The Study of the Effects of Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Students' Writing

Amir Rezaei
Department of English Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University
Siros Izadpanah [*]
Department of English Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University
Ali Shahnavaz
Department of English Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University

Abstract

Corrective feedback (CF) and its subsequent impacts on language learning is one of the most important fields of the language studies which has newly grabbed a lot of attention. There is a considerable amount of research investigating corrective feedback and error. What had not been researched extensively yet was the investigation of the effects of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners. Few researches have studied on the effects of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners. To this purpose, 180 male and female teachers(purposive sampling) who were teaching EFL classes in an ELT program in foreign language institutes in Zanjan, Iran and 350 students chosen through stratified random sampling(from 4000 English language learners by Morgan's sample size). Three instruments were used in this research. PET Test, a questionnaire used by Fukuda (2004) and the next one was Hamouda (2011). The findings suggested that corrective feedback had a significant effect on their writing, but the teachers did not think so. In terms of perceptions about the effect of corrective feedback on the correct writing of English language students, there is a significant difference between the group of students and teachers. It is concluded that most of the feedback given by teachers was concentrated on grammatical errors whom teachers' view of feedback was based on the context, which might origin from the absence of sufficient teacher training. The fact that feedback was based on each context may be positive, because all students were different, even teacher trainees might still take advantage from studying the provision of feedback. Pedagogical implications extracted to assist English language instructors to be informed of the advantages and values of the many types of corrective feedback, to effectively establish the necessary activities in the classroom, and to successfully supply the students with appropriate kind of oral corrective feedback.

---

[*] Department of English Language Teaching, Zanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran.

1. Introduction

 One of the most current discussion in language learning is corrective feedback (CF). CF means the feedback that students get on their linguistic errors whom they make in their production in a second or foreign language. Recently, both written and orlal CF have grabbed much focus due to their importance for the advancement of theories of L2 acquisition and because they have held an essential place in L2 instruction (Ellis & Sheen, 2011).

While there are many studies examining the various facets of the corrective feedback, one facet which has not received much attention, which it deserves, is the effects of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing. Understanding what the teachers and students want and what their perceptions are. This will provide essential information to the language teachers on how the problem of corrective feedback should be dealt with in the EFL instructional setting. Keeping this facet of corrective feedback in mind, the present research aims to solve this issue in the researches literature. The findings of this research can have vital implications for language learning and teaching.

Most of the recent researches have studied on the usefulness of CF on learners at the same proficiency level, intermediate level, and have not considered the likely distinctions of students' performances at varying levels as well. Hence, the current research is intended to examine not only differential results of CF on the advancement of students' correct utilization language, also the amount of the usefulness of these kinds of CF are relying on the proficiency level of students.

The function of cf in foreign language acquisition (FLA), more particularly written corrective feedback (WCF), has been specifically studied in recent years (Akiyama, 2017; Ashwell, 2000; Chandler, 2003; Ellis & Shintani, 2014; Ferris, 1999; Russell & Spada, 2006; Sheen, 2010; 2011; Truscott, 1996; 1999). As a matter of fact, formerly there has been an increase in the amount of researches directing this issue (Storch, 2010.)

As argued by Nunan (2001, p. 177), "writing a consistent, fluent, expanded work of writing is apparently a highly complex thing to do in language production and it is something the ideal speakers never become proficient". Hence, Raimes (1991) requires the necessity for further of anything for second language writer: method learning, straight teaching, aiding systems, teacher reaction, training, etc. Ordinarily, overwhelm the happening of errors relies on the way they are corrected and written feedback is an important facet of any English Language Writing program specifically with the priority of the process method to writing.

Harmer (2001, p.128) has also argued that "when a learner converses a segment of language and views how it becomes, that data is returned back into the learning process, in other words, that product turns out input". This kind of input or feedback could be proposed by the author himself, by the people who is talking to, and, specifically, by the teacher. As expressed by Hyland and Hyland (2001, p. 185), "giving written feedback to students is one of the EFL

writing teacher's most significant responsibilities, proposing the type of distinctive focus that is in other respects seldom viable under ordinary classroom situations".

To date, the results of previous studies on feedback kinds have shown some fascinating frameworks, but the incompatibility of the results makes it obvious that more investigation is required. Among diverse methods of giving written CF, more new researches (e.g. Bitchener, 2008; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Sheen, 2007; Sheen, 2009) emphasized on the effectiveness of CF on the acquisition of the grammatical structures. Notwithstanding the fact that some positive results have been accounted on the effectiveness of CF, there are researches like Ellis (2008) which did not find any difference in efficiency of CF, so there is a clear necessity to do more research in this particular domain to get uniform answers.

Since the study of the efficiencies of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing has not been explored, an investigation is needed to be done in order to fill the gap, considering the study of the efficiencies of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing on the fundamental elements of the foreign language learning. Accordingly, the aim of this study was to study the efficiencies of corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' written productions.

Research Question and Hypothesis

RQ: Does corrective feedback have any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing correctness ?

H0: Corrective feedback does not affect the correct writing of English language students.

H1: Corrective feedback has an effect on the correct writing of English-language learners.

2. Literature review

2.1 Intrduction

The issue about the fact that whether WCF has any effect on the advancement of learner's grammar returns back to the mid-90s with the publication of the well-known work called 'The case against grammar correction in second language writing classes' by Truscott (1996). In his research, the writer decreased the significance of WCF in learner's written homework because of its efficiency and unfavorable effects. Such strong case versus grammar correction originated from (1) research showing the inefficiency of correction, (2) the origin of both the correction process and language learning, (3) its detrimental result on learners' learning process and (4) debate against it. By referring to great works of the time done on WCF (Hendrickson, 1978; Knoblauch & Brannon, 1981; Hillocks, 1986; Robb,1986; Franten & Risel, 1987; Lekee; 1991; Krashen, 1992; Shepard, 1992), Truscot (1996) introduced explanations based on research for expressing that feedback on grammar had shown ineffective. Furthermore, the writer also focused on the necessities that must be accomplished in order for grammar correction to have any effect on

learners. For example, the teacher observing the occurring of the mistake, comprehending the mistake and even being able to propose a solution are among some of these necessities.

Previous studies on teachers and students' perceptions and preference on corrective feedback (Feris, 1995; Hedgcock & Leftkowitz, 1994; Komura, 1999; Leki, 1991; Roberts, 1999) have steadily shown that L2 learners actually anticipate and value teachers' corrective feedback. Some of these studies have also investigated learners' preferences for varied types of feedback. For instance, Komurra (1999) and Leki (1991) have indicated that learners desire indirect corrective feedback with error codes or definite labels to direct teachers' correction (that is, providing the student with the corrected form of the error) or errors which have been defined but not indicated.

A research done by Norouzian (2014) noticed a conflict between the thing teachers stated they do and what learners perceived. Though teachers said that they corrected all the errors on a composition, majority of the students disagree with it. Moreover, teachers ignored the utilization of error codes when giving feedback, but more than 50% of students stated they did use them. When indicating awareness of error type, teachers expressed they inform their students of the standard being utilized (grammar, punctuation and spelling among others) but 90% of students renounced this. Eventually, when teachers were inquired of about their students' advancement on grammatical correctness, more than a half of them thought they did some or good advancement. Anyway, 46% of students said they had little advancement and 37% no advancement at all.

Worth mentioning that most of the studies conducted in this field have just focused on this fact that, the conflict noticed is substantial and for sure it symbolizes, firstly, a negative view towards teachers' WCF and, secondly, a deficit of advancement of students' writing abilities as the marking is ascribed as futile.

Sattarpour (2011), explored if direct focused corrective feedback and direct unfocused corrective feedback intrigued any intriguing effects on the exact utilization of English language articles by EFL students across two different proficiency levels (low and high). The candidates were classified into low and high proficiency levels by giving a TOEFL test. Then, sixty students in each proficiency classification consisted of two experimental groups and one control group, 20 students in each group. One experimental group received focused written corrective feedback and the other experimental group received unfocused written corrective feedback.The results showed that focused group did better than both unfocused and control groups concerning correct use of English articles in both proficiency classifications .

One most important criticism of Sattarpour 's research is that, these results indicated that unfocused corrective feedback is of limited pedagogical value, but focused corrective feedback improved learnerts' grammatical correctness in L2 writing more effectively.

Sermsok, K., Lianmimitr, J., & Pockakorn, R. (2016) tried to give information on teacher corrective feedback that would be advantaageous for

EFL learners' writing improvement. It focused on feedback provided to rectify grammatical errors made by students as the writers comprehended that this type of errors might prevent the effectiveness of students' works of writing and ended in written miscommunication. Both direct and indirect teacher feedback types were studied. Some pedagogical advices had been given based upon the findings. It was expected that this work could support teachers and students in a writing class reach the goal of producing grammatically correct English writing works. It was proven that both teacher direct and indirect feedback, both in the written or oral forms were useful to the correction of EFL students' grammatical errors. Which type of feedback was the most advantageous concerning different factors, so it was upon the writing teachers to comprehend it. Additionally, the teacher feedback, another vital factor that might not be ignored was a good relationship between teachers and students. Obvious, exact and encouraging teacher feedback might fully contribute to EFL students' writing improvement. With effective techniques and perception between teachers and students, it was not away from reach for students to produce a good work of writing.

What is wrong with this study is the issue that it is a one-directional study which is focused only on the relationship of feedback from a teacher to learner and only grammar is concentrated.

Lee (2004) investigated the existing error correction works in the Hong Kong secondary writing classroom from both the teachers' and the learners' viewpoints. The analysis of the data gathered through questionnaires showed that almost all students (83%) expressed their tendency for teachers' corrective feedback. But, 68% of the learners said that, notwithstanding receiving teachers' corrective feedback, they were making the same mistakes repeatedly, and only 10% believed that they were wanted to make good advancements. In a succeeding think aloud analysis, the students said that they desired to receive corrective feedback mostly to know what kind of mistakes they had made.

Gram (2005) did a research on 33 Saudi college students' perceptions and preference on their teachers' corrective feedback. Results of the research proved that the learners had a high level of desire for getting feedback from their teachers and presumed it crucial and highly effective. In a similar way, Zacharias (2007), Lordunathan, & Menon, (2017), investigating teachers' and learners' perceptions to corrective feedback, got to this result that totally the learners find their teachers' corrective feedback vital, which, as the learners expressed, was originated from their awareness that teachers might control scores. The findings also showed that students liked teachers' corrective feedback against the other methods of error correction same as peer feedback. Eventually, the findings demonstrated that the learners considered corrective feedback on language more advantageous than corrective feedback on content and researches on teachers' corrective feedback have investigated the students' understandings to error correction methods in general, correction of grammatical errors compared to style or content, or different types of feedback. However, no study has studied foreign language learners' preferences for getting corrective feedback on specific surface-level errors such as punctuation,

spelling, adverb, etc. In fact, the majority of the corrective feedback researches have concentrated on very general and macro-level grammatical categorizations, which consist of smaller subcategorizations; for instance, word categorization includes subcategorizations same as the wrong utilization of a word, wrong pronoun, and inappropriate connector, etc.

Eventually, other researches were also done with identical results to the previously mentioned favor for: linguistic error correction (Chiang, 2004), direct correction (Diab, 2005) and correcting all errors (Diab, 2005; Lee, 2005). As can be seen, the research of students' and teachers' preferences and perceptions does not arrive to obvious results. Evidently, teachers' practices affect students' anticipations concerning error correction but not always. In most of the researches referred to, there was a conflict between the teachers' practice and students' inclinations. Due to all this, more studies are required in the domain of WCF and perceptions.

3. Methodology

3.1 Design and Context of the Study

A quasi-experimental design was used in the current research and the participants were selected through stratified random sampling. Three comparison groups were used in this research. Levy and Ellis (2011) defined quasi-experimental study as one kind of experimental design at which, though we had treatment, group comparison, and measurement of results, the extent of the researcher's control over sampling of participants was limited and the homogeneity of the groups was not as likable as possible. To homogenize the students, PET Test was used, even if the researcher attempted to define the participants randomly into each group. It should also be expressed that many efficient unrelated variables could not be perfectly controlled. On the basis of these presumptions, it could be said that there were two features going on at the same time that did not match each other. One was the important factors (like gender, age, etc.) and the other was the treatment (studying the effect of various comment kinds) that was utilized in this research. Although the design was quasi-experimental, in categorizing procedure many of these factors were taken into consideration so as to decrease the outcomes of unrelated factors.

3.2. Participants

Students in their pre-intermediate and intermediate level participated in the research. For this research, two kinds of candidates were involved: teachers and learners, so as to understand the different views of each category. The Statistical population of this research was about 4000 English language learners and 500 teachers in different foreign language institutes in Zanjan, Iran. The sample of this research were 180 male and female teachers that teach language courses in language institutes in Zanjan who were chosen through purposive sampling and 350 students who were chosen through stratified random sampling. These candidates were teachers and students who approximately aged from 16 to 31 and above; they were chosen through non-

random sample because the sampling was decided by the courses instead of the teacher as Fraenkel and Wallen (2010) expressed, non-random sample is when in the population not all the participants have the same procabality to be chosen. The technique used in non-random sample is the purposive, at which the writers said that the population was chosen by the specific goal of the study adding a personal judgment. According to this study, the prior awareness of the candidates to be chosen within the institute determined that method.

Morgan's sample size table was used to determine the size of our sample. The current research included a group of pre-intermediate and intermediate students from an undergraduate English Language Teaching program (ELT) who were homogenized and selected based on PET test. Among whom, the marks of 350 learners were located one standard deviation below and above the mean (+/-1 SD), and as a result, were considered to be almost at the same writing level. These students were considered as the participants of this research. All student participants were EFL students with almost the same knowledge and their ages ranged from 16 to 30 and above. The objective sample was composed by the whole group of each candidate, where their interventions were utilized for getting the data to satisfy the observation grids. However, The candidates were chosen through stratified random sampling.

Table 1.
Age * level * Sex Cross tabulation Count

Sex			level Pre-intermediate	Intermediate	Total
Male	Age	16 - 20	18	12	30
		21-25	34	26	60
		26-30	12	6	18
		more than 30	6	6	12
	Total		70	50	120
Female	Age	16 - 20	65	23	88
		21-25	58	39	97
		26-30	21	6	27
		more than 30	12	6	18
	Total		156	74	230
Total	Age	16 - 20	83	35	118
		21-25	92	65	157
		26-30	33	12	45
		more than 30	18	12	30
	Total		226	124	350

To test the above hypothesis we used the comparison of the theoretical mean with the experimental mean. First, we considered the assumption of the normality of the sample using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.
To test this hypothesis, we used a one-sample parametric T test.
The hypotheses concerning the comparison of experimental and theoretical means can be written as follows:
H0: The mean is smaller or equal to 3. (Corrective feedback does not affect the correct writing of English language students.)

H1: The mean is opposite to number 3. (Corrective feedback has an effect on the correct writing of English-language students.)

Or:

$$\begin{cases} H_0: \mu = 3 \\ H_1: \mu \neq 3 \end{cases}$$

3.3. Instrument(s)

Three instruments were used in this research. PET Test, as a known standardized language proficiency test, was the first instrument utilized at the beginning of the research to control the homogeneity of their writing proficiency level. The next instrument for data collection was a questionnaire used by Fukuda (2004) and the next one was Hamouda (2011). The questionnaire included 7 different closed-questions together. Item 1 questioned the favor of instruments to give correction, either pencil or red pen. Item 2 was concerned with the concentration of mistakes (all, some or none).

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

This research was performed during the class time in the second semester of the year (2017). The questionnaire and the PET were distributed among the candidates by the researcher. The candidates were given 35-minute time to finish answering the questionnaire, and they were come with some comments. They were informed that the data would be utilized for research purposes and they were made certain that they would be kept fully confidential. The present research aimed at investigating whether direct/indirect corrective feedback resulted in any differential effects on the correct utilization of English language by EFL learners across two different proficiency levels and also studied on the students and teachers' beliefs and perceptions towards different facets of language and different kinds of feedback. In current study, the candidates were homogenized and divided into pre-intermediate and intermediate proficiency levels by giving a PET test. This led to formation of two proficiency levels, 226 participants in pre-intermediate level, and 124 participants in intermediate level, totaling 350 participants. Then, both proficiency levels were classified into three groups, two experimental groups and one control group. The first experimental group was given direct corrective feedback; the next experimental group was given indirect corrective feedback, while the third one, as a control group, received no feedback.

The questionnaires were initially administered for piloting purposes to thirty students from English classes and two teachers who taught English to these thirty students. This preliminary testing of the questionnaires highlighted some ambiguities in certain questions that were rectified before the questionnaires were administered to participants in the actual research. All the candidates, teachers and learners, in the pilot study were said to finish the questionnaire in not more than thirty-five minutes. Participants were observed while completing the questionnaires and were requested to indicate any difficulties they encountered, such as items that were unclear or difficult to answer. Not all participants finished completing the entire questionnaire in the given time.

As a result of the pilot exercise, Also, three items – mechanics, concord, and style and register – were simplified since some learners had difficulties comprehending them. After the candidates in the piloting exercise had finished completing the questionnaires, the researcher held a discussion with them to elicit verbal feedback about the questionnaires   .

Before the participants started completing the questionnaire, the researcher elaborated the goal and the potential utility of the study and made it obvious that the questionnaire was not a test. The researcher assured the candidates that their answers were utilized for research objectives only. Before signing the consent form, the participants were made aware that their participation is not obligatory and the study was anonymous. All candidates were given an opportunity to read the consent form, and once they were satisfied and understood the content, they were requested to sign it.

Ultimately, the researcher emphasized the importance of giving honest answers, and after all the explanations and clarifications, participants were assured of confidentiality and of the potential usefulness of the data. After collecting the consent forms from the participants, the researcher distributed the questionnaire for completion .

The researcher of the present study delivered the questionnaires personally to the respondents in order to ensure a high response rate and proper completion. For the student participants, questionnaires were distributed in person at the institution and were done at the time of distribution. Learner candidates finished the questionnaire outside of planned class time during a lunch hour or at a time they found suitable, in order to complete the questionnaire under the supervision of the researcher. The researcher encouraged student participants to attend to all questions.

In order to prevent cross-contamination of opinions, student participants were allowed to consult with one another while completing the questionnaire. Teacher candidated finished the questionnaires outside of their work time. This was done due to the fact that it was impossible to get all the teachers together and complete the questionnaire at the same time. Teachers were given abundant time as well, but because they completed the questionnaire at different places during their own free time, the researcher could not monitor the process and record the time each of them used. However, when the researcher asked the teachers to indicate the total time they spent to complete the questionnaire none of them indicated that they had taken more than 35 minutes. The researcher delivered the questionnaire to teachers in their offices. When the teachers finished completing the questionnaire, the researcher either collected it in person or the teacher brought the questionnaire back to the researcher. All the questionnaires given to teachers were returned. However, unlike in the student participants' questionnaires, some questions in some of the teacher participants' questionnaires were not completely answered. This demonstrated that the presence of the researcher during the completion of questionnaires played an important role in order to obtain all the necessary information from the respondents.

3.5. Data analysis Procedure

The questionnaires were distributed between the second and third week of May, 2017. All candidates completed the instrument for data collection during their planned English lessons. Concerning the teachers, they took more time to perfect the questionnaire because of their tasks.

When the questionnaires were finished, we counted the whole number of cases in which candidates either agreed or did not agree which each of the statements given for the different questions .

To analyze the data collected from these participants, SPSS version 23 software was used. First of all, in order to get certain on the reliability of the marks, the candidates' written productions were submitted to two raters to be scored (i.e., inter-rater reliability). Then, the Cronbach alpha was executed .

Afterwards, Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were conducted so as to control the distribution of the data for normality, and to see whether the assumptions required for parametric tests were met. In each question, there were one independent variable and one dependent variable. Therefore, in order to answer the questions, four independent sample t-tests (one for each question) were run.

4. Results

Does corrective feedback have any significant effect on Iranian EFL students' writing correctness? In order to test the above hypothesis we used the comparison of the theoretical mean with the experimental mean. First, we considered the assumption of the normality of the sample using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

The results of the above test were given in the following tables:

Table 1.
The normality test table of variables

variables	sig	Decision making	Test result
Scores in the student group	2.0	Null hypothesis is accepted	Distribution is normal
Scores in Teachers Group	2.0	Null hypothesis is accepted	Distribution is normal

Given the Sig values obtained in the above table, which are more than 0.05, the null hypothesis is assumed to be the normality of the discussed variable at the significant level of 0.05.

Therefore, to test this hypothesis, we will use a one-sample parametric T test.

The hypotheses concerning the comparison of experimental and theoretical means can be written as follows:

H0: The mean is smaller or equal to 3. (Corrective feedback does not affect the correct writing of English language students.)

H1: The mean is opposite to number 3. (Corrective feedback has an effect on the correct writing of English-language learners.)

Or:

$$\begin{cases} H_0 : \mu = 3 \\ H_1 : \mu \neq 3 \end{cases}$$

.

The calculation results are recorded in the following table:

Table 2.
One-Sample Statistics

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Students	Q	350	3.2282	.34160	.01826
Teachers	Q	180	2.9799	.26065	.01943

As seen in the table above, the mean in the student group was higher than that of teachers.

Table 3.
One-Sample Test

				Test Value = 3			
					Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
roup		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Difference	Lower	Upper
Students	Q	12.499	349	.000	.22821	.1923	.2641
Teachers	Q	-1.037	179	.301	-.02014	-.0585	.0182

Based on the values in the above table, especially the Sig value in the student group was less than 5%, the null hypothesis at a significant level of 5% is rejected. i.e., the mean of the sample had a significant difference with mean 3 (Theoretical mean). As the mean of the sample was 3.03 higher than 3, then the hypothesis that the mean sample was higher than the theoretical mean, is accepted. In terms of students, corrective feedback affected the correct writing of English language students.

While in the teacher group, the Sig value was more than 5%, the null hypothesis was not rejected at a significant level of 5%. That is, the mean sample did not have a significant difference with the value of 3(theoretical mean). i.e., corrective feedback did not affect the correct writing of English language students.

In the table below, the results of the independent T test were recorded to compare the mean scores between the two groups of teachers and students, which, given the Sig value, which was less than 5%, assumes the mean equality in the group was rejected.

In terms of perceptions about the effect of corrective feedback on the correct writing of English language students, there was a significant difference between the group of students and teachers.

Table 4.
Independent Samples Test

t-test for Equality of Means

		+	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	(2-Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper
Q	Equal variances assumed	8.556	528	.000	.24835	.19133	.30538
	Equal variances not assumed	9.315	453.430	.000	.24835	.19596	.30075

5. Discussion

Corrective feedback has most often been considered popular in English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts and its efficiencies in language acquisition has been highly questioned. An increasing number of foreign language learning researches indicate that there is a dilema in the efficiency of corrective feedback in terms of EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions and preferences. It was the goal of this research question to investigate the perceptions and preferences of teachers and learners on corrective feedback in learning English as a foreign language. The results of the research demonstrated that the teachers and learners seemed to have roughly the same views on corrective feedback. However, the teachers and learners had one contrasting viewpoint that is about error correction: the teachers did not seem to prefer correction all the time, but the learners did. Additionally, the findings demonstrated that while the teachers did not favor corrective feedback, the learners preferred corrective feedback. Language teachers were obliged to know what their learners needed in corrective feedback and to provide a common understanding with their learners for adding to the efficiency of corrective feedback.

As the findings based on Fukuda questionnaire showed, the mean of students (3.2282) towards the effectiveness degree of corrective feedback was higher than that of teachers (2.9799). It can be inferred that teachers had a negative view towards the effectiveness of corrective feedback in contrast with that of the learners who had a positive opinion on its effectiveness. The reason for this difference was the fact that teachers had many different methods and techniques for teaching away from corrective feedback and they thought that the responsibility of teaching and learning was not just on their shoulders compared to the views of students who thought that the responsibility of teaching and learning was upon their teachers shoulders.

While there were many studies examining the various aspects of the corrective feedback, one aspect which had not received much attention, which it deserved, was the teachers' and learners' preferences and perceptions of corrective feedback. Understanding what the teachers and students wanted and what their perceptions were. This research provided essential information to the language teachers on how the problem of corrective feedback should be dealt with in the EFL instructional setting. Keeping this aspect of corrective feedback in mind the present research aimed to fill this distance in the

researches literature. The findings of this research might have crucial implications for language learning and teaching.

Concerning the general results of written CF away from its specific type, the results of this study were in agreement with the study of Bitchener and Knoch (2011b) who found that advanced L2 authors were able to make more gains in correctness because of targeted written CF. In this regard, the findings of their study informed us that there was potentiality for written CF to be effective in targeting specific types of errors made by L2 authors as well, even when their existing levels of correctness were very high, and that these might be targeted successfully with one feedback treatment.

The results of the existing research supported Feris and Roberts (2001) Zhang, (2017), who stated that there were no significant differences among the effects of corrective feedback kinds on the students' writing correctness. In this research, this was verified concerning both grammatical and lexical writing correctness. Additionally, much like the results of Feris and Roberts, this research showed that corrective feedback kinds were more efficient than the no corrective feedback state .

However, the students' preferences towards the various corrective feedback kinds in this research did not correspond to those of Feris and Roberts' research. Unlike their research, in which only 48% of the candidates preferred the feedback kind, there was a significant desire for the same kind of feedback here. In addition, Bitchener and Knoch (2009a) found evidence showing that all types of corrective feedback were more efficient than the control condition on students' grammatical correctness. While this research perfectly supported such a result in regard with correctness. In this research, 'direct' feedback kinds turned out to be more efficient than the no corrective feedback kind.

Concerning the findings from the above research question, some implications can be suggested:

Consider the setting. Before you decide error correction practices for your classrooms, you should consider the context in which learner language use and errors take place. As immersion teachers are well informed, learners in the preliminary stages of cognitive development and language learning need to be motivated to produce language that transfers meaning; error correction methods that require learner concentration on language rules or vocabulary are not suitable for students in those early stages. The kinds of corrective feedback methods that elicit learner-generated corrections are obviously more suitable for the more cognitively mature and EFL proficient students.

Practice different feedback methods. Good teachers know that one size does not fit all. Individual students may well differ in terms of the specific error correction method most suitable for their unique language enhancement needs. Selecting to learn and utilize a few different kinds of feedback that seem to provide learner-generated corrections fosters your possibility of reaching more learners.

This research is subject to some limitations: the first one to be stated is the absence of time to do the research. Although the research was cross-sectional, it might have benefited more of a longitudinal research observing the

development of such preferences along time. Although the number of participants is considerable enough for a pilot study, a larger number would have helped for the provision of more support to the results, specifically in the case of teacher in which only few participated in the research.

Concerning the methodology used, the use of a quantitative method as the questionnaire shows limits the research to just numbers and graphics. As preferences were under analysis, a qualitative method such as interview or diaries would have been of benefit.

6. Conclusion

Several facets were analyzed during the research and many conclusions can be drawn. First of all, taking into consideration students' views on WCF represents can give useful perceptions of a practice that, to my knowledge, is often ignored. The giving of feedback in all their forms (oral or written) may lead the student through a process of self-discovery and learning. From the other point of view, feedback can also stop students from acquiring and internalizing the target language. Hence, it is a vital matter the treatment of such practice with the sensitivity and relevance it deserves. Facets such as individual differences, preferences, beliefs and perceptions have an effect and are worth of future studies.

As stated before, this research should be presumed as the first step to a larger research on the role played by WCF in a classroom context. Up to this time, most of the researches done on WCF concentrated on its efficiency concerning language learning. Furthermore, control and experimental groups were used creating non-naturalistic contexts for research. It is our belief that the authentic WCF used in real classrooms is worth of research as it is in such settings where real language teaching and learning occurs. Future research should take into account facets such as anxiety aroused by the giving of WCF or beliefs and attitudes which may stop students from functioning at their full capacity.

The main goal of this research was observing students' preferences concerning WCF in facets concerned with methods used, handling feedback and feelings. In addition, this research began to investigate the link existing between students and teachers when it comes to giving of WCF. As it was elaborated throughout the research, teachers' perception about their students does not agree with what students want from their teachers. In most instances, teachers do not appreciate methods, desires and even ways of handling learners' written output. This absence of harmony may affect the learning process and WCF may not function at its best. In my opinion, teachers must assess students' expectations concerning WCF as knowing preferences can be advantageous for both groups.

A fascinating fact is students' desire to be directly corrected and especially on language and lexical facets. This indicates how traditional views of the language are still present in present classrooms as students consider knowledge of the grammar and vocabulary as knowing the language. Concerning their preference for direct correction, it may be explained as the continuous idea that

the teacher is a symbol of wisdom and that students are empty vessels that should be filled. Not encouraging self-correction and other methods has led to think that all the work is to be done by teachers.

The research question was concerned with investigating, if corrective feedback had any significant effect on Iranian EFL learners' writing correctness. The findings which were extracted from Fukuda questionnaire from two different perspectives, i.e. teachers and students, showed that students believed that it was effective but from the teachers view, it was not effective and the findings indicated that there was a significant difference among their views.

Eventually, it was seen that teachers know the theory and are informed of the benefits gained from, say, indirect feedback. But, their practice differs highly from what they have expressed in the questionnaire. One reason to explain this is may be the constraints they find in their daily school routine in which, for instance, time is an issue.

References

Akiyama, Y. (2017). Learner beliefs and corrective feedback in telecollaboration: A longitudinal investigation. *System*, *64*, 58-73.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.007

Ashwell, T. (2000). *Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom*: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? Journal of Second language Writing, 9(3) 227–57. DOI: 10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). *The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing*. Journal of second language writing, 14(3), 191-205. DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001

Bitchener, J. (2008). *Evidence in support of written corrective feedback*. Journal of Second Language Writing, 17(2) 102–18. DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2015). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development (96). Multilingual Matters*. DOI: 10.1002/tesq.62

Chandler, J. (2003). *The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing*, (3)12 96-267. DOI: 10.2307/3586012

Chiang, K. K. (2004). *An investigation into students' preferences for and responses to teacher feedback and its implication for writing teachers*. Hong Kong Teachers' Centre Journal, 3 98–115.

Diab, R. L. (2005). *EFL university students' preference for error correction and teacher feedback on writing*. TESL Reporter, 38(1) 27–51.

Diab, R. L. (2006). *Error correction and feedback in the EFL writing classroom*: *Comparing instruction and student preferences*. English Teaching Forum, 3: 2–14.

Ellis, R. & Shintani, N. (2014). *Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research*. London: Routledge. DOI: 10.1002/tesq.214

Ellis, R. (2009). *A typology of written corrective feedback types*. ELT Journal, 63(2) 97–107. DOI: 10.1093/elt/ccn023

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M. & Takashima, H. (2008). *The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context*. System, 36(3) 353–71. DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001

Ferris, D. (1995). *Can advanced ESL students be taught to correct their errors?* CATESTOL Journal, 8, 41-62.

Ferris, D. (1999). *The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott (1996).* Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1) l–l1. 10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. DOI: 10.3998/mpub.2173290

Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). *Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?* Journal of Second Laguage Writing. 10(3) 556–569. DOI: 10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X

Frantzen, D. & Rissel, D. (1987). *Learner self-correction of written compositions: What does it show us? In VanPattern B., Dvorak, T.R. & Lee, J. F. (Eds), Foreign Language Learning: A Research Perspective (92–107).* Cambridge: Newbury House. GARCÍA MAYO M. P. & Alcón, E. (2014). Negotiated input and output/interaction. In Herschensohm, J. and Young-Scholten, M. (Eds.), The Cambridge handbook of second language acquisition (209–29). Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Hamouda, A. (2011). *A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards: Correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context*. English Language Teaching, 4(3) 128–41. DOI: 10.5539/elt.v4n3p128

Harmer, J. (2001). *Mistakes and feedback. The Practice of English Language Teaching. Essex, UK:* Pearson Education.

Hedgcock, J. and Lefkowitz, N. (1995). *Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity in second language*

writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 141-163. DOI: 10.1016/1060-3743(94)90012-4

Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). *The treatment of error in written work.* The Modern Language Journal, 64(2) 216–21. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1980.tb05188.x

Hillocks, G. JR. (1986). *Research on Written Composition: New Directions for Teaching.*

Komura, k. (1999). *Student response to error correction in ESL classroom.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, Sacramento, California State University.

Knoblauch, C. H. & BRANNON, L. (1981). *Teacher commentary on students writing: The state of the art.* Freshman English News, 10(2) 1–4.

Krashen, S. D. (1992). *Comprehensible input and some competing hypotheses.* In Courchêne, R., Glodden, J. I., St. John, J. & Therien, C. (Eds.), Comprehension based Second Language Teaching (19–38). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Lee, I. (1997). *ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching.* System, 25(4), 465-477. DOI: 10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00045-6

Lee, I. (2004). *Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong.*

Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(4) 285–312. DOI: 10.1016/j.jslw.2004.08.001

Lee, I. (2005). *Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think?* TESL Canada Journal, 22(2) 1–16. DOI: 10.18806/tesl.v22i2.84

Lee, I. (2013). *Research into practice: Written corrective feedback.* Language Teaching, 46(1), 108. doi:10.1017/S0261444812000390

Leki, I. (1991). *The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes.* Foreign Language Annals, 24(3) 203–18. DOI: 10.1111/j.1944-9720.1991.tb00464.x

Lourdunathan, J., &Menon, S. (2017). Developing speaking skills through interaction strategy training. The English Teacher, 34, 1-18.

Norouzian, R. (2012). *Written error feedback from perception to practice: A feedback on feedback.* Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(1) 11–22. doi:10.4304/jltr.3.1.11-22

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology.* Hemel Hemstead Herts: Prentice Hall.

Robb, T., Ross, S. & Shortreed, I. (1986). *Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality*. TESOL Quarterly, 20(1) 83–95. DOI: 10.2307/3586390

Russell , J., & SPADA, N. (2006). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research*. In Norris, J. M. & Ortega, L. (Eds.), Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching (133–64). Amsterdam: Benjamins. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., & Pochakorn, R. (2016). *The Impact of Teacher Corrective Feedback on EFL Student Writers' Grammatical Improvement*. English Language Teaching, 10(10), 43. DOI: 10.5539/elt.v10n10p43

Sheen , Y., Wright, D. & Moldawa, A. (2009). *Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners*. System, 37(4) 556–69. DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002

Sheen, Y. (2010). *The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA. Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2) 169–79. DOI: 10.1017/S0272263109990489

Sheen, Y. (2011). *Corrective Feedback, Individual Differences and Second Language Learning*. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2013.07.003

Sheppard, K. (1992). *Two feedback types: Do they make a difference?* RELC Journal, 23(1) 10-103. DOI: 10.1177/003368829202300107

Storch, N. (2009). *Comparing type of feedback and processing mode: Pair versus individual processing of feedback on writing*. Paper delivered at the Second Language Writing Symposium, Phoenix, Arizona, November.

Storch, N. (2010). *Critical feedback on written corrective feedback research*. International Journal of English Studies, 10(2) 29–46.

Truscott, J. (1997). Review article: *The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning*, 46(2) 327–69. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x

Truscott, J. (1999). *The case of "the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris*. Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(2) 111–22. DOI: 10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Zacharias, N. T. (2006). *Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback*. RELC journal, 38(1), 38-52. DOI: 10.1177/0033688206076157

Zhang, X. (2017). Reading–writing integrated tasks, comprehensive corrective feedback, and EFL writing development. *Language Teaching Research*, *21*(2), 217-240.