

# A Qualitative study of the Effectiveness of Different Kinds of Written Corrective Feedback from EFL Teachers' perspectives in Iran

<sup>1</sup>Victoria Sayad Deghatkar, <sup>\*2</sup>Mohammad Reza Khodareza, <sup>3</sup>Valeh Valipour

<sup>1</sup>Department of English language, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran, [victoriadeghatkar@yahoo.com](mailto:victoriadeghatkar@yahoo.com)

<sup>\*2</sup>Department of English language, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran, [m.khodareza@toniau.ac.ir](mailto:m.khodareza@toniau.ac.ir) (Corresponding Author)

<sup>3</sup>Department of English language, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran, [v\\_valipor@toniau.ac.ir](mailto:v_valipor@toniau.ac.ir)

## Abstract

The research presented in this paper has sought to discover the type of feedback EFL teachers believe results in the greatest amount of learner uptake in current and future writing tasks. Data from eight face-to-face interviews with EFL teachers at Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research (ACECR)- Guilan Branch experienced in teaching at different language proficiency levels have been analyzed and compared in an effort to discover the type of feedback EFL teachers believe help learners in developing various writing skills. Interview questions were applied to discern a difference between direct and indirect corrective feedback and how EFL teachers implemented these different kinds of written corrective feedback in classroom practice. Participants from this study supported the incorporation of a combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback methods recently known as dynamic corrective feedback when assessing foreign language writers. They emphasized the importance of giving ends to each writing task obviously explaining essential requirements, and representing a timeline for completion of innovative steps for the assignment. All eight of the participants reported that they offered corrective feedback to learners. They believed that when learners realized why an error was marked, they were more able to incorporate the feedback into current and future writing tasks, thus becoming writers that are more proficient.

**Keywords:** corrective feedback, indirect feedback, direct feedback.

## INTRODUCTION

EFL students participate in English lessons to including a lack of motivation to write and an improve their various language skills inability to learn how to write assignments. For academically. Switching from speaking English an EFL student to improve the target language to writing with some precision has proven to be writing skills, Jiang and Yu (2014) found that a challenge for language learners. Chen, Karger the ability to achieve "professional and and Smith (2017) describe the sense of urgency academic success in all disciplines depends, at in helping foreign language learners in least in part, on writing skills" (p. 35). Studies improving their writing skill, stating," the by Chen et al. (2017)

in the workplace to come up"(p.29). He also explained the deficits faced by EFL writers,

have shown that EFL ability to write in English is essential for students develop speaking, listening, and academic performance and career development reading skills more easily. In the same way, EFL instructors struggle to know which language errors should be corrected and how many corrections must be noted before student motivation decreases. Instructors use a variety of direct and indirect corrective feedback methods and, more recently, the integration of the two, known as dynamic corrective feedback, in accordance with their belief in the type of corrective feedback that keeps students more competent in the current and future writing assignments.

EFL students also experience an inability to independently detect errors or a lack of understanding of why the error was marked. Lu, Wang and Yin (2009) stated: "the main difficulty in correcting students' mistakes is their inability to identify their mistakes" (p. 128). Other studies by Hung and Young (2015) describe EFL students' writing problems as a result of a lack of language skills. Their research showed that students focused heavily on technology resources such as the Internet, word processing applications, and file sharing with peers and teachers. Most of the time understandability seemed to be more important than grammatical or content errors made by English language students in their written tasks. The teachers updated various techniques, modeled the correct writing styles for their class, and led them as a writing group and, as a goal, assigning students to write independently. Students have been learned different types of revising tasks such as selfediting, technological review, peer review or teacher conferencing in the early stages of writing. They have also implemented a rewriting component so students have the opportunity to improve their grade.

As EFL learners assimilate the parallel use of English grammar with similarities to their native language, language educators aim to equip students with the appropriate vocabulary, grammar, and procedural instructions to current and future writing tasks. Due to the constant use of educational technology as a useful writing tool, academic writing has not advanced in competency and fluency, as Chen et al. (2017). This trend has attracted the attention of researchers as they have studied the causes of weakness in the field of writing skill. Ferris,

Brown, Liu, Eugenia, and Stine (2011) noted that there is an increasing number of EFL students enrolled in academic writing courses. According to Lo et al. (2009) writing is an essential skill for professional and personal use, which can be developed for usual or academic purposes.

## Literature Review

Truscott (1996) championed a controversial idea that suggested that language instructors ought to prevent grammar correction because it does not considerably provide noticeable improvements in future writing tasks. Truscott (1996) powerfully declared, "grammar correction has no place in writing courses and ought to be discarded" (p. 328). His article entitled *The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes* rocked the beliefs and practices of second language instructors. He reasoned that grammar correction demotivated L2 writers and decreased their self-confidence. It also failed to offer long-term learner uptake on future writing tasks as a result learners might not perceive the reasoning behind the errors or the way to correct them.

Furthermore, he deduced that the dearth of effectiveness is strictly what ought to be expected thanks to instructors' time constraints and also the different abilities of language teachers in 'detecting and correcting' grammatical errors, a phrase coined by Jiang and Yu (2014). He believed that students would, with more attempt and practice, eventually discover these errors and self-correct while not receive help.

An argument ensued, spear headed by Ferris (1999), once she published a response to Truscott's rejection of corrective feedback within the *Journal of Second Language*

Writing. She, along with but not restricted to, Brown (2012) and Lambert (2015), explained the long and exhausting task of correcting written assignments. Although she needed to consider Truscott's (1996) statement concerning preventing grammatical correction, she declared that his conclusions were "premature and excessively strong" (p. 2). She rebutted his arguments by mentioning two main weaknesses

together with his assertion, "The problem of definition and also the problem of support" (p. 3). Ferris (1999) discovered that Truscott (1996) broad-brushed his definition of grammatical correction by not processing specifically what sorts of errors to focus or what standard would be applied to verify accuracy. Moreover, she described effective grammatical correction as "selective, prioritized and clear" (p. 4), which, she believed, has helped some L2 learners in writing tasks. Finally, Ferris (1999) accused Truscott (1996) of inappropriately performing research without involving a control group and of exaggerating the results of his investigation by dismissing data that contradicted his hypothesis.

Ferris (1999), on the opposite hand, supported the combination of corrective feedback by noting that although feedback varies from teacher to teacher, it alerted students to content, structural or grammatical errors. In her defense, Ferris (1999) in agreement with Truscott's (1996) statement stated, "there is a few reason to assume that grammar, morphological and lexical information are acquired differently. If this is the case, then probably no single form of correction can be effective for all three categories" (p. 343). As a language teacher, Ferris (1999) believed in helping students to "identify and correct patterns

Therefore, he opposed the idea that grammatical correction reduced errors in future written tasks.

Finally, Truscott (1999) questioned Ferris' (1999) strategy of helping students for selfediting. He argued that Ferris (1999) created no distinction between grammar correction and strategy training; so, students would not have enough data to make acceptable corrections. He believed that more contextual researches are needed to prove that grammatical correction would aid EFL learners.

## Method

### Participants

The researcher conducted eight face-to-face, interviews with EFL teachers in English language department of Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research, (ACECR) - Guilan Branch. All Eight interviews were audio recorded and stored. The interviewees were full-time teachers teaching different levels of language proficiency; including three teachers teaching elementary level learners (all females), three teachers teaching intermediate level learners (one male and two females), and two

Table1 *Teacher Overview*

Teacher	Gender	Education	Level Taught	Experience
A	F	BA	Elementary	3
B	F	BA	Elementary	5

of frequent and heavy errors" (p. 5) and later on provided them with specific instruction concerning the foundations and reasoning for correcting the patterns of errors. This technique reflected the mentioned system model wherever instructors controlled students towards independence by modeling correct writing formats and focusing on skills, they need for writing. Truscott (1999) refuted Ferris'(1999) argumentation, he mentioned that because students expect to receive correction, does not mean it ought to be. In his writing classes, he found that the grammar correction failed to remove frustration, lack of motivation or confidence in his students, instead he believed learners were inspired to experience advanced ways of learning writing, instead of simplifying.

teachers teaching advanced level learners (one male and one female). Six of the participants had an MA degree in TEFL, while the other two had BA degree in English language and literature. The participants had 3 to 10 years of teaching experience. Table1 describes this data.

### Research Questions

Questions in the interviews centered on what form(s), if any, of written corrective feedback, teachers believe aided learners on written tasks. The research examined what type of corrective feedback teachers have implemented and believed as beneficial in improving current and future written tasks. It provided insight into some

Victoria Savad Degharkar	C	F	MA	Elementary	5	7014
	D	F	MA	Intermediate	7	
	E	M	MA	Intermediate	8	
	F	F	MA	Intermediate	8	
	G	M	MA	Advanced	10	
	H	F	MA	Advanced	10	
	Totals	2 Male, 8 Female	2 BA, 6 MA		Mean=7.0 years, Standard Deviation=2.50 yrs	

common challenges and successes EFL teachers have encountered when instructing foreign language learners in the writing process. Focusing on this purpose leads to the following research questions:

1. Which method(s) of written corrective feedback do teachers believe strengthens foreign language writing tasks?
2. Do teachers announce that students apply different types of written corrective feedback into future writing tasks?

#### Research Instruments

The interview involves two main sections. The first 9 questions labeled General Questions, found in Appendix A, focused on gaining key information about the respondent's background. The second section of the interview was involved with open-ended questions that sought to gain exact information that could answer the two research questions. Q1-Q4 focused on teachers' beliefs about suggesting corrective feedback and Q5-Q12 were about how teachers apply corrective feedback and how that corrective feedback affects students' future writing tasks. The questionnaire, became a model after Spradley's (1979) guidelines, used to emerge information by asking a various range of question types. Descriptive questions (Q5, 6, 7, and 8), as explained by Spradley (1979), focused on eliciting examples through experiences on how teachers evaluate written tasks (p.88). Structure questions (Q1, 3, 4, 9 and 10), according to Spradley (1979), determine how teachers set the foundation for developing good writers and what other sorts of corrective feedback they used in assessment (p. 129). Contrasting questions (Spradley, 1979) (Q2 and 11) asked teachers to compare and contrast elementary level writers with intermediate and advanced level writers and whether they believed in offering any kind of feedback (p.161). Finally, Q12 is a rating question (Spradley, 1979) that determine what type of

feedback teachers believe improves writing tasks (p. 170).

#### Research Procedure

After receiving approval from the Education Office of Rasht, we began contacting EFL teachers in ACECR. Names were collected from ACECR English language department and initial contact was made. Upon receiving a response from an instructor, time and meeting place of their preference was agreed up on. All interviews took place at ACECR English language department where each person worked; a copy of the interview questions and a consent form were emailed to the prospective informant prior to each meeting. The researcher arrived at each site promptly in order to facilitate necessary check-in procedures when the interview took place during work hours.

Participants received an explanation regarding the interview process, were asked to sign the consent form and for permission to audio record the interview for future reference.

After explaining the procedure and the expectation of both the researcher and the teacher, interviews began promptly.

The interviews were recorded using a smartphone recorder application and the vocal input was transcribed into written text. The recordings were listened again to ensure the accuracy of the written transcript. Subsequent to the interviews, a transcription of the interaction was mailed to each participant. To accurately report what teachers believe about written corrective feedback, the researcher asked clarification questions during the interviews and asked respondents to elucidate unclear concepts or ideas upon mailing the transcript to each participant.

#### Data Analysis

Information were analyzed qualitatively. The thirteen questions planned by the researcher focused on seeking information about the sort of

feedback EFL teachers believe aids foreign language learners. In an effort to protect the teacher's privacy, data were coded by assigning a letter to every one, Teacher A, Teacher B and etc. Q1-4 used to gain background information with respect to how teachers plan the stage to motivate EFL students to express themselves in writing tasks; Q5-9, 12 and 13 focused on answering research question 1; while Q10 and 11 applied in answering research question 2. Examples used in this research protected the privacy of teachers and students by not disclosing names or locations of reported occurrences. The analysis was solely based upon data recorded in the transcripts and clarification responses that were returned. In analyzing data, the researcher examined each question individually.

Teacher's answers were tallied to discover significant, recurring terms. Repeated words or phrases across these levels directed attention towards a theme, which was subsequently analyzed and compared. In Q12, data were tallied in Table 2 regarding teacher responses to which type of feedback they believe results in the greatest amount of learning. Tables were not deemed as necessary for the other questions. The final question, Q13, asked informants if there was anything they wanted to say about written corrective feedback. Three of the eight teachers had no more information to share. The others five teachers reiterated what they felt were the essential aspects of corrective feedback.

## Results

This section will describe for the reader the type of feedback these eight teachers incorporated into classroom practice as a means for strengthening writing tasks. Data from interview questions 5-9, 12, and 13 has been used to answer RQ1 about which method(s) of corrective feedback teachers believe strengthens second language writing tasks. Throughout this research, teachers reported using direct written feedback, indirect written feedback or a combination of direct and indirect feedback known as dynamic feedback when evaluating written tasks. They articulated specific methods of feedback depending on student's age and

competency. Overall, teachers expressed that they made a great effort in getting to know their students' styles and strategies. They emphasized the importance of articulating a specific goal for each writing task that focused on developing a specific skill and making sure that students have a clear understanding of the necessary expectations. They also stressed the importance of modeling good writing for students.

Responses to RQ2 regarding whether teachers report that students incorporate written corrective feedback in future writing tasks will be found in questions 10 and 11. Teacher C described that the arduous task of crafting concise feedback that aids writers and watching them walk out the door and throw graded assignment into the recycle bin, led him to incorporate techniques like rewriting to improve a grade. The teacher implemented the completion of a feedback reflection as an aid in student uptake. Individual conferencing with students has the potential to produce the greatest amount of student uptake, Teachers B, E and G expressed the challenge of time constraints to carry out this task.

Question1: What kind of training have you received in regards to giving feedback on EFL writing tasks? How has that training influenced your feedback strategy?

Six of the eight informants reported having had formal EFL training. Teacher F mentioned receiving intentional reading training in his master's study, but writing training had come through observation in an EFL room or by trial/error. Teachers also had received specific training or teacher training workshops while working as teacher in ACECR. Teacher H had a background in teaching English Literature, but as an EFL instructor, she based her teaching on what ACECR English language department expected. Teacher E emphasized, "The kind of feedback you give on writing is completely driven by what your instructional goal is." Both she and Teacher H discussed the importance of training learners to engage metacognitive processing where they see themselves both as readers and as writers. This practice increases awareness of what they are doing and why. Teachers also discussed implementing feedback training in classroom practice. Regarding bilingual language assessment, Teacher B

emphasized the importance of looking at learner's abilities than the deficits." Another idea, as proposed by Teacher D, discussed "making the feedback specific, as immediate as possible, so students learn from it right away and they know exactly what they need to do to correct it and make their work better."

Question 2: Compare and contrast differences between EFL writers with different levels of language proficiency.

All the respondents agreed that EFL writers from different levels of language proficiency have similar and different writing problems. Intermediate and advanced level learners have more vocabulary, confidence, and they write as if they talk which is not in academic English with poor grammar, too many colloquial collocations and a low percentage of academic words. Elementary learners also struggle with grammar, word endings and sentence structure. When elementary learners write like a book, it works; while when they talk like a book, it appears awkward.

Question 3: Could you describe what kind of assignment (Inter-sentential, dialogue journal, or essay) you might give as a first writing assignment for an EFL writing Class?

Teachers reported that a first writing assignment usually included writing about something EFL learners had words for and could describe something familiar within their background knowledge: Yalda night or Nowruz festival. Teacher A talked about using "real life tasks" students would see again, like comparison and contrast. Teacher B displayed a picture of a scene with emotion so students could "visualize real situations" and begin to express their feelings with words. Using the scaffolding method, Teacher C would brainstorm a topic with learners and describe for them how to write the beginning, middle and end of a story. Teacher D favored the use of dialogue journals where students could free write or compose ideas from writing prompt. Teacher E alternated between free writing and formal writing. Teacher F stressed the importance of writing every day in class, but a first assignment focused on something familiar, something students had words to describe. Teacher G gave students a prompt, "What is your one wish for the school

year?" Teacher H adopted a curriculum that focused on structure and style.

Question 4: Tell me a story of how you prepare writing classes before assigning graded work, i.e., Building atmosphere and safe spaces.

Due to the personal nature of writing, respondents agreed on the importance of building a safe environment of trust and mutual respect as a breeding ground for good writers. Instructors incorporated scaffolding by modeling good writing and applying the "do, we do, you do" strategy as outlined by Teacher A integrated scaffolded learning into her classes. Teacher B, from a dual language classroom, described how she used dictation every day. In response to the personal nature of writing, Teacher E added, "Writing is intimate." Teacher H concurred by stating, "Writing is vulnerable," because of the risks of exposing inner thoughts and feelings in writing.

Question 5: Could you tell me a story of how you would assess each type of writing task (inter-sentential, dialogue journal, or essay) in regards to the types of feedback (direct or indirect) you would offer?

When analyzing responses to this question, teachers differentiated between assessing free writing, namely, dialogue journals where students wrote for fluency and formal writing where students fulfilled specific criterion for an essay. They related stories of how they assess students for these two types of writing. Four teachers (A, B, D, and E) reported using direct written feedback and four teachers (C, F, H and G) reported incorporating a combination of direct and indirect feedback called dynamic feedback when assessing writing.

Question 6: Can you tell me a story of how you assessed grammatical errors using direct feedback that identifies the location and type of error in an inter-sentential task? Dialogue journal? Essay?

In answering this question, teachers disclosed creative ways of offering direct feedback, but their responses did not always directly address all the details of the question. They offered direct feedback by color-coding their responses, engaging learners in a game that aided in discovering grammatical inconsistencies, asking

students to orally read what they have written, individually conferencing with a student or using a sentence-patterning chart that offered variety in word or phrase choices. Teachers offered direct feedback couched in positive terms that encouraged learners to continue developing as a writer.

Question 7: Can you tell me a story of how you assessed grammatical errors using indirect feedback that identifies the location and type of error in an inter-sentential task? Dialogue journal? Essay?

Teachers offered similar answers to Q 6 for indirectly assessing writing tasks. They reported that integrating indirect feedback strategies such as reading aloud, drawing a connection between oral and written language and developing critical thinking skills encouraged student autonomy. In fact, teachers expressed a common goal of guiding students toward independent composition and employed various methods of scaffolded learning to reach that goal.

Question 8: Do you believe future EFL writing improves because of corrective feedback? If so, please tell me a story about a type of feedback you believe has helped improve writing.

Five instructors expressed that they believe that corrective feedback improves future writing tasks. Teacher A used the term "definitely" in her response. Two teachers C and E agreed but to a lesser degree. Teacher C used the phrase, "In general." Teacher E said, "Corrective feedback done wrong can destroy a writer's confidence." Teacher H was not sure due to the lack of personal research supporting such a conclusion.

Four of the ten teachers mentioned that raising learner's awareness resulted in improved writing. Teacher A described EFL "writing as never wrong, it just can be better." Teacher H stated, "When a learner thinks about what they are learning, they learn better; they learn more." Teacher G supported encouraging metacognitive awareness. As a rule, teachers agree that corrective feedback aids EFL learners in writing. They related stories that supported this view.

Question 9: In question 8 you mentioned that you have used (type) of feedback with EFL students, tell me a story about using other methods.

In conjunction with the methods of feedback mentioned above, teachers also built confidence in new writers through comparison, free writing, peer editing, and a focus group intervention. Ideas teachers expressed may have already been mentioned in this research, but for each one, it represented a type of feedback the teacher being interviewed typically did not exercise in their classrooms.

Teachers A, F, G, and H strove to build confidence in their student's writing ability by letting them see how much progress they had attained from the beginning of the semester. They saved written assignments from early in the semester to compare with a recent task. This acted as an encouragement for students as they visually saw the improvements in their writing. Teachers sought to build confidence in EFL writers by varying the type of feedback they offered. Whether a teacher produced a nearly written piece for students to see personal progress, provided opportunities for students to engage in a group writing project where peers edited each other's work, assigned free writing tasks, read student work aloud, or asked clarification questions, they incorporated creative means of offering feedback. This included color-coding feedback, which was believed to aid in increasing understanding of the errors when composing in English.

Question 10: Tell me stories about grading where you had evidence that students had read your feedback and stories where you doubt they had read your feedback. Percentage read?

Teachers responded with stories of students who read and incorporated feedback into current and future writing tasks and stories of students who never bothered to read teacher feedback. Conferencing individually or in small groups was a key component for engaging students in reading feedback. Teacher A, B, and C, all teachers teaching Elementary EFL learners, suggested that fewer students read the feedback. Teacher B stated, "I feel like 30 percent actually care about it and 70 percent do not." Teacher C divided her response into thirds, Teacher D stated that she does not "write a ton of feedback.

I mainly conference with them (second graders) and give oral feedback." She estimated that about seventy percent of her students incorporated her feedback into future writing tasks.

Respondents discussed creative ways of engaging students in becoming better writers. Components that teachers expressed as tools for improving writing tasks included a rewriting process that had the potential to improve a student's grade, completing a feedback reflection that caused students to think about the process of writing and conferencing individually with students or collaborating as a group. Unfortunately, time constraints play a significant role for conferencing teachers can accomplish.

Question11: Do you believe student writing would improve from receiving no corrective feedback? Why or why not?

The researcher expected that one or two educators would practice offering 'no feedback' in adherence with the notable controversy incited by John Truscott (1996), but found that all eight participants believed in offering feedback on formal writing tasks. Teachers had this to say about feedback. "You will progress with receiving comprehensive feedback" (Teacher A). Teacher B described how hurt she would have felt to have her whole paper broken apart with red ink, but she found it helpful when instructed on how to improve specific areas. Teacher C reported that by not offering feedback about where to put punctuation or capitalization, students would continue, "writing the same way they write anyway, thinking it is correct." Teacher D also noted that language learners might be unaware that they are making errors. Teacher F compared feedback to parenting by saying, "You do not want to break someone's back, but you also want to guide him or her in writing properly by offering solutions." He continued, "The way we teach is through feedback along the way. To go to the next level, someone needs to guide you." Feedback is a form of learning how not to repeat the same error.

Question12: Please rate in order of effectiveness which type(s) of feedback you believe results in the greatest amount of improvement. Why?

Data from Table 2 represents how teachers responded when asked to rate, in order, the type

of feedback they found most useful with language learners. Readers will notice that seven teachers reported that solely offering indirect feedback was the least effective means of feedback, while one respondent found it less effective, Teacher G. None of the respondents found it most effective. seven teachers rated only offering direct feedback to EFL learners as less effective, while Teacher G rated it most effective. Seven teachers rated offering a combination of direct and indirect feedback as most effective, while Teacher G rated it least effective. Readers will observe that the data supported the opinion that most teachers believed that offering a combination of direct and indirect feedback yielded the most learner uptake in writing.

Table 2 *Feedback Reported as Most Effective*

	Most Effective	Less Effective	Least Effective
Indirect	0	1	7
Direct	1	7	0
Combination	7	0	1

Question13: Is there anything else I should know about corrective feedback?

Five of the educators reiterated what they felt as the most important aspects of the interview, as recorded in the following paragraphs. Teachers D, F and H had no more information to share at this time. Four participants expressed the importance of getting to know their students. Understanding a learner's home life and cultural background aids in building a relationship with them, as reported by both teachers C and M. Teacher H accomplished this task by requiring each learner to complete a language biography. In this biography she asked, "What do you read? What do you write? What things are difficult? What things do you find easy?" She kept this biography in the learner's portfolio for referencing throughout the semester. Along with relationship building, Teacher G reiterated that EFL students need a safe environment where they can make mistakes. Teachers expressed the importance of knowing and understanding your students as a critical ingredient for teaching effectively.

In summary, data gathered from this study denoted that teachers incorporated feedback into formal writing tasks because they believe that



they are helping students become better writers. They strive to make writing tasks purposeful, aimed towards a specific goal. All eight instructors reported that they hone their feedback to "focus on a feature". They offered feedback through a combination of means— direct feedback and indirect feedback to increase learner uptake. Two teachers had designed and implemented a rewriting process to ensure that students read the feedback. They stressed the importance of making sure students knew exactly what was expected of them for each assignment.

## Discussion

The discussion portion of the paper has sought to answer the research questions in conjunction with teacher responses regarding feedback. Participants in this study have all received specific training as EFL teachers by completing university degrees, webinars, and/or teacher training workshops. They compared and contrasted advanced writers with elementary writers who both struggle with academic writing skills. Intermediate and advanced level language learners of English write more fluently and creatively, while elementary level language learners write like a book, even though they struggle with word order, tense and subject/verb agreement.

Teachers also stressed the importance of making their classroom a safe space where students could gain confidence in their writing ability. Creating and maintaining a positive environment provided EFL students with the freedom to practice with language without fear of ridicule when they made a mistake.

Teachers reported that a first writing assignment usually tasked students with writing about something familiar, something they had the words to describe. This included writing a narrative essay or personal experience. Clear expectations regarding types of required grammatical features and word count were explained.

RQ1: Which method(s) of corrective feedback teachers believe strengthens foreign language writing tasks?

In answering RQ1, one first needs to discover whether teachers believe corrective feedback is beneficial (Q8)? Responses to Q8 supported the practice of offering feedback, with conditions. Instructors mentioned the use of various direct feedback methods. They discussed the incorporation of a rubric or checklist on formal tasks that clearly delineated expectations for that particular essay. When assessing, teachers restricted their concentration on two or three major categories of errors. Teachers did their best to protect students from becoming overwhelmed by the immensity of the task of correcting every error. seven out of eight participants overwhelming believed, according to Q12, that offering a combination of indirect and direct feedback known as dynamic (WCF) aided students in becoming better writers. Using a rubric, reading a sentence or essay aloud and asking students to listen to determine whether it sounded correct, projecting student work on a screen with no name attached and asking students to double-check for errors, conferencing individually or as a group, or beginning with a small list of requirements and gradually adding to that as a checklist for components needed to complete each assignment represented how teachers offered combination feedback. Combination feedback, according to teachers, encouraged metacognitive processing as students began to discover for themselves the reasons behind some of their errors. Teachers believed that offering a combination of direct and indirect feedback ensured that students encountered a safe environment to write. By making sure feedback was positive, individualized and purposeful strengthened a learner's ability to compose academic tasks.

In regards to distinguishing between indirect and direct feedback, at times, there was confusion regarding whether the type of feedback a teacher mentioned was direct or indirect. The reasoning behind this discrepancy could be because it had been a long time since teachers had studied the technical terms for the types of feedback they felt achieved the most learner uptake.

Other confusion may arise at the mention of free writing opportunities in conjunction with writing that is purposeful. This practice was an exercise designed to develop fluency as a writer to provide new writers with ways to communicate their thoughts.

RQ2: Do teachers report that students incorporate corrective feedback in future writing tasks?

Responses to Q10 and Q11 supported the fact that teachers believe that their feedback produced beneficial results as learners advanced academically. Teachers recounted stories of students who integrated feedback into future assignments and others who did not. Respondents differentiated between two types of writing tasks—formal and informal writing. Formal writing represented essays, for a grade, while informal writing represented a means of developing fluency. For example, Teacher H related a story of a student who became the "best writer in the class" by taking feedback from previous tasks and incorporating that into the current task.

Teachers modeled good writing for students in dialogue journals and on the board as they guided the class in composition. They equipped students with the language and grammar necessary for composition. Teacher F summed up this answer by remarking that for her classes, no research has taken place that either supports or negates whether students actually incorporated feedback into future writing tasks.

Participants divided students into three groups: students who are motivated to learn and go above and beyond the requirements when completing an assignment, students who are good students and complete everything that is required of them, and other students who attend English classes because they have to. To bridge the gap between whether students assimilated feedback into current and future assignments Teacher F, occasionally incorporated a peer feedback process where students were given someone else's paper and asked to fix the errors they discovered. By tasking students with this responsibility, they were hopefully able to decipher inconsistencies in a peer's work and remember to adjust their own writing the next time. Teachers who held students accountable for feedback encouraged the development of meta-language skills, where students understood why an error was marked. Teacher H reiterated that she did not "the level you are in at, I want to see your progress."

Teachers also supported the scaffolded learning concept where a mentor/teacher guided a student towards independent mastery of a skill(s) as teacher support faded in the background, Jiang and Yu (2014). Teachers described the process of writing using the 'I do, We do, You do' formula (Teacher C), a tool that guided students towards independence. They modeled good writing for students on a white board or in a dialogue journal (I do).

Teachers teaching elementary language proficiency level learners read stories about specific topics and built a word wall of vocabulary related to that topic. Teachers teaching Intermediate and advanced level learners modeled the writing they expected for assignments in a dialogue journal or whiteboard. They also provided sentence starters as a tool to spark the flow of creativity. Together, as a class, they brainstormed how to construct a sentence, paragraph, or essay (We do). Finally, students had an opportunity to practice what they had learned on an assignment (You do). They could always look back at the model on the whiteboard, word wall or sentence patterning chart and imitate the 'we do' steps. The practice of scaffolded instruction has the potential to guide students from passive learning to active learning, where they have the skills to apply key principles and writing techniques into current tasks. As students incorporate feedback into current and future writing assignments, they have the propensity to blossom as writers.

## Conclusion

Participants of this study reported that they believe that offering corrective feedback on written tasks aids students in their written production. It was discovered that the majority of teachers teaching learners from different levels of language proficiency believed that offering a combination of direct and indirect feedback or simply called dynamic feedback assisted the development of metacognitive strategies when implementing changes in current and future written assignments. Instructors embraced the practice of offering corrective feedback on written tasks in an effort to equip students with appropriate grammatical and procedural instruction. Feedback that is

purposeful, individualized and positive provided motivation for new writers to continue in the assimilation of the English language and culture. Scaffolded learning helps to guide students towards independence in the writing process. Teachers offer feedback because they believe it has value; learners who read and understand feedback can benefit from incorporating it into current and future writing tasks.

## Reference

[1] B  
r  
o  
w  
n  
,  
D  
.  
(  
2  
0  
1  
2  
)  
.  
T  
h  
e  
w  
r  
i  
t  
t  
e  
n  
c  
o  
r  
r  
e  
c  
t  
i  
v  
e  
f  
e  
d  
b

a  
c  
k  
d  
e  
b  
a  
t  
e  
:  
N  
e  
x  
t  
s  
t  
e  
p  
s  
f  
o  
r  
c  
l  
a  
s  
s  
r  
o  
o  
m  
t  
e  
a  
c  
h  
e  
r  
s  
a  
n  
d  
  
p  
r  
a  
c  
t  
i  
t  
i  
o  
n

- e  
r  
s  
.  
TESOL Quarterly, 46(4), 861-867.<http://www.jstor.org/stable/43267895>
- [2] C  
h  
e  
n  
,  
Y  
.  
,  
C  
a  
r  
g  
e  
r  
,  
C  
.  
L  
.  
,  
&  
Smith, T. (2017). Mobile-assisted narrative writing practice for young English language learners from a funds of knowledge approach. *Language Learning & Technology*, 21(1), 28-41. Retrieved from <http://www.llt.msu.edu/issues/february2017/chencargersmith.pdf>
- [3] F  
e  
r  
r  
i  
s  
.  
(  
1  
9  
9  
9  
)  
.  
T  
h

e  
c  
a  
s  
e  
f  
o  
r  
g  
r  
a  
m  
m  
a  
r  
c  
o  
r  
r  
e  
c  
t  
i  
o  
n  
i  
n  
L  
2  
w  
r  
i  
t  
i  
n  
g  
c  
l  
a  
s  
s  
e  
s  
:  
A  
r  
e  
s  
p  
o  
n  
s  
e

t  
o  
T  
r  
u  
s  
c  
o  
t  
t  
.  
J  
o  
u  
r  
n  
a  
l  
o  
f  
S  
e  
c  
o  
n  
d  
L  
a  
n  
g  
u  
a  
g  
e  
W  
r  
i  
t  
i  
n  
g  
,  
8  
(  
1  
)  
,  
1  
-  
1  
1  
.

[4] F  
e  
r  
r  
i  
s  
,  
D  
.  
,  
B  
r  
o  
w  
n  
,  
J  
.  
,  
L  
i  
u  
,  
H  
.  
,  
E  
u  
g  
e  
n  
i  
a  
,  
M  
.  
,  
&  
S  
t  
i  
n  
e  
,  
A  
.  
(  
2  
0  
1  
1  
)  
.

R  
e  
s  
p  
o  
n  
d  
i  
n  
g  
t  
o  
L  
2  
s  
t  
u  
d  
e  
n  
t  
s  
  
i  
n  
  
c  
o  
l  
l  
e  
g  
e  
  
w  
r  
i  
t  
i  
n  
g  
  
c  
l  
a  
s  
s  
e  
s  
:  
T  
e  
a

c  
h  
e  
r  
p  
e  
r  
s  
p  
e  
c  
t  
i  
v  
e  
s  
.  
T  
E  
S  
O  
L  
Q  
u  
a  
r  
t  
e  
r  
l  
y  
,  
4  
5  
(  
2  
)  
,  
2  
0  
7  
-  
2  
3  
4  
.  
R  
e  
t  
r  
i  
e  
v

- e  
d  
f  
r  
o  
m  
h  
t  
t  
p  
:  
/  
/  
w  
w  
w  
.  
J  
s  
t  
o  
r  
.  
o  
r  
g  
/  
s  
t  
a  
b  
l  
e  
/  
4  
1  
3  
0  
7  
6  
2  
9  
[5] H  
u  
n  
g  
,  
H  
.  
C  
.  
,  
&
- Y  
o  
u  
n  
g  
,  
S  
.  
S  
.  
-  
C  
.  
(  
2  
0  
1  
5  
)  
.  
T  
h  
e  
e  
f  
f  
e  
c  
t  
i  
v  
e  
n  
e  
s  
s  
o  
f  
a  
d  
o  
p  
t  
i  
n  
g  
-  
r  
e  
a  
d

- e  
r  
s  
  
t  
o  
facilitate EFL Students' Process-
- Based Academic Writing. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 18 (1), 250-263.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.18.1.250>.
- [6] Jiang, J., & Yu, Y. (2014). The effectiveness of internet-based peer feedback training on Chinese EFL college students' writing proficiency. *International Journal of Information & Communication Technology Education*, 10(3), 34-46. doi:10.4018/ijicte.2014070103
- [7] Lambert, J. (2015). Written corrective feedback [Video webinar]. (Cambridge University Press). Retrieved from <http://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2015/12/15/written-corrective-feedback/>
- [8] Lo, J.-J., Wang, Y.-C., & Yeh, S.W. (2009). Development of a synchronous collaborative writing revision instrument for teaching English. *International Conference on Information Management and Engineering*. doi:10.1109/ICIME.2009.9
- [9] Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- [10] Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- [11] Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122. University of Wisconsin, Madison. (2019). WIDA: English language development standards. Retrieved from <https://wida.wisc.edu/teach/standards/eld>