59, 39.33%) had entity mindsets; it is not unusual, thus, to have a large proportion of the participants who chose to consider self-correction useful, and gave rise to a significant difference between the two groups of entity and incremental mindset holders.

Furthermore, in a descending order, the learners preferred the following feedback handling strategies: writing down points by type, referring back to previous compositions, reviewing by incorporating teacher's comments, making a mental note, asking for teacher explanations, not doing anything about the errors, identifying the points to be explained, consulting a dictionary or a grammar book, and reviewing by revising and expanding.

According to Saito (1994), students' strategies for handling feedback may hinge upon the type of feedback they are exposed to in their classes; once students are provided with corrective feedback on their writing, they may simply read through the corrected writing in lieu of making a lot of effort aiming at rewriting or revising. Nonetheless, if the feedback gives only clues for the learners to make corrections on their own, they are encouraged to correct errors and revise their writings. Rewriting or revision, according to Saito, had become one of the popular methods of addressing feedback, but learners in the current study, and in Saito's study, did not seem to find this approach useful, and they were incognizant of its value.

EFL learners with entity mindsets were not significantly different from EFL learners with incremental mindsets with respect to making a mental note, writing down points by type, identifying points to be explained, referring back to previous compositions, consulting a dictionary or a grammar book, reviewing by incorporating teacher's comments, reviewing by revising and expanding, and the strategy of not doing anything. The only significant difference between entity and incremental mindset holders was related to their preferences for teacher explanation. Based on Saito (1994), many ESL/EFL learners, while writing in an L2, feel they need more help on grammatical errors, and they believe it is the teacher's role and responsibility to model these aspects of the L2. This is especially true with the entity mindset holders who are less likely to realize the importance of peer correction or self-correction of their written productions. These EFL learners certainly resemble the participants in studies of Munguugu-Shipale (2016), Yang (2016), Lee (2013), or Ray (2019), who longed for metalinguistic explanations, explicit error correction, and directive explicit feedback.

Besides, thinking prompts received priority in the following order, L1/L2, word, and rule, while they the thinking prompts of goal and fit were not favored by the learners. In Saito's (1994) study, the students found the rule prompt the most useful one. In fact, through this prompt, they wonder if they know a grammar or spelling rule for an error and try to find out or remember the rule. By using the word prompt, the students ask themselves 'Is this the right word or expression? Possible words are …' and through the L1/L2 prompt, the question would be 'How do I say it in my language? Does it make sense in English?' Although the L1/L2 prompt was not favored by the students in Saito's study, it was rated useful by the respondents in the current study. According to Saito, students' perceptions towards thinking prompts differ probably because of the extent to which their teacher integrates or uses the thinking prompts in the classroom activities. In classes where no such prompts are used, the students are likely to rate them as not useful, whereas in classes where they are utilized, students are quick to realize their value. Thinking prompt did not turn out to cause significantly different preferences in the EFL learners with entity mindsets or incremental mindsets.

Conclusion

The present study addressed a lacuna in the domain of second language writing feedback preferences, i.e., the possible differences between learners with entity vs. incremental language mindsets regarding L2 writing feedback preferences. The data elicited from 150 intermediate EFL learners unveiled that teacher-student conferencing, self-correction, peer correction, and correction using prompts were the types of feedback that the learners preferred to receive, and the difference between entity and incremental mindset holders reached statistical significance for teacher correction with comments, self-correction, and teacher-student conferencing. With respect to the strategies the learners utilized to handle feedback, the two groups of learners were significantly different just in terms of asking for teacher explanation. Finally, thinking prompts received priority in the following order, L1/L2, word, and rule, while goal and fit were not favored by the learners; thinking prompt did not turn out to cause significantly different preferences in the EFL learners with entity or incremental mindsets. Important conclusions and implications could be made from the obtained results: feedback preferences vary from person to person, and a single fact of having an either entity or incremental mindset cannot certainly be a determining factor; as Yang (2016) put it, linguistic features of learners' first language, cognitive processing, affect, instruction, and cultural perception are all at work in this regard. Other have pointed to level of education and previous experience with feedback as other factors affecting feedback preferences. L2 teachers are thus advised to provide a combined form of feedback to enhance students' overall skills and meet the needs of a wide variety of learners regarding their feedback preferences in writing.

References

Albalawi, F. H. E. (2017). *L2 demotivation among Saudi learners of English: The role of language learning mindsets.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Nottingham, the U.K.

Alkhatib, N.I.M. (2015). *Written corrective feedback at a Saudi university: English language teachers' beliefs, students' preferences, and teachers' practices.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Essex, Colchester, UK.

Barcelos, A. M. F. (2003). Researching beliefs about SLA: A critical review. In P. Kalaja & A. M. F. Barcelos (Eds.), *Beliefs about SLA: New research approaches* (pp. 7–33). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Benson, P., & Lor, W. (1999). Conceptions of language and language learning. *System*, 27(4), 459–472.

Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an intervention. *Child development*, *78*(1), 246-263.

Burnette, J. L., O'Boyle, E. H., VanEpps, E. M., Pollack, J. M., & Finkel, E. J. (2013). Mind-sets matter: A meta-analytic review of implicit theories and self-regulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 655.

Carroll, S., Swain, M., & Roberge, Y. (1992). The role of feedback in adult second language acquisition: Error correction and morphological generalizations. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *13*(02), 173-198.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cimpian, A., Arce, H. M. C., Markman, E. M., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Subtle linguistic cues affect children's motivation. *Psychological Science*, *18*(4), 314-316.

Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.

Dweck, C. S. (2007). The perils and promises of praise. *Kaleidoscope, Contemporary and Classic Readings in Education, 12*, 34-39.

Dweck, C. S. (2019). The choice to make a difference. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 14*(1), 21-25.

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

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

Dweck, C. S., & Molden, D. C. (2007). Self theories: Their impact on competence motivation and acquisition. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 122–140). New York: The Guilford Press.

Ellis, R. (2006). Researching the effects of form-focused instruction on L2 acquisition. *AILA Review, 19*, 18–41.

Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research and language pedagogy*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Hannum, M.C. (2016). *Fault in our feedback: Students' experiences and preferences regarding corrective feedback.* Unpublished master's thesis, the University of Toledo, Ohio, USA.

Hong, Y. Y., Chiu, C. Y., Dweck, C. S., Lin, D. M. S., & Wan, W. (1999). Implicit theories, attributions, and coping: A meaning system approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(3), 588-599.

Horwitz, E. K. (1998). The beliefs about language learning of beginning foreign language students. *The Modem Language Journal*, 72(3), 283–294.

Johansson, M. (2018). *Formative assessment: Students' attitudes and preferences in Swedish upper secondary school*. Unpublished master's thesis. Orebro University, Sweden.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. New York: Norton.

Lee, E. J. E. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System, 41,* 217-230.

Lou, M. T. (2014). *Changing language learning mindsets: The role of implicit theories of L2 intelligence for goal orientations and responses to failure.* Unpublished master's thesis. University of Alberts, Canada.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2016). Changing language mindsets: Implications for goal orientations and responses to failure in and outside the second language classroom. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 46*, 22-33.

Lou, N. M., & Noels, K. A. (2017). Measuring language mindsets and modeling their relations with goal orientations and emotional and behavioral responses in failure situations. *The Modern Language Journal, 101*(1), 214-243.

Lyster, R. & L. Ranta (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*, 37–66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(01), 1-40.

Mercer, S. (2012). Dispelling the myth of the natural-born linguist. *ELT journal, 66*(1), 22-29.

Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2009). A mindset for EFL: Learners' beliefs about the role of natural talent. *ELT journal*, *64*(4), 436-444.

Mercer, S., & Ryan, S. (2010). A mindset for EFL: Learners' beliefs about the role of natural talent. *ELT journal*, *64*(4), 436-444.

McDonough, K. & A.Mackey (2000). Communicative tasks, conversational interaction, and linguistic form: An empirical study of Thai. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*, 82–91.

Mungungu, S.S. (2016). *Lecturers' and students' perceptions and preferences about ESL corrective feedback in Namibia: Towards an intervention model.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Namibia, Namibia.

Rissanen, I., Kuusisto, E., Tuominen, M., & Tirri, K. (2019). In search of a growth mindset pedagogy: A case study of one teacher's classroom practices in a Finnish elementary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *77*, 204-213.

Robinson, P. (2005). 'Aptitude and second language acquisition'. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 25, 46–73.

Roy, S. (2019). *Exploring multilingual writers' preference between audio and written feedback, and the impact of feedback format on their revision process in a U.S. composition class.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania, the U.S.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' performances for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 11*(2), 46-70.

Sternberg, R. J. (2002). The theory of successful intelligence and its implications for language aptitude testing. In P. Robinson (ed.), *Individual differences and instructed language learning*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

White, C. (2008). Beliefs and good language learners. In C. Griffiths (Ed.), *Lessons from good language learners* (pp. 121–130). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, J. (2016). Learners' oral corrective feedback preferences in relation to their cultural background, proficiency level, and types of error. *System,* 61, 75-86.

Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational psychologist*, *47*(4), 302-314.