



A Study on Teacher Practices, Perceptions, and Attitudes Towards Written Corrective Feedback

Fatma Solmaz

Kırşehir Ahi Evran University

Songül Taş

Kırşehir Ahi Evran University

İmran Mollaoğlu Kalın

Bingöl University

ABSTRACT

Written corrective feedback (WCF) is widely implemented in EFL writing classrooms; however, there is not consensus on how and to what extent it should be used. The controversial findings of the WCF studies reflected in teaching practices and perceptions of the practitioners on WCF, and many studies reported that there was an inconsistency between the teacher practices and perceptions on WCF. Here, the current study aimed to examine the practices of English teachers and their perceptions regarding written corrective feedback and took the form of a multiple-case study to generate insights into the issue. In that, two different cases were described and compared by employing artifacts, think-aloud processes, and semi-structured interviews. The qualitative content analysis of the data demonstrated that the teachers implemented direct and unfocused feedback, and they provided feedback for almost all the occurring errors. Moreover, the teachers considered that direct and unfocused feedback was beneficial, especially for low-proficiency level of students. Overall, the findings of the present study indicated that there was a consistency between teacher WCF practices and their perceptions of WCF. Further findings and suggestions for future studies were provided.

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing literature recognizing the importance of feedback in EFL writing classes. According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback is the information given for “a performance or understanding” of a person, it can be clarifying or commenting on the correctness of the performance, and mostly occurs after an instruction. Feedback can be both positive and negative, while positive feedback is a signal for the accuracy of the performance; negative feedback is a signal for the “non-target-like feature” of the performance (Ellis, 2009; Iwashita, 2003). Feedback is considered a tool in many theories and approaches, and particularly the effects of negative feedback have been mainly investigated. Corrective feedback (CF), which is a type of negative feedback, has also been searched extensively; however, there is not any consensus on some issues regarding CF (Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2010). At the heart of the issue on the effectiveness of corrective

feedback, there is the discussion between nativist and cognitive-interactionist views. The nativists, who are purely implicit, argue that negative feedback is unnecessary and since it forms negative evidence, it is harmful to language learning. On the other hand, the cognitive interactionists, who signify both implicit and explicit learning, give much importance to the CF, which aids the learner to see the gap in their interlanguage (Ferris, 2010; Li, 2018,).

Today, according to many researchers and teachers, CF has a role in L2 writing instruction though how and to what extent it should be used is still a question (Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2010; Li, 2018). Guénette (2007) concludes that the conflicting findings originate from the methodological and design differences. Ferris (2010) emphasizes the same problem, and he indicates that even though the same phenomena are examined, the researchers focus on different aspects of feedback. Ellis (2009) lists the issues that there is inconsistency in the studies as; “whether CF is effective, what error types require to be corrected, who should be the corrector, what type of CF should be provided, and what time CF should be provided”. Likewise, Bitchener (2012) argues that some pedagogical factors might influence the efficiency of the written corrective feedback (WCF) such as the number of treatments that the learners take, the quality of scaffolding they take, other learner variables such as their aim, and understanding of WCF. He states that more studies are required to clear the controversial potential of the WCF. Still, the contradicting findings cause confusion on many teachers deciding their practices (Evans, et al. 2010), and Brown (2012) states that the practitioners should consider these variables designing their teaching.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Implementation of WCF in writing classes is a common practice and teachers mostly have positive attitudes towards WCF. Its efficiency in writing in another language is agreed by the majority. For instance, Evans, Hartshorn, and Tuioti (2010) conducted an international study and concluded that WCF is implemented largely on grammatical errors and the teachers believed its efficiency to some extent according to the teacher self-reports. Similarly, the studies conducted by Rajab, Khan, and Elyas (2016) in the Saudi context and Fallah and Nazari (2019) in Iran reported positive attitudes of the teachers towards WCF. They also indicated that while novice teachers preferred immediate feedback, more experienced teachers favored delayed and peer feedback. On the other hand, Soleimani and Rahimi (2021) found that the teachers in Iran had negative attitudes towards providing WCF, and they believed that WCF is increasing their workload, it is time-consuming, and not beneficial to the language proficiency levels of the learners.

The exploration of teachers’ beliefs and practices on WCF has been another matter of focus and the studies revealed inconsistent findings. For instance, the study of Pearson (2018), which was conducted in the United Arab Emirates, reported this issue and concluded that teachers mostly concentrated on language accuracy, especially grammar, they provided unfocused and direct feedback, and there was inconsistency in the feedback comment types. In the same vein, the study of Sakrak-Ekin and Balçikanlı (2019), conducted in the Turkish EFL context, showed that the teachers had positive beliefs regarding the efficiency of WCF, and even though they preferred indirect and focused feedback, they mostly used direct and unfocused WCF. This inconsistency between the teacher practices and perceptions was also observed in L2 Latvian teachers (Dilans, 2014), EFL teachers in three different Asian countries (Wei and Cao, 2020), in Iran (Soleimani and Rahimi, 2021), and Hong Kong (Lee, Luo, and Mak, 2021).

Similar to the teachers, in most of the studies, positive attitudes of the learners towards WCF were reported (Chen, Nassaji& Liu, 2016; Kim, et al. 2020; Zheng and Yu, 2018) except the students in Saudi Arabia (AlBakri, 2016). Kılıçkaya (2019) carried out a study examining pre-

service teachers' preferences and perspectives of online WCF types and the WCF timing in a Turkish university context and concluded that they mostly preferred taking metalinguistic and immediate feedback. On the other hand, like Korean learners preferred direct feedback (Chung, 2015), Chen, Nassaji & Liu (2016) found that the students in China preferred direct WCF, in particular, on content and organization. In addition, they were positive to self-correction methods.

There is a large number of published studies (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Al Shahrani, 2013; AlBakri, 2016; Alkhatib, 2015; Nanni & Black, 2017) that demonstrated the disparity between the teachers' and students' perceptions and attitudes on WCF. For example, some students preferred direct and explicit focus-on form feedback while the teachers tended to choose indirect feedback and focus on content and organization (Al Shahrani, 2013; Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010); Nanni & Black, 2017) though in some cases, it was vice-versa (e.g. Alkhatib, 2015).

Previous studies examining WCF reported inconsistent results on the practices of teachers and beliefs and attitudes of the teachers' and students'. The reported inconsistencies might be derived from many different reasons. For example, when learner differences were examined, Han and Hyland (2015) investigated the impact of individual differences (cognitive, behavioral, and affective) on their engagement with WCF and they concluded that students' L2 goals, beliefs regarding WCF, language aptitudes affected their engagement. Similarly, Zheng and Yu (2018) reported that language proficiency might affect learner attitudes; since low-proficiency learners showed little understanding of WCF, especially indirect WCF, as Alkhatib (2015) reported. Besides, Zheng, Yu & Liu (2020) showed that positive beliefs and clear goals regarding L2 writing resulted in better-enhanced engagement with WCF.

On the other hand, teachers had different concerns regarding WCF. The student's individual needs are based on their proficiency and expectations, student motivation, institutional policies such as requirements of providing the specific type of WCF or exam requirements, culture, class size, teacher knowledge and beliefs of WCF efficiency and implementation, teacher learning, and teaching experiences, time allocated to WCF and accuracy, and their awareness of their beliefs and practices are reported across the studies exploring the challenges and teacher criteria on providing WCF (Agudo, 2014; Alkhatib, 2015; Guénette, 2012; Lee, 2019; Lee, Luo & Mak, 2021; Rajab, Khan & Elyas, 2016; Sakrak-Ekin & Balçikanli, 2019; Storch, 2018; Wei & Cao, 2020).

Statement of the Purpose and Research Questions

Regardless of the discussion on written corrective feedback, it is widely practiced in classrooms, and examined by the researchers. Mao & Lee (2020) asserted that there is a domination of quantitative studies on WCF which were situated in a controlled context, and they were disconnected from real classrooms, not reflecting them. In addition, case studies were commonly implemented while other approaches had a small portion in the qualitative studies. On the other hand, Amrhein & Nassaji (2010) called for papers that compare the teachers' opinions and actual practices on WCF. In summary, it has been shown from the literature review that there is no inconsistency among the teacher perceptions regarding the efficiency of WCF as well as the teachers' practices. The conflicting results of the existing studies pointed out the need for more studies exploring teacher perceptions regarding WCF and comparing them with teacher practices for a better understanding of WCF. In the light of the previous studies, the present study aims to explore two teachers' attitudes and perceptions regarding written corrective feedback from two different Turkish state universities. Their WCF practices are also explored by identifying the type of feedback as well as the errors addressed are examined to shed a light on the reasons behind the teacher feedback practices. This study aimed to address the following research questions:

1. What are the ELT instructors' attitudes and perceptions of written corrective feedback?
2. Is there any dis/similarity between the teacher practices and perceptions of written corrective feedback?

Theoretical Framework

The literature on WCF is mainly based on whether the feedback is focused or unfocused, and whether it is direct or indirect. Focused feedback refers to targeting a certain grammatical point and providing feedback according to that feature whereas unfocused feedback refers to providing feedback to overall errors from various grammatical structures (Sheen, 2007). On the other hand, direct feedback indicates providing the correct form of the error while indirect feedback is identifying the error without any correction (Shintani and Ellis, 2013).

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The current study administers the form of a multiple-case study which was reported to allow the researcher to provide in-depth insight into issues by describing and comparing multiple cases (Creswell, 2012). The multiple-case study procedure was chosen because they provide better face validity and allow researchers to avoid building too narrow theories (Dörnyei, 2007). Furthermore, case studies are pointed to allow us to combine qualitative and quantitative data and methods (Yin, 1994). Accordingly, in the present study, a multiple-case study procedure was employed to generate insights into teacher practices and perceptions about WCF. Two different cases were described and compared to shed light on the teacher practices and perceptions about WCF.

Settings and Participants

The participants of the study were determined through purposeful sampling. Via this sampling, the participants who could provide rich and varied insight regarding WCF (Dörnyei, 2007) were chosen. In the present study, the participants were two ELT instructors working in two different English preparatory schools and instructing writing classes in which they provided WCF to the student writings. The participants were given pseudonyms for their privacy, and their consent was taken to participate in the study. The first participant, who was given the pseudonym Derya, has been teaching in a state university for four years. She is a graduate of the ELT department of METU. She has seven years of teaching experience, three years of which were in a state middle school. She has been teaching in English preparatory school in a state university in Turkey. The students at the preparatory school are from English Language and Literature department and the English level of the students is B1 in general (students' levels were determined based on the proficiency exam held by the institution at the beginning of the semester). The students have 27 hours of English lessons per week. Three hours of the lessons are writing classes. In the writing classes, accompanied by a book, Derya, first, presents theoretical information regarding writing principles. Afterward, she gives the students the right to choose one of the topics provided in the book and gives a writing assignment related to that topic. The next week, before the assignments are handed over to the teacher, the students perform peer feedback in the class, and then, she collects the assignments and gives feedback to them, and asks the students to keep the writings in

their folders for their portfolios. In addition, the Edmodo platform is also used in the writing class. From time to time, students have writing assignments on the platform, but they do not always get feedback for them. On the other hand, the writing exams consist of two stages. In the first stage, they are asked some theoretical questions related to what they covered in the writing classes, and in the second part, they are asked to write about a 100-words essay, selecting from the given topics.

The second participant, who was given the pseudonym Elif of the study is also a graduate of the ELT department of METU. Elif had worked as an intern teacher in Italy via the Comenius program for seven months after her graduation. She has nine years of teaching experience in English preparatory schools in state universities in Turkey, and she has been working in the present university for six years. She teaches the students from the Department of International Relations. The students here have A1 English proficiency (students' levels were determined based on the proficiency exam held by the institution at the beginning of the semester). They have 24 hours of lessons a week, of which four hours are online. Similarly, Elif follows a writing book, that provides information on the basics of writing, in writing classes, and the students complete the writing tasks given in the book in-class time. They are provided immediate feedback by their teachers in the class as they write in the class. On the other side, the students are asked to complete a writing task in the midterm exam.

Data Collection Tools

Data were gathered from multiple sources to triangulate the data. The first type of data was artifacts, teacher feedback given for the writings of the students in the midterm papers. Collecting artifacts provides useful information sources for qualitative studies since they present ready-to-analysis data on the phenomenon, and they are nonreactive and useful for the triangulation process (Creswell, 2012; Hatch, 2002). Derya provided feedback on thirty midterm papers while Elif evaluated twenty-one papers. The inconsistency of the number of papers was caused by the class sizes of the schools. The second data collection tool was the think-aloud technique, and the participants performed giving feedback during the think-aloud protocols. According to Dörnyei (2007), the advantage of think-aloud protocols is that they allow the participants to verbalize their inner thoughts focusing on the task. Therefore, the participants were asked to verbalize their process of giving feedback to collect data regarding teacher perceptions of WCF. Finally, as a follow-up, semi-structured interviews were adopted to gain a detailed understanding of collecting data on the teacher attitudes and perceptions of WCF. Interviews are one of the most used techniques for exploring deeply the participant perceptions on the phenomenon (Dörnyei, 2007; Hatch, 2002). The present study employed the one-on-one interview protocol by asking open-ended questions regarding WCF.

Data Collection Process

The data collection process was completed in three different stages. The data collection tools of the current study were collecting artifacts, think-aloud processes, and semi-structured interviews. First, for the think-aloud protocols, the instructors were video-recorded while they were providing feedback on their students' writing. The instructors provided WCF to four of the randomly selected writings of the students. The first attempts of the think-aloud process had the purpose of piloting and training the participants to provide information as much as possible during the process. They were later excluded from the data analysis. The recorded sessions are transcribed and member-checked by the teachers for trustworthiness. Lastly, the video recordings were coded

by the researcher. In the second stage of the data collection, the teachers were asked to provide WCF to the students' midterm paper writings. After the instructors provided feedback to all writings, the researcher also checked the papers and identified the student errors. The errors identified by the researcher were compared with the ones that were provided feedback by the teachers. The types of WCF were decided by the researcher according to the framework provided above. At the last stage, after taking an expert opinion on the interview questions, one-on-one semi-structured interviews were carried out with the instructors. During the interviews, the instructors were asked five open-ended questions on their opinions and attitudes regarding WCF and the process was audio-recorded. The following interview questions, which are selected based on the literature, are asked during the interview:

1. What do you think about the role of WCF in writing classes?
2. What type of feedback is more beneficial for the students? Why?
3. What timing of the feedback is more beneficial for the students? Why?
4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of providing WCF?
5. Is there anything that you would like to add about WCF?

Data Analysis

For the first stage of data analysis, the student writings from the midterm exams were provided feedback by their instructors. The papers were examined, and the feedback types were classified according to the theoretical framework. That is, if the teacher provided feedback to simply certain forms, the feedback was called focused WCF, and when the teacher gave feedback to all types of errors, the feedback was identified as unfocused feedback. Besides, if the teacher corrected student errors, the feedback type was identified as direct feedback while the errors were merely indicated the feedback was identified as indirect feedback.

In the second stage of the data analysis, video recordings of the think-aloud processes which included live sessions of providing WCF were systematically analyzed. The recordings were first transcribed, and the types of feedback were identified according to the theoretical framework. After that, the identified feedback types were compared with the WCF types given to the writings.

Lastly, the data derived from the audio recordings of the interviews were analyzed based on the qualitative content analysis scheme of Creswell (2012). The audio recordings were firstly transcribed by the researcher and sent for member-checking. After the validation of the instructors, the data were broken into chunks and then each of them was coded. The codes were labeled, and finally, emerging themes were decided by the researcher.

Trustworthiness

The trustworthiness of the current study was confirmed via data triangulation. Golafshani (2003) asserts that triangulation is used to increase the validity and reliability of the studies. Triangulation might be employed through various data collection or data analysis procedures but with multiple information sources. For data collection, triangulation was carried out by collecting artifacts, carrying out think-aloud sessions, and semi-structured interviews. For the data analysis, multiple case study was employed with two participants from different settings. The transcriptions of the interviews were member-checked. Besides, a colleague, who was experienced in the coding process and had a master's degree in English Language and Literature, accompanied the coding and identification of themes process. Both the researcher and the instructor coded 25% of the data,

and they compared labeling of the codes and themes. They had 90% agreement in general. The remaining parts were discussed, and they reached an agreement.

FINDINGS

Teacher Practices of WCF

In order to determine the teacher practices of WCF, the think-aloud sessions were carried out with the instructors. The analysis of the think-aloud sessions revealed that the teachers employ direct and unfocused WCF. During the think-aloud, the teachers, firstly, focused on the title of the writings. They repeated the words, phrases, and sentences when they sensed an error. When they identified the error, they provided feedback. There was a slight difference between the provisions of the feedback of the instructors. Derya, who was teaching the preparatory school students of the English Language and Literature Department, underlined the error and instead of just correcting the error, she indicated the type of error. For example, even though she said, "you should have added *to* here." in the recording, she wrote "preposition" into the paper. However, she did not consistently indicate the type of error. She sometimes directly provided the correct version. For instance, she provided optional words in a sentence after writing the wrong word choice. On the other hand, Elif provided all the corrections. She put a tick to all the correct sentences by saying "a nice sentence, well done, good, etc."

The analysis of the feedback given to the student writings was similar to the think-aloud sessions. The teachers gave direct and unfocused feedback. The teachers corrected all the errors in the writings regardless of the grammatical form or elements of writing. On the other hand, the deeper analysis of Derya's feedback showed that she also provided corrections of the errors, however; they were not always direct corrections but included some indication of the errors. For instance, instead of adding a comma, she wrote "*punctuation*", or she wrote "*past tense*" instead of correcting *is* to *was*. It might be concluded that she made use of both direct and indirect WCF. Further analysis of the writings demonstrated that both instructors made use of footnotes to give feedback as well as the corrections made in the writings. Elif provided some feedback as follows:

- *Nice title ✓*
- *No introduction!*
- *Structural errors! (past tense...)*
- *Unclear words!*
- *Punctuation errors!*
- *Not well organized!*

The notes started with positive comments and moved to negative ones. The notes included comments regarding both grammar and aspects of writing such as how to start and end a paragraph, spelling, and coherence. They were short and clear in nature.

Derya also made use of footnotes under the writing with longer explanations:

Your writing seems good but try to write longer for the next time. In this way, you can explain your ideas in a more detailed way and that would make your writing more attractive.

Do not repeat the same pronoun, instead use other clause types, make use of transitions. You can check the internet to improve your writing.

Like Elif, Derya's notes mostly started with positive comments, and then, included the lacking parts of the writings as in the extract above. The notes indicated the errors in grammatical structures and other elements of writing such as organization and coherence. Besides, some directions to

sources such as the internet or a specific part in the book were made for the students to improve their writing and grammar.

Teacher Perceptions and Attitudes of WCF

The present study aimed to examine teacher perceptions and attitudes of WCF. Five main themes emerged with the analysis of the interviews. The findings regarding teacher perceptions of WCF are presented in Table I below with their frequencies and each theme is explained in detail below.

Table 1. Emerging Themes and Codes with Frequencies

<i>Themes</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>Codes</i>	<i>f</i>
The significance of WCF	25	<i>Important, necessary, and advantageous</i>	12
		<i>Improving writing skills</i>	6
		<i>Easier to remember</i>	4
		<i>Develops language proficiency</i>	3
Types of WCF	27	<i>Direct feedback over indirect feedback</i>	8
		<i>Focused feedback over unfocused feedback</i>	7
		• <i>Grammar</i>	
		• <i>Other elements of writing</i>	
		<i>Immediate over delayed feedback</i>	10
Language proficiency of learners	14+7	<i>Peer feedback</i>	2
		<i>Low and high proficiency students</i>	12
Disadvantages of WCF	15	<i>Need for a guide/supervisor</i>	2
		<i>Excessive feedback</i>	5
		<i>The feelings of disappointment and failure</i>	5
		<i>Time-consuming</i>	1
How to provide WCF	5	<i>Leading memorization and laziness; harmful</i>	4
		<i>From focused and direct to unfocused and indirect</i>	2
		<i>Constructive and encouraging language</i>	2
		<i>Color of the pen</i>	1

A common view amongst interviewees was that WCF is important and necessary for writing skills. The interviewees argued that WCF develops learner writing skills as well as language proficiency. Also, they emphasized that the students do not realize their errors and WCF makes them notice what they need to focus on to improve their skills. Elif pointed out that:

...written corrective feedback is also very important, especially in writing. In that, students can see their errors or what they should improve in their writing in the written format so it will make it easier for them to remember and uh ... correct their mistakes or the other things to develop in their writings.

Commenting on the types of WCF they prefer, opinions regarding direct feedback and indirect feedback were diverse. Elif had the following to say:

I guess both of them are very important I can't decide on one of them, but I can say that both of them are equally important, and it doesn't matter for students. But when you think of our classes especially if you give them a direct one, they will understand better.

Here, Elif argues that both types are efficient for the learners; however, in her setting, in which she is teaching to low-proficiency students, she believes that direct WCF would work better. Likewise, Derya made an emphasis on the importance of learner proficiency regarding feedback types. Talking about this issue she said:

If the proficiency levels are high, sometimes you don't need to give very descriptive feedback. You just underline the error, and the student can realize that there is a problem there and can figure out it himself. However, I experienced that giving indirect feedback to students with grammar or language deficiencies did not work very well. Such students should be given direct feedback. I mean, you should underline the error and make an explanation next to the error; why is this wrong; is there a meaning problem, choice of words, or a grammatical problem.

Derya argued that low-proficiency learners could not notice or comprehend indirect feedback based on her experiences. On the other hand, indirect WCF works for high-proficient students.

Furthermore, both instructors favored unfocused WCF. However, they made an over-emphasis on grammar rather than other elements of writing. Derya commented on the issue by highlighting that she focused on grammatical errors at the beginning of the writing classes and over time, she gave more feedback regarding the coherence, structure, and organization of the writings. After pointing that she evaluates all the elements of writing, Elif stated that she gave more importance to grammar, especially in the writings of the midterm papers.

Regarding the timing of the feedback, the interviewees believed that the students benefited more from immediate feedback Elif stated:

...for our students. Especially immediate feedback is beneficial because sometimes when you give them delayed feedback, they don't even remember what we are talking about, so I think for today's children/for students, immediate feedback is more important or more beneficial.

Pointing out similar concerns regarding students forgetting about their writings, Derya also indicated that delayed feedback felt uncaring and not interested in the student writings. On the contrary, immediate feedback was found to be more efficient in decreasing the rate of errors. She argued that:

... I don't believe that delayed feedback would influence in the same way. I observed this in the students too. For example, when I give immediate feedback and ask them to rewrite it, the students work on their text and correct their text. Even, the error rates of the learners in the other texts can be lower when I provide immediate feedback.

Furthermore, Derya mentioned her experiences with peer feedback. She asserted that peer feedback was not efficient with low proficiency learners because they could not notice the errors. According to her, peer feedback would work only when high proficient and low proficient learners were matched. She had the following to say:

I tried peer feedback a little at first, but then I saw that it was wrong and not helpful in any way. The student reads the writing but does not underline any error because according to him there is no problem with the writing. The student cannot give feedback to his friend because he does not know it either.

Another emerging theme was the importance of learner proficiency levels regarding WCF. The participants indicated that WCF is necessary, especially for low-proficiency learners and the type of feedback should be decided according to the student levels. Elif pointed to the proficiency levels of her students while commenting on WCF while Derya explained her ideas regarding WCF based on the learner profile. She also stated that students need a guide while writing and constant feedback to improve their writing skills. For example, she said:

...Yes, it is important to give feedback, but when the teacher gives feedback to a student at a higher level, it is much easier for the student to reflect on that, while for other students, some amount of time is required, and you must wait for the student to comprehend it over time. Which means you need to give feedback more often.

While mentioning the disadvantages of feedback, concerns were divergent. Elif highlighted the importance of the amount of feedback. She thought that:

... if you give a lot of written feedback to the students, students might think that they can't write, or they can think that they fail rather than succeed so it ... it might cause disappointment in children or especially young learners but maybe you should decide on the most important ones or points and you should give feedback accordingly. You shouldn't write everything on paper.

She indicated that excessive feedback would cause a sense of failure and disappointment in the students. That is why; she suggested providing feedback only to the significant errors. Derya expressed another concern. She argued that giving constant feedback would cause laziness and memorization. On the issue, she stated that:

...there is such a handicap of giving feedback constantly, the student is getting lazy. I mean, he might think that there is a person who always giving feedback and correcting me. They do not search for themselves and memorize. I think directing the students to sources or you can study on this topic would be more constructive for the student. If there is a person giving feedback constantly, this would push the student to laziness.

She complained that constant and direct feedback would cause passive learners, and as a remedy, she suggested giving indirect feedback and directing the learners to sources that they can improve themselves. Furthermore, as a disadvantage of WCF, she indicated that giving WCF was time-consuming for the teacher, but still, it was necessary for the language development of the learners.

Lastly, the instructors made some comments on how to provide WCF. Elif stated that *"feedback should be provided periodically and at a certain level."* Moving from her experiences as a student, Derya stated that *"the one getting the feedback should be able to understand it and it should be clear."* She mentioned that even the red marks in the paper might be discouraging the learners. Hence, she suggested giving constructive and improving feedback by moving from positive aspects of the writings to the parts that need improvement.

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated teacher practices and perceptions on WCF. The study findings showed that the teachers believed in the efficiency of providing WCF. When the results are evaluated as a whole, it is seen that WCF is recognized as a facilitator in the development of students' writing skills, as well as creating awareness against the demand for writing skills in students. The student, who is not aware of what he did wrong while writing, finds the opportunity to see his mistakes thanks to the feedback given to his writing and takes action to correct his deficiencies in this direction. Thus, feedback allows students to improve their writing skills and triggers a kind of necessary motivation in this direction. In this context, the results of this study are in a framework consistent with the results of previous studies. As such, previous studies have demonstrated that teachers had positive attitudes towards WCF and believe that WCF is efficient for student writing development (Evans, Hartshorn and Tuioti, 2010; Fallah and Nazari, 2019; Rajab, Khan, and Elyas, 2016). Whereas the findings of the present study are contradictory to the study of Soleimani and Rahimi (2021) that found negative attitudes towards WCF.

The most striking finding of the present study was that there is consistency among the teachers' practices and perceptions. It is seen that both participants marked the mistakes and wrote the correct ones as much as possible while giving feedback on the writing papers. In the interview, teachers produce answers that confirm this. At this point, it is possible to make the following inference: It is the students' performance in writing that prompts teachers to choose the types of feedback. In other words, it is not clear that participants have already decided on the type of feedback because of the belief that direct or indirect feedback is beneficial theoretically. Since the participants are aware of the proficiency levels of the students, there is an attitude that predicts possible performance and shapes itself accordingly. In that regard, the findings seem to be consistent with the previous studies (Sakrak-Ekin and Balçikanli, 2019; Pearson, 2018), in terms of teacher practices, while they are contradictory to the previous studies which have suggested that teacher practices were incompatible with their practices (Dilans, 2014; Lee, Luo and Mak, 2021; Sakrak-Ekin and Balçikanli, 2019; Pearson, 2018; Soleimani and Rahimi, 2021; Wei and Cao, 2020). Besides, the findings are partly in the same line with the findings of Mao and Crosthwaite (2019) who found that the teachers provided indirect feedback even though they concluded that teacher practices and beliefs did not match. The participants employed unfocused feedback; however, they emphasized grammatical errors both in their practices and perceptions. While giving feedback, they corrected all the errors and they stated that grammatical errors should be treated. They appear to employ direct and focused feedback, mainly for low-proficient learners. Besides, they provided feedback starting from positive aspects and then they focused on the deficiencies of the writings. One of the participants emphasized the need for directing the learners to sources and the practices of the teacher matched with her perceptions.

The consistency of the findings might have resulted from the settings of the instructors. In the present study, there was an over-emphasis of the participants on the student proficiency. They believed that direct feedback was more effective in low proficiency students, and they taught low proficiency students which explain the consistency in using direct feedback. On the other hand, it was observed that one of the participants, Derya, made use of indirect WCF, which could be explained with the proficiency level of her more proficient students. Additionally, the participants believed in the efficiency of unfocused feedback and practiced widely. Unlike the participants, the findings of Farrokhi and Sattarpour (2011) and Rahimi (2019) showed that focused feedback was more effective regardless of the student levels.

CONCLUSION

The present study examined teacher practices and perceptions of two regarding WCF. The findings demonstrated that the teachers gave direct and unfocused feedback, and they provided feedback for almost all the errors committed by their students. In addition to correcting the errors in the students' writings, they also provided holistic comments as footnotes. The findings regarding the teacher perceptions showed that the teachers believed in the efficiency of the WCF in improving writing skills and language proficiency. The teachers considered that direct and unfocused feedback was beneficial, mostly for low-proficiency level students. Furthermore, the teachers stated that WCF should be provided as soon as possible, however, as the timing of the feedback, its amount had significance since excessive feedback could be discouraging. Lastly, they supported providing constructive and positive WCF. The teacher practices and perceptions matched in the present study. The analyses of artifacts and think-aloud sessions demonstrated that the teachers made use of direct and unfocused feedback. Similarly, the interviews showed that the teachers favored direct and unfocused feedback.

Although the current study contributed to the existing literature by its findings, it has some limitations which are needed to be considered. First of all, the present study collected data from two instructors from two different settings, in which the students had different language proficiency levels, which might have caused inconsistency regarding their practices. Further studies might include more participants who share similar and different settings to investigate the effect of student proficiency levels in the teachers' practices and perceptions of WCF. Secondly, the current study focused on the teacher practices in the midterm writings and the general perspectives of the instructors on WCF. Further studies might investigate teacher practices throughout the year by examining the teacher perspectives at the beginning and end of the year to reveal whether there is a change in their practices and perspectives. Finally, the present study focused only on teacher perspectives. Future studies might include student perspectives as well to discover whether there is an in/consistency among the teacher and student perspectives regarding WCF.

REFERENCES

- Agudo, J. D. D. M. (2014). Beliefs in learning to teach: EFL student teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. In *English as a foreign language teacher education* (pp. 209-230). Brill.
- AlBakri, S. (2016). Written corrective feedback: Teachers' beliefs, practices and challenges in an Omani context. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 44-73.
- Alkhatib, N. (2015). *Written corrective feedback at a Saudi university: English language teachers' beliefs, students' preferences, and teachers' practices* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex).
- Al Shahrani, A. A. (2013). Investigation of written corrective feedback in an EFL context: beliefs of teachers, their real practices and students' preferences. (Master's thesis, University of Melbourne)
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why?. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95-127.
- Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(2), 166-182.
- Baz, H, Balçıkanlı, C. & Paşa, T. C. (2016). Perceptions of English instructors and learners about corrective feedback. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1,1.
- Brown, D. (2012). The written corrective feedback debate: Next steps for classroom teachers and practitioners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(4), 861-867.
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Chong, S. W. (2018). Three paradigms of classroom assessment: Implications for written feedback research. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 15(4), 330-347.
- Chung, B. (2015). Written Corrective Feedback: The Perception of Korean EFL Learners. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 75-88.
- Dilāns, G. (2016). Corrective feedback in L2 Latvian classrooms: Teacher perceptions versus the observed actualities of practice. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(4), 479-497.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford university press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1).
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Tuioti, E. A. (2010). Written corrective feedback: The practitioners' perspective. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 47-77.

- Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2011). The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12).
- Golafshani, N. (2003). Understanding reliability and validity in qualitative research. *The qualitative report*, 8(4), 597-607.
- Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 445-463.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Suny Press.
- Fallah, N., & Nazari, M. (2019). L2 teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback: The mediating role of experience. *English Teaching & Learning*, 43(2), 147-164.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181-201.
- 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.
- Guénette, D. (2012). The pedagogy of error correction: Surviving the written corrective feedback challenge. *TESL Canada Journal*, 117-117.
- Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2015). Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom. *Journal of second language writing*, 30, 31-44.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects on L2 development. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 25(1), 1-36.
- Kılıçkaya, F. (2019). Pre-service language teachers' online written corrective feedback preferences and timing of feedback in computer-supported L2 grammar instruction. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 1-26.
- Kim, Y., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(1), 176-199.
- Lee, I. (2019). Teachers' frequently asked questions about focused written corrective feedback. *TESOL Journal*, 10(3), e00427.
- Lee, I., Luo, N., & Mak, P. (2021). Teachers' attempts at focused written corrective feedback in situ. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 100809.
- Li, S. (2018). Corrective feedback in L2 speech production. *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching*, 1-9.
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 46-60.
- Nanni, A., & Black, D. A. (2017). Student and teacher preferences in written corrective feedback. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 14(3), 540.
- Mao, Z., & Lee, I. (2020). Feedback scope in written corrective feedback: analysis of empirical research in L2 contexts. *Assessing Writing*, 45, 100469.
- Pearson, W. S. (2018). Written Corrective Feedback in IELTS Writing Task 2: Teachers' Priorities, Practices, and Beliefs. *Tesl-Ej*, 21(4), n4.
- Rajab, H., Khan, K., & Elyas, T. (2016). A case study of EFL teachers' perceptions and practices

- in written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 5(1), 119-131.
- Rahimi, M. (2021). A comparative study of the impact of focused vs. comprehensive corrective feedback and revision on ESL learners' writing accuracy and quality. *Language Teaching Research*, 25(5), 687-710.
- Sakrak-Ekin, G., & Balçikanli, C. (2019). Written corrective feedback: efl teachers' beliefs and practices. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, 19(1), 114-128.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *Tesol Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283.
- Shintani, N., & 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(3), 286-306.
- Soleimani, N., & Rahimi, M. (2021). (Mis) Alignment of Iranian EFL Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback beliefs and practices from an Activity Theory Perspective. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1901640.
- Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 51(2), 262-277.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). Discovering the future of the case study. Method in evaluation research. *Evaluation practice*, 15(3), 283-290.
- Wei, W., & Cao, Y. (2020). Written corrective feedback strategies employed by university English lecturers: A teacher cognition perspective. *SAGE Open*, 10(3), 2158244020934886.
- Zheng, Y., & Yu, S. (2018). Student engagement with teacher written corrective feedback in EFL writing: A case study of Chinese lower-proficiency students. *Assessing Writing*, 37, 13-24.
- Zheng, Y., Yu, S., & Liu, Z. (2020). Understanding individual differences in lower-proficiency students' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-21.

Fatma Solmaz is an instructor at Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey. She graduated from Middle East Technical University with a BA in ELT in 2015. She is doing her Ph.D. at Anadolu University in ELT.

ORCID: : 0000-0001-8706-5728

E-mail: fatmasolmaz@ahievran.edu.tr

Songül Taş is an instructor at Kırşehir Ahi Evran University, Turkey. She graduated from Middle East Technical University with a BA in ELT in 2012. She is doing her Ph.D. at Anadolu University in ELT.

ORCID: 0000-0003-2590-6063

E-mail: songultas@ahievran.edu.tr

İmran Mollaoglu Kalın is currently working as an instructor at Bingöl University, from Middle East Technical University with a BA in ELT in 2015. She completed her master's degree at Gaziantep University in English Language and Literature in 2022. She is doing her Ph.D. at Ataturk University in ELT.

ORCID: : 0000-0002-8429-6202

E-mail: imollaoglu@bingol.edu.tr