فصلنامه تحقیقات جدید در علوم انسانی
Human Sciences Research Journal
دوره جدید، شماره نوزدهم، تابستان ۱۳۹۸، صص ۱۹۶-۱۷۹ New Period, No 19, 2019, P 179-196
شماره شاپا (۲۴۷۶-۷۰۱۸) ISSN (2476-7018)

Review of Students' Reaction and Response to Teachers' Written Feedback on Their Writing

Khatereh Khaleghi
M.A student of English language teaching at Iran university of science and technology

Abstract
In the realm of second language research, investigating the writing skill has been of much concern for decades. Written corrective feedback, however, still merits more research attention. Furthermore. Most of the conducted research pertains to other language settings and written corrective feedback in EFL contexts is yet in need of exploration. This study seeks to review students' reaction and response to teachers' written feedback on their writing. In this regard, this study was done as a review for learners' perceptions and views towards teacher's written corrective feedback. In this descriptive study, the library research method is used to collect data. The results showed that that feedback raises students' awareness of the informational and linguistic expectation of readers, increase students' attention on the subject they write, modify students' thinking behavior toward their work, and focus their attention on the purpose of writing. First and foremost, all of the stakeholders involved in the field of ELT including theoreticians, researchers, material developers, teachers, etc. need to treat the writing skill as an active language skill in which feedback plays a crucial role. It is believed that teachers and learners actively involve themselves in the process of writing. It is essential to keep in mind that research involving WCF and language learning is still developing. Therefore, much more research is still needed to fully understand the role of WCF types on EFL learners' writing. Repeating this study in other conditions would provide a better understanding of this issue. Teachers can investigate a variety of WCF techniques that might be appropriate in their contexts.
Keywords: Written Corrective Feedback, Writing skill, EFL learners, Students' perceptions, Feedback

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

Introduction

Carson (2001) notes that teachers must accept the fact that L2 writing contains errors and these errors are part of L2 writing process. According to Goldstein (2001), students come to class both to improve their language proficiency and become more confident in their writing abilities. Instruction should provide learners with proper language input, writing experience and feedback to fulfill their goals. He believes that overt classroom instruction is only one factor of teaching process and providing students with feedback on their writing is another factor.

Reviews on previous research reveal that disagreement on the findings on the effectiveness of corrective feedback on student writing may be due to design flaws in those studies as highlighted by Bitchener (2008), Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima, (2008), Bruton (2009, 2010), and Gueette (2007). Such flaws may include, but not be limited to, too many areas of errors addressed in the studies, and failure to compare corrected texts with a new piece of writing. Only a few studies (e.g. Bitchener, 2008; Ellis, et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007) addressed only one error category, and required a new piece of writing as a post-test.

According to Ferries (2003), it seems that several decades of ongoing research activity on WCF is still too imperfect and contradictory due to a lack long-term studies benefiting from adequate regulations in terms of, data collection methods, analysis procedures and the research setting.

It was not uncommon to find many students who could not construct meaningful and grammatically correct sentences or well-written paragraphs and essays. One possible reason for this was that most teachers tended to address writing as a product rather than a process. Instead of engaging students in an extensive practice of writing through process approach activities, such as generating ideas, redrafting, and reviewing others‘ writing (Hedge, 2005), teachers expected students to produce a piece of written product for evaluation. This kind of writing does not replicate real-life writing; rather it is writing meant for learning, not for communication (Hedge 2005). Another reason might be related to teachers ‘inappropriate feedback on students‘ writing. They tend to give little feedback, which might be based on their previous teaching experience and their beliefs about how WCF should be given on students ‘writing, rather than following a standard WCF policy provided by the department. As Williams (2003) pointed out, if teachers‘ WCF includes vague comments or the inconsistent marking of errors, it may negatively affect the learners‘ abilities in writing, making them frustrated, passive, and confused.

The difficulties that students face in writing classes have been previously observed at several Saudi Universities. AbuSeileek (2006), who carried out a study at the Umm Al-Qura University in Saudi Arabia, concluded that students find writing to be the most problematic‘ of all their language skills. Moreover, Alhaysony‘s (2008) study at the King Abdul-Aziz University in

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

Saudi Arabia also indicated that students do not learn effective writing skills, because their teachers do not respond properly to their texts. In another study, Alhazmi and Schofield (2007) discussed the difficulties that Saudi ESL undergraduate students in their third year of a four-year program encounter with various aspects of writing. They found that the major problem was the dominance of traditional approaches in teaching writing.
The authorities have also recognized this problem. In order to improve the instruction of writing skills in the last few years, the standards for quality assurance and accreditation' of higher education programs in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has been trying to improve students' writing skills (Self Evaluation Scales for Higher Education Programs, 2015). This requires teachers to develop a rubric for giving appropriate feedback on students' writing in order to trace their performance and assessments. This feedback should be advisory, that is, aiming at helping student writers build awareness, knowledge, and strategic competence so that they can strengthen their writing skills in the future. However, no attention has been paid to student' beliefs and thinking or how they made sense of teaching writing which is essential for understanding the reasons behind students' inappropriate WCF responses and designing pedagogical improvements.

Purpose of the study

This study seeks to define teachers' written feedback and to investigate the effective factors on feedback. It also examines the review of related literature on teachers' feedback and student's response to it. It is assumed in this study that an inquiry into the students' rationale for their response to their writing help to determine their level of understanding of the role and function of feedback in the writing process, to uncover their expectations, and to make relevant suggestions that encourage them to adopt a process approach to learning writing despite the constraints they are confronted with in the context under consideration. It is also assumed that knowledge of the students' opinions about the feedback they receive help to pinpoint any discrepancy between the teachers' feedback practices and learners' preferences.

Methodology :

The current research is applied and descriptive one. Library research method is used in order to collect data,. It involves the step-by-step process used to gather information in order to write a paper. In this method, data were gathered from authentic print and digital journals and books.
Various concepts have been employed to define corrective feedback in the literature. In addition, based on Eva (2012), a number of expressions are used to exemplify feedback such as corrective feedback, error correction, positive evidence and negative evidence. In what follows these concepts and expressions will be defined to clear up the confusion. According to

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

Chaudron (1977), there is a difference between corrective feedback and error correction. He believes that these two terms do not have similar meanings. In fact, corrective feedback is provided when there is an error that needs to be repaired. However, error correction refers to corrective moves aimed at correcting the non-target like forms.

Positive evidence and negative evidence point to two kinds of language input to which L2 learners are exposed. The former presents models of L2 grammar showing the correct use of the target language. However, the latter gives information about the unacceptability of language forms (Long, 1996). Negative evidence includes two types namely direct and indirect. The direct negative feedback occurs when teachers respond to errors in an effort to attract learners' attention to them. On the other hand, indirect negative feedback provides learners with signals showing unacceptable forms due to missing input (Chomsky, 1981). In addition, based on Ferris (1999) and Shelly and Jill (2010) there are different techniques for providing feedback such as peer correction, teacher-student conferences, audio taped commentary, email comments and comments given on learners' drafts.

Definitions

Effectiveness of Feedback

The investigation of the effectiveness of giving written corrective feedback has yielded different results. Many researchers concluded that written corrective feedback is of high significance. For instance, Fathman and Whalley (1990) explored the impact of feedback on grammatical accuracy. The results of their study showed that corrective feedback had a positive effect in developing learners' writing concerning grammatical accuracy. Moreover, Lalande (1982) made comparisons between two types of feedback groups. Two groups were provided with direct corrections on errors in their writing whereas the other two groups received error codes. The findings revealed that the groups who received error codes performed more accurate in writing than groups who were given direct corrections. In addition, Jean (2003) found out that direct corrective feedback, underlining and coding led to more grammatically accurate pieces of writing.

While many studies indicated that corrective feedback provision is effective, few studies demonstrated that error correction is ineffective. For example, Robb, Ross and Shortreed (1986) concluded that giving feedback doesn't make significant differences regarding accuracy and quality of students' writing. Instead, they suggested that teachers spend their time and effort on presenting important aspects of linguistic structures.

Ferris (1999) confirms that Truscott (1996) may have been right in his assertion that there is not sufficient evidence in L2 learning literature to reinforce the efficacy of feedback. Nevertheless, this does not demonstrate that feedback is ineffective. Given this, we investigate recent studies on

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

effectiveness of feedback. To begin with, there are studies in the L2 literature indicating that feedback is ineffective.

For example, Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998) studied 62 ESL students' development in writing accuracy over seven weeks. Participants were divided into two groups. The experimental group was provided with feedback and grammatical explanation on both an editing exercise and journal entries. The control group wrote four journals each week and edited them and received no feedback or grammatical explanation. In order to assess students' overall development in linguistic accuracy over the assigned period, students were given two questions and were asked to answer one of them prior to the treatment and one after treatment. Both control and experimental groups indicated a similar improvement in their linguistic accuracy in writing on the post-test measures. The researchers assert that this shows that practice in writing and making revisions by students could be as effective as corrective feedback by teachers. Moreover, Fazio (2001) examined the effect of correction, commentaries, and the amalgamation of both. Primary level students took part in the study and they were given feedback for five months. At the end of this period, it was revealed that the students did not made progress in their accuracy.

Truscott and Hsu (2008) also explored the effectiveness of feedback. They studied the difference between underlining errors and no feedback and found no difference between them. Besides, Ferris and Roberts (2001) investigated the efficacy of underlining errors in their study and discovered that it helps students to write accurately. The difference between the findings of these two studies may be due to the differences in the context and participants. Hence, Truscott and Hsu's (2008) study does not disprove the effectiveness of feedback. In a similar vein, Ferris and Roberts' (2001) study does not prove the effectiveness of feedback. Nonetheless, there are many other studies that reinforce the efficacy of feedback. Both Truscott (1996) and Ferris (1999) pointed the need to include a control group for studying the efficacy of feedback. There are several recent studies that examined the efficacy of feedback and they also made use of control groups. Ashwel (2000) compared three patterns of feedback as well as no feedback. The three types of feedback assisted the students to develop their writing remarkably more than no feedback. In Bitchener's (2008) study, the efficacy of three explicit types of feedback are assessed compared to no feedback. The students who received feedback were to a great deal more accurate in writing new texts than those who received no feedback.

Ellis et al. (2008) studied the effect of focused and unfocused feedback in comparison with no feedback. Both focused and unfocused feedback enhanced students' accuracy in developing new pieces of writing, whereas students who were given no feedback did not perform better. Ferris and Roberts (2001) made comparisons between two types of feedback, underlining the students' errors and coding the students' errors, and no

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

feedback. They concluded that the students whose errors were coded and underlined enhanced their abilities in self-revision and writing new texts considerably more than the students who did not receive feedback. In what follows, several studies that take into consideration different sources and types of feedback will be introduced in detail.

The Source of Feedback

In early L2 learning settings, teachers were the mere source of feedback. However, in L1 writing contexts peer students were also a common source of feedback as well as teachers. L2 writing classrooms took this strategy from L1 writing settings. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether peer feedback in L2 classrooms is effective or not (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). A great deal of research has been conducted to explore the efficacy of the sources of feedback.

Both teacher and peer feedback have been studied to indicate the benefits and weaknesses of both. Yang et. al (2006) carried out a study in which they made comparisons between teacher and peer feedback. Two groups of students were investigated, one which received feedback from peers and the other which received feedback from their teachers. It was revealed that students relied on, made use of and favored teacher feedback more than peer feedback. The finding that the amount of self-correction in the peer feedback group was more than in the teacher feedback group shows that students were more autonomous in editing their writing with peer feedback. However, this does not indicate the reality of the writing classroom, since in normal writing classrooms teachers are the major source of feedback, or teachers give feedback in line with peers. In a qualitative enquiry, Hyland (2000) examined teacher and peer feedback given to individual students. She discovered that peer feedback given without any teacher guidance enabled students to use their own abilities, and that the restricting nature of teacher feedback made students to not have autonomy in deciding on the use and the source of feedback. Given that, Hyland proposes that teacher feedback need to be given in a way that leaves a room for students to decide on using their own ability when editing their written texts.

The two above-mentioned studies were carried out with university students. It was assumed that students before tertiary education cannot take advantage from peer feedback because of their low level of knowledge in the other language (Tsui & Ng, 2000). On the other hand, other studies have examined the efficacy of teacher and peer feedback for students who have not passed tertiary education. In a mixed qualitative-quantitative investigation, Tsui and Ng (2000) addressed the role of teacher and peer comments in writing revisions among secondary school L2 writers. In line with the other two studies, it was indicated that the students made use of teacher comments more than peer comments. The influence of the teacher made students to use teacher feedback more than peer feedback whereas peer feedback helped

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

students to have autonomy. Hence, concerning secondary students, teachers also need to use a strategy for giving feedback that guides learners to evaluate their own writing (Tsui & Ng, 2000).

Types of Corrective Feedback

There exist many types of feedback including direct versus indirect feedback, coded versus uncoded feedback, positive versus negative feedback as well as electronic feedback. John, Stuart and Denise (2005) differentiated between direct and indirect feedback. They refer to direct or explicit feedback as feedback that is provided when teachers specify errors and present correct forms. On the other hand, indirect feedback is given when teachers inform learners of errors but do not supply them with corrections. In their opinion, learners themselves are responsible for error correction.

Besides, the researchers have studied coded and uncoded feedback. According to John, et. al (2005) coded feedback refers to the spotting of the precise location of a given error and showing the type of error via a code. On the other hand, uncoded feedback occurs when teachers underline, circle or place errors. Students specify and correct errors in both types of coded and uncoded feedback.

Moreover, Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) highlight another type of feedback called commentary. In commentary feedback, teachers jot down their comments on learners' writing in the margins or at the end of the written text. This type of feedback offers detailed information on meaningfulness of ideas and also ways in which a piece of writing could be improved. Hyland (2000) make a distinction between two types of commentary feedback namely positive and negative feedback. In his idea, positive feedback is a means for encouraging learners for their writing developments. Negative feedback, however, is used to demonstrate weaknesses in writing.

Furthermore, David (2009) pointed to electronic feedback. He showed that learners are interested in using computer software such as concordancers, corpora tools and electronic dictionaries in which they are exposed to various and many examples of the target language forms. Despite such an interest, he identified some limitations of this type of feedback including the availability of computer labs and the willingness of teachers to make use of them in their classes to develop writing skills of the students.

There are many other studies that have examined which type of corrective feedback enhances students' writing accuracy. Some of these types are distinguished based on the focus of feedback. Other distinctions have also been made such as whether to give feedback on form before content or vice versa. Moreover, researchers have also explored the quality of the comments given to students when offering feedback. Many other types of feedback have been classified according to the explicitness and implicitness of the feedback.

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

The Focus of Feedback

This criterion considers whether all the students' errors are corrected extensively or one or two particular types of errors are selected to be corrected. Unfocused corrective feedback may be more difficult to be applied by students because they are supposed to correct a range of errors. On the other hand, focused corrective feedback may be more efficient since students correct the same error many times and it guides them to comprehend the feature and learn the correct form (Ellis, 2009). Ellis et al. (2008) compared the effect of focused and unfocused corrective feedback as well as no feedback. It was revealed that corrective feedback was effective for both focused and unfocused groups in developing students' accuracy in new pieces of written texts. The focused and unfocused groups did not indicate any significant difference and did better in a post-test and a delayed post-test than the control group, which received no feedback. This finding is of importance concerning curriculum design and the reason is that if unfocused feedback is provided, it assists students to improve their accuracy in a variety of linguistic features, whereas focused feedback guides students to improve accuracy in one or two concentrated features. Hence, this reveals that focused feedback leads students to more progress than unfocused feedback.

The Types of Comments

One of the techniques for dealing with students' writing is using teachers' comments on students' writing. Research has been carried out to explore the influence of those comments and the extent to which students can utilize them in their writing. For example, some teachers make use of praise to alleviate criticism and suggestions on students' writing. Hyland and Hyland (2001) examined whether teachers use criticism, suggestions or praise mainly. They realized that teachers employ praise more than other tools. They discovered that praise was used to mitigate their questions and criticisms.

Besides, Hyland and Hyland (2001) studied what factors motivate teachers to employ these mitigations and how it influences students in their study. The teachers made use of mitigation to lessen their criticism and the teachers' mitigation frequently made the meaning of their responses unclear to their students and sometimes created misunderstanding by the students. Furthermore, Sugita (2006) addressed the effect of three other comment forms that were used by teachers between drafts in order to know to what extent students use each type of these commentaries. Sugita discovered that the imperative form of comments was more effective on revision than the question or statement form of comments to lead students to edit their writing effectively. This finding shows that teachers need to be attentive in deciding on the types of comments when responding to their students' writing.

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

Reformulation

Another type of giving feedback on students' writing is to reformulate a part of the students' writing in which there is an error. A typical method for providing feedback is reconstruction. This involves native speakers to give feedback, thus it could not be employed in those places in which there are not any native speakers. The native speaker rewrites the students' texts in a native-like form without any modification in the students' ideas (Cohen, 1989).

In a case study, Qi and Lapkin (2001) examined the extent to which noticing influenced L2 writing development with two students, one with a higher proficiency level and the other with a lower proficiency level. Their findings suggest that composing and reformulating enhance noticing, but high level proficiency students are more successful in applying the reformulated correction, whereas low level students are not successful in editing their writing if it is reformulated. This may be due to the point that low level proficiency students cannot understand the reformulated form entirely. Thus, it is of high importance for teachers to take into account the students' levels when reformulating their writing. The students should also be instructed in order to know how to notice the reformulated forms to use them in their writing and remember them.

Additionally, Sachs and Polio (2007) examined the efficacy of reformulation compared to error correction as two means of improving students' linguistic accuracy, and how the learners' awareness of linguistic rules pertained to accuracy in their revised writing. Sachs and Polio revealed that students performed better while they received error correction feedback rather than reformulation. This study also supports Qi and Lapkin's (2001) findings and that students who are more aware of the linguistic rules are more accurate in editing their writings. Therefore, based on the findings of this study, it is suggested that considering learners' levels when reformulating their writings is important for teachers.

Review of related literature

Many researchers have focused on English language teachers' perceptions of written corrective feedback. The conducted studies indicate that teachers hold different views about the effectiveness of corrective feedback on writing. Besides, comparisons have been made between teachers' perceptions and their real practices. In particular, Icy (2003) studied perceptions, practices and problems of L2 writing teachers with regard to corrective feedback. The researcher developed a questionnaire and distributed it to English teachers in Hong Kong secondary schools. Teachers answered to open and close-ended questions. The questionnaire included various aspects of written corrective feedback such as strategies to correct students' errors in writing, ways of perceiving work in error correction and concerns and problems regarding giving feedback on writing. The results indicated that whereas many teachers highlight writing errors comprehensively, few mark

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

them selectively. Moreover, the results revealed differences between teachers' perceptions and their real practices concerning corrective feedback in writing.

While some studies showed that teachers' perceptions differed from their real practices, the results of Katia's study (2011) indicated that teachers' perceptions shape their pedagogical practices. In this study, 15 Brazilian teachers completed a five-point Likert-type survey. The survey included 22 statements about issues related to written corrective feedback. The researcher made use of a cross-sectional survey. Katia's research was a mixed-method study in which bothqualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis were used. The results revealed that Brazilian teachers seem to believe that form-focused correction is recommendable instructional approach. Besides, the qualitative analysis of teachers' perceptions regarding written feedback showed that teachers' perceptions guide their pedagogical practices.

As previously highlighted, a number of studies have investigated second language teachers' perspectives of written corrective feedback. Other studies, on the other hand, have made comparisons between second and foreign language teachers with regard to their perceptions of written corrective feedback. For instance, Kyounggrok (2010) conducted a comparative study to find similarities and differences in perceptions of foreign language teachers (Korean as a foreign language=KFL) and second language teachers (ESL) in North America concerning written corrective feedback. Those teachers teach L2 college students.

The researcher employed online survey to explore the perceptions of both types of teachers regarding aspects of corrective written feedback, types of written feedback, and approaches to provide feedback on student writing. The participants of the study consisted of 153 college instructors of ESL and KFL across North America. The survey included 46 items. Data was analyzed using descriptive and correlational statistics. The results revealed that both groups of teachers differed in terms of location, focus of feedback, error treatment, number of drafts and follow up methods.

The researcher concluded that these variations may lead to change in written feedback practices. Besides, many factors can contribute to these changes such as culture, context, student proficiency and training opportunities. The study also suggested that the difference in the practices of written feedback provided by foreign and second language teachers resulted from time management issues and lack of training opportunities of providing written feedback. KFL teachers used comprehensive, direct feedback on local aspects of student writing on a single draft. On the other hand, ESL teachers favored selective, indirect feedback among various possible types of corrective feedback.

Ken (2006) investigated teachers' perceptions of error and the possible effects of first language and experience. The study focused on reactions and

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

responses of Japanese and English EFL teachers and a group of native English speaking non-teachers to a single text by an EFL learner. The participant of the study were classified into three groups which are Japanese teacher group, a group of native English speaking non-teachers living in London with little experience of Japanese and a group of native English speaking teachers from the UK. Teachers were asked to identify and correct writing errors in an authentic text on the topic 'beauty'. The text was written by pre-intermediate level students at a Japanese University. The questionnaire data indicated that all teachers considered error correction as a positive pedagogy strategy. The findings showed that Japanese L1 teachers of English found more errors and implied in fragment of rules. However, the native English speaking teachers were more selective in correction by identifying far fewer errors. The researcher concluded by stating that it seems that it is important for teachers to distinguish between grammatical errors and stylistic difference to inform teaching and marking.

While there are many studies that focus on the effectiveness of feedback and the types of feedback, there are other studies that investigate student perceptions or student versus teacher perceptions toward feedback and types of feedback. It is essential to examine student perceptions regarding feedback because research findings suggest that students can most effectively follow those kinds of feedback which they prefer (Montgomery & Baker, 2007). Investigating teacher perceptions is also important because teachers should feel confidence while they provide a kind of feedback that they prefer. Thus, it is important to investigate student and teachers' preferred styles of feedback.

Diab (2006) explored EFL students' perceptions regarding feedback. It was found that the students in the study were concerned about the accuracy of their writings and they thought that the different features of their writings were equally important. Moreover, some of the students thought that their errors should be corrected on the first drafts while others thought that their errors should be corrected on the final drafts. They also preferred more explicit error correction and wanted all their errors to be corrected on their papers. The students were also in favor of the teacher commenting on the ideas of their writing. This last finding of the study is interesting because students generally have a preference for comments on the form rather than the content in their writing (Diab, 2006).

In another study, learners' perceptions regarding the usefulness of coded versus un-coded feedback in helping them in error correction and developing their second language writing were investigated. It was found that the students generally liked their errors to be coded so as to incorporate their teachers' feedback in their writing. Lee (2008) looked at students' perceptions from various perspectives by collecting data in different ways such as a student questionnaire, a teacher interview, and feedback analysis. It was found that students generally preferred more teacher comments and

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

preferred more explicit feedback on their papers. In addition, students could not understand the teacher feedback on their papers completely. The students at a high proficiency level gave more importance to error feedback than the students at a low level of proficiency. Therefore, it is vital for teachers to be attentive to the impact of their feedback practices on student beliefs and expectations because this can help teachers to improve their affective and reflective feedback practices.

There are a number of studies that examine not only student perceptions regarding feedback, but also teacher perceptions. Schulz (2001) compared student and teacher perceptions across Colombian and U.S cultures. It was found that the students across both cultures had relatively equally positive attitudes toward grammar corrective feedback. The teachers also preferred feedback on grammatical errors. Chandler's study (2003) also observed student and teacher perceptions regarding four different types of feedback: 1) direct correction, 2) underlining and describing the error, but not correcting, 3) describing the error, but not location, and 4) underlining only. Chandler found that direct correction was preferred by students because they can incorporate it easily and it was preferred by teachers because they can respond to students' papers fast. The students also wanted underlining because they thought that it assists them to progress in writing and teachers preferred it because it is the easiest type of feedback to be given to students.

Lee (2004) focused on student and teacher opinions about teacher feedback and found that both of them preferred comprehensive error feedback. In another study (Kanani & Kersten, 2005), teachers' focus on feedback and students' perceptions regarding their teachers' feedback were explored. In addition, it was investigated whether teachers' perceptions match the students' expectations. Kanani and Kersten (2005) found that teachers' feedback and students' expectations matched to some extent. The teacher in this study marked, underlined and circled the students' errors without correcting or coding. Though the students approved of their teacher's feedback, they liked more explicit feedback. Montgomery and Baker (2007) in their study revealed that the students preferred a kind of feedback that is easy for the students to incorporate. Students also preferred a type of feedback which focuses on linguistic errors. They were also interested in feedback on form more than on content.

Though the students' attitudes were investigated in the other studies, the results of the studies may not fit circumstances, even with the same participant. This may be because students' perceptions may change due to their improvement in proficiency. Sakalı (2007) conducted a study with 200 pre-intermediate students and 11 teachers and the results showed that students mostly changed their preference over time because of their progress in writing. It is also suggested that teachers should consider utilizing different types of feedback that vary according to the students' level of proficiency and needs. This study is in line with those of Montgomery and

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

Baker (2007) and Lee (2004), in that it shows that students generally prefer a type of feedback which is understandable to them and therefore, can be used easily. Because students' proficiency levels change over time, their ability to understand feedback changes as well.

In another study, Ferris (1997) examined 17 university ESL students' first drafts and revised drafts and found that particular types of commentary appeared to be more influential. The study counted more than 1611 marginal and end comments. The research findings suggest that the students apparently took the teachers' requests quite seriously and that the revisions made in response to requests phrased as questions or statements had primarily positive effects (11-61:). Imperatives were rare in teachers comments, but when they occurred, the students appeared to take them seriously especially in marginal notes; 71: of marginal comments in imperative forms appeared to lead to positive changes. In general, longer comments and those that were text specific were associated with major changes more than other shorter and general comments.

In a study, Sugita (1116) investigated a particular aspect of commentary on EFL student writing. Three types of handwritten commentary were used between drafts: statements, imperatives, and questions. The result shows that, although the teachers tend to avoid imperative comments, imperatives seem to be more influential on revision than other two types. The teacher's imperative comments seem to be direct instruction which have a feeling of authority so that students pay a great deal of attention to teacher feedback and follow the instructions and revise the drafts.

According to another categorization of feedbacks, some researchers (e.g. Ferris, 1991) have distinguished between direct and indirect feedback strategies. According to these researchers, both students and teachers have a preference for direct explicit feedback based on which the errors are identified and he teacher provide the correct form of them.

However, according to Ferris and Roberts (1111) indirect feedback is preferable for most student writers because it engage them in guided learning and problem solving, leading to reflection about linguistic forms that may foster long-term acquisition.. According to Ferris (1111) indirect feedback helps students to make progress in accuracy over time more than direct feedback does.

Reflection on teachers' feedback has been identified as a factor that can influence students writing abilities in long term. In a study, Hewings and Coffin (1997) identified three types of responses and feedback depending on the degree of reflection happening in groups. They studied three groups. In group A, the responses received only minimal feedback from the teacher or students. In group B, the feedback style modeled by the tutor and his frequent postings appeared to encourage more peer involvement in putting forward ideas and responding to others. The contributions were often short and the interaction between group members was dynamics. Group C's tasks

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

and tutor modeling encouraged more reflection at the expense of the dynamism of group B. however, as a result of the greater reflection; students were constructing disciplinary knowledge through sharing their own experiences.

In addition to the studies done about the importance of teacher feedback in enabling learners revise their writing, the interpersonal aspects of response as factors that influence the construction and interpretation of response have been investigated as well. In a study done by Hyland and Hyland (1111), it was shown that feedback not only communicates beliefs about writing, language, or content but also expresses human relations. That is to say, in most cases, teachers attempt to pay special attention to the ways they give comments (e.g. praising, criticism, or suggestion). Furthermore, they try to mitigate directness while giving feedback so that they won't appear offensive.

Conclusion

Written corrective feedback (WCF) has had a long and controversial history in the fields of L2 writing and second language acquisition (SLA) over the past several decades. The research activity on the topic of WCF started to progress in 1990s. Truscott (1996, 1997) called for the rejection of error correction since it takes teachers‘ and students‘ attention away from more important concerns. However, teachers didn’t regard error in student writing (Santa, 2006). As noted by Ferris and Hedgcock (1998), Hairston (1986), and Leki (1990a), composition instructors invest a great deal of time in annotating student papers with their feedback. This study seeks to review students’ reaction and response to teachers’ written feedback on their writing. In this regard, this study was done as a review of survey for collecting data about learners’ perceptions and views towards teacher’s written corrective feedback.

The ability to share ideas and feeling through written communication needs writing skill mastery. This mastery requires appropriate implementation of teaching technique during learning process. Whether the technique is implemented appropriately and helps the students to improve their writing or not need to know. What students’ think and feel toward the technique can be teacher’s consideration to improve or provide the description of success and failure toward the implementation which contribute to students’ comfort during writing learning. Students’ mastery toward writing skill helps them to share ideas and feeling in written form. Their writing fulfills good criteria of organization, content, grammar, vocabulary and mechanics. Giving feedback by teacher known as teacher’s written corrective feedback to students’ writing is one of ways to improve students’ writing. Through identifying writing problem and giving comment and suggestion, students can know what their writing problems are, why the problems occur and how to improve their writing. As a result, students’ writing is better than before

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

they get the feedback. The advantages of the feedback are not the only reason to implement the feedback in writing class. Knowing students' thought and feel toward the feedback can be another reason. What they think and feel toward the feedback help teachers to adjust and improve the feedback which suits their students' comfort and the goal of writing teaching and learning.

According to the studies, review students' reaction and response to teachers' written feedback on their writing . The results showed that that feedback raises students' awareness of the informational and linguistic expectation of readers, increase students' attention on the subject they write, modify students' thinking behavior toward their work, and focus their attention on the purpose of writing.

First and foremost, all of the stakeholders involved in the field of ELT including theoreticians, researchers, material developers, teachers, etc. need to treat the writing skill as an active language skill in which feedback play a crucial role. It is believed that teachers and learners actively involve themselves in the process of writing. Approaches to teaching writing, therefore, should be aimed at empowering both teachers and learners to successfully control their writing process.

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

Refrences

__ Ashwel, 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, 227-258

__ Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Month Investigation. Applied Linguistics, 31(2), 193-214

__ Carson, A. (2001). Research on direct versus translated writing: Students' strategies and their results. The Modern Language Journal, 85, 169-188.

__ Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12(3) 267–296.

__ Crystal, D. (1992). An encyclopedic dictionary of language and languages. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers

__ Ellis, R. (2006). The place of grammar instruction in the second/foreign language curriculum. In S. Fotos & E. Hinkel (Eds.), New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classroom (pp. 17-34). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

__ Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). Analysing Learner Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

__ 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.

__ 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.

__ Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (pp. 178–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

__ Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. TESOL Quarterly,31(2), 315-339.

__ Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (Eds.),

__ Ferris, D. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. Assessing Writing, 19, 6-23

__ Ferris, D. R. (1995). Can advanced ESL students be taught to correct their most serious and frequent errors? CATESOL Journal, 8(1), 41-62.

__ Ferris, D. R. (2003). Responding to writing. In B. Lroll (Ed.), Exploring second language writing (pp. 119-140). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

__ Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, andpractice. Mahwah, N J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

__ Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be? Journal of second language writing, 10, 161-184

__ Ferris, D., Brown, J., Lui, H., & Stine, M. (2011). Responding to L2 students in college writing classes: Teacher perspective. TESOL Quarterly, 45(2), 207-234.

__ Goldstein, L. (2001). For Kyla: What does the research say about responding to ESL writers? In T. Silva & P. Matsuda (Eds.), On second language writing (pp. 73- 90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elbaum Associates.

__ Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. Journal of second language writing, 16(1), 40- 53.

__ Horowitz, D. (1991). ESL writing assessments: Contradictions and resolutions. Assessing second language writing in academiccontexts, 71-85

__ Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback in second language writing: context and issues. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

__ James, C. (1998). Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis. London: Longman.

__ Junqueira, L & Payant, C. (2015). "I just want to do it right, but it's so hard": A novice teacher's written feedback beliefs and practices. Journal of Second Language Writing, 27, 19-36

__ Kellerman E. (2004). Transfer and non-transfer: Where are we now? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2, 37-57

__ Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. Modern Language Journal, 75, 305-313. Kern, R. & Warschauer, M. (2000). Introduction. In R. Kern &

__ Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. Modern Language Journal, 75, 305-313

__ Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college- level writing classes. Foreign Language Annals, 24, 203-218.

__ Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). Review article: Recasts as feedback to language learners. Language Learning, 51, 719-758.

__ Long, M. H. (2006). Problems in SLA. Mahwah, N. J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

__ Long, M. H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition (pp. 15-41).

__ Lyster , R. (1998). The ambiguity of recasts and repetition in L2 classroom discourse .Studies in Second Language Acquisition , 20 , 51 – 81 .

__ Mackey, A. (2007). Feedback, noticing and instructed second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 27, 405-30

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]

__ Richards, J. C. (1998). Beyond training. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press

__ Ross-Feldman, L. (2007). Interaction in the L2 classroom: Does gender influence learning opportunities? In A. Mackey (Ed.), Conversational interaction in second language acquisition (pp.53-77). Oxford: Oxford University Press

__ Schachter, J. (1991). An error in error analysis. Language Learning, 27, 205-214.

__ Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. Language Teaching Research, 10, 361–392.

__ Sheen, Y. (2006). Exploring the relationship between characteristics of recasts and learner uptake. Language Teaching Research, 10, 361–392.

__ Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? RELC Journal, 23(1), 103-110

S__ kehan, P. (1998). A cognitive approach to language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press

__ Stern, G. (1992). Today research, tomorrow inspiration. ELT, 3(1), 201-214.

__ Ur, P. (1996). A course in language teaching: Practice and theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

__ Williams, J. (2001). Undergraduate second language writers in the writing center. Journal of Basic writing, 21(2), 73-91

[Downloaded from jnrihs.ir on 2026-11-07]