The Role of Written Corrective Feedback in Enhancing Students' Proficiency in Writing: Case of Second Year Students,University of Constantine 1

Abstract:
Written corrective feedback is of a crucial role to the improvement of students' writings.Every time their writing teachers provided them with the feedback, students should not hesitate to make use of it to develop their writing. This study discusses the effects of the different types of written corrective feedback in enhancing students' writing and at finding out the appropriate type of written corrective feedback to be used. This is done through comparing the results of the effects of three types of corrective feedback on students' written productions. The hypothesis is that ifstudents are provided with un-coded written feedback, coded written feedback, and peer feedback this would result in effective results on the writing performances of students who receive un-coded corrective feedback in comparison to those who receive coded feedback and peer feedback. To test the validity of this hypothesis, the researcher opted for a questionnaire, directed to teachers of writing in the department of Letters and English Language, at the University of Constantine 1.
Keys words: written corrective feedback;coded feedback;un-coded feedback;peer feedback;

Amina ZEMIECHE
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Foreign Languages
University of Mentouri
Constantine

ملخص:
الملاحظات الكتابية التصحيحية تلعب دورا هاما في تحسين المهارة الكتابية لدى الطلبة.ولهذا يجب على الطلبة الاستفادة من هذه التقنية من أجل تحسين مهاراتهم الكتابية. لتحقيق ذالك، ينبغي تزويد الطلبة بالنوع المناسب من الملاحظات الكتابية. وتسعى هذه الدراسة لتوعية الطلبة والمدرسين بالدور الذي تلعبه الملاحظات الكتابية في تعزيز الكتابة لدى الطلبة. كما تهدف إلى معرفة النوع الأنسب من الملاحظات الكتابية التصحيحية وكيفية استخدامها وذالك لتشخيص مشاكل الطلبة في الكتابة. ولذالك، وضعت الفرضية التالية: إذا تم تزويد الطلبة بملاحظات كتابية غير مشفرة، ملاحظات كتابية مشفرة، و ردود فعل الأقران، فإن ذالك من شأنه أن يحسن كتابات الطلبة المزودين بملاحظات كتابية غير مشفرة. ولاختبار صحة هذه الفرضية، تم اعداد استبيان لأساتذة مقياس التعبير في قسم واللغة الإنجليزية، جامعة قسنطينة 1.
الكلمات المفتاحية: الملاحظات الكتابية التصحيحية ؛الملاحظات الكتابية غيرالمشفرة؛ ردود فعل الأقران.

Introduction:

Writing is one of the four language skills students should develop when attempting to learn a foreign language. Given its complexity, both EFL teachers and specialists make considerable efforts to find out easier ways of teaching and making students learn this skill.

Via providing different kinds of feedback, teachers try to enhance students' writing. Through this study, three main questions arise: What type of written feedback do teachers give to their learners? Do teachers have a preference for a particular type of feedback? Does un-coded feedback have a particular effect on their learners' writing proficiency? To answer these questions, it is hypothesised that if students are provided with un-coded written feedback, coded written feedback, and peer feedback this would result in effective results on the writing performances of students who receive un-coded corrective feedback in comparison to those who receive coded feedback and peer feedback. The aim behind this study is to choose apositive kind of feedback to improve the learners' writing proficiency. In this research, the researcher attempts to shed some light on the notion of written corrective feedback and its different types as a tool to enhance the students' writing skill. The writer also deals with the practical side of the present study in which the results are analysed and discussed.

Review of the Literature
1.1. Definition of Feedback

By definition, feedback is any verbal or non verbal comment made by the teacher to other students. With regards to the nature of feedback and its importance, Sárosdy, Bencze, Poór, and Vadnay say that feedback "refers to the information that learners receive from their teacher about their performance, which will help them take self-corrective action and improve their achievement." (2006: 121). Therefore, improving student achievement is the main goal behind providing feedback.

According to the Oxford Basic English Dictionary, the word feedback refers to "advice or information about how well or badly you have done something." (2012: 143).

1.1.1. Written Corrective Feedback

Feedback might be of two types: Written or oral. In writing classes, whenever students submit their written productions, they expect teachers to have responses regarding their written work. These teachers' responses or corrections represent the written corrective feedback whose effectiveness has been a debatable topic over the years in EFL writing research.

The debate is whether the teacher's correction is effective for students' linguistic development or not. Truscott's view is one of the most famous ones in this domain.In the 1996 review article in language learning, he argues: "all forms of error correction of L 2 student writing are not only ineffective but potentially harmful and should be abandoned." (cited in Chandler, 2003: 267). In a subsequent study, Truscott (2007: 271) claims that Written Corrective Feedback is a 'clear and dramatic failure'. (cited in Marzban & Arabahmadi, 2013: 1000).

Many studies, however, refute Truscott's (1996) strong view against written corrective feedback. Those studies defend the view that feedback is efficient; for example, "Cardelle and Corno(1981), Frantzen and Rissell (1987), Fathman and Whalley (1990), Ferris (1997), Ashwell (2000),Ferris and Roberts (2001),". (cited in Chandler, 2003: 269). This debate over the effectiveness of corrective feedback given by teachers to EFL students has been prominent in recent years. Here, it is worth mentioning Hyland's (1998) opposing standpoint to that of Truscott in which he stresses the positive role of written corrective feedback not only in improving students' written production, but also in developing the students' learning process as a whole. Hyland asserts: "In fact, teacher-written feedback is generally welcomed and highly valued by second language writers (Hyland, 1998) and seems to lead to improvements in writing (Ferris, 2003)" (Hyland, 2006:103). He, then, maintains: "In terms of academic literacy development, feedback emphasizes a process of writing and rewriting where the text is not seen as self-contained but points forward to other texts the student will write and to further stages of learning." ibid.

Despite the continuous dispute over the effectiveness of written corrective feedback in enhancing students' writing skill, the present study seeks to highlight its effectiveness via empirical evidence, as will follow.

1.1.2. Types of Written Corrective Feedback

A growing number of researches (Semke, 1984; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992; Truscott, 1996) about feedback types try to find out about the kinds of corrective feedback which are more likely to help EFL students improve the accuracy of their writing (Bitchener et al.

2005). Hence, a brief explanation about the different types is provided in what follows.

1.1.2.1. Direct Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback is defined as "the provision of the correct linguistic form or structure above or near the linguistic error" which could include "the crossing out of unnecessary word/ phrase/ morpheme, the insertion of a missing word/ phrase/ morpheme, or the provision of the correct form or structure" (Bitchener 2008.cited in Elwood and Bode, 2013: 334). That is, direct corrective feedback represents the teachers' attempts to correct students' errors in a clear and precise way by showing the errors and giving the right form of those errors. As argued by Bitchener et al. "Direct or explicit feedback occurs when the teacher identifies an error and provides the correct form". (2005: 193)

In this type, the teacher points out the mistake, shows its type and provides its corrected version to the student writer. The distinctive feature of this type of written corrective feedback is supplying the right form of the mistake.

For students with low proficiency levels and who are unable to self-correct their mistakes, direct corrective feedback is very advantageous in that it provides ready alternatives for their mistakes. One of the disadvantages, nevertheless, is that it does not lead to long term learning. (Ellis, 2008)

1.1.2.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback

As opposed to direct corrective feedback where the teacher's role is that of indicating the mistake as well as correcting it, indirect corrective feedback asks the teacher for indicating the error and giving opportunity to the learners to find the correct form of the error themselves. It is claimed, therefore, that in an "indirect CF errors are indicated but no corrections are provided." Shintani and Ellis (2013: 288). Furthermore, Ellis claims: "Indirect CF involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it." (2008:100)

Correcting their own mistakes, learners engage in critical thinking which in turn leads to long term retention. "Since it provides a chance for learner reflection hence more in-depth processing, indirect CF is more likely to result in long-term learning." (Asassfeh, 2013: 86)

Regarding the importance of feedback, researchers have split into two groups: Those favouring direct corrective feedback and those favouring indirect corrective feedback. Ferris and Roberts (2001) note that direct corrective feedback can reduce the areas of students' misunderstanding, especially confusion about where the errors are located or what type of error is committed as well as the error codes used (cited in Elwood and Bode, 2013: 334)

Although the previously mentioned claim favours direct feedback in teachers' corrections, it is worth mentioning that indirect feedback has also long-term positive effects on students' learning process as it leads to long-term retention i.e. students use the feedback in order to correct themselves and they become able to avoid these kind of mistakes on future writing occasions. In fact, they will remember mistakes and teachers' comments each time they are asked to write. Besides, direct feedback might lead the teacher to impose on the students to write what they do not intend to write about. "Ferris (2002) suggests that indirect feedback is generally more appropriate and effective than direct feedback. The danger of direct feedback is that teachers may misinterpret students' meaning and put words into their mouths." (Falhasiri et al. 2011: 255). That is, indirect feedback means that the teacher uses the implicating strategies indicating that the student has made a mistake but does not correct it giving the opportunity to learners to do so. In other words, there is only an indication of the error without any correction "Thereby leaving the student to diagnose and correct it" (Bitchener et al. 2005: 193). They conclude that indirect feedback is more effective than direct feedback for it helps learners to improve the accuracy of their writing.

a. **Coded Feedback**

Showing codes or symbols to name the underlined errors refers to what is known as coded feedback. While correcting students' writing, teachers look for the error, underline, circle, or show it on the margin and indicate its type using a specific code. Correcting the errors is the students' duty.Bitchener et al. (2005) argue that coded feedback demonstrates the errors, their location, and uses codes to indicate their types (193).

143

Harmer (2001) asserts that when "we use these codes, we mark the place where a mistake has been made and use one of the symbols in the margin to show what the problem is. The student is now in a position to correct the mistake." (p. 112). Getting those guidelines about the location of the mistake is expected to help the learner to correct it.

b.   Un-coded Feedback

Un-coded feedback refers to the fact that the teacher of writing signals an error in the students' written texts without showing the type of the error or its correction. Here, it is the writer's task to find out the error type and correct it too. Bitchener et al. (2005) indicate that "un-coded feedback refers to instances when the teacher underlines an error, circles an error, or places an error tally in the margin, but, in each case, leaves the student to diagnose and correct the error" (193)

When providing un-coded corrective feedback, teachers do not correct the students' mistakes. They only locate them while students should find the type of the mistake and its correct form. It is said, therefore, that "un-coded feedback refers to underlining, circling and placing errors. Students diagnose and correct errors in both coded and un-coded feedback" (John, Stuart & Denise, 2005 cited in Al Shamsi 2013:17-18)

1.1.2.3. Peer Feedback

In addition to teachers' written comments student writers receive during the writing process, classmates' comments or "Peer Feedback" is also available in a writing class. Ferris (2003) posits

> It is suggested that peer feedback offers student writers a more varied and authentic audience than simply writing for the teacher, that careful reading and evaluation of peers' texts builds critical thinking skills that can help students to better assess their own writing, that students will feel less threatened by and resentful of feedback given by peers than by the teacher, and that peer response groups will lighten the teacher's "composition slave" responding load. (p.15).

Given the benefits suggested by Ferris, Peer Feedback is regarded a very helpful tool in enhancing student writing especially because it lowers anxiety felt when receiving the teacher's correction.

Fieldwork

The Teachers' Questionnaire

The questionnaire was directed to twenty two (22) teachers of writing in the Department of Letters and English language at the University of Constantine 1 during the academic year 2014-2015. The reason behind designing this questionnaire is to gather some information about teachers' practices in the writing classes, their conceptions about proving written corrective feedback and the way it is incorporated in the instruction of writing.Finally, the questionnaireaims at finding out about the best type of written corrective feedback for the improvement of students' writing proficiency.

This questionnaire is concerned with the effects of corrective feedback on students' writing. The respondents are expected to provide factual information about how the correction of any essay is conducted. It deals with students' preferences and their attitudes towards each type of corrective feedback. Besides, it seeks to answer questions related to the different forms of providing written feedback and the different effects each one of them might have on the students' writing skill.

Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on Writing

Question One: When correcting students' mistakes in writing, do you

a- Provide the correct form
b- Underline the mistake and name its type giving opportunity to the students to correct it (coded feedback)
c- Just underline the mistake and it is up to the students to find both the type of mistake and the correct form (un-coded feedback)

a	b	c	a+b	a+c	all of them	Total
05	06	00	05	01	05	22
22.73%	27.27%	0%	22.73%	04.54%	22.73%	100%

Table 1. Types of Feedback Provided

145

This table is a classification of the types of Written Corrective Feedback provided by the teachers of writing in the department. This table shows that 22.73% of the teachers provide the correct form of the mistakes made by students. This is the so-called direct feedback. 27.27% of the informants, on the other hand, claim that they provide indirect coded feedback through underlining and naming students' mistakes. No one of the informants (00%), however, provides indirect un-coded feedback: Neither correcting the mistake nor even showing its type.

Another category of teachers representing 22.73% of the sample report their simultaneous use of two types of Written Corrective Feedback which are direct feedback and indirect coded feedback. Furthermore, 04.54% claim that they use both Direct Corrective Feedback and Indirect Un-coded Feedback when correcting their students' writing.

In the last category, 22.73% of the teachers claim that they use a combination of the three types altogether depending on each student's level. That is, students with an average or good level are able to correct themselves depending on the indirect feedback provided without waiting for their teachers' direct feedback. Weak learners, however, feel the need for providing them with the correct form of the mistake.

- <u>Please, justify your choice:</u>

Teachers making use of direct feedback justify their choice by the fact that students are too weak to correct their mistakes by themselves. Using codes is unclear, especially for freshmen. Another teacher adds that they need to have full feedback (direct one): The mistake and how to correct it.

Teachers in favour of indirect coded feedbackjustify their choice by the fact that coded feedback helps to guide both peer review and self-assessment. In addition, it allows students to become autonomous and aware of their own weaknesses. Moreover, giving students the opportunity to try and correct their mistakes after specifying the type gives a chance for those learners to be good reviewers of their own work. However, students are in some cases unable to identify the mistake. Coded Feedback is used to give students the opportunity to correct their own mistakes. Teachers opting for direct feedback and coded feedback justify their choice by the following factors:

146

-I insist on coded feedback because students do not only make mistakes at the word or the sentence level, but also at the paragraph level. In this case, the teacher cannot provide corrections for each mistake.

-When students correct themselves, they learn better and sometimes the teacher gives them the correct form to avoid fossilisation.

These results prove that the best way of benefiting from Written Corrective Feedback is to use all the different types depending on the students' level, the mistake made, and the period of time allocated for the written task. The latter means that if the teacher gives a written assignment which is to be done in only one session and they are to provide immediate, then it would be less time consuming if the teacher provides un-coded feedback. There is, however, a common agreement on the fact that good learners are to be given un-coded feedback since they are able to look for the type of the mistake and correct it.

Question Two: Which of the following types is the most effective in improving your students' writing?
  a- Direct feedback
  b- Coded feedback
  c- Indirect un-coded feedback

a	b	c	a+b	a+c	b+c	all of them	Total
07	11	00	01	01	01	01	22
31.52%	50%	00%	04.55%	04.55%	04.55%	04.55%	100%

Table 2. Effectiveness of the Different Types of Feedback in Improving Students' Writing

This table shows that 31.82% of the participants believe that direct feedback is more effective than any other type in improving the students' writing skill. They claim that correcting students' mistakes and providing the correct form is the feedback which leads to improvement. However, 50% opt for indirect coded feedback claiming that it is the most beneficial one in comparison to the others because it points out the type of the mistake of the learner. Then, the latter's task is to replace the mistake with the correct form.

147

On the other hand, none of the participants (00%) believes in the efficacy of indirect un-coded feedbackin spite of its validity in transforming students into active participants in the learning process by using the signalled mistake and trying to look for both its type and its correct version.This type of feedback seems to have no positive effects on students' level in writing.

Another 04.55% of the teachers assert that the best way to improve students' writing is to use a combination of direct feedback and coded feedback. Another 04.55%use a combination direct+ un-coded feedback is the most effective form, and still other 04.55% of the participants chose indirect feedback with its two forms (coded and un-coded)as the best among the other types or combinations. Still one more 04.55% of the participants provide an answer which is that the incorporation of all the three types is the best one. This implies that using these types depends on the level of students and the type of the mistake made.

To conclude with, results of Table 2 serve as sound evidence proving that coded written corrective feedback is considered the best way to improve students' writing. These results do not confirm the set hypothesis which indicates that the best type in improving students' writing is indirect un-coded feedback.

Question Three: Which type of WCF (Written Corrective Feedback) do your students prefer?

direct feedback	don't know	no type	conference feedback	Total
16	04	01	01	22
72.73%	18.19%	04.55%	04.55%	100%

Table 3. Students' Preferences about WCFProviding
WCF: Written Corrective Feedback

Table 03 represents students' preferences about the different types of Written Corrective Feedback. It seems that direct feedback is regarded as being the most favourable one for student writers. This is due to the fact that it is effortless in that the writers' task is just to look at the teacher's correction. The right answer is already there for the students.

They make no efforts in searching for the type of mistake or its correction.

With regard to this question, 13.64% of the participants declare that they do not know which type is preferred by their students; while 04.55% of the participants have provided no answer. No attention seems to be paid to the importance of students' interests and preferences in the learning process. Knowing what they like, helps a lot in providing a suitable working atmosphere for learning. It is, therefore, advisable to investigate about the type of feedback they prefer most in order to use it for making improvement take place.Still another answer, made by one informant, indicates that students prefer conference feedback.

Question Four: Which type leads to long-term improvement?

direct feedback	coded feedback	indirect un-coded feedback	don't know	all of them	Total
03	02	08	07	02	22
13.64%	09.09%	36.36%	32.72%	09.09%	100%

Table 04. Long Term Improvement in Students' Writing according to the Type of Feedback

13.64% of the respondents state that direct feedback is the one which leads to long term effects.In favour of coded feedback, only 09.09% of the participants think that it has long term effects on students' writing performance.

36.36% claim that indirect un-coded feedback is the one which has long term effects on enhancing students' writing. Mistakes that are only underlined ask for correction. Before that, the writer has to find the type of the mistake. All these steps lead the learner to remember their own mistakes. Consequently, they do not repeat the same mistakes.09.09% of the teachers concerned with the study confess that they do not know which type leads to improvement in writing on the long run. 22.73% have no answer for this question while 09.09% claim that all of those types lead to long term effects on students' writing skill.

Table 04 shows that indirect un-coded feedback is the type which leads to improvements on the long run in students' writing skill. This tends to confirm the hypothesis in that indirect un-coded feedback is the most effective type in improving students' writing skill.

Question Five: How do students react to the written feedback you provide?

a-They overlook it

b-They try to correct their mistakes

c-Ask you for clarification about the comments you provide

a	b	c	a+b	b+c	a+b+c	a+c	Total
03	07	03	01	04	03	01	22
13.64%	31.82%	13.64%	04.55%	18.18%	13.64%	04.55%	100%

Table 05. Students' Reactions to the Teachers' Corrective Feedback

13.64% of the informants argue that their students overlook the feedback they provide them with. 31.64% of the teachers indicate that they students try to correct the mistakes they make. 13.64% of the informants indicate that students in their writing class ask for clarification about the comments their teachers provide each time they get written feedback on their written assignments.

The other observation that could be made is that some teachers have students who overlook feedback and some others who try to correct their mistakes. Only 04.55% represent this category. 18.18% claim that their students are of two types: Those who overlook feedback and those who ask for clarification about their teachers' comments. 13.64% indicate that all types of responses are made by their students. Finally, 04.55% of the respondents declare that there are two patterns of students according to their responses: Those who overlook feedback and those who ask for clarification about their teachers' comments.

On the whole, the prevailing type of reactions among student writers is that students seem to take into consideration their teachers' feedback by trying to correct the existing mistakes.

Question Six: Do you provide feedback on the
- a- First draft
- b- Second draft
- c- Third draft
- d- All of them

a	b	c	d	a+b	a+c	Total
01	01	02	12	04	02	22
04.55%	04.55%	09.99%	54.55%	18.18%	09.09%	100%

Table 06. Number of Drafts on Which Feedback is Provided

04.55% of the respondents commented on the first draft only. Another 04.55% claim that they provide feedback on the second draft. 09.09% of the respondents said they supply feedback on the third draft; 54.55% claim that they provide Written Corrective Feedback on the three drafts altogether. Still, 18.18% assert that they correct both the first and the second drafts. Finally, 09.09% of the informants declare that they provide Written Corrective Feedback on the first and third drafts in the writing process.

It is worth concluding that the majority of the teachers of writing in the department provide WCF on all the subsequent drafts produced by their students. This proves that those teachers are aware of the importance of Written Corrective Feedback in enhancing students' writing. It is also obvious that teachers emphasise the fact that learners must write and rewrite different drafts of the same production taking into consideration the feedback their teachers provide for the sake of improving their own writing and limiting the range of mistakes. This way, students are expectednot to make the same mistakes again.

Question Seven: To what extent is the provision of teachers' feedback important in enhancing students' writing?

- a- Very important
- b- Important
- c- Of little importance
- d- Not important

a	b	c	d	Total
21	01	00	00	22
95.45%	04.55%	00%	00%	100%

Table 07. Importance of WCF in Enhancing Students' Writing

95.45% of the informants claim that providing Written Corrective Feedback is very important in improving students' writing skill. 04.55% of the respondents claim the opposite. They argue that WCF is not important in improving students' writing.

Providing Written Corrective Feedback provision plays an important role in boosting students' writing in English.

Question Eight: Do you think that peer feedback is beneficial for students' writing?

yes	no	Total
19	03	22
86.36%	13.64%	100%

Table 08. Importance of Peer Feedback

Table 08 represents teachers' answers concerning the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving students' writing skill. 86.36% of the respondents believe that peer feedback is important in improving students' writing; against 13.64% who claim that peer feedback has no benefits on students' writing skill.

In effect, the great majority of participants are in favour of peer feedback built on the premise that students feel more relaxed and less defensive receiving their peer's feedback than their teachers' one. Those teachers believe that peer feedback helps in the improvement of writing. It all seems that learners prefer their peers' feedback because it is

provided in a relaxed atmosphere without the teacher's interference. To students, the teacher is regarded by learners as a stressful factor in the writing process.

Question Nine: Do you allow for peer feedback in your writing classes?

yes	no	Total
20	02	22
90.91%	09.09%	100%

Table 09.Allowance for Peer Feedback

90.91% of the total respondents (N=22) assert that they allow peer feedback in their classes. Students receive each other's copies and try to comment on their comrades' mistakes. However, 09.09% of the respondents state that they do not allow peer feedback, for it is,they claim time consuming.

Question Ten: How do students react to their peers' feedback?

Students' reactions towards their peers' feedback can be classified into three categories. The first category is made up of students who seem to respond negatively to peers' feedback. They do not like, trust or even take it into consideration. In the second category, nonetheless, students seemed to be repulsive at the beginning but changed their responses through time as a result of their teacher's guidance. In the last category, learners respond very positively to peer review and they find it motivating and even exciting.

Discussion of the Results

The results of this investigation prove that the best way of benefiting from written corrective feedback is to use all the different types depending on the students' level, the mistake made, and the period of time allocated for the task. The findings also indicate that good learners are to be given un-coded feedback since they are able to look for the type of the mistake and correct it, as well. This partly confirms the set hypothesis because this finding only applies to learners with high levels. For learners with low levels, the results showit is coded written corrective feedback which is considered the best way to improve students' writing. The results partly confirm the set hypothesis which indicates that if students are provided with un-coded written feedback,

coded written feedback, and peer feedback this would result in effective results on the writing performances of students who receive un-coded corrective feedback in comparison to those who receive coded feedback and peer feedback. The best type in improving students' writing is un-coded feedback in comparison to coded feedback and peer feedback for learners with high level. That is to say, when student writers are provided with indirect un-coded feedback, they are more likely to improve and more likely to experience long term retention. Mistakes that are only underlined ask for correction, and the writer has first to find the type of mistake. All these steps lead the learner to remember their own mistakes.They do not, it is hoped, make the same mistakes again. Findings of the study indicate no significant role of peer feedback in enhancing students' writing skill.

Conclusion

This study aims at investigating the effects of types of written corrective feedback on learners' writing proficiency. To reach this aim, the researcher hypothesised that if students are provided with un-coded written feedback, coded written feedback, and peer feedback this would result in effective results on the writing performances of students who receive un-coded corrective feedback in comparison to those who receive coded feedback and peer feedback. In testing the validity of this hypothesis, a teachers' questionnaire was opted for. The analysis and discussion of the questionnaire's results indicated that the best type of feedback is un-coded feedback for good level learners. For low level learners, however, it is coded feedback which is found to be the best type in improving students' writing proficiency. It is therefore, recommended that EFL writing teachers should provide un-coded written feedback to good learners and coded written feedback for low level learners.One of the limitations of the study is its population which is confined to second EFL learners. Due to timelimits, this investigation relied on the results obtained from the teachers' questionnaire, and no experiments were carried out. It is, therefore, suggested that for future research in this area of knowledge researchers should widen the scope of the study by including first and third year students. Additionally, researchers should design a students' questionnaire since this study relied on data collected through a teachers' questionnaire only. It is also

suggested to design an experimental study which would bring more reliable results.

References

Al Shamsi, R. R. S. S. (2013). *English Language Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Providing Corrective Feedback on Grade 4-8 Students' Writing in AL AIN Schools, United Arab Emirates*. Unpublished Master Thesis,University of United Arab Emirates.

Asassfeh, S. M. (2013). Corrective feedback (CF) and English-major EFL learners' ability in grammatical error detection and correction. *ELT Journal*, 6(8), 85- 94.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227–257.

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.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. In Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2013). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System*. 42, 333-343.

Cardelle, M., & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on second language learning of variations in writtenfeedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 15, 251–261.

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, 267-296.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.

Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2014). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System*. 42, 333-343.

Falhasiri, M., Tavakoli, M., Hasiri, F., & Mohammadzadeh, A.R. (2011). The effectiveness of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on interlingual and intralingual errors: A case of error analysis of students' compositions. *ELT Journal*, 4(3), 251-264.

155

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be? In Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2014). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System.* 42, 333-343.

Ferris, D.R. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second-language Students.*Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd ed).* Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journalof Second Language Writing*, 7 (3), 255–86.

Hyland, k. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. Oxon: Routledge.

John, B.,Stuart, Y. & Denise (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedbackon ESL student writing. In Al Shamsi, R. R. S. S. (2013). *English Language Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Providing Corrective Feedback on Grade 4-8 Students' Writing in AL AIN Schools, United Arab Emirates.*Unpublished Master Thesis,University of United Arab Emirates.

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.

Marzban, A., & Arabahmadi, S. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL students' writing. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 1000 – 1005.

Oxford Basic English Dictionary. (2012). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sárosdy, Bencze, Poór & Vadnay (2006). *Applied Linguistics for BA Students in English*. Budapest: Bolcsesz Konzorcivm.

Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195–202.

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

Shintani, N., and Ellis,R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on

learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 286–306.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. In 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, 267-296.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. In Marzban, A., & Arabahmadi, S. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback on Iranian EFL students' writing. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 1000 – 1005.