

Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why?

Hannah R. Amrhein

University of Victoria

Hossein Nassaji

University of Victoria

Abstract

A growing body of research has examined the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF) for L2 writing. An area that has attracted considerable attention recently is how students and teachers perceive the usefulness of WCF. However, research in this area has largely focused on students' perspectives, with fewer studies comparing students' and teachers' opinions. This study investigated how ESL students and teachers perceive the usefulness of different types and amounts of WCF, and also the reasons they have for their preferences. Qualitative and quantitative data was collected from 31 ESL teachers and 33 ESL students by means of written questionnaires. The results showed that while there were some areas of agreement between teachers and students, important discrepancies in their opinions did occur, not only in how WCF should be provided but also why. Pedagogical implications of the study are discussed.

Résumé

De plus en plus études examinent l'efficacité des remarques écrites des professeurs dans l'écriture des étudiants de langue seconde. Un domaine d'étude qui attire de plus en plus attention récemment est l'un de la manière dans lequel les étudiants et les professeurs perçoivent l'utilité des remarques écrites. La plupart des études dans cet domaine examinent les opinions des étudiants. Moins souvent ces études comparent les opinions des étudiants et des professeurs. Cet étude examine comment les étudiants et les professeurs de langue seconde perçoivent l'efficacité des différents genres et quantités de remarques écrites, et examine aussi les raisons pour ces perceptions. Employions un sondage, les réponses qualitatives et quantitatives de 31 professeurs et de 33 étudiants ont été ramassé. Les résultats montrent que bien qu'il y a des accords entre les opinions des étudiants et les opinions des professeurs dans quelques domaines, il y a aussi des désaccords importants, non seulement dans les perceptions concernant la manière dans lequel les professeurs devrais remarquer sur l'écriture des étudiants, mais aussi concernant les raisons pour lequel les professeurs devrais remarquer sur l'écriture des étudiants. Les implications pédagogiques de cet étude sont discuter.

Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why?

Introduction

A great deal of research has examined the effectiveness of corrective feedback for L2 writing. An important area that has attracted much attention recently is how students and teachers perceive the usefulness of written corrective feedback (WCF) (e.g., Diab, 2005; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hyland, 2003; Leki, 1991; Makino, 1993; Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Schulz, 1996, 2001). This research has important implications for language learning and teaching because if students' and teachers' perceptions of instructional effectiveness do not correspond, it can lead to students' discontent, and learning can be impaired (Brown, 2009; Schulz, 2001). Although previous research has explored teachers' and students' opinions toward corrective feedback, much of this research has focused on students' perspectives, with fewer studies comparing students' and teachers' opinions. In particular, students' and teachers' preferences for various types of WCF and their reasons for preferring particular types of corrective strategies have been left much unexplored. This study examines and compares ESL students' and teachers' opinions and preferences for different types and amounts of WCF, and also explores the reasons why they prefer particular types and amounts of WCF.

Review of the literature

The literature on L2 learning has continuously shown varying positions regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback on errors. As early as the 1970s, research has questioned the value of error correction (in ESL learning in general and in ESL writing), and a rift was created in the field of second- or foreign-language teaching as to whether error correction is useful. With respect to error correction in *writing* (WCF), some early research found it to be ineffective for the most part (e.g., Hendrickson, 1977, 1980; Hillocks, 1982; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986; Semke, 1984), while several other studies found that different types of error correction in L2 writing can be useful (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Dulay & Burt, 1977; Kennedy, 1973; Krashen, 1977; Krashen & Selinger, 1975).

Other research, however, has provided ample evidence in support of written error correction. To this end, the effects of different types of WCF (e.g., error identification, direct error correction, indirect error correction, comments on errors with no correction, metalinguistic feedback, comments on content) have been examined in various research (e.g., Ashwell, 2000; Chandler, 2003; Clark & Ouellette, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Ferris, 1997; Hartshorn, 2008; Sheen, 2007; Sachs & Polio, 2007). However, despite the support for WCF in general, the different types and amounts of WCF that work best are still unclear, and research findings in support of the use of different types of WCF

demonstrate varied results. For example, Sheen (2007) found that WCF on structural errors that targeted a single linguistic feature improved learners' accuracy. On the other hand, Sheppard (1992) found that the use of holistic WCF on meaning was more useful than surface-level WCF on form in increasing students' awareness of sentence boundaries. Research has also demonstrated varying findings even within studies (e.g., Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Clark & Ouellette, 2008; Hartshorn, 2008). For example, Clark and Ouellette's (2008) study showed that WCF helped learners somewhat, but was not sufficient to help them correct their errors. They found that WCF helped learners notice that errors existed, but did not help them to identify the boundaries and nature of the errors. In addition, while Hartshorn (2008) found that WCF helped improve overall structural accuracy, Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) found that a combination of WCF and conference feedback improved accuracy levels in some structures, but found no overall effect on accuracy improvement.

With increasing research evidence both for and against the effectiveness of WCF, researchers have looked for ways to explain why different amounts and types of WCF might be ineffective. Research has suggested that one major problem is the perspective from which WCF is provided. For example, when teachers correct errors, they often change students' language according to what they think learners want to or should say, but there is at times a mismatch between the idea that a student wants to express and that which a teacher assumes is correct (Ferris, 1995; Gass & Selinker, 1994; Zamel, 1985). At the root of this problem lies a misunderstanding between students and teachers. Research has also provided evidence that students often do not understand the meaning of much of the WCF on their papers and also do not know what they are expected to do with the WCF. Ferris (1995) and Hyland (1998), for example, found that students had problems understanding the WCF provided to them and that often students' use of feedback did not completely match the teacher's intentions.

The effectiveness of WCF has also been suggested to hinge upon students' preferences for it. In other words, students' opinions and preferences for certain types and amounts of WCF affect their use of it for learning. For example, if a student prefers or believes that one type of WCF is more useful, then he or she may be more likely to pay more attention to the correction and use it for learning than if he or she does not believe in its effects (McCargar, 1993; Schulz, 2001). Adding to the complexity, research investigating students' preferences for WCF has found that students' preferences for WCF vary. Some studies have found that students appreciate receiving large amounts of different types of WCF irrespective of the types of errors on which it is focused (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Ferris, 1995; Lee, 2005; Radecki & Swales, 1988). Other studies have found evidence demonstrating that students prefer WCF in the form of comments on content and ideas rather than on grammatical, structural and surface errors (Semke, 1984; Zamel, 1985; Woroniecka, 1998). Yet, some studies have found that students prefer WCF in the form of comments on content and ideas as well as explicit WCF on their grammatical, structural, and surface errors (e.g., Ashwell, 2000; Leki, 1991; Ziv, 1984). Lee (2005) found that students preferred comprehensive WCF rather than selective WCF, and that students approved of overt correction as well as indirect WCF such as coding.

Another important question has been whether students' expectations and preferences are met by the actual WCF that teachers provide. While some research has shown agreements between students and teachers in a number of areas, others have found considerable discrepancies (e.g., Diab, 2005; Hyland, 1998, 2003; Jeon & Kang, 2005; Saito, 1994). For example, Montgomery and Baker (2007) compared teachers' self-assessments and student perceptions of the use of local and global WCF in an intensive ESL course and found that students' perceptions of the amounts of local and global WCF they received matched the teachers' perception of the amounts of local and global WCF they provided. However, Diab (2005) compared an ESL teacher's beliefs with two of her students' beliefs about the effectiveness of various types of WCF and found that the students' views on the effectiveness of teachers' feedback strategies conflicted with that of the teacher's.

The conflict and uncertainty regarding the effectiveness of various types and amounts of WCF, as well as the incongruity between students' and teachers' perceptions regarding WCF are pedagogically problematic. For example, teachers may be providing a particular kind of WCF but students may not agree with it. As noted above, if students do not agree that a certain type of WCF is needed, then they will be less likely to use it. Therefore, it is important for both teachers and students to be clear on what works for them and how. Thus, several researchers have suggested that in order for feedback to be effective, there needs to be an agreement between teachers and students, and perhaps students' expectations need to change to better fit what is most effective in developing their writing skills (e.g., Diab, 2005; Hyland, 1998; Jeon & Kang, 2005; Leki, 1991; Plonsky & Mills, 2006; Raimes, 1991; Saito, 1994; Schulz, 1996, 2001). But is it possible for teachers and students to agree on WCF? In an experimental study, Plonsky and Mills, (2006) trained students by allowing their teacher to explain his approach to providing WCF, and demonstrated a significant change in the students' perceptions and opinions of WCF after the treatment. Thus, although research has shown that students do not always receive the WCF that they prefer, it is possible to open dialogues between teachers and students to improve the effectiveness of WCF by improving students' perceptions of it. One way of doing so is by conducting studies that not only compare students' and teachers' opinions about WCF, but also investigate teachers' and students' reasons for preferring particular types of WCF.

The purpose of the present study was to examine and compare the opinions and preferences of ESL students and teachers with regard to WCF. It examined what types, as well as what amounts of WCF ESL teachers and students consider useful and whether there are differences between teachers' and students' opinions and preferences. The study also examined ESL students' and teachers' reasons for their preferences.

Research questions

1. What amount of WCF do ESL students and teachers think is most useful, and why?
2. What types of WCF do students and teachers think are most useful, and why?
3. What types of errors do students and teachers think should be corrected, and why?

4. Are there differences between students' and teachers' preferences and reasons regarding the usefulness of different amounts of WCF, types of WCF, and types of errors to be corrected?

Methodology

Both quantitative and qualitative data was collected by means of a written questionnaire that elicited participants' opinions about the usefulness of different types and amounts of WCF and also the reasons for their responses. Quantitative data was collected through close-ended questionnaire items with Likert scale formats. To gain more in-depth information about why teachers and students preferred a particular type or amount of feedback, qualitative data was also collected through open-ended questions. The open-ended questions allowed participants to describe, in their own words, the reasons they had for their preferred feedback choices. Parallel questionnaires were constructed, piloted, and distributed to teachers and students.

Participants

This study involved 64 participants: 33 adult ESL students and 31 ESL teachers from five different English language classes at two different private English-language schools in Victoria, B.C., Canada. Both schools offer general English programs for 20-24 hours per week. The curricula at both schools are mainly communicative, focusing largely on improving learners' speaking and listening abilities, but the classes also include work on the formal aspects of language including pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. One of the schools accepts absolute beginner students (equivalent to approximately less than 12 on TOEFL internet-based test (iBT)) up to advanced learners (equivalent to approximately 79-90 on TOEFL iBT). The other school requires a basic knowledge of English to enroll, and levels at this school range from beginner to advanced. It was important that students were proficient enough in reading and writing English to understand the questionnaire items and to provide reliable responses. Therefore, the student participants were chosen from upper-intermediate to advanced classes. The student group consisted of 13 males and 20 females aged between 18 and 28, with varying first languages (Korean, Spanish, Portuguese, Japanese, and Mandarin). The students had been in Canada studying English ranging from two to six months. The teacher group consisted of nine males and 22 females between the ages of 26 and 47 with ESL teaching experience ranging from one to eight years, and at least a bachelor's degree as well as TESL, TESOL, TEFL, or Cambridge ESOL certification. All of the teachers were teaching at the same two private language schools that the students attended at the time of this study, and had taught in the last year or were teaching the upper-intermediate or advanced level classes that the students attended at the time of this study.

Questionnaire design

To compare students' and teachers' preferences and their reasons, parallel questionnaires (designed to collect both quantitative and qualitative data) were constructed. To this end, first a single questionnaire was designed, and then the instructions and wording of the items were modified for each group (see Appendices A and B). The quantitative data was collected through close-ended questions such as yes-no questions, multiple choice, and Likert-scale items. Qualitative data was collected through open-ended questions. All but one of the questionnaire items were based on items from questionnaires used in previous studies that examined similar research questions (Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994), which increased the validity of the research tool.

Before the questionnaire was administered in the main study, a pilot study was conducted to examine whether any items were problematic, and to estimate the time required to complete the questionnaire. In the pilot study, the student's version of the questionnaire was administered to an intact, upper-intermediate class of eleven students at one of the schools in this study. The teachers' version of the questionnaire was administered to six English teachers at the same school. All of the participants in the pilot study (from both groups) were timed, observed, and asked if any questionnaire items were unclear or difficult to answer. Four items were removed because they elicited similar responses to those elicited by other items, and participants had commented that the questionnaire was too long. Also, the wording and formatting of two items was simplified because students had difficulties understanding them. None of the data collected in the pilot study was used in this study. The final versions of the questionnaire used in this study contain five items (see Appendices A and B).

The main study was conducted over a two-week period in August and September 2007. The questionnaires were distributed to the participants in person at the schools participating in this study and were completed at the time of distribution. Student participants completed the questionnaire outside of scheduled class time or in lieu of optional activities during class time. Students were given unlimited time, but none took more than twenty-five minutes to complete the questionnaire. Teacher participants completed the questionnaires outside of their work time. Teachers were also given unlimited time, but none took more than twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Analysis

The questionnaire responses were recorded in an excel spreadsheet and then imported to SPSS 15.0 for statistical analysis. For the quantitative data, the frequencies of responses on the questionnaires were calculated and then compared. Then Chi-square tests were used to find out whether there was a statistically significant difference between students' and teachers' responses. For the questionnaire items that included Likert scales, the means of participants' responses were calculated and t-tests were conducted to compare the results. Qualitative analysis was conducted on the participants' explanatory responses. To this end, the participants' explanations on the open-ended

questions were summarized and categorized according to common themes and then compared between teachers and students.

Results

The questionnaire results are presented in two main sections: Amounts of WCF (questionnaire items one and four), and Types of WCF (questionnaire items two, three, and five). Participants' responses are presented as well as their explanations for their responses. The explanations are categorized to aid interpretation. The differences between the groups' responses are also presented. The results are discussed in relation to the four research questions in the discussion section of this study.

Amounts of written corrective feedback

On item one, participants were asked whether they think that teachers should mark all errors, just some, or none at all and respond only to the ideas and content. On this item, participants were able to choose more than one option. As Table 1 shows, the option *Mark all errors* was the most popular choice for both students (93.9%) and teachers (45.2%). The second most popular option for students was *mark all major errors but not minor ones* (9.1%). The second most popular option for teachers was *mark only errors that interfere with communicating students' ideas* (25.8%); however, no students chose this option. A chi-square test showed a significant difference ($p=0.01$) between the teachers' and students' opinions regarding the amount of errors they thought should be marked. While students preferred that teachers mark all major errors, the teachers preferred that they should correct only the errors that interfere with communication.

Table 1
Participants' Responses to Different Amounts of Written Corrective Feedback

Options	Students		Teachers	
	n	%	n	%
a) Mark all errors	31	93.9	14	45.2
b) Mark all major errors but not minor ones	3	9.1	5	16.1
c) Mark most major errors, but not necessarily all of them	1	3.0	4	12.9
d) Mark only a few of the major errors	0	0.0	4	12.9

e) Mark only errors that interfere with communicating ideas	0	0.0	8	25.8
f) Mark no errors; respond only to ideas and content	0	0.0	3	9.7
*Total Responses	33	106.1	31	122.6

**Participants were allowed to choose as many options as they like. Therefore, total responses add to more than 100%.*

Table 2 shows the teachers' and students' explanations for their preferences. Of the 27 students who provided explanations to the above item, the majority (77.8%) placed value on the importance of seeing all of their errors so that the WCF could be used as a learning tool to improve their writing. Most students explained that "students must see all of their errors in order to improve their writing." Interestingly, several students also commented on the WCF procedures that they believe teachers should carry out. Most of the 18 teachers provided explanations that showed they considered students' feelings and desires when providing their feedback. The majority (55.6%) of teachers explained that "students appreciate and want to know the correct forms [of their errors]" and a relatively high frequency of teachers (16.7%) also explained that "marking too many errors can be discouraging [to students]."

Table 2
Explanations for Different Amounts of Written Corrective Feedback

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Some errors are too advanced for students to understand.	Student competence	0	0.0	2	11.1
b) Students can't differentiate major from minor errors, so the teacher should correct all of them.		1	3.7	0	0.0
c) Students appreciate and want to know the correct forms.	Students' desires	0	0.0	8	55.6
d) Marking too many errors can be discouraging.		0	0.0	2	16.7

e) It depends on the reason for writing.	Procedures	0	0.0	0	5.6
f) The teacher should mark all errors at first, then focus on repeated ones.		1	3.7	0	0.0
g) At first the teacher should mark major errors, and later focus on minor errors.		1	3.7	0	0.0
h) The teacher should tell students the reasons for the errors.		1	3.7	0	0.0
i) First the teacher should respond to content and organization, then on final draft mark errors.		0	0.0	0	5.6
j) The teacher should only mark some errors, and make general comments at the end.		0	0.0	0	5.6
k) It is the teacher's duty to correct all errors.	Teacher responsibility	1	3.7	0	0.0
l) The teacher should mark only major errors because it's too time consuming to mark all errors.	Time	1	3.7	0	0.0
Total Responses		27	100.0	18	100.0

To further examine the amount of corrective feedback, on item 4 participants were asked, "If an error is repeated in a writing assignment more than once, do you think it is useful for the teacher to mark it every time it occurs?" As Table 3 shows, more students (78.1%) and teachers (80.7%) marked "yes" than "no" (students = 21.9%, and teachers = 19.4%). These findings demonstrate that the vast majority of both students and teachers thought that a repeated error should be marked every time it occurs. A chi-square test showed no significant difference between the opinions of teachers and students for this item.

Table 3

Participants' Responses for Correction of Repeated Errors

		<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Total Responses</u>
Students	n	7	25	32
	%	21.9	78.1	100.0
Teachers	n	6	25	31
	%	19.4	80.7	100.0

Table 4 shows participants' explanations for this item. The majority of both students and teachers showed that they consider WCF to be a learning tool when they explained that a repeated error should be marked each time it occurs "so students can be reminded and get an overview to see patterns" (students = 69.6%, and teachers = 47.4%). Some teachers (21.1%) also explained that "the teacher must be consistent" and mark all errors, and several teachers (15.8%) also demonstrated they value student autonomy and explained that it is useful to "just mark an example and students should do the rest." . Interestingly, as in the previous questionnaire item, several students commented on the WCF procedures that they believe teachers should carry out.

Table 4
Explanations for Correction of Repeated Errors

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
a) Yes, the teacher must be consistent.	Consistency	0	0.0	0	21.1
b) Yes, so students can be reminded and get an overview to see patterns.	Learning tool	16	69.6	8	47.4
c) No, it is better to give students a chance for self-correction.	Student autonomy	0	0.0	0	5.3
d) No, students should think about it and do it themselves.		1	4.4	0	0.0

e) No, just mark an example and students should do the rest.		0	0.0	0	15.8
f) No, only once or twice	Procedures	3	13.0	0	5.3
g) Yes, but don't dock marks for reoccurrences.		3	13.0	0	0.0
h) No, but dock marks for repeated errors.		0	0.0	1	5.3
Total Responses		23	100.0	19	100.0

Types of written corrective feedback

Item two of the questionnaire examined participants' opinions of the usefulness of different types of WCF. The types of WCF were represented by an example of each (See Table 5 and Appendices A and B) and participants rated them (1= not useful at all, 2 = not useful, 3 = doesn't matter, 4 = quite useful, and 5= very useful). Table 5 shows students' and teachers' mean ratings for each type of WCF as well as the t-test results which demonstrate any significant differences between participants' responses.

Table 5

Participants' Responses for Different Types of Written Corrective Feedback

Item	Feedback Type	Means		t-value	p-value
		Students	Teachers		
2A	Clues or directions on how to fix an error	2.8	3.6	t=2.160	p=.035
2B	Error identification	2.4	2.8	t=1.402	p=.166
2C	Error correction with a comment	4.1	3.8	t=1.127	p=.264
2D	Overt correction by the teacher	4.1	3.1	t=3.357	p=.001
2E	Comment with no correction	2.6	3.9	t=4.493	p=.000

2F	No feedback	1.2	1.1	$t=0.444$	$p=.659$
2G	Personal comment on content	1.4	2.1	$t=2.802$	$p=.007$

For *clues or directions on how to fix an error* (e.g., direction to a certain section of a grammar book, dictionary, or class worksheet), the mean response from students (2.8) and teachers (3.6) both demonstrate an overall neutral to positive rating. A t-test did show, however, that teachers' opinions were significantly more positive than students' on this item, $t(60) = 2.160$, $p < .05$. For *error identification*, the mean responses from students (2.4) and teachers (2.8) both demonstrate an overall neutral to negative ratings. For *error correction with a comment*, the mean responses from students (4.1) and from teachers (3.8) both demonstrate overall positive ratings, and no significant differences were found between students' and teachers' opinions on these items. For *overt correction by the teacher*, the mean response from students demonstrates an overall positive rating (4.1) and from teachers demonstrates an overall neutral rating (3.1). A t-test showed a significant difference between students' and teachers' opinions on this item, $t(60) = 3.357$, $p < .05$. For *comment with no correction*, the mean response from teachers was positive (3.9), while from students it demonstrates an overall neutral (2.6) rating. A t-test also showed a significant difference between students' and teachers' opinions on this item, $t(60) = 4.493$, $p < .001$. For *no feedback* on an error and for *a personal comment on the content* of the writing, the mean responses from students (1.2) (2.4) and from teachers (1.1) (2.1) all demonstrate overall negative opinions. However, for *a personal comment on the content* of the writing, students' responses were more negative than teachers and a t-test did show a significant difference of opinions on this item, $t(60) = 2.802$, $p < .05$.

Tables 6 to 10 show participants' explanations for the above feedback types. For *clues or directions on how to fix an error*, the majority (64.7%) of both students and teachers showed that they value student autonomy and explained that clues or directions are useful because "it is important for students to know how to self-correct so they remember their errors." However, a number of students also demonstrated that they believe that it is the teacher's responsibility to provide more specific WCF than merely a clue or direction. They explained that "clues are not useful. Students need more specific advice" (23.5%), and "clues are not useful. Students need the correct form" (11.8%) (Table 6).

Table 6

Explanations for Clues or Directions on How to Fix an Error

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) It is important for students to know how to self-correct so they remember their errors.	Student autonomy	11	64.7	8	64.7
b) Clues are not useful. Students need specific advice.	Teacher responsibility	4	23.5	0	0.0
c) Clues are not useful. Students need the correct form.		2	11.8	0	0.0
d) Clues are useful, but are too much work for teachers.	Teacher effort	0	0.0	0	17.7
e) Clues are only useful for high level students.	Student competency	0	0.0	3	17.7
Total Responses		17	100.0	17	100.0

For *error identification*, the majority of students provided explanations showing that they believe it is teachers' responsibility to provide specific and detailed WCF. This is demonstrated by students' explanations such as "error identification is useful to see where errors occur, but is not enough information for self-correction" (58.8%), "error identification leaves too much work for students" (11.8%), and "error identification is not useful. Correction is best (5.9%).” On the other hand, the majority of teachers (77.8%) showed that they consider student autonomy to be important and WCF to be used as a learning tool when they explained that "error identification saves time and guides students in self-correction, which allows students to better remember their errors.” A number of students also provided this explanation (23.5%) (Table 7).

Table 7
Explanations for Error Identification

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Saves time and guides students in self-correction, which allows students to better remember their errors.	Student autonomy / Learning tool	4	23.5	14	77.8
b) Error identification is useful to see where errors occur, but is not enough information.	Teacher responsibility	10	58.8	0	11.1
c) Error identification leaves too much work for students.		2	11.8	0	0.0
d) Error identification is not useful. Correction is best.		1	5.9	0	0.0
e) Error identification is only useful for high-level students.	Student competency	0	0.0	2	11.1
Total Responses		17	100.0	18	100.0

For *error correction with a comment*, the most common explanations from students showed that they regard this type of WCF as a learning tool. They explained that “comments are useful for students to see why the error exists and how to fix it” (44.4 %), and that “students will remember better with comments” (38.9%). The teachers considered the time needed to provide comments and many explained that “comments and corrections are useful, but too time-consuming for teachers” (33.3%). A number of teachers also simply commented on the WCF procedure and wrote that “comments with corrections are best” (26.7%), while some explained just the opposite, “corrections with comments are not useful” (20%) (Table 8).

Table 8
Explanations for Error Correction with a Comment

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Comments are useful for motivation, but not for grammar correction.	Learning tool	0	0.0	0	6.7
b) Comments are useful for students to see why the error exists and how to fix it.		8	44.4	0	0.0
c) Students will remember better with comments.		7	38.9	0	0.0
d) Correction with comment is useful only for lower levels.	Procedures	1	5.6	0	0.0
e) Correction with comments is impolite and rude.		1	5.6	0	0.0
f) Comments are too much; the correct form is enough.		1	5.6	0	0.0
g) The teacher should comment on re-occurring mistakes.		0	0.0	0	13.3
h) Corrections with comments are not useful.		0	0.0	0	20.0
i) Comments with corrections are best.		0	0.0	0	26.7
j) Comments and corrections are useful, but too time-consuming for teachers.	Time	0	0.0	5	33.3
Total Responses		18	100.0	15	100.0

For *overt correction by the teacher*, about half of the students regarded this type of WCF as a learning tool and explained that “teacher correction is important so students can see their errors and it's the best way to learn from them” (43.8%). Half of the students also demonstrated that they believe it is the teacher’s responsibility to provide more than just correction. They explained that “teacher correction is useful but not enough,

comments are also necessary” (50.0%). Teachers’ explanations were varied for this type of WCF. Some considered student capacity and explained that overt correction by the teacher is not useful because “students do not pay attention to or understand them” (35.3%), and because teachers “should not make up for students’ carelessness” (23.5%). Also, a number of teachers (23.5%) explained that in order to minimize time-consumption, only the important errors should be corrected (Table 9).

Table 9

Explanations for Overt Correction by the Teacher

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Teacher correction is not useful.	Procedures	0	0.0	0	5.9
b) Teacher correction is only useful for very problematic errors.		0	0.0	0	5.9
c) It is the teacher’s job and that’s how students learn.	Teacher responsibility	1	6.3	0	5.9
d) Teacher correction is useful, but not enough; comments are also necessary.		8	50.0	0	0.0
e) Teacher correction is important so students can see their errors and it’s the best way to learn from them.	Learning tool	7	43.8	0	0.0
f) Teacher correction is not useful because students don’t pay attention or understand them.	Student competency	0	0.0	4	35.3
g) Teacher correction is not useful because, they should not make up for students’ carelessness.		0	0.0	0	23.5
h) The teacher should select important errors, otherwise it’s too time-consuming.	Time	0	0.0	4	23.5
Total Responses		16	100.0	17	100.0

Finally, for *comment with no correction*, students' explanations varied. Some considered that student capacity may limit the usefulness of this type of WCF when they explained that "students will remember better with comments and self-correction" (35.3%), and "comments are too confusing, students don't understand them" (23.5%). As with the previous types of WCF discussed in this section, a number of students also considered it teachers' responsibility to provide more than just comments and they explained that "comments are not enough, errors must be corrected too" (23.5%). On the other hand, the largest number of teachers commented on the procedures for this type of WCF and explained that "comments are useful if they are explanatory" (31.3%) and that "comments are useful for fluency, but not accuracy" (25.0%) (Table 10).

Table 10
Explanations for Comment with no Correction

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Comments are too confusing, students don't understand them.	Student competency	4	23.5	0	12.5
b) Comments only work if students are dedicated and motivated.		1	5.9	0	18.8
c) Comments are not enough, errors must be corrected too.	Teacher Responsibility	4	23.5	0	12.5
d) Students will remember better with comments and self-correction.	Student autonomy	6	35.3	0	0.0
e) Comments are rude.	Procedures	1	5.9	0	0.0
f) Comments are useful for fluency, but not accuracy.		0	0.0	0	25.0
g) Comments are useful if they are explanatory.		1	5.9	5	31.3
Total Responses		17	100.0	16	100.0

Types of errors to be corrected

On item five, using the same rating scale as in item two (1= not useful at all, 2 = not useful, 3 = doesn't matter, 4 = quite useful, and 5= very useful), participants rated the usefulness of WCF on six different types of errors (see Appendices A and B). Table 11 shows students' and teachers' mean ratings for each type of WCF as well as t-test results, which demonstrate any significant differences between students' and teachers' responses.

Table 11
Participants' Responses for Correction on Different Types of Errors

Feedback Type	Means		t-value	p-value
	Students	Teachers		
WCF on Organization Errors	3.8	4.3	t=2.122	p=0.038
WCF on Grammatical Errors	4.6	4.5	t=0.529	p=0.599
WCF on Content or Ideas	3.1	4.0	t=3.186	p=0.002
WCF on Punctuation Errors	3.3	3.9	t=2.108	p=0.039
WCF on Spelling Errors	4.1	3.8	t=1.467	p=0.148
WCF on Vocabulary Errors	4.5	3.9	t=2.227	p=0.030

For *WCF on organization errors* and *WCF on grammatical errors*, the mean responses from both teachers (4.3) (4.5) and students (3.8) (4.6) demonstrated positive responses. However, a t-test showed that teachers' responses for *WCF on organization errors* were significantly more positive than students', $t(59) = 2.122$, $p < .05$. For *WCF on content or ideas* and *WCF on punctuation errors* the teachers' responses showed overall positive opinions (4.0) (3.9), but students showed overall neutral opinions (3.1) (3.3) for both of these types of WCF. T-tests showed significant differences between students' and teachers' opinions on these items, $t(59) = 3.186$, $p < .05$ and $t(59) = 2.108$, $p < .05$. For *WCF on spelling errors* and *WCF on vocabulary errors*, the mean responses from both the teachers (3.8) (3.9) and the students (4.1) (4.5) demonstrated overall positive responses. However, a t-test showed that teachers' responses were significantly more positive than students' for *WCF on vocabulary errors*, $t(59) = 2.227$, $p < .05$.

Table 12 shows the participants' explanations for error types. Rather than explain

their responses, most students commented on the WCF types that they believe are more useful. The majority of students (71.4 %) commented that “grammar, spelling, and vocabulary are more important than organization and ideas.” The largest number of teachers considered students’ desires to be important, which is demonstrated in their explanations that “students appreciate all types of feedback” (33.3%) and that “students are clients and expect all types [of feedback]” (11.1%).

Table 12

Explanations for Correction of Different Types of Errors

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Content and ideas are important so students learn to be understood.	Learning tool	0	0.0	0	22.2
b) It depends on the reason for writing.	Procedures	0	0.0	0	22.2
c) Grammar, spelling and vocabulary are more important than organization, and ideas.	Comment on WCF type	10	71.4	0	11.1
d) Grammar is important than spelling and punctuation.		1	7.1	0	0.0
e) Organization, grammar and punctuation are most important.		1	7.1	0	0.0
f) All types of feedback are useful.		1	7.1	0	0.0
g) Vocabulary is most important.		1	7.1	0	0.0
h) Students appreciate all types of feedback.	Student desire	0	0.0	0	33.3
i) Students are clients and expect all types.		0	0.0	1	11.1
Total Responses		14	100.0	9	100.0

Discussion

The results of this research are discussed here with respect to the research

questions posed in this study, and the differences and similarities between the teachers and students (research question 4) are discussed throughout.

The first research question asked what amount of WCF ESL students and teachers think is most useful, and why. The results of this research found that students thought it most useful for teachers to provide WCF on as many errors as possible. Students disapproved of the options in which the teacher marks only a few errors, marks only errors that interfere with communication, responds only to content and ideas, or does not repeatedly mark a repeated error. Thus, to students, the larger the quantity of WCF, the more useful they think it is. Teachers also thought that WCF should be provided on all errors, but teachers also considered whether errors interfere with communication which is demonstrated by the fact that the second most common response from teachers was to mark only errors that interfere with communicating ideas. These responses demonstrate that the teachers, unlike the students in this study, discriminate between errors that they think are more and less important to mark.

The findings, however, also demonstrate some significant differences in opinions between teachers and students regarding the amount of WCF. Students showed preference for larger quantities of error correction on all types of errors, while most teachers were more selective and opted to attend to communication and/or accuracy. When they were asked for their explanations, students were fairly consistent, believing that seeing their errors marked will help them learn and remember them better than if their errors are not marked. The reasoning of the teachers, however, varied. Some teachers responded according to what they thought was useful for language learning, while some others seemed to base their responses on what they thought students wanted. For example, they reasoned that students appreciate and want to know the correct forms, but that too much WCF could be discouraging. These responses demonstrate that teachers were divided on the amount of correction they believe is necessary and they were divided on their reasons as well.

With regard to repeatedly correcting errors each time they occur, both teachers and students saw WCF as a learning tool and thought that a repeated error should be marked each time it occurs, which demonstrates that they value consistency, and several teachers explained that “the teacher must be consistent.” The reasons for their opinions showed to be similar between the groups, since the most common explanation from both groups was that repeatedly marking a repeated error “allows students to be reminded and get an overview to see patterns.” These findings are not in line with the previous research findings that suggest that allowing students to correct at least some of their own errors is most useful (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hendrickson, 1980; Makino, 1993), and if a teacher marks a repeated error every time it occurs, it leaves little room for self-correction as students would not be held responsible for seeking out and correcting their own errors. However, some teachers did demonstrate they value student autonomy and explained that it is useful to “just mark an example and students should do the rest.” Therefore, in this study, students’ (and many of the teachers’) preferences and opinions about effective error correction contradict what has been found to be a useful error correction strategy.

The second research question asked what types of WCF students and teachers

think are most useful, and why. The students in this study thought that it was mainly the responsibility of the teacher to correct errors, which corresponds with Lee (2005). The students also showed approval of having their errors explicitly marked and corrected with WCF such as *error correction with a comment* and *overt correction by the teacher*. Their explanation was that explicit types of WCF allow them to remember their errors and understand how to fix them. Most students explained that *a clue with no correction* is not useful because students need more specific advice. This preference suggests that students prefer explicit and explanatory WCF rather than being left to self-correct, despite the fact that self-correction has been found to be useful in some previous research (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hendrickson, 1980; Makino, 1993).

Like the students in this study, the teachers thought that *error correction with a comment* was useful. However, a large number of teachers also showed that they valued *clues or directions on how to fix an error* and *comment with no correction*, and they explained that *overt correction by the teacher* can be too time-consuming, showing that when it comes to error correction, teachers' strategies also reflect their concern for their workload. These results demonstrate that the teachers value student autonomy and expect students to do their part by finding out how to correct their errors and making their own corrections. They explained that they think this type of WCF leads to self-correction, which is useful because they thought it would help students remember their errors. Thus, while students showed strong preference for more explicit feedback, teachers showed preference for less explicit feedback and WCF that requires effort from students and promotes student autonomy.

The third research question asked what types of errors students and teachers think should be corrected, and why. The students showed positive opinions about the usefulness of WCF on form-focused errors such as grammatical errors, punctuation errors, spelling errors, and vocabulary errors. However, they demonstrated mixed neutral or negative opinions about the usefulness of WCF on ideas or content of the writing. These findings provide evidence that students are anxious to perfect their English, and that rather than focusing on conveying interesting and coherent ideas, they considered error free writing to be their goal. These findings are consistent with those of previous studies, which have found similar results (Hedgcock & Leftkowitz, 1994; Leki, 1991; Raimes, 1991).

Teachers, however, had different opinions. They believed that the WCF should focus as much on comprehensibility of the content as on form-focused correction. Teachers showed most positive opinions towards WCF on grammatical errors, organization, and on content or ideas. In fact, in this study, some teachers also believed that in order to minimize time-consumption, only the important errors should be corrected. However, teachers did also show some positive opinions towards form-focused WCF on punctuation, spelling, and vocabulary errors. These findings correspond somewhat to the findings of previous studies (Hyland, 2003; Lee, 2008; Furneaux, Paran & Fairfax, 2007), which showed that language accuracy is an important focus of teachers' feedback. As for their reasons, they considered students' desires and expectations to be important factors, showing that their provision of WCF depends, at

least in part, on what they think students want and expect.

Overall, participants' responses and explanations showed several differences between the opinions of the two groups. Although students' explanations showed that they understand and value some student autonomy, for the most part their responses showed that they value large amounts of WCF from the teacher. Many of the students' explanations also showed that they see WCF as a learning tool that is the responsibility of the teacher to provide. The teachers' responses and explanations revealed that they not only value and strive for student autonomy when they provide WCF, but they also take into account students' competency and desires when providing WCF. In addition, some of their explanations show that the amount of effort and time required for WCF may dictate how much and what types of WCF they provide.

In summary, this study showed both similarities and difference between teachers' and students' opinions about the usefulness of different types and amount of WCF. Students and teachers shared many of the same reasons regarding the usefulness of some types of WCF but not others. Furthermore, unlike students, teachers seemed to be more divided in their preferences and explanations about why and how errors should be corrected.

Conclusion, Implications, and Limitations

The differences of opinions between students and teachers found in this study are important and raise the question of whether students should be corrected according to what is proven to be useful, what teachers believe is most beneficial, or according to what they would prefer. These differences could create some tension as well as challenges in error correction pedagogy. For example, students approval of WCF that requires less of their effort to correct shows their keenness on transferring the responsibility of error correction to teachers. This desire to shift responsibility to teachers contradicts the overall goal of language pedagogy, which should be to increase student autonomy and to equip them with strategies to improve the accuracy of their own writing. Thus, research is needed to find out how the differences between teachers' and students' expectations can be best addressed for optimal pedagogy.

Pedagogically, the findings suggest that teachers need to openly discuss the use of WCF with students, and ensure that students understand the purpose of WCF and shoulder responsibility for error correction. Of course, it is also important that teachers bear in mind students' beliefs and attitudes because any discrepancies between students' and teachers' beliefs can hamper the effectiveness of corrective feedback. Thus, it is a good idea for teachers to communicate with students regarding corrective feedback practices as well as adapt their WCF practices to promote learner autonomy, and at the same time consider students' preferences so as to motivate and encourage students to be in command of their language learning. Students and teachers must become aware of any differences in opinion about what constitutes useful WCF, so that both students and teachers can modify their expectations accordingly (Leki, 1991).

Having said that, although students' preferences are important, as Brown (1998)

cautions, students' preferences should not be idealized because they are "not necessarily more effective for being preferred" (p. 253). Therefore, rather than yield to the preferences of students immediately, it is important that teachers be aware of the possible consequences of the mismatch between their students' expectations and their own expectations. Ignoring students' expectations may de-motivate students (Leki, 1991). However, if the teacher always follows students' preferences, this may result in student dependence on the teacher, and misguided student expectations (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990). Research has found that students' preferences and expectations are often affected by their prior language learning experiences, and these experiences may not necessarily have been beneficial (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990). Thus, it is necessary for teachers to demonstrate and explain the use of effective types of WCF, including those types which initially may not be preferred by students. In short, teachers need to shift students' expectations to better fit what will contribute to the development of writing (Saito, 1994).

However, although this study examined students' and teachers' perceptions regarding WCF and not the efficacy of WCF, we must recognize that error correction is a complex issue. For any error correction strategy to be effective, we should consider not only the nature of the feedback, but also the type of error and how and when it should be corrected. We should also consider the many other factors that may affect the effectiveness of error correction including the sociocultural context in which the feedback is provided, as well as various individual learner needs and differences. Ideally, WCF should be individualized. However, individualized feedback would constitute an enormous amount of work for teachers and, as demonstrated in this study, teachers held time and effort in high regard. Therefore, other strategies could be considered, two of which would be students' correction of their own errors and peer feedback (Lee, 2005). As Leki (1991) pointed out, completely accurate writing is an unrealistic goal because "certain errors in writing may never disappear and, therefore, enormous expenditures of effort to eliminate them may be pointless" (p. 204). In reality, students' errors often reoccur even after WCF is provided (Cohen, 1987; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Radecki & Swales, 1988). Thus, it is important that teachers bear in mind the complexity of learning and make decisions not only based on students' expectations, but also on other factors that can influence the effectiveness of feedback.

Furthermore, there are certain limitations to this research, which should be considered. First, the number of participants in this study was limited. They were drawn from only two language schools, and so the results cannot be easily generalized to a wide variety of contexts. Therefore, further research with larger sample sizes from different instructional contexts are needed. Also, this study deals with the notion of errors, which is a complex notion and the participants may not view errors consistently. For example, this study asked participants to discriminate between major errors, minor errors, errors that interfere with communication, etc. It is possible that participants did not all make the same distinction between these types of errors (i.e., some participants may consider major errors to be the same as errors that interfere with communication). In addition, some participants may not view errors in ideas or content as real errors that require corrective feedback, while other participants may consider content errors as real errors that do

require corrective feedback. Considering these possibly differing views, This future research examining teachers' and students' opinions about corrective feedback should ensure that participants have a clear and consistent understanding of the notion of error and how it should be dealt with.

In addition, the findings of this study are based on self-report data from students and teachers in which they reported their opinions about the usefulness of WCF and preferences for WCF. These findings, however, may not accurately reflect teachers' practices in the classroom. Thus, studies that compare teachers' opinions with their actual practices are helpful. Lastly, in this study efforts were made to design a questionnaire with items that were clear and relevant, while also allowing participants to express their opinions about corrective feedback. Since the items were a combination of closed- and open-ended items that did not comprise a scale, no reliability estimates were calculated because there is no standard way of calculating the reliability of such questionnaire items. This lack of reliability measurements could also be considered a limitation of this study that should be kept in mind when interpreting the results.

References

- 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*, 227-257.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008) The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback, *Language Teaching Research, 12*, 409-431.
- 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*, 191-205.
- Brown, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. London: Longman.
- Brown. A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal, 93*, 46-60.
- Cathcart, R. L., & Olsen, J. E. W. B. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for error correction of classroom conversation errors. In J. F. Fanselow and R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76: Selections based on teaching done at the 10th annual TESOL convention* (pp. 41-53). Washington: TESOL.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of 12 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267-296.
- Clark, H., & Ouellette, M. (2008). Students' noticing and incorporation of written feedback: A snapshot of ESOL writing instructors' commentary on adult ESOL students' essays. Master's Thesis, University of Texas. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10106/669>

- Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A.L. Wenden and J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Engelwood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23, 28-43.
- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1977). Remarks on the creativity in language acquisition. In M. Burt, H. Dulay and M. Finochchiaro (Eds.), *Viewpoints on English as a second language* (pp. 95-126). New York: Regents Publishing Company.
- 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, 353-371.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 315-339.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second language Writing*, 10, 161-184.
- Furneaux, C., Paran, A., & Fairfax, B. (2007). Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 45, 69-94.
- Gass, S. (1988). Integrating research areas: A framework for second language studies. *Applied Linguistics*, 9, 198-217.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hartshorn, K. (2008). The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. Master's thesis, Brigham Young University. Retrieved from <http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/ETD/image/etd2575.pdf>
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learning receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 141-163.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1977). *Error analysis and selective correction in the adult ESL classroom: An experiment*. ERIC Document Reproduction Services, ED 135260.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). The treatment of error in written work. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 216-221.
- Hillocks, G. Jr. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composition process. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 16, 261-278.

- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230.
- Jeon, M., & Kang, I. (2005). *Investigating student preferences in error correction in Korean-language teaching*. American Association of Teachers of Korean, 5 (10), Retrieved from <http://www.aatk.org/html/KLA10/MJeonIKang.pdf>
- Kennedy, G. (1973). Conditions for language learning. In J. W. Oller, and J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Focus on the learner pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher* (62-82). New York: Newbury House.
- Krashen, S. D. (1977). Some issues relating to the Monitor Model. In H. D. Brown, C. Yorio, and R. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77: Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice* (pp. 144-158). Washington: TESOL.
- Krashen S. D., & Selinger, H. W. (1975). The essential contributions of formal instructions in adult second language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(2), 173-183.
- Lalande, J. F. II (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22, 1-16.
- Lee, L. (2008). Focus-on-form through collaborative scaffolding in expert-to-novice online interaction. *Language Learning and Technology*, 12(3), 53-72.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.
- Makino, T. Y. (1993). Learner self-correction in EFL written compositions. *ELT Journal*, 47, 337-341.
- McCargar, D. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 192-207.
- Montgomery, J., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 82-99.
- Plonsky, L., & Mills, S.V. (2006). An exploratory study of differing perceptions of error correction between a teacher and students: Bridging the gap. *Northern Arizona University Applied Language Learning*, 16, 55-77.
- Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16, 355-365.
- Raimes, A. (1991). Errors: Windows into the mind. *College ESL*, 1(2), 55-64.
- Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortseed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 83-95.
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on a l2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29, 67-100.

- Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(2), 46-70.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 343-364.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.
- Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(3), 195-202.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-284.
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23, 103-110.
- Stiff, R. (1967). The effect upon student composition of particular correction techniques. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 1, 54-75.
- Woroniciecka, I. (1998). *A nonnative student's reactions to instructors' feedback on his papers: A case study of an undergraduate history student* (Master's thesis). University of Toronto: Department of Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. Retrieved from http://www.nlcnc.ca/obj/s4/f2/dsk1/tape11/PQDD_0004/MQ40680.pdf
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.
- Ziv, N. D. (1984). The effect of teacher comments on the writing of four college freshmen. In R. Bach and L. S. Bridwell (Eds.), *New directions in composition research* (pp. 362-280). New York: Guilford Press.

Appendix A: Students' Questionnaire

Appendix A: Student's Questionnaire

(1) If there are many errors in your writing, what do you think your English teacher should do? You can check more than one!

- Teacher should mark all errors.
- Teacher should mark all major errors but not the minor ones.
- Teacher should mark most of the major errors, but not necessarily all of them.
- Teacher should mark only a few of the major errors.
- Teacher should mark only the errors that interfere with communicating your ideas.
- Teacher should mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content.

Please explain the reason for your choice(s).

(2) The following sentences all have the same error and a teacher has given a different type of feedback for each. For each sentence circle the number that best describes how useful the feedback is.

For example, if you think the feedback is a very useful way to point out an error then circle 5. If you think the feedback is not a useful way to point out an error then circle 1.

1 = not useful at all (useless) 2 = not useful 3 = doesn't matter
4 = quite useful 5 = very useful

- A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
Look at Section 2 in grammar book.
- B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
- C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
have been (wrong tense)
- D. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
have been
- E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
wrong tense
- F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
- G. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. 1 2 3 4 5
I'm sorry to hear that.

(3) Please explain the reasons for your choices for each type of feedback in item 2.

A. clues or directions on how to fix an error (the teacher gives clues or directions on how a student can correct his/her work)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

B. error identification (the teacher points out where the errors occur, but no errors are corrected)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

C. correction with comments (the teacher corrects errors and makes comments)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

D. teacher correction (the teacher corrects errors)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

E. commentary (the teacher gives feedback by making comments about errors, but no errors are corrected.)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

F. no feedback on an error

Please explain the reason for your choice.

G. a personal comment on the content (the teachers gives feedback by making comments on the ideas or content, but no error are corrected.)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

(4) If you repeat an error in a writing assignment more than once do you think it is useful for your teacher to mark it every time it occurs?

Yes

No

Please explain the reason for your answer.

(5) If there are many different errors in your written work, which type(s) of error do you want your English teacher to point out most? Circle one number that best describes each statement.

1 = not useful at all (useless) 2 = not useful 3 = doesn't matter
4 = quite useful 5 = very useful

- A. Teacher points out *organization errors*. 1 2 3 4 5
(Example: *paragraph structure, sentence order*)
- B. Teacher points out *grammatical errors*. 1 2 3 4 5
(Example: *tense, word order, sentence structure*)
- C. Teacher points out *content/idea errors*. 1 2 3 4 5
(Example: *comments on your ideas*)
- D. Teacher points out *punctuation errors*. 1 2 3 4 5
(Example: *, . ? !*)
- E. Teacher points out *spelling errors*. 1 2 3 4 5
(Example: *word is spelled wrong*)
- F. Teacher points out *vocabulary errors*. 1 2 3 4 5
(Example: *wrong word choice, wrong meaning*)
- G. Other _____

Please explain the reason for your choice(s).

Thank you to all the students who participated in this study!

Appendix B: Teachers' Questionnaire

Appendix B: Teacher's Questionnaire

(1) If there are many errors in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's writing, what do you think is most useful to do? Please check all that apply!

- mark all errors
- mark all major errors but not the minor ones
- mark most of the major errors, but not necessarily all of them
- mark only a few of the major errors
- mark only the errors that interfere with communicating your ideas
- mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content

Please explain the reason for your choice(s).

(2) The following sentences all have the same error and a teacher has given a different type of feedback for each. For each sentence circle the number that best describes the usefulness of the feedback from an intermediate to advanced ESL student.

For example, if you think the feedback is a very good way to point out an error then circle 5. If you think the feedback is a very bad way to point out an error then circle 1.

1 = not useful at all 2 = not useful 3 = doesn't matter

4 = quite useful 5 = very useful

- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <p>A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I ^{look at section 2 in grammar book.} <u>am</u> very lonely.</p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |
| <p>B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.</p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |
| <p>C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I ^{have been (wrong tense)} <u>am</u> very lonely.</p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |
| <p>D. Since I arrived in Victoria, I ^{have been} <u>am</u> very lonely.</p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |
| <p>E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I ^{wrong tense} <u>am</u> very lonely.</p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |
| <p>F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.</p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |
| <p>G. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.
<i>I'm sorry to hear that.</i></p> | <p><u>1 2 3 4 5</u></p> |

(3) Please explain the reasons for your choices for each type of feedback in item 2.

A. clues or directions on how to fix an error (the teacher gives clues or directions on how a student can correct his/her work)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

B. error identification (the teacher points out where the errors occur, but no errors are corrected)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

C. correction with comments (the teacher corrects errors and makes comments)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

D. teacher correction (the teacher corrects errors)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

E. commentary (the teacher gives feedback by making comments about errors, but no errors are corrected.)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

F. no feedback on an error

Please explain the reason for your choice.

G. a personal comment on the content (the teachers gives feedback by making comments on the ideas or content, but no error are corrected.)

Please explain the reason for your choice.

(4) If an error is repeated in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's writing more than once do you think it is useful to mark it each time it occurs?

Yes

No

Please explain the reason for your answer.

(5) For each of the following questions, circle one number that best describes its usefulness for an intermediate to advanced ESL student.

1 = not useful at all (useless) 2 = not useful 3 = doesn't matter
4 = quite useful 5 = very useful

- A. How useful is it to point out *organization errors* in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's written work? 1 2 3 4 5
- B. How useful is it to point out *grammatical errors* in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's written work? 1 2 3 4 5
- C. How useful is it to point out *content/idea errors* in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's written work? 1 2 3 4 5
- D. How useful is it to point out *punctuation errors* in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's written work? 1 2 3 4 5
- E. How useful is it to point out *spelling errors* in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's written work? 1 2 3 4 5
- F. How useful is it to point out *vocabulary errors* in an intermediate to advanced ESL student's written work? 1 2 3 4 5

Please explain the reason for your choice(s).

Thank you to all the teachers who participated in this study!