The Effect of Coded and Non-Coded Corrective Feedback on Developing Accuracy of Iranian EFL Students' Written Performance

Milad Mousapour Balegh, M.A.

Faculty of Foreign Languages, IAU, Tabriz Branch – Iran. ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5110-5536

*Corresponding Author: *Milad Mousapour Balegh, M.A., Faculty of Foreign Languages, IAU, Tabriz Branch – Iran*

Abstract: *Writing is one of four language skills which expresses who we are, even after our life time. It makes our knowledge, our personal aspirations and our work for the future visible to others. The ability to write correctly is precious; however, we may be unaware of unwanted errors we make. Corrective feedback gives you an objective evaluation of your work since it is often difficult for us to fairly assess our own writing. The present study attempts to get the effect of coded and non-coded corrective feedback on developing accuracy of Iranian EFL students' written performance. A 12-week treatment was given to 40 homogenous students who were studying English as a second language at Kish English Institute–Central Tehran branch divided into 2 groups aged from 18 – 25. Our quasi-experimental research contained a pre-test, a post test, and two experimental groups. Corrective feedback (coded and non-coded) was the independent variable, which was the major variable hoped to be investigated. Accuracy of written performance was the dependent variable which was observed and measured to determine the effect of independent variable. The first experimental group received CCF and the second experimental group got NCCF in their writing tasks. The study concluded that there was a moderate effect of corrective feedback groups (coded & non-coded) on the post-test writing accuracy scores based on Cohen's (1988) guideline. It showed that NCCF group outperformed the CCF, so teachers can use NCCF for better results. It is advised teachers should incentivize students by showing them benefits of corrective feedback. Researches in the field of corrective feedback have different results still; therefore, doing as many researches as possible is the only way to cope with this situation.*

Keywords: *Corrective Feedback (CF), Coded Corrective Feedback (CCF), Non-coded Corrective Feedback (NCCF), Accuracy, Writing*

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Language as a formal system of signs governed by grammatical rules of combination to communicate meaning which can be described as closed structural systems consisting of rules that relate particular signs to particular meanings (Trask, 2007). Considering four skills of a language, reading and listening involve receiving information and so they are called the receptive skills, while speaking and writing are known as the productive skills because they involve producing words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs. Productive language skills, speaking, and writing, are important because they are the observable evidence of language acquisition. The more the speaker or the writer produces appropriate and coherent language the more we have proof of the progress in the learner's language system.Teaching productive skills is also important because written and spoken communication are basic life skills. In real life, people generally may need to inform, convince, or share ideas. They are also sometimes required to take notes, fill in forms, and write emails, letters, reports, or stories (Adolphs, 2002; Knapp,1997).

It is unavoidable to mention the ability to write correctly is very important. At the same time, most errors come from this side. Hence, teachers have responsibilities to help students recognise and fix their errors. In the last twenty-five years, approaches and methods to teaching English composition to ESL writers have continually evolved. However, throughout all of these years of changes, one aspect

of composition instruction has remained consistent: the inclusion of teacher feedback. In fact, for many ESL composition instructors, teacher feedback is considered the largest investment of time and energy, eclipsing even the amount of time spent preparing and conducting lessons (Ferris &Hedgcock, 1998). As an essential part of education and training programmes, it helps learners to maximise their potentials at different stages of training, raise their awareness of strengths and areas of improvement and identify actions to be taken to improve performance. Feedback is about giving information in a way that encourages the recipient to accept it, reflect on it, learn from it, use it, and hopefully make changes for the better (Carless, 2006).

Feedback is a term that has numerous definitions, and it has been proven relatively difficult to define precisely. Moreover, feedback can relate to several issues, and it can be used for different purposes. Here, however, the focus is on education and thus definitions related to that context are presented. One way of understanding feedback is to see it as "information that students are given about their performance with the intention of guiding them in acquiring desired attitudes and skills" (Westberg and Hilliard 2001:13). Hattie and Timperley (2007:81) modestly say feedback to be "one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement". With this note, it is important to truly see the effect that feedback has on people in different contexts and situations, all the way from homes to schools and classrooms. Another definition of feedback relating to the field of education arises from the assumptions that feedback ultimately is what one needs in order to learn,a key to learning. It is "a product that is presented to learner by someone" (Taras 2013:31). This views the process of feedback giving ending up to be a product, and making the feedback receiver a learner in the context.

A dictionary defines feedback in the following way: "helpful information or criticism that is given to someone to say what can be done to improve a performance, product, etc." (Merriam-Webster 2015). From this statement, one can already see that feedback can be given on multiple issues and with different approaches. What is important, however, is the fact that it is given in order to improve the receiver's performance in the future. According to Askew (2000:6) feedback is simply "a judgement about the performance of another". She continues to state that when feedback is given, the receiver is usually someone who is not as skilled in that topic as the feedback giver. In other words, it is assumed that the one giving feedback is competent enough to advice someone else. This is often the case with teacher- student feedback, when the teacher helps the students and shows his/her expertise. Moreover, it can be assumed that whether the person giving the feedback is a student talking to another student, or a child giving feedback to an adult, the receiver of the feedback is someone who at that point is not aware of the issues and will want to hear what the other person has to say. These are assumptions that will not always hold true, but are a good base for the concept of feedback

Feedback is an essential part of effective learning and its use serves an important aspect in educational institutions. It is worthy to note that the importance of feedback in this research is mainly tied to academic performance (Race, 2001). It is implied that providing feedback is of paramount importance towards enhancing students' academic performance. Bellon et al. (1991) concurs with this idea and asserts that feedback helps students to understand the subject being studied and gives them clear guidance on how to improve their learning. Meanwhile, one of the key subject areas that requires a lot of feedback is the studying English as a foreign language (EFL). This can be reinforced by ideas which suggest that EFL teaching and learning are surrounded by a lot of challenges which can hamper performance (McKay, 2001; Granger &Meunier, 2008; Ahmad, Razak, Saeed, 2013). Such challenges can be identified and dealt with through the use of feedback systems (Yi'An, 2001). Meanwhile, it is considered that providing feedback in class is more effective when different types of feedback methods are combined together (Williams, 2005). A notable combination of feedback methods that can yield effective results includes a combination of oral and written teacher feedback methods (Chandler, 2003). Oral and written teacher feedback methods have been established to enhance students' understanding, the level of thinking and performance (Schwartz & White, 2000). Thus, if students are to exhibit their language skills in a better way, it is important to provide both oral and written feedback. But the use of both oral and written teacher feedback methods varies with context under which it is being provided. Notably, English language university contextual situation still needs to be fully explored.

Though the provision of teacher feedback is considered to be a desirable and essential component in learning, its use among university students is relatively different (Crawford, 2016). In most university

classes, teacher feedback is rarely provided and students often encounter a lot of difficulties. The inability and insufficient provision of teacher feedback poses huge drawbacks on students' academic performance (Brown, Peterson, & Yao, 2016). To be specific, Banditvilai(2016) noted that the ineffective use and lack of provision of teacher feedback severely undermines students' language skills. The reason being that university students are presumed to have gained significant knowledge and understanding of how to tackle language problems (Hyland, 1998). This problem can be a contributing factor to lack of improvement in university students' language skills (Granger &Meunier, 2008). Thus, if students are to exhibit sound improvements in their language skills, then teacher feedback needs to be provided to students continuously. However, the use of teacher feedback is surrounded with different perceptions about its importance and conditions under which it can yield effective positive changes in students' language skills. For instance, Freeman et al. (2015) noted that teacher feedback is more effective when provided in the form of positive feedback as opposed to negative feedback. Núñez et al. (2015) concurred with this idea and asserted that negative feedback is demotivating and can cause students to lose interest in learning. Such has been a case with most Kurdish students as noted by a decline in the number of students enrolling in language studies at university level (Salim, 2018).

In addition, teacher feedback has been downgraded among English language students for failing to deal with specific errors undermining students' language skills (Man & Tomoko, 2010). This can be supported by insights which showed that feedback often fails to deal with structural and lexical mistakes (Ahmad, Saeed, & Salam, 2013). Despite the challenges that may be observed in the use of teacher feedback, its benefits are often underscored in most universities (Abdullah, 2015). The reasons being that it incites students to depend too much on their teachers and hinders their innovative abilities (Brown, Peterson, & Yao, 2016; Freeman et al, 2015). All these issues can be made clear and addressed by examining the effects of teacher feedback on students' language skills. This also includes looking at conditions under which teacher feedback can warrant improvements in students' language skills.

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is broadly defined as direct or indirect error correction, words of encouragement or praise, comments, advice, and suggestions that instruct students to make changes to their written compositions (Irwin, 2018). WCF in L2 writing classrooms has gained considerable attention in applied linguistics research over the past twenty years. WCF may take different forms of teacher's responses to errors in students' texts, among others Coded-Correction Feedback (CCF) and Non-Coded Correction Feedback (NCCF). A number of research studies on the effectiveness of various types of corrective feedback have been undertaken recently (Dewanti, Laksmi&Saukah, 2017).Following the important role of feedback in learning, Brown (2007) suggests that teachers should sensitively apply methods of responding to and correcting students' writing. Error correction in writing can begin in the drafting and revising stages, during which time it is more appropriate to consider errors. Carless (2006) also confirms that students who receive feedback during the writing process have a clearer sense of how well they perform and what they need to do to improve. In addition, feedback can also modify students' thinking or behaviour toward their work and focus their attention on the purpose of writing.

WCF may take different forms of teacher's responses to errors in students' texts. The teacher provides the student with the correct form (Direct CF); the teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction (Indirect CF). Indirect CF takes the form of underlining, circling and use of cursors to show omissions in the student's text (Latief & Muth'im, 2014). Non-Coded Corrective Feedback (NCCF); with the absence of any code, in order to be able to correct the incorrect performance of the language, the students should be able to identify what kind of errors they have made before they are able to correct the errors. Coded Corrective Feedback (CCF) is used with the theory that by being helpedwith the availability of codes to indicate errors, the students will be able to connect their memory to the area indicated by the code. Their prior knowledge is supposed to guide them to come to the right correction. This is in line with Krashen's (2003) Monitor Hypothesis theory which claims that if the students know the rule, they will be able to correct the incorrect production of language the performer must be consciously concerned about. The findings of previous research reveal that both Coded Corrective Feedback (CCF) and Non-Coded Corrective Feedback (NCCF) are effective to improve students' writing as shown by Hong (2004) who carried out a study on the effect

of teachers' error feedback on international students' self-correction ability by having three groups: CCF, NCCF and control group. The findings of the research show that there is a statistically significant difference in students' self-correction ability between the control group and the experimental groups (CCF and NCCF).

1.2. Statement of the Problem and the Purpose of the Study

Writing is a difficult language skill and also an important one for language learners. Since learners find writing in an L2 a big challenge, they come to class both to improve their language proficiency and become more confident in their writing abilities. Instruction should provide students with ample amounts of language input and instruction, as well as writing experience and feedback to fulfil their goals. Feedback is seen as a key for encouraging and consolidating learning. Different researchers (e.g. Bitchener, 2008; Ferris, 2006) have argued that feedback plays a central role in learning this skill. Freesman(1987) believes that if students fail in well performance, further feedback is necessary to help them take correct actions on their writing in order to improve it and reach an acceptable level of performance. There are different forms of corrective feedback which are used to improve the accuracy of writing. One of these kinds of corrective feedback is indirect written corrective feedback. Ellis (2008) defines indirect corrective feedback as indicating students' error without actually correcting it and it can be done by underling the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the students' text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. Bitchener, Cameron and Young (2005) stated that indirect corrective feedback is usually divided into coded and uncoded (non-coded) forms. Indirect feedback is often preferred to direct feedback on the grounds that it leads to guided learning and problem solving (Lalande, 1982) and encourages students to reflect about linguistic forms. However, no or few studies have been done on coded and non-coded corrective feedback in the Iranian context. So the aim of this study is to search about the effect of coded and non-coded corrective feedback.

Furthermore, there is a common assumption that a good piece of writing is often seen from its flawless grammar. Thus, in the world of academic writing, accuracy always becomes the main concern of any writing teachers. Giving feedback, therefore, becomes necessary since teachers could not put aside and disregard grammar (Setyowati, 2015).

During an academic writing teaching, accuracy has become the main concern. Teachers, mostly judge the quality of the students writing often from its accuracy. When a student makes a lot of grammatical errors in his writing, we directly jump to a conclusion that his writing is 'bad' or 'terrible'. We often thought that error corrections should be done to improve the quality of the students' writing. Because of this, we are often trapped in the torturing assessment activity in which we have to read piles of students' compositions and do, what it seems to be, endless checking of students' errors which are mostly in grammar. And we, too, often feel depressed that however hard we have tried to fix the students' grammar, the correction mostly harvest on nothing. Then, we are asking ourselves, why does that happen? (Setyowati, 2015).

The major problem in students writing is Grammar. Grammar errors occur in the writing of almost all non-native students (Abdulkareem, 2013). Grammar errors rarely occur in native speakers' writing(Kraichoke,2017) but very commonly do in the work of less proficient ESL students, whose mother-tongue "interferes" with the production of correct English (Nonkukhetkhong, 2013). EFL writing teachers are seeking effective methods of providing learners with feedback that ultimately results with them producing future writing that is more competent than their previous writings. Corrective feedback is extremely beneficial to English language learners (ELLs). There has been much research done on the effects of corrective feedback on second language acquisition. Whether the feedback is explicit and direct or implicit and indirect, ELLs will see benefits and growth in their language development and improving grammatical accuracy. By using positive feedback on a consistent basis, ELLs will build confidence in their skills which in turn will help them progress with the language (e.g. sheen, 2007). Results of some studies (e.g., Krashen, 1985, 1999; Semke, 1984; Hsu& Truscott, 2008) show that explicit error correction is both ineffective and harmful in L2 writing classes. Therefore, Truscott (1996) argues that classroom time should not be spent on grammar instruction and correction and should be abandoned. However, in the Iranian context, teachers still prefer focused and direct corrective feedback and they rarely use indirect feedback to increase noticing in learning among students. Due to these conflicting results, more research is needed to find

an effective way for improving accuracy in students writing in the Iranian context. Different studies have shown the positive effect of coded and non- coded corrective on developing accuracy of EFL learners in other countries (e.g. Bitchener, Cameron &Young, 2005). Therefore, the aim of this study is to investigate the effect of coded and non-coded corrective feedback on developing accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' written Performance.

Efforts to promote an improvement in student's language skills can prove to be effective when centred around the concept of error analysis. Error analysis plays a pivotal role in addressing language problems face students not only at their levels, but also at other levels. However, there are diverging views surrounding the advantages and disadvantages of error analysis. Hence, it is important to examine related studies on error correction so as to map strategies that can be used to enhance students' language skills. Notable work on error correction is centred on ideas developed by Truscott (1996) who was against the idea of correcting L2 grammatical errors. The reason was Truscott believed that error correction inflicted harm on students. In other words, Arguments were that no positive feedback can be obtained from using error correction. As such, error correction is considered to lack effectiveness in L1 (Leki, 1990). However, Truscott believed that the same applied to L2 and this implies that error correction is ineffective in addressing language errors made by L1 and L2 students. In addition, Truscott strongly argues that the effectiveness of error correction still remains to be proved as noted by Sheppard (1992). Supporting ideas point out that students often have challenges in identifying their mistakes and hence need assistance from the teacher to guide them (Hendrickson, 1978). This entails that teacher feedback is needed all the time to guide students in correcting their mistakes. Thus, ideas by Hendrickson highlight that errors made by students are there to expose students' limitations and help them to find ways to correct them. All these ideas place a great stumbling block in examining if error correction is desirable and can provide positive feedback or not.

1.3. Significance of and Justification for the Study

Since Truscott (1996) has argued that any kind of correction will not help learners acquire knowledge of linguistic forms and structures, debate about corrective feedback has been raised in SLA field. Ferris (1999) has disputed this claim, arguing that it was not possible to dismiss correction in general as it depended on the quality of the correction-in other words, if the correction was clear and consistent it would work.

Anderson (1983, 1985) claimed that more than just exposure to positive L2 input is needed, and that CF plays an important role in leading learners to modify their output. CF plays an important role in improving L2 writing accuracy (Brown, 2007; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2004), though debate over its effectiveness has increased in the past decade (Chandler, 2003; Truscott, 1996). Most teachers use direct corrective feedback in their classes. However, there are studies which show the effectiveness of indirect corrective feedback. Through indirect corrective feedback, correct forms of errors are not given and students should think and collaborate about the correct form. This can increase noticing and learning about that error. So this study tries to focus on two different types of indirect corrective feedback. A number of studies were conducted regarding the use of Coded Correction Feedback (CCF), and Non-Coded Correction Feedback (NCCF); however, the effect of CCF and NCCF on the accuracy of students' writing in Iranian context has not yet been explored.

Corrective feedback has been a part of debate over the last few years due to different sides having different perspectives towards it as we mentioned earlier. There is widespread support for feedback on learners' errors as being conducive to language acquisition, and few language teachers would say that correction does not constitute part of what they do in the classroom. In the SLA literature, support for correction can be found in strands of theory such as Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, which argues that when learners receive direct metalinguistic feedback on their output, learning takes place.

Despite ideas established stating that error correction is trivial in learning, some of the prior studies have not managed to establish any significant positive effects of error correction in learning (Ferris, 1995; Salteh & Sadeghi, 2015). A study by Cohen and Robbins (1976) on ESL students established that the use of written feedback does not cause meaningful improvements in the students' ability to deal with ESL errors. Their study did not rule out the importance of error correction but managed to emphasise that error correction can prove to be ineffective most of the times. However, the study managed to highlight that inconsistency and questionable quality of the part of the teachers is what causes students to make errors.

Also, Truscott (1996) noted that there is not much evidence that proves that written correction helps students in dealing with their language errors. There are a series of studies which dismissed Truscott's idea and these studies date back to the 80s. For instance, Cardelle and Corno (1981) conducted a limited scale analysis of error correction on ESL students in USA. Similar studies consequently followed such as the one by Fathman and Whalley (1990) and Ferris (1994). All these studies aimed at dismissing ideas by Truscott and outlined that the study cannot be generalised. These studies also managed to establish that corrective feedback has positive effects on ESL students. With all these ideas in mind, it remains imperative that error correction is beneficial but its importance and desirability is subject to vary. This can vary according to the nature of students involved, learning environment, teacher quality and competence etc. The effectiveness of error correction can be said to be beneficial when it is provided in the form of positive feedback. The importance of error correction is also governed by factors such as timing, feedback amount and mode.

When we consider the previous findings of CF, we should be cautious about the circumstantial basis of that sampling target if we want to implement that in our society. Easily saying, a result in a different country may not have the same income for our country. Thereafter, it can be argued that such a finding cannot be generalised as there are intricate complexities within different contexts and, therefore, teachers as decision makers should be granted the opportunity to decide which kind of corrective feedback is 'suitable' for their learners based on a context analysis. So, this study tries to investigate the effect of using coded and non-coded corrective feedback for developing accuracy of Iranian EFL learners.

1.4. Research Questions and Hypotheses

RQ1. Do CCF and NCCF have any effect on developing accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' written performance?

H0. CCF and NCCF do not have any effect on developing accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' written performance.

1.5. Definition of Key Terms

Corrective Feedback (CF): Any type of response or move the teacher makes to warn the learner about the presence of an error (Kartchava, 2019). It is a frequent practice in the field of learning and achievement. It typically involves a Learner receiving either formal or informal feedback on his or her understanding or performance on various tasks by an agent such as teacher, employer or peer(s) (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In this study, we will focus on indirect corrective feedback and underlying or crossing will be used instead of providing exact correct form for the error.

Coded Corrective Feedback (CCF): The strategy of identifying the exact location of errors with codes and using the codes to indicate the type of error (Bitchener, Cameron & Young, 2005). It takes the form of underlining, circling and use of cursors to show omissions in the student's text (Latief & Muth'im, 2014). CCF is used with the theory that by being helped with the availability of codes to indicate errors, the students will be able to connect their memory to the area indicated by the code. Their prior knowledge is supposed to guide them to come to the right correction (Dewanti, Laksmi & Saukah, 2017). In this study, we will introduce some codes and their meaning for the learners of the class that get this kind of feedback. So, instead of mentioning the complete name of error we will use codes which indicate that error and students will collaborate about the correct form with their partners and teacher.

Non-coded Corrective Feedback (NCCF): Students' errors will be mentioned with the absence of any code, in order to be able to correct the incorrect performance of the language, the students should be able to identify what kind of errors they have made before they are able to correct the errors (Dewanti, Laksmi & Saukah, 2017). So, in this study, the researcher as the teacher of the class will underline, cross or mention the error in the margin of the page. For finding out the correct form students should collaborate with the teacher and their partners.

Accuracy: The ability to produce target-like and error-free language (Ellis, 2003, 2008; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Inagaki, Kim & Wolfe-Quintero, 1998; Lennon, 1990; Skehan, 1998). It includes learner's use of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Accuracy is often compared to fluency when

we talk about a learner's level of speaking or writing. Example: A learner might be fluent (make their meaning clear) but not accurate (make a lot of mistakes). In the classroom: Language manipulation activities can help develop accuracy. These include controlled practice, drills, the study and application of grammar rules, and activities that help students to 'notice' their own mistakes. In this study, accuracy is calculated through the total number of grammatical errors per total number of the T-units.

Writing: One of the four skills –LSRW (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in language learning. It is the system of written symbols, representing the sounds, syllables or words of language, with different mechanisms - capitalization, spelling and punctuation, word form and function (Durga & Rao, 2018). Writing as a skill is very important in teaching and learning a foreign language. Writing skills allow you to communicate clearly with others and create useful resources for the workplace. Writing skills are important because they allow people to get a point across without being physically present. Many employers get their first impression of future employees through the writing skills they display in their resumes, cover letters and email communications.

1.6. Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

1.6.1. Limitation

In order to execute this test thoroughly, it is necessary to spend a lot of time because you cannot get an immediate feedback from students right after corrections. A teacher needs to do CF for a few weeks and wait for the income from the students. It could be better if our sample-scale was broader; however, it is limited to a small number of students. Redoing this test at another spatial form, whether in a different district, city or any other changes would affirm our mission; however, it requires again time and perhaps financial supports.

Another limitation can be the fact that we could not target the long-term effects of CF on the students which means results could be more confident and valid with more number of post-tests, possibly delayed. Having a third group who did not receive any feedback at all apart from our current two groups of CCF and NCCF could give our test more validity.

1.6.2. Delimitation

I would consider the trouble with subject of interest of our testees which means some of our participants might not have an equal reaction to CF of a particular context versus another one as delimitation of our study.

Another delimitation can be the difficulty to find two intact classes with same authentic language proficiency regardless of their current levels which they are involved (e.g., C1, B2, B1), mentality, social stance and even some unsystematic changes in rare cases might be spotted as constraints.

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Writing is difficult because, among the four language skills -- listening, speaking, reading, and writing, writing is one of the output skills and it usually demands relatively higher mental thinking ability than the other three skills. Writing is important in that it can help develop students' critical thinking ability, which is one of the most essential qualities for students' language development.

2.1. Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback has received a significant amount of attention in the research field and it has been studied from different perspectives. Thus, I consider this topic to be important also for my research and have covered corrective feedback relatively extensively here. There are researchers who find corrective feedback to be even unnecessary, and, in fact, feel people learn best without the focus on error correction. This field of research is based on Krashen's and Chomsky's views about learning: according to Chomsky, there is a Universal Grammar system build in us that helps us learn, and thus we do not need to specifically focus on errors (Smith, 2004). The theory of Universal Grammar supports the fact that positive evidence is sufficient for L1 acquisition. Even if proof for negative input was found by caretakers, they still believe negative evidence is not necessary. When it comes to learning an L2, some researchers believe Universal Grammar is available during the learning process here as well, while others see negative evidence as essential to learning. However, there is a middle line to these opposite views, where the effect of negative evidence and the importance of it is

acknowledged, but it cannot have any effect on L2 inter language grammar (Profozic, 2013). As for Krashen, he sees correcting as unnatural and unnecessary, arguing that children should learn languages naturally, without interference and error correction from an adult. Related to this is Krashen's theory of comprehensible input, which is a factor making foreign language learning or second language learning easier for people (Ruiz-Madrid &Usó-Juan, 2006). However, most researchers nowadays have acknowledged the important role of corrective feedback, and the next paragraphs seek to present the issues relating to it.

The attitude towards the role of feedback has changed a lot along with the changes in the approaches and methodologies in language teaching. Under the influence of Behaviorism and Structuralism, error correction was considered as a necessity in treating learners' errors. Later in 1970s and 1980s, error correction was put aside as it was believed that it interfered in natural process of language acquisition (Krashen, 1982). It was by the increasingly attribution of the Interaction Approach to language learning and teaching that error correction and feedback found their place in the classrooms. But the debates and disagreements on the usefulness of CF continues to last, resulted by the diverse evidence the researches provided. The studies and papers have been mostly divided into two groups of those providing evidence on the uselessness of CF and those advocating its provision. Among the researchers believing that the CF does not provide any positive effect on second/foreign language learning, (Kepner, 1991; Krashen, 1982; Sheppard, 1992; Truscott, 1996, 2004, 2007). Krashen argues that "comprehensible input serving as positive evidence" is enough for learners to acquire second languages (as cited in Sheen, 2011, p. 22). Therefore, in Krashen's Input Hypothesis, error correction is barely conducive to second language acquisition since it only focuses on facilitating explicit knowledge, not implicit knowledge (Sheen, 2011). However, Long (1983, 1996) proposed the Interaction Hypothesis to challenge this viewpoint, emphasizing the significance of interactionally modified input as interlocutors (e.g., competent speakers' and learners') negotiate meaning in communicative contexts. This negotiation, he argues, is far more conducive to language learning than merely providing comprehensible input as positive evidence. For example, in a later study Long (1996) argues that recasts, which rephrase an incorrect utterance by changing one or more of its elements without changing the meaning, connect "input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways" (p. 452). Others in support of CF have pointed to Schmidt's (1990) 'noticing hypothesis', claiming negative evidence helps learners notice the gap between the language they are producing and the target structure, thus possibly enabling them to correct their language production. Lalande's (1982) study of 60 intermediate EFL learners indicated an advantage for indirect feedback over direct feedback but the difference was not statistically significant. Lee's (2008) survey also found that the use of a correction code is helpful if symbols are few in number and all understood by learners.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) have divided corrective feedback into six categories, and their definitions have been used on several studies later on. First, according to them, explicit correction occurs when a teacher provides a correct form, indicating that what the student said was incorrect. Second, recasts refer to reformulation of all or part of the student's utterance, except the error. Third, clarification requests indicate that there is something wrong in the student's utterance, or that it has been misunderstood. Fourth, metalinguistic feedback occurs when a teacher does not explicitly provide the correct form, but uses comments, information or questions in order to help a student. Fifth, elicitation refers to the ways teacher can directly use to get the correct form from a student. It can be done by pausing the speech, asking to reformulate, or asking questions to get the correct form. The sixth and final type of corrective feedback is repetition, which occurs when a teacher repeats a student's erroneous utterance, often using intonation as help. Moreover, it always depends on the situation and the case when deciding what corrective feedback type to use. For example, if the goal of the task is to simply produce the right form of the word, then a teacher can simply repeat the incorrect form or even provide the correct form. Time, unfortunately, is often in short supply in classrooms, and thus it is not always possible to spend a great amount of time trying to get students to correct their mistakes. Thus, explicit correction is often used when correcting errors.

According to Profozic (2013) corrective feedback is a term used to indicate to the learner that there is something wrong in the utterance, and some change or correction must be adjusted in order to make it more target-like. Research about feedback supports the fact that corrective feedback and error correction are important functions (Brookhart& Moss, 2009). Moreover, we recognize the importance

of corrective feedback when considering both explicit and implicit knowledge. Corrective feedback has a significant role in the acquisition of both those knowledge when learning a second language (Reitbauer &Vaupetitsch, 2013). However, in the school environment learning is often explicit and thus this study will focus more on that.

Students have an essential role in the process of corrective feedback, since they are the ones responding to it. There are indeed several ways one can respond to corrections: some students benefit from the feedback and actually learn from it, while others might forget it as soon as it is said. For corrective feedback to be beneficial, it has to be timely, specific, understandable and actionable (Fisher & Frey, 2011). More information about this will be under section three, "Feedback in the classroom". If feedback does not fulfill this criteria, it will most likely be unpurposeful and even negatively received by the students. Ferris (2006) has divided the typical ways students answer to corrective feedback into seven subcategories. Error corrected simply means that the error made was corrected after the feedback. Incorrect change happens when a student corrects the mistake, but it remains incorrect. No change, as it states, means that the student did not change anything. Deleted text occurs when the erroneous part is deleted. Correct substitution, in other words a case where a correct change is made by substituting for the identified error. In addition to previous, an incorrect substitution happens when a change is made, but the error remains. Finally, a teacher-induced error, which is the worst case scenario, results in a student error after teacher gives feedback. Similarly, Yoshida (2009) divided the students' responses into different categories: uptake, acknowledgement, uptake and acknowledgement, unsuccessful uptake, and no uptake and no acknowledgement. The first takes place when the student responds to the feedback somehow, the second when the students responds with simple expressions such as "yeah", the third when both the above happen, fourth when the learner tries to correct the error but fails, and the fifth and final option occurs when the student gives no response at all.

Yoshida (2009) states that the effectiveness of corrective feedback for the student depends on several issues. First of all, availability of multiple scaffoldings and collective scaffolding. The glossary of education reform (2016) has defined scaffolding as different techniques used to gain students' understanding, and in the end, independence in the process of learning. With the help of multiple and collective scaffolding, teachers can adapt their teaching to meet the needs of the students. Second of all, whether the environment is relaxed and collaboratively. Obviously, the better and the more supporting the environment, the more successful the results are. Third of all, learners' focus on the topic and the instructions. as well as other learners' answers, plays a significant role. If one does pay attention to anything that goes on in classroom, or is partly focused, learning is not likely to happen. Finally, learners' goals influence the effectiveness of corrective feedback. For example, a well-motivated and interested learner will more likely learn faster, whereas someone who is not interested or feels his/her goal is purely to pass the test or the course, will not benefit from the feedback a great deal (Yoshida, 2009).

Noticing is a term that is often linked to corrective feedback. Noticing can be explained as the amount of correction used after the feedback (Santos et al, 2010). Moreover, it is done consciously and attention is paid to the input received, so that the input could become intake. In other words, when noticing, one makes a conscious effort of correcting something that is incorrect. When considering noticing together with corrective feedback, it enables learners to realize and understand the difference there is between a target form and what they said Profozic (2013). In other words, learners are constantly comparing their use of language to the target form. Furthermore, it may be extremely beneficial to notice the negative evidence, because learners' learning and restructuring can improve a great deal (ibid.).

Arab students' preferences for oral corrective feedback were studied by Abukhadrah (2012). 20 male students and 10 teachers were interviewed, observed and focus group interviews were held. Students were all adults, over 23 years old. The results point out that the students and teachers both have positive attitudes towards error correction. Thus, L2 learning can benefit from corrective feedback.

Moreover, most students find focusing on grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary important, and feel these areas should receive the most attention. Errors relating to other areas, such as social interaction, are seen as less important. However, there was a difference between teachers and students when studying different error types. Teachers believed that in addition to grammatical errors, semantic

errors should receive more attention, too. The most popular feedback strategy for students was metalinguistic feedback, followed by explicit feedback, elicitation, recasts and clarification requests. As for teachers, they preferred recasts and prompts in the form of clarification requests, followed by repetitions and elicitation. As the results show, there is a mismatch between students' and teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback strategies. Moreover, it is important to consider studies from different parts of the world, because the school system definitely is not the same in every country. In this case, the students saw error correction as important, which has been the case in other studies as well (see for example Preston et al. 1985).

Lyster and Saito (2010) investigated the use of oral feedback in SLA classrooms through a meta analysis. The material focused on 15 studies. First of all, the results indicated that corrective feedback has major effects on target language development. Second of all, the largest effects were observed with the use of free constructed responses, prompts and recasts. Third of all, explicit correction was shown to have positive effects as well. Thus, all types of correction can positively affect L2 learners' interlanguage development. Age was also considered, and it seems that younger learners benefit from corrective feedback more than older learners. Furthermore, similarities and differences in corrective feedback and learner's uptake between four classroom settings in France, Canada, New Zealand and Korea were investigated by Young Hee (2004). The results show that recasts were the most typical feedback types in all contexts, but more frequent in Korea and New Zealand. Uptake and repair following recasts played a more significant role in the two classrooms. Moreover, recasts leading to uptake and repair may be greater in the cases where recasts are more salient, and where students orient themselves more towards linguistic forms than to meaning. Thus, the context can have a noteworthy role in corrective feedback and learner uptake.

Veliz (2007) conducted a survey to analyse the role of corrective feedback more specifically recasts in the Interaction between teachers and L2 students in a classroom. Thus, it explored the effects of recasts on students' self-correction in order to finally come to the conclusion whether or not students are able to notice this type of underlying correction and, therefore, reformulate their ill-formed utterances. Besides, it also undertook a comprehensive survey of the literature on the topic. Two different groups of students from the English Teaching Training Programme at Universidad Católica Raúl Silva Henrríquez were studied. Five students taking English courses at an Intermediate level and five taking advanced English courses. Intermediate and advanced students had been categorised on the basis of their number of English language courses they had taken. Intermediate students had taken four, whereas advanced have taken seven. In this paper the point at issue is whether harmful and ineffective or essential and rather effective, and whether recasts are noticeable for students to 'read between lines' and figure out the underlying correction. It took the stand that recasts are only effective when using them with advanced students as they are more cognitively advanced and, therefore, able to make inferences and interpret the Implicit message to reformulate their mistakes. The results as well as the tests on the whole, clearly demonstrate that recasts as a corrective technique happen to be a bit more effective with advanced students than with intermediate students, though the difference Is not striking.

Rodrigo& Wiley (2019) believe that there is a wide body of literature showing that quality teacher feedback is directly related to academic success. What is not so clearly defined, however, is what exactly constitutes "quality" feedback, particularly when considering written corrective feedback strategies in ESL environments. Also unclear is whether or not established forms of feedback are equally as effective when applied in different cultural contexts. The aim of this study was to add to the existing body of knowledge associated with the efficacy of written corrective feedback and to examine its effectiveness with consideration of the Thai cultural context within which it was delivered. The findings of the study showed that indirect, coded, unfocused written corrective feedback was effective at improving the writing accuracy of Thai university students. It was also discovered that 52% of the 2718 writing errors marked for correction were semantic mistakes. The results of this study should help both foreign and local teachers choose written corrective feedback strategies when teaching in Thai higher education learning environments. It also calls for further research in regards to the possible connection between written semantic mistakes, L1 interference, and electronic translators.

Suzuki (2005) presented a study investigating the relationship between corrective feedback and learner uptake in adult ESL classrooms. Inspired by Lyster and Ranta (1997), the present study describes and analyzes the patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake, observed in a different context from that of Lyster and Ranta's study. The database consists of 21 hours of interaction between three ESL teachers and thirty-one adult ESL students. The interaction was audiotaped and transcribed, and then coded according to Lyster and Ranta's corrective discourse model. The results show both similarities and differences to those in Lyster and Ranta's study. While the distribution of types of corrective feedback following learner errors showed no major difference from that reported by Lyster and Ranta, the ratio of uptake following certain corrective feedback types greatly differed from their results. Possible accounts for the differences in the results are discussed from the aspects of the classroom setting, students' ages and their motivation of participating in the language learning programs, teachers' experience, and the target language. Furthermore, the present study was inspired by Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, and it investigated the relationship between error types and corrective feedback, as well as the relationship between corrective feedback and uptake, in an adult ESL context. Although this study identified similarities and differences in comparison to Lyster and Ranta's study, it did not yield any generalizations about the patterns of error treatment sequences. As is clear from the studies reviewed, the patterns of corrective feedback and learner uptake vary depending on the instructional context. Specifically, variables such as students' age, L1 background, the purpose of learning the target language, and the goal of the class could all trigger different results from each classroom observation research. The present study indicates that very different results could be expected depending on the classroom and learners, and it seems to offer grounds for further research as to which variables lead to greater differences in results of occurrence of corrective feedback and learner uptake. With regard to the limitations of the study, firstly, the small number of instances of coded feedback moves should be noted. There were some cases where it seemed too premature to claim that one type of corrective feedback has higher rate of occurrence than the other type. Specifically, there was a case where only one instance of explicit correction was observed over grammatical errors while there were two instances of metalinguistic feedback, but in percentage terms, the difference of occurrence frequency looked greater (4% for explicit correction and 8% for metalinguistic feedback). Secondly, the research results may have been more reliable if there had been a second reviewer. However, one was not available for this particular study due to limited resources. Thirdly, the study may have benefited if more introspective data from the teachers and students had been collected to further account for the variability in the results. Nonetheless, the results of the current study were unique in some interesting aspects. In this particular ESL context, recasts were also effective in eliciting uptake, and learners responded to any corrective feedback as much as 97% of the time. Whether the rate of uptake correlates with second language learning still remains an empirical question. The study conducted by de Bot (1996) addresses the issue of the necessity of having learners produce correct forms after corrective feedback. De Bot claims that language learners are likely to benefit from being pushed to retrieve linguistic forms of the target language. In relation to de Bot's claim, Clark (1995) and Grosofsky, Payne, and Campbell (1994) argue that participants remember items that they have generated in response to some kind of cues better than the items that have just been presented to them. As these researchers reveal that learner response to corrective feedback seems helpful in language learning, the next phase of error treatment study should explore the relationship between learner uptake and its contribution to language development.

Colpitts and Howard (2018) think that corrective feedback (CF) has generally been accepted as an effective means for improving student writing, some debate still exists as to whether focused (narrow) or unfocused (broad) CF is more effective in improving student writing in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts and undertook a comparative study of two groups of high-proficiency Japanese and international students of English at one private university in the Kansai area of Japan. A third control group who did not partake in any corrective feedback were also used for comparison. Both groups of students wrote argumentative essays on a subject of their choosing over the course of eight weeks. The first group, Treatment Group A, was comprised of seven Japanese and non-Japanese university students (n = 7) who were trained in giving meta-linguistic (error coded), computer-mediated unfocused peer CF. The second group, Treatment Group B, was comprised of seven Japanese university students (n = 7) who were trained in giving meta-linguistic, computer-mediated focused feedback on five errors identified as being the most common in an initial diagnostic writing

sample done in the first week. The initial draft, post-peer CF draft, post-teacher CF draft, and final draft were then analyzed. Students' ability to correctly resolve errors, and the number of errors per 100 words that emerged in each draft were then examined. The results suggest that unfocused peer and teacher CF may be a more effective means of reducing student errors in writing, possibly because it provides more overall learning opportunities.

Pishkar (2022) made a study of the relationship between corrective feedback and ELT students' motivation The study utilized both a quantitative and qualitative research aimed at determining of the grade 1 to pre-university students' perceptions and teachers' perceptions and attitudes about corrective feedback and also qualitative data was also collected to gain more in-depth information about why teachers and students preferred a particular type or amount of feedback. Two hundred and forty participants were selected from grad 1 to pre university at high school in Jiroft. These respondents had average level of English language proficiency, a situation faced by many students in this area who rarely used English language outside the school. The instruments used in this study were questionnaire and interview to determine students' perception on their views on using corrective feedback in the English class and also to investigate whether the use of corrective feedback has great effect on students' motivation. Data of questionnaires were analyzed by SPSS version 17 in Likert scale to determine the respondents' perception of using corrective feedback. In addition, interviews were transcribed to investigate the effects of using corrective feedback in motivation and what type of corrective feedback is preferred by teachers and students. Results of the study indicate that the students have positive attitudes about using corrective feedback and the use of corrective feedback is more effective in improving students' learning and their motivation. It is hoped that the findings of this research would provide the reason why the corrective feedback should not be neglected when teaching a foreign language rather it should be looked upon as a resource for foreign language learning EFL students. Furthermore, today, the part of restorative criticism (CF) in second dialect obtaining (SLA) and remote dialect procurement (FLA) settings is very obvious. There have been various reviews here and they have all authenticated the critical impact of remedial input in remote dialect learning (e.g., Ancker, 2000; DeKeyser, 1993; Katayama, 2007; Lightbown and Spada, 1999; McDonough, 2005; Schmidt, 1990; Swain, 1985;). CF has been explored from various points and distinctive hypotheses. There are studies that have explored the introduction of CF as indicated by learners' ZPD in interactional shape and have inspected their past composing pieces formed outside the classroom and gave criticism stepwise. There are likewise different reviews (e.g., Lynch, 2001; Mendez, 2010; Nishimura, 2000) that have inspected the connection that happens while the learner is playing out the errand to such an extent that exclusive when the learner experiences an issue the educator hinders and helps the learner disguise the point by transaction of importance. There are, in any case, not very many reviews in the FL setting which have endeavoured to look at the arrangement of CF as indicated by learners' ZPD in oral interactional circumstances happening in the classroom. At the end of the day, the investigations of CF gave in unconstrained talks between the instructor and learners are extremely uncommon. The present review was subsequently completed to research the adequacy of various sorts of mistake revision techniques in best framework and propelling the learners' stream of correspondence by asking their suppositions and observations. The consequences of factual investigation demonstrated noteworthy contrasts for the "verifiable" and "express" classes. As it were, educators favoured unequivocal blunder rectification though learners were more for understood adjustment. This finding is in accordance with the past research discoveries which demonstrated that the majority of the understudies favoured their mistakes to be amended verifiably by the educators since they feared losing face amid discussion (Matsuura, Chiba & Hilderbrandt 2001). As understudies need to convey what needs be in the learning procedure, furnishing them with successful input encourages their learning as well as improves their phonetic abilities and is utilized as a method for inspiration and advancement for their certainty. R. Ellis (2009) said the significance of positive input in educational hypothesis in view of its "full of feeling backing to the learner" (p.26). He trusted that it "encourages inspiration to keep learning" (p.26). At the point when dialect learners are considered as "entire people", they are seen as individuals who candidly and mentally are impacted by many included figures the learning procedure, a standout amongst the most critical of which is the blunder amendment techniques utilized by the dialect educators. The structure picked by the teacher to change learners' errors can extraordinarily help learners, induce them, prepare them, or of course, may hone them, prevent them, and demoralize them. Hattie and Timperley (2007)

underlined the competent effect of input on learning and achievement; in any case, this impact could be sure or negative. The previously mentioned thoughts are firmly identified with the discoveries of the present review. As a rule, there were inclination clashes amongst educators and learners. Learners longed for more backhanded, understood and postponed amendments, though educators put stock in immediate, express and quick remedies. The utilization of a mix of adjustment sources would be wiser (Zhang, 2012) and the aftereffects of this review highlight the indicate that for EC be more effective, instructors ought to regard learners' convictions. This implies wherever the adjustment is a bit much, they can give it after the action in a more backhanded manner. They ought not turn to unequivocal and quick adjustment at all circumstances. However, it ought to likewise be noticed that at whatever point certain blunders in the discussion create the impression that can frustrate the stream of discussion, instructors can fall back on prompt revision. Accordingly, the classifications of rectification i.e. sorts, times, and sources are variable with respect to the circumstances and settings of learning and furthermore the individual qualities. To choose a suitable blunder rectification technique, instructors additionally need to consider social and situational setting. S/he needs to respect the level, age, needs, expertise, time, material and every single other component that may assume some part in the educating learning forms. Hattie and Timperley (2007, p.75) called attention to that "the fundamental motivation behind input is to lessen inconsistencies between current understandings and execution and an objective." Therefore, instructors need to guarantee "that criticism is focused at understudies at the suitable level, since some criticism is powerful in diminishing the disparity between current understandings and what is wanted, and some is ineffectual."

2.1.1. Reasons for Giving Feedback

The way one should give feedback depends greatly on the task, and the reasons for giving feedback are often relatively different depending on the task or situation. Harmer (2004) has made a distinction between fluency work and accuracy work, in other words the oral work of students. According to Harmer, during fluency work teacher should only correct errors that are in the way of communication. Correction needs to be subtle and one has to use one's judgement to see what needs to be corrected and what does not. The point with this is the fact that students are speaking a foreign language in order to gain experience and become more confident in speaking. Thus, there is no point in correcting all the little mistakes they make. Moreover, by using gentle correction students do not feel incompetent and have the courage to speak in the future (Harmer, 2004). Luoma (2004) also points out that informal feedback is rather common with speaking assessment. On the other hand, she also states that one needs to develop more organized strategies for reporting feedback. When it comes to accuracy work, however, feedback can be more precise and the focus is usually on one issue at a time. For example, if students are practicing the present tense of a verb, it is essential that they are being corrected, if the form is not present, or if they are not sure how to say something. During this oral work, teacher corrections are not meant to give away the right answers directly. Here, as in all aspects of feedback, teacher should strive for feedback that helps the students find the right answer themselves, using their own thoughts and previous knowledge as help (Harmer, 2004). Moreover, oral feedback works well in situations where writing could feel overwhelming to the student (Brookhart& Connie, 2009). In other words, if a teacher feels he/she has so much to say that in writing all of it might go to waste or make the student anxious, it is a good strategy to use oral feedback. Verbally one can focus on many issues if one wants to, but still be encouraging and effective. Moreover, oral feedback instead of written feedback is especially useful with young students or with students struggling with written text (ibid.). With oral feedback, it is easier for students to pay attention in some cases, and they can just listen and absorb the information, whereas written text demands concentration and skills for assimilating the matters in a different way.

The term formative assessment is often mentioned when talking about feedback, and feedback also is an essential part of formative assessment. One definition for formative assessment is that it is "assessment for enhancing and shaping learning through modifying teaching" (Spendlove 2009). Whereas summative assessment focuses on students' grades and accountability, formativeassessment uses students' results in a feed-forward way (Fisher & Frey, 2011). Moreover, the same assessment can be used in both ways, depending on how one makes use of the information received from the assessment. There are several reasons why formative assessment is an important part of teaching and giving feedback.

First of all, feedback itself is not useful if not used effectively. Combined with formative assessment, feedback can improve students' performance and do it efficiently (Fisher & Frey, 2011). Thus, teachers must be able to take advantage of feedback as a part of formative assessment. If feedback is merely given because that is what teachers are supposed to do, it might not result in good achievement. Second of all, Hattie and Timperley (2007) have designed a formative assessment system consisting of three components: feed-up, feedback, and feed-forward. They see feedback as an important part of the system, providing students help and information about their progress. Feedup consists of the part where students are presented the purpose of an assignment, whereas feedforward is a phase where student learning is guided based on their performance. Together these phases ensure an effective learning process. Finally, formative assessment describes not only to teachers but also to students how the students are performing when compared to classroom learning goals. Formative assessment takes into account both the cognitive and motivational factors of the students. If feedback is given properly, students can understand where they are at the moment and where to go next. Moreover, when they know where they are, they will probably be more motivated to continue and feel that they have some control over their own learning (Brookhart, 2008). According to Clarke (2003), in the field of feedback and assessment, misguided views and bad practice affect learning, and thus make learners loose some of their self-esteem and motivation. That is why cognitive and motivational factors both need to be taken into account, and teachers need to plan their way of giving feedback when teaching.

Formative assessment takes time, but it is also a powerful way for effective feedback. Clarke has made an important notion about the use of formative assessment and feedback:

> "In order for formative assessment to be embedded in practice, it is vital that teachers have children learning as their priority, not their teaching or the opinions of outside parties." (2003:1)

Here the role of the teacher is again emphasized greatly. It seems self-evident that learning is always the main goal in schools. However, it can easily take a step back while teachers start to focus more on their own performance. This does not necessarily mean the teacher is incompetent or that he/she does not care about the students. On the contrary, teachers might focus on teaching and spend a significant amount of time planning lessons. Unfortunately, something else rather than learners' needs may be controlling him/her and the end result is not what expected. One might think that since one has seen someone else use this technique, it must be good, or that if one does something completely different from the others teachers, one gets judged by them. However, learning must always be kept the priority and children's needs the main goal when teaching. With formative assessment, feedback is also more powerful than in situations where it is not linked to anything. Jackson (2009) states that feedback used in the right way can provide children with real-time feedback. It is especially important to give feedback during the learning process, so that the effect is the most efficient. If one gives a great deal of feedback to students, but has no bigger goals or a larger system to support it, the results may not be as good as one hoped. Moreover, a teacher's job during formative assessment is to collect information constantly during the lesson and then use this information to adapt his/her teaching to meet the students' needs (Gardner et al, 2010). Students have an active role as well, because the feedback they get guides them and helps them move to the right direction.

It is self-evident that people acknowledge that students need positive reinforcement and positive feedback when studying. Teachers should use praise as a part of teaching, and the end result would be helping and motivating the learners, and, moreover, developing students' mindsets (Reitbauer et al, 2013). As pointed out earlier, learners always interpret teacher's words in their own way, and the situation is the same when praising them. Combining teacher's input and learner's input one gets the outcome (Brookhart, 2008). In other words, students take into account both input sources when making decisions and forming their study schedule. Observing the situation and giving adequate praise is effective, but one should not praise students to an excess. To praise effectively is an area of its own, and the first issue to encounter are the forms of praise one uses: as a teacher one should become aware how one uses praise, and in which situations. As a guideline, it is profitable to notice that "praise needs to separate the action or process from the person or product" (Reitbauer et al, 2013).

The research and studies above reveal the large effect that different types of feedback have in teaching and learning. Oral feedback received the most attention, because it is the most important type of feedback when considering this research. However, one must notice that for example oral and written feedback have many common issues, such as the goal to motivate and help the students learn in the best possible way. Most importantly, feedback needs to be effective in order to work, and this only succeeds if formative assessment is included in teaching and in giving feedback. There are, of course other types of feedback as well, such as peer feedback and non-verbal feedback, which both are often present in the classroom. Peer feedback can be widely profitable if used correctly and often enough. In the classrooms and in language learning the intention is to learn new issues, and thus correction is often needed. Corrective feedback, as stated above, is a large part of the field of feedback, and it has, for example, been divided into different sections according to the ways teachers' correct students' errors. The following section will focus on the role of feedback in more detail, providing information about the feedback contents, feedback strategies and methods, and models of teaching related to the use of feedback in the classrooms. Moreover, the role of feedback is observed from both the teachers' and students' perspective, examining the previous research relating to the topic of oral feedback.

2.1.2. Teacher's Role in the Feedback Process

Harmer (2004) has pointed out several different roles for the teacher in the classroom. According to him, teacher is often seen as an examiner when asked from the students. It is one of the roles the teacher has, but it should not be the most important one. Teacher must examine student's level of achievement and often grade them, so in addition to examiner, a teacher is alsoan evaluator. Moreover, teachers should be resources for the students. Students should feel free to ask questions and trust that the teacher will help them as well as he/she possible can. Assisting, thus, is also a part of teacher's work. If one sits behind the desk and lets the students work on their own, or does not even offer help at any point in the class, students get the feeling that they are alone, and nevertheless, they have to achieve good results. In addition to the above roles, a teacher is also an editor and an audience. Editing student's work, both orally and in written form is essential for students' language development. Audience here refers to situations where students perform and show their knowledge in class and the teacher in there to observe and give feedback. As one can see, Harmer's division of roles already proves the multiple and versatile roles a single teacher must remember during every classroom session.

In addition to research, corrective feedback has been extremely important for teachers, since in a formal teaching situations error correction is usually expected (Profozic, 2013). Moreover, some type of analysis of errors and misconceptions is substantial, because it enables teachers to make meaningful decisions (Fisher & Frey, 2011). Analysis makes it possible for teachers to find out what is difficult or easy for the students, and they can also focus on individual students and their needs. Furthermore, with the help of corrective feedback, teachers receive a basis for their teaching and re-teaching. Some concepts may have to be covered more than others, and when teachers notice there appears several errors in a certain issue, they will know they have to pay more attention to it (Fisher & Frey, 2011).

A study in China aimed to find out teachers' use of corrective feedback in a task-based EFL classroom. Students were aged 17-19 years, and the research consisted of 50 students and one teacher. The data was collected in the north-west of Beijing in a university by recording lessons, and the final material was eight hours of recorded data. Iwashita and Li (2012) found five different types of corrective feedback: explicit correction, teacher recast, student recast, clarification request and elicitation. Recasts were the largest group, consisting of over half the corrections, whereas clarification requests and elicitation were both about ten percent of the data. Moreover, a study conducted in Belgium (Lochtman 2002) found out that teachers mainly use three types of oral corrective feedback: explicit corrections, recasts and teacher initiations to self-corrections by the pupils. The latter one was the most used in the data, recasts came next, and explicit corrections were the smallest unit. The data consisted of 600 minutes of classroom recordings, altogether 12 lessons.

Three Dutch speaking secondary schools and three teachers participated in the study, and the students in the classes were aged 15-16. Both these studies show that explicit correction and teacher recasts are a popular way of correcting errors among teachers. It is slightly troubling that explicit correction is used relatively extensively, because many researchers have pointed out that it is the least productive way for students to learn. For example, Askew et al. (2000), Brookhart (2008) and Clarke (2003) all strive towards learning where students have a major role in becoming better learners through corrective feedback that helps the learners realize and notice the error themselves.

Cruz and Mendez (2012) wanted to find out more about teachers' perceptions about the use of oral corrective feedback. They used an interview and a questionnaire in the data collection. The study took place at a Mexican university, and five language instructors aged 25-60 were interviewed. 15 instructors filled in the questionnaire. The results of the study show that teachers have a positive view about oral corrective feedback, and they strongly feel they need to correct students' errors in order for them to become fluent and accurate. They also see corrective feedback having a positive effect on language learning. However, some teachers were also concerned about students' feelings when giving corrective feedback. The minority of the teachers thought that corrective feedback is not relevant when acquiring accuracy and fluency. Interestingly, self-correction was judged to be less effective from teacher correction. Finally, the majority of the teachers believed that their students also prefer teacher corrective feedback rather than peer's. Overall, teachers have a positive perception about oral feedback in this study. Kamiya (2012) also studied teachers and their beliefs and practices about oral corrective feedback in the US. Four teachers read three studies of oral corrective feedback and they were then observed, interviewed and recalled. Surprisingly, the results show that classroom practices did not change much, regardless of the teachers' previous experience. However, the teachers with more experience had already stated and firm believes of oral corrective feedback, and the studies they read had no influence on their teaching. Since the studies were of contrasting findings, all of the teachers seemed to select certain information from the studies to identify themselves with. Research showed that the teachers' language learning and teaching experience had a significant impact on their stated beliefs on corrective feedback.

Gurzynski-Weiss and Révész (2012) examined the role of the teacher's feedback in the classroom interaction. In the study, 23 lessons from nine classrooms were taped and transcribed, the learners being university-level intermediate Spanish learners in the United States. The aim was tofind out whether feedback is given during the task, during focused or unfocused tasks, or during pre- , during-, or posttask phases. The teachers had taken part to a teaching methodology course before teaching, apart from one teacher. Altogether nine teachers participated, five of which were native speakers and four non- native speakers of Spanish. Each class had students aged 18 to 22, and number of students varied from 14 to 18 students per class. Overall, 73.4% of the errors received feedback, and teacher feedback was more often given during nontasks than during tasks. Nontasks consisted of tasks that did not fully focus on meaning, focusing primarily on form, such as drills. Compared to tasks, students produced modified output more during nontasks, and teachers also provided them with more chances of doing so during nontasks. Focused and unfocused task had an effect on the amount of feedback, since more feedback was given related to unfocused tasks. However, the type of feedback given by the teachers did not change much according to this division. Finally, most of the errors found occurred in the posttask phase, and the least errors in pretask phase. Teachers gave more feedback in the posttask phase compared to the possibilities for it in the duringtask phase, and they also provided implicit feedback more often during the posttask phase. This study shows that there are indeed differences in how much and in which way feedback is given during the different parts of the class and during different tasks or nontasks. One cannot simply see a lesson as one unit and feedback as one simple way of providing information: they are both a complex phenomenon and should be examined as one.

Teacher's role in giving feedback, corrective feedback strategies, and learner uptake has been studied in Finland, too. Surakka (2007) studied the different ways the teacher used corrective feedback in an EFL classroom, and how students responded to it. Students were recorded for four years, and they were on grades 3-6 during the process. With the help of 48 hours of classroom video recordings, she found out that teachers often react to students' mistakes with implicit feedback, for example recasts.

This, however, shows that teachers do most of the work for the students, since recasts usually give away the right answer. Moreover, the results indicate that learners take on the feedback in over half the cases, and also corrected the error in 52% of the cases. Pehkonen studied teacher's evaluative turns in Finnish CLIL classrooms (2008), and also used video recordings as her data. She revealed that teachers use multiple and varying methods, both linguistic and nonverbal. Moreover, it seems that the teachers use exceptionally direct ways when abandoning students' answers as wrong. Finally, the results show that nonverbal communication appears to play a significant role in classrooms, and that teachers' ways of evaluating can be quite versatile.

2.1.3. Students' Role in the Feedback Process

Students' views and their feedback to teachers and to each other should be taken into account in every class (Askew &Lodge 2000). A teacher surely knows the basis for teaching, and what is considered to be effective, but it is also essential to hear the students' ideas. Moreover, with the help of the students, teachers can improve their teaching to meet the needs of a certain class or a group of people. People are different, and thus one cannot teach everyone in the same way using the same methods. Moreover, even though the teacher has a clear message or an action plan, it is the learners' interpretation that matter in the end (Reitbauer et al, 2013). That is why teachers should observe the class and change their ways if necessary. In addition, students' experiences about certain comments can be divided into information and judgement (Brookhart, 2008). One should always avoid judging people, and the role of the teacher is to provide information and help students form a mindset of their own. Judging often leads to motivation problems or, unintentionally or not, given statements. Overall, students need to actually understand the feedback they get in order to succeed and for it to have an effect on their self-assessment. According to Osler (2010), several schools lack the capability to include students in the decision- making process. It seems strange that schools are specifically designed for children, but children do not have a say in the development processes. Moreover, this ruling of schools makes students frustrated, because they feel that their opinion does not matter at all.

A study conducted in the mid 1980's by Preston et al. (1985) already gave some insights into what students' find to be effective oral feedback. The researchers recorded speeches given by students along with the instructor's oral feedback. Students were then asked what aspects of the feedback they find helpful and whether some of the feedback would increase or decrease their self-esteem. Personally directed feedback and feedback that focuses on certain features of the speech was found to be most helpful by the students. Complements were said to make them feel good, but not significantly improve their skills. Negative feelings were sometimes caused by critique from the instructor. Most of all, this study shows that students want to receive quite specific feedback and feedback that they can relate with or understand. The researchers also state that teachers should use both positive and negative feedback, because critical but constructive feedback is seen as helpful, and positive feedback promotes good self-esteem. (Preston et al, 1985).

A survey studying students' perceptions about how to improve schools and how to learn effectively was conducted in English Midlands, and 13 schools participated in the study, forming the data (Osler, 2010). The results show that there is indeed a great deal one can improve in schools. First of all, students often requested more innovative teaching and the use of multiple teaching styles. Relating to this, they wanted to get more positive feedback and encouragement instead of error correction. This is an essential remark. since some studies also point out that students want their errors corrected. (For example Abukhadrah 2012). Second of all, teachers should listen to students more when giving feedback. Again, the feedback and the signs from students are vital and every teacher should be willing to notice the requests and change his/her behavior accordingly. Third of all, students in this study were worried about the pressures they felt from the teacher to succeed and perform well. In other words, they felt that they could not always fulfill their teachers' wishes. This is an interesting remark, since it should not be about what the teacher wants, but about what the student feel is useful and important to learn within the guidelines. Finally, students expect teachers to treat them with respect, since they are also respecting the teacher in return. Overall, fair and equal treatment is valued (Osler, 2010).

Relations of student perceptions of teacher oral feedback with teacher expectancies and student selfconcept were examined in a study in Taiwan (Yi-Hin et al, 2011). The data consisted of nearly 1600 Taiwanese pupils on grades 3-6, from four cities and 47 classrooms. Teachers were asked to choose certain pupils from their classes to a high- expectancy group, certain pupils to a low-expectancy group, leaving the rest of the pupils to an average-expectancy group. A questionnaire was used to measure students' perceptions of teachers' oral feedback. Feedback was divided into two sections: academic feedback about test performance, assignments and so on, and nonacademic feedback about helping a classmate or breaking the rules, for example. Thus, with both the groups and positive and negative feedback, four feedback subgroups were formed for the study: positive academic, negative academic, positive nonacademic and negative nonacademic. The results show, first of all, that teachers had higher expectancies for girls than boys. Second of all, those students who teachers chose in the high-expectancy group received more positive than negative feedback, both in academic and nonacademic groups. Thus, teachers provide feedback to students differently, according to their own expectations. Third of all, students had a higher self-concept if they had received more positive academic feedback, and lower self-concept after receiving negative academic feedback. However, positive academic feedback is still more reliable compared to negative academic feedback when looking at students' academic self-concept. Moreover, nonacademic feedback had little effect on self-concept. What is also considerable was the fact that boys received more negative feedback than girls. On the other hand, there was no difference in the amount of positive feedback. In addition, one must remember that a Taiwanese culture can differ greatly from the culture for example here in Finland, so the results must be interpreted accordingly. For example, the pupils in Taiwan are quite school oriented, and thus the nonacademic feedback did not affect their self-concept, but in Finland the results might be different.

Self- assessment is an important issue to consider when considering the importance of students' role in a classroom. Hand in hand with students' self-assessment goes reflection. One can actually learn to reflect with practice and help from the teacher. Reflection is seen as an important factor in students' learning process (Hilliard &Westberg, 2001). Students assessing their work themselves during and after the task or performance is essential in order for them to learn issues thoroughly. Reflection also helps learners to build on what they already know and identify deficits in the knowledge. Moreover, errors are more easily detected in the thinking process with the help of reflection. Connected to this is the concept of generalizing. It is relatively easier to apply new information in different situations once one knows to reflect on issues. Thus, learning can be accelerated. If learners feel they can have an effect on their own learning, they will also more likely have motivation and confidence (Hilliard&Westberg, 2001). During classes, leaving students time to reflect on what they have learned will considerably help them to internalize the knowledge and develop the skills they need in the future (Dean et al, 2012). Finally, the feeling of active participation plays an essential role (Carnell, 2000).

Self-assessment is an issue that has raised awareness more now than before. Lyster (2007) has incisively reported self-repair as to "increasingly handing the floor to students". In other words, it is nowadays not only the teacher who assess or corrects the students, but they can do it their selves to a greater extent. Connie and Brookhart (2009: 45) state that feedback according to self- regulation theorists is external regulation, in a way that when students receive feedback from a teacher, it changes into internal regulation. Hathaway (1997) points out that self-assessment can be both positive and negative. In order to change self-criticism to positive self-talk, one has to change the way one thinks and believes, because simply believing something has a significant effect on self esteem. Moreover, students' misconception can influence learning (Fisher & Frey, 2011). False assumptions from previous experiences or misguided information follows students to the next topic, and can affect learning. They are, unfortunately, rather persistent, and even intractable to some degree. Therefore, it is important to understand their role. Misconceptions are influenced by students' own perceptions about school and learning. Moreover, even their expectations can affect learning. As a teacher, one has to consider this side of learning and adapt one's teaching to meet the needs of the students. Both self- assessment and misconceptions are influenced by the type feedback teacher decides to use. In addition to this, learners need to understand that external factors are not, at least always, a reason for their failures. One should instead focus on the positive factors and work for a successful outcome (Reitbauer, 2013).

Overall, feedback as a concept has been widely acknowledged among researchers, and information on feedback can be found from different types of feedback, not to mention feedback models and strategies. However, this current study will bring forward the voice of the students and focus on their perceptions of the use of oral feedback in upper secondary schools in Finland. This area is one of the least studied, and thus it will be essential for future teachers and practitioners in the field of education. Feedback is, after all, one of the most influential forces in teaching and learning, and the use of it should be studied more extensively also in the future. Naturally, it is important to study feedback use in the classrooms and take into account teachers' opinions as well as study how the already established feedback strategies are being used. However, students have an important role in developing teaching as well, and their views on the topic need to be covered. Thus, this study will widen the views on the use of oral feedback and hopefully inspire and provide advice to teachers.

2.1.4. Corrective Feedback in Writing

In addition, for novice student writers, making errors is a natural and indispensable part when they are moving forward. In this case, written corrective feedback (WCF) to students' errors from instructors plays a key role in helping them improve written accuracy so that they can move smoothly to a higher language level. CF is an important part of second language writing because it allows of providing teacher-to-student interaction in L2 writing class (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, &Tinti, 1997).

Not all linguistic errors are necessarily treatable with written CF. According to Pienemann's (1989) Processability Theory, there are set processing procedures that are activated during language generation and learners will only be able to acquire a certain structure or structures when they are developmentally ready to do so. When this is considered, it is easy to see why written CF may not be effective if the targeted linguistic structure is beyond a learner's stage of development. For this reason, many studies have looked at the effectiveness of written CF on either one or a small number of linguistic error categories. Bitchener (2008), Bitchener and Knoch (2008, 2010a, 2010b), Sheen (2007) and Sheen et al. (2009) focused on one or two functional uses of definite and indefinite articles and all found significant gains for the treatment groups in the immediate post-tests and delayed post-tests. No such gains were found for the control groups.

In contrast, the effectiveness of written CF for several other linguistic error categories (lexical items and prepositions) has been tested and no benefits have been found (Bitchener, Cameron & Young, 2005; Ferris, 2006; Frantzen, 1995; Lalande, 1982). For lexical items, this could be due to the low frequency with which a particular word is used, providing few occasions for a learner to notice acceptable usage. With prepositions, their use is not so much rule-governed as idiosyncratic, making it more difficult for learners to choose the correct preposition. For this reason, feedback may need to be provided on numerous occasions, which is not usually the case in CF studies.

The effects of written CF on short-term revision or long-term improvement also become issues raised in previous research studies. From both theoretical and practical perspective, the influence of written CF on short-term revision is an interesting and relevant issue (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). When students receive written CF on a text and are then asked to revise that text, they do so successfully, with "success" being defined as a statistically significant reduction in the number of errors from one draft to the next. When they do not receive written CF, they are much less able and likely to correct errors on their own as supported by several research findings related to short term effect of written CF as confirmed by some studies in EFL context, e.g. a study by Ashwell (2000) and another study by Hsu and Truscott (2008). A study by Ferris and Roberts (2001) reveals that ESL college students who received error feedback successfully revised more than 60 percent of their total errors and their correction ratio was significantly higher than a control group's ratio. A study of Ashwell (2000) involved 50 Japanese university students (EFL context) in four treatment groups in which three of the four received form-based feedback before revising their texts. The result shows that students who received form based feedback wrote significantly more accurate revised drafts than a control group receiving no feedback. Furthermore, in Hsu and Truscott (2008) study, 47 EFL graduate students were divided into two groups and the finding discovered that students in the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group in self-correcting errors during revision.

Several gaps regarding the previous research about written corrective feedback have been identified as a basis to conduct a new study. As most of the previous studies focused on partially learned linguistic features, there is a need to conduct a further research in regards to other grammatical items or other aspects of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary and mechanic (Bitchener, 2008). Therefore, the components of student's writing quality in this present study involved those aspects of writing. In the case of research of written CF on short-term effects, previous studies basically involved experiment and control group, without comparing the effect of different kinds of correction feedback (Ashwell, 2000; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hsu & Truscott, 2008).

Halabieh (2019) concluded by his article with the subject of "Written Corrective Feedback Major Types: What Type to Use? When to Use?" that in general, there is no consensus on the efficacy of a certain type. However, this could be due to different contexts of conducting these studies. A more meticulous research is needed to establish solid grounds for corrective feedback provision. 6 As demonstrated in this paper, implicit vs explicit and coded vs uncoded are the least researched types. Thus, no clear-cut background on them is crystalized. On the other hand, focused vs unfocused and direct vs indirect are to some extent well researched. Hence, several efficient domains of each type are discovered; this would help teachers in providing the most useful corrective feedback in their classes.

Lopez (2021) believes the practice of error has been heavily contested throughout the years(e.g., Truscott, 2001). However, such criticism only prompted L2 (acquisition and writing) researchers to conduct more research on written CF and L2 composition teachers to continue embracing a practice that has been ubiquitous to this day. Not surprisingly then, empirical interest in written CF, which dates as far back as the late 1960's (e.g., Stiff, 1967), has rendered an extensive body of research which has come a long way: studies from an L2 writing perspective have demonstrated its potential as a revision tool (e.g., Hsu & Truscott, 2008), and those from an L2 acquisition perspective have proved that it does assist in L2 learning/development (e.g., Bonilla et al., 2018).

Throughout the years, researchers have stated their concern about the lack of practical answers for L2 practitioners (e.g., Ferris, 2010). This article addresses an aspect that may not only hinder its application but also prevent L2 (writing) teachers and written CF researchers from fully understanding research findings, namely, a lack of consistency in key terminology. Therefore, the two most prevalent and contended variables are addressed and a proposal for this typology drawn from such an analysis. Overall, by critically discussing the discrepancies in terms of feedback scope as well as feedback type and by advancing an up-to-date schematization of written CF, it is hoped that L2 teachers and researchers alike can widen their current understanding of the written CF literature and advance in turn the error correction practice.

Irwin (2018) made a study which explored the intricate interaction between students' preferences for written corrective feedback and actual teacher feedback practices in a second year academic EFL writing class in a Japanese university. The results also show that while the teacher attempted to offer various types of feedback, it remained largely teacher cantered, resulting in students having a somewhat passive role in the feedback process. This study concludes that while there is a need for teachers to take their students' feedback preferences into account, diversity and a range of feedback strategies are more important considerations. Additionally, it is evident that students prefer that their teachers provide direct lexical and grammatical error corrections and to attend to all of their mistakes. Indirect feedback that simply pointed out that a mistake had been made did not seem particularly beneficial to this group. This preference resulted in a divergence between the students' expectations and teacher practice which relates to the second research question. In some situations, such as the case when students requested that all composition errors be directly corrected by the teacher, it can be argued that the teacher's pedagogical beliefs rightly superseded students' desires. While teachers may feel that their students' desires and expectations place a heavy burden on them, they should be heartened by one finding of this study. The vast majority of students felt that the feedback they received from their teacher helped them improve their writing skills. One avenue of future study into written corrective feedback could be comparing the roles that direct and indirect feedback have on student perceptions in both product and process oriented writing classes.

2.2. Coded vs Non-Coded Corrective Feedback

Ahmadi-Azad (2014) made a research to investigate the effects of two types of WCF (coded and uncoded) on Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy with regard to 10 kinds of errors (Verb Tense, Capitalization, Punctuation, Selling, Word Formation, Adding something, Deleting something, Wrong Word, Subject-Verb agreement, and plural vs. singular errors). The results revealed that coded type of WCF had a positive influence on learners' accurate use of all selected grammatical structures (especially Verb Tense) both in the short term and in the long run. The results were discussed in relation to some implications and recommendations for further research.

Another study by Alzahrani (2016) was conducted on exploring English language teachers' stated beliefs on coded unfocused corrective feedback in improving learners' writing accuracy at King Abdulaziz University (KAU). The study reveals that unfocused corrective feedback is useful to produce a better second draft; however, some learners' errors still recur in new writing despite the continuous corrections offered by teachers. Participants in this study further believe that using codes to mark learners' errors is not as beneficial as it should be, and it would be more effective if used selectively.

Moreover, Dewanti, Laksmi and Saukah (2017) investigated the effects of Coded Correction Feedback and Non-Coded Correction Feedback on senior high school students' writing quality. This study investigated the effect of Coded-Correction Feedback (CCF) and Non-Coded Correction Feedback (NCCF) on the quality of Indonesian EFL students' writing involving 53 senior high school students of 11th Grade. Each student was exposed to two different treatments (CCF and NCCF) and the students' writing quality, after receiving each type of treatments or WCF, was then measured. The result of this study revealed that the quality of the students' writing with CCF was better than that with NCCF. The findings of this study showed that the quality of the students' writing receiving CCF was better than that receiving NCCF because CCF promotes awareness with noticing as well as understanding. Hence, the use of CCF can be considered more effective than NCCF. Therefore, it is suggested that CCF be employed in giving corrective feedback to the students' compositions to improve the quality of their writing, and that teachers employ CCF when giving WCF to improve the quality of students' writing.

Kazemipour (2014) published an article which aimed at examining the effect of a partly teacher-, partly peer-feedback on final exam papers on the performance of students in the following semesters. The students in the Experimental group were given their exam papers with the errors just underlined by the teacher, for which the students themselves would find the correct answers in groups of 3 or 4 followed by a conference with the teacher, while the control group was just provided with the corrected papers by the teacher, followed by a possible conference with the teacher to solve any questions the students might have encountered. The results indicated that the experimental groups' speech and written productions contained less errors in the first sessions of the next semester. The results of this study shed some light on the on-going debate on the feedback and its divergent types. It is yet to be believed that error correction and provision of CF depends largely on various variables, e.g. the learners' age range, the amount of motivation, their personality type, etc.

Salimi and Valizadeh (2015) investigated the effect of coded and un-coded written corrective feedback with regard to possible improvements in the accuracy in writing of pre-intermediate EFL learners. It, further, sought whether such an effect would last in the long run. In the course of 14 weeks, learners' errors in 2 groups (i.e., coded and uncoded) were reacted. The research aimed to investigate whether there is a difference in the effect of two written corrective feedback (i.e. codec and uncoded) on some selected target features in the short term and in the long run. After the 10-week experiment, the results showed that coded type of corrective feedback had a positive influence on students' accuracy in selecting grammatical structures and punctuation both in the short term and the long run. Both the long-term and short-term mastery of the linguistic forms showed that the coded way of giving feedback seems to have a similar effect. This finding can well answer the research questions and indicates that teachers' decision on CF selection should depend on the acting time and the educational focus on the type of grammatical features.

Sampson's (2012) study regarding the effects of un-coded correction which is writing the correct forms on each error and coded annotations which is writing symbols for learners in order to self-

correct on EFL learners' written accuracy found that coded feedback seems to be more effective because of the increased cognitive engagement and social interaction it affords. Moreover, Bulut and Erel's (2007) study investigated the effects of direct and indirect coded error feedback on learners' accuracy in writing. According to the results of the study, learners receiving indirect coded feedback had fewer errors than the direct ones. It also seems logical that using a code engages learners in self-editing and cognitive error processing (Guénette, 2007). There are other studies, however, that suggest that coded feedback may not lead to accuracy development. Ferris and Roberts (2001) found no significant differences the learners who corrected the underlined errors and those who self-corrected errors marked with a code. Robb et al.'s (1986) study also showed no advantage for any of coded and uncoded feedback types. Similarly, in Semke's (1984) study, no difference between the two approaches was However, three recent studies by Van Beuningan et al. (2012) and Bitchener and Knoch (2010b) indicated positive short-term effects for both direct and indirect feedback but direct error correction had a more significant long-term effect. Vyatkina's (2010) study was in favor of direct feedback which led to more successful revisions which showed that more implicit feedback types (coded) may be confusing for learners and lead to wrong guesses, which confirms previous research (e.g., Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996). Some researchers (Bitchener, 2012; Polio, 2012) have discussed written error correction from the perspective of various approaches to SLA, for example generative theory, monitor theory (Krashen, 1985), skill acquisition theory (McLaughlin, 1987), processability theory (Pienemann, 1998, 2007; Pienemann & Keßler, 2012), usage-based approaches (Ellis, 2007, 2012)., skill acquisition theory (DeKeyser, 2007), sociocultural theory (Lantolf, 2000, 2012), and the interaction approach (Hatch, 1978; Long, 1981, 1983) and what they might have to say about written error correction. Whether and how corrective feedback can help students to become good writers is of great interest for researchers (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2010). Currently, the research focus is on the potential of written CF in helping learners' interlanguage development and most of the studies are mainly inspired by the proposals made by the Noticing Hypothesis by Schimdt (1994). An understating of this theory is felt necessary here.

Truscott is known as having the most extreme views of using CF in classrooms. In his first paper against the provision of corrective feedback, he not only considered feedback as having very little effect on learning process, but he also insisted on the negative affective influence it might have on the students. By reviewing the papers and research on the in/effectiveness of the CF, he tried to demonstrate that most of the studies attempted to be optimistic about the results (Truscott, 1996). Kepner (1991) also compared the feedback on grammatical structure with feedback on the content of the writings of students, reaching to the conclusion that those who received feedback on content performed better in later writings. Similar result was observed by Shepperd (1992). Despite these studies, and their claims on ineffectiveness and also harmfulness of CF, other scholars have continued to demonstrate how CF can be effective and useful as a tool in helping the learners (e.g. Bitchener & knoch, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ellis et al., 2008; Ferris, 1999, 2006; Sheen, 2007; Sheen et al., 2009;). The disagreement continues to include those studies comparing the effectiveness of different types of CF (e.g. Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). In their study, Ferris and Roberts (2001) indicated that indirect feedback is more effective since it engages the students in guided learning, promotes reflection and attention to the form, it also seems to foster long-term retention. Chandler (2003) examined the possible existing differences between direct vs. indirect feedback on students' writings, concluding that both types were very effective indeed, with having better functions than describing the type of error to the students. Bitchener andKnoch (2009) investigated the effect of different types of feedback (direct CF + written and oral meta-linguistic explanation; Direct CF + written meta-linguistic explanation; only direct CF) on the functional use of the English article system "a" and "the". With no differences witnessed in the low-intermediate groups receiving different kinds of feedback, they concluded that the provision of CF suffices. Truscott (1996) mentioned about the limitations and problems some studies suffer from, leading to the invalidity of their results. The first one mentioned is the lack of control group in some of the studies (Ferris 1995, 1997, 2006; Lalande, 1982). The second one is that they "did not examine the effect of CF on new pieces of writings" (p.354). These studies (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001) continued to examine the effect on the later drafts of the same writing. The third problem with the studies (e.g. Kepner, 1991) is no inclusion of pre-test to make the groups of learners homogeneous. The current study has tried to exclude these kinds of problems in its process.

More recent studies have sought to overcome the problems of earlier studies by including a control group, having students write new texts for the post-test and using similar instruments for all stages of testing (e.g. Bitchener, 2008, 2009a; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010a; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008; Sheen, 2007; Sheen, Wright, &Moldawa, 2009; Van Beuningen et al., 2008, 2012). In all of these studies there was an improved level of accuracy in the immediate post-tests, which can be taken as clear evidence of uptake. Participants noticed the difference between what they had produced and the written CF provided, and then accurately used the correct version when producing a new text.

Circa 1970s corrective feedback has been studied by numberless scholars. Thus, a heavy literature has been condensed on shelves by time pass. Roughly more than 60 papers dealing with the types of CF were reviewed via conducting a search on Google Scholar, Academia, and Science Direct. The key words searched for were types of corrective feedback, direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, coded corrective feedback, uncoded corrective feedback, focused corrective feedback, unfocused corrective feedback, explicit corrective feedback, and implicit corrective feedback with a time span from 2013 to 2018. The rational of having different types was explained. Moreover, the major written corrective feedback types were demonstrated in addition to some of their ideal domains to be applied in. It was found that certain types of corrective feedback have precedency over other types in specific domains.

Mujtaba, Nawaz andParkash(2020) made a study to investigate the effect of indirect codded correction feedback (ICCF) and affective short comments of the teachers on the students writing performance. The study aimed to answer whether ICCF alone enhances the quality of the students writing or does it work better with the short affective comments of the teachers. The study was conducted at a private university of Karachi, and data for the purpose of this study was conducted from 90 undergraduate business students. There were two group of students: control and experimental. The participants were randomly assigned into two groups: control (ICCF only, N = 45) and treatment (ICCF and short affective teachers' comments, N = 45). For the purpose of this study, all participants were required to complete three writing tasks and the tasks were assessed and graded by two subject experts. The researcher applied t-test to find whether there was any significant difference in the mean score of both the control and treatment group. The result of the study unveiled that treatment group students performed well than comparison group students as it was revealed in their third writing draft. Moreover, the result of the questionnaire unveiled that the respondents of the treatment group were of the view that ICCF and short affective teachers' comments increased their perceived motivation level.

Vyatkina (2010) published an article exploring the effectiveness of instructor-written corrective feedback for the improvement of writing accuracy by beginning college-level learners of German. The researcher investigated changes in error rates in six error categories in essay writing in correlation with three different corrective feedback types administered consistently throughout one semester: direct, coded, and uncoded feedback. The author analyzed both short-term revision effects and semester-long changes. The study found that all groups improved their accuracy in redrafting; participants did not shorten the essay length in the final drafts to eliminate errors; direct correction led to slightly higher correction rates for selected errors; and there was no significant difference in overall error rate changes between the groups. The study concludes with suggestions for further research and pedagogical applications. This study also showed that the revision process helped students to improve the accuracy in redrafting. Instructors in this study found 55% - 88% fewer errors in the final drafts than in corresponding rough drafts. Moreover, separate tests performed for each error category yielded similar results. Participants in this study made significantly fewer errors related to verbs, nouns, word order, and spelling as well as lexical and structural errors in the revised drafts. This finding corroborates previous research results showing that self-editing leads to superior final writing products (e.g., Ferris, 2006; Polio et al., 1998).

Betha, Hamzah and Rosa (2021) explored the lecturers' written corrective feedback on students' research proposal writing. It describes giving direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback regarding types of writing errors students have made. This descriptive research used a

qualitative approach, by using documentation in collecting the data. Personal research proposals of postgraduate students of English Education Graduate Program of UniversitasNegeri Padang were collected to get lecturers' feedback on the students' weaknesses in their research proposals. The result revealed that indirect corrective feedback was the most frequent type used by the lecturers. The findings indicated that written corrective feedback might improve students' writing accuracy in research proposal writing; however, it depends on the error types of writing. This study needs additional information of written corrective feedback, especially indirect corrective feedback in improving students' writing accuracy. They further added, during the corona pandemic, face to face learning process is not allowed, so that the guidance of thesis writing for students must be done online. Lecturers provided two types of written corrective feedback that applied in giving correction on students' research proposal writing which are direct and indirect corrective feedback. Indirect corrective feedback was the most frequent type used by lecturers in responding research proposal writing of postgraduate students, however, there were students who did not corrected lecturers' correction. This study revealed that students have difficulties in responding indirect corrective feedback on content errors, clarity errors and references to source errors. This study needs more information of written corrective feedback, especially indirect corrective feedback in improving students' writing accuracy. Therefore, this study suggests to explore written corrective feedback on postgraduate students by considering students' attitudes toward types of written corrective feedback given by the lecturers during research proposal writing.

Alavinia, Javidi and Orujlu (2012) made an effort to investigate the impact of indirect feedback on improving Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy. Self-correcting and self-editing strategies were utilized as the two major criteria for assessing Iranian students' writing accuracy. To conduct the study, 51 pre-intermediate learners majoring in English literature at Urmia University were selected as the participants of the study. Then, the participants were randomly assigned to three groups, i.e. indirect coded feedback group, indirect noncoded feedback group, and control group. The learners in all groups were then required to write a composition and self-correct its second draft based on the feedback received from the instructor (control group received no treatment). Next, the participants were involved in a third writing task in which they were supposed to self-edit their writings. The final analysis of the obtained data through running independent samples t-test and ANOVA revealed that indirect feedback had a significant effect on improving Iranian students' writing accuracy. Indeed, both experimental groups were found to have acquired more selfcorrection ability than the control group. Outcomes also revealed that indirect coded feedback group had more self-editing ability than indirect non-coded feedback and control groups. Finally, indirect coded and non-coded feedback groups showed differential selfediting ability in the third draft. They continued, two fundamental points rendered the present study different from earlier studies. First, the distinction between selfcorrection ability and self-editing ability was addressed under the auspices of the application of indirect corrective feedback. In line with the gained upshots, indirect feedback was proven helpful in improving the learners' self-correction ability in writing, as well as their self-editing capability. Second, indirect coded and non-coded feedback types, which had rarely been touched upon in relation to learners' self-correcting and self-editing abilities throughout the literature on the issue, were investigated in the current probe. The outcomes reached at via the implementation of the present scrutiny are liable to bring manifold implications mainly for teachers and learners. More mindful and strategic provision of corrective feedback in a non-threatening and appealing manner is thought to bring about higher levels of motivation and involvement among the learners, which, in turn, can help optimize the quality of learning. After all, emphasizing the key role of self-correction and self-editing abilities in individuals may produce more autonomous learners who are more aware of the appropriate learning processes and strategies, and can apply these proper ways in their life-long course of learning and development.

Omar (2014) carried out to examine how effect is teachers" feedback on writing error correction in EFL context and to determine the effects of written feedback on EFL Libyan secondary school students" writing. It seeks to identify the differences between two kinds of written feedback (coded and uncoded feedback) and students" perception towards written feedback provided by their teacher. The research applied both qualitative and quantitative approaches employed on ten Libyan third year

students. Data collection involved two writing essays, administration of questionnaire for students and interviews with four students. The findings of the research showed that students improved on their essay writing by committing lesser errors after receiving written feedback from their teacher on the submitted essays, but the coded group recorded more improvement in correcting the errors than the uncoded group. Further findings from the questionnaire and interviews revealed that the entire participants (four students) had a positive perception towards giving and receiving feedback. The study suggested that effective approaches on how to give suitable written feedback on students" written essays should be considered by EFL teachers in classroom. Generally, the findings of the study showed that teacher's written feedback is useful and helpful to promote students" writing. The results indicated that corrective feedback was effective in decreasing the students" errors. The findings also enhanced our understanding of written feedback as a method in improving the writing ability among EFL students. It revealed the students" general satisfaction with coded feedback and their strong preference of receiving written feedback on all of their written errors. The findings suggested a number of ideas for further research. Firstly, the study was conducted in one Libyan school so the findings could not be generalized to other Libyan schools. Thus, the study should be replicated to include as many secondary schools as possible in Libya in order to provide more information about the whole Libyan EFL context of teaching and learning writing skill. This will help to gain more detailed findings to ascertain the actual writing correction practice in Libyan secondary school. Furthermore, the results of this study cannot be applied to EFL children who study English at primary school levels because these learners have different characteristics and needs concerning accuracy in writing. Therefore, further research examining the effect of written feedback on primary school students" writing needs can be conducted. In addition, the findings of the present study did not indicate any long-term effects of teachers" feedback on students' writing. Therefore, future research should concentrate on the investigation of written feedback including multiple essays over a longer period of time. Finally, and more broadly, research is also needed to determine the FL teachers" perception of written feedback and other approaches such as face-to-face oral feedback, conference, peer review, guided-selfevaluation, and electronic feedback.

Hernández (2020) made a report to examine the effects of two methods of corrective feedback on the writing skills of students from an English Language Teacher Education program. The purpose of this study was to determine if two methods of corrective feedback (coded vs. uncoded) have any effect on helping students successfully self-edit their compositions from one draft to another. The study focused specifically on finding out if students developed their grammar and vocabulary accuracy over an academic semester. To this effect, a quasi-experimental research design was conducted with a group of 27 students from two sections of an upper-intermediate English language level of a teaching education program from a public university in Colombia. Participants in the study answered research instruments including a language profile questionnaire, grammar and vocabulary pre- and post-tests, entry and exit compositions, and a series of three two-draft student compositions. Data analysis included quantitative and qualitative approaches. Results indicate no significant difference of one condition over the others in terms of grammar and vocabulary accuracy development.

Doi, Separ andWanggai (2021) investigated (1) a significant difference of effectiveness that indirect coded CF and indirect non-coded CF have on improving grammatical accuracy with self-editing in the second draft of writing under teachers' correction, (2) a significant difference of effectiveness using indirect coded CF, indirect non-coded CF, and that of control group on improving grammatical accuracy in the second draft of writing, (3) a significant difference of effectiveness that indirect coded CF and indirect non-coded CF have on improving grammatical accuracy in a new draft of writing, (4) a significant difference of effectiveness using indirect coded CF, indirect non-coded CF, and that of control group on improving grammatical accuracy in a new draft of writing. Self-editing strategy was utilized as the major criteria for assessing students' writing accuracy. This research belonged to quasi-experiment with pretest posttest non equivalent design. To conduct the research, 54 students majoring at English Letters study program in Flores University were selected as the samples of the research. The three intact classes with 18 students of each class were randomly assigned to three groups, i.e., indirect coded corrective feedback group, indirect non-coded corrective feedback group, and control group. Free writing, as the major source of data, involved seven different topics. The scoring scheme adopted based on the basis of five broad categories; content, organization, vocabulary, language use,

and mechanics of writing that the students' handwriting were set at 100. Two periods of posttest were settled as immediate and delayed posttests. The students in all groups were, in immediate posttest, required to write with self-editing the second drafts based on the indirect corrective feedback received from the teachers (control group received no corrective feedback), and then the students were involved in a new draft of writing in delayed posttest. The instrument reliability was assessed by the inter-rater technique. The data were analyzed by running ANCOVA continued by post hoc Scheffe analysis. The upshots of the research denote; firstly, indirect coded CF and indirect non-coded CF have a significant difference of effectiveness on improving students' grammatical accuracy in the second draft with self-editing strategy; secondly, indirect coded CF is more effective than the use of indirect non-coded CF, and that of control group in the second draft with self-editing strategy; thirdly, indirect coded CF and indirect non-coded CF have a significant different in a new draft of students' writing; fourthly, indirect coded CF is more effective than the use of indirect non coded CF, and that of control group in a new draft of writing.

Chuang (2009) compared four ways of responding to EFL students in writing class to study whether they resulted in different outcomes in term of student's errors in writing. A total of 119 intermediate level students were selected as subjects, including students from three English reading and writing classes, and some voluntary participants. The students of three English reading and writing classes received three different kinds of reviews for their writing: one group received coded corrective feedback from the teacher followed by peer to peer feedback and student-teacher conference; one group received coded corrective feedback from the teacher followed by student-teacher conference only; and one group received feedback of direct written correction only. The group of the voluntary participants served as the control group, which received no correction on their grammatical errors in their writing. The results showed that the group receiving coded corrective feedback from the teacher followed by the student-teacher conference only and the group receiving coded corrective feedback from the teacher followed by the peer-peer interaction and student-teacher conference outperformed the group receiving written correction from the teacher and the group receiving no feedback in terms of verb and noun endings in their post-review writings. In addition, this study reconfirmed that highly rule-governed linguistic knowledge, such as noun endings, can be learned; it also revealed that peer interaction as well as student-teacher interaction can facilitate this learning. Furthermore, the study showed that the group with the student-teacher conferences and the group combining the peer-to-peer interaction with student-teacher conferencing outperformed the group receiving only written correction from the teacher and the group receiving no feedback on verb and noun endings in their post-treatment writings. This suggests that, for the median level students, neither providing no feedback on the errors they made in their writing nor providing only written corrections are good alternatives for facilitating the acquiring of correct forms of target languages; there are better choices than these two. Also, grammatical errors are "treatable" when the linguistic categories of the mistakes belong to the highly rule-governed linguistic categories. The results support the idea that other than the scaffolding provided by the experts, peer-peer interaction can also provide the effect of scaffolding. The quantitative analysis of this study also confirmed the theoretical expectation that learners" awareness of linguistic forms in the inputs and deliberately looking for the proper linguistic forms in generating outputs, can facilitate the acquiring of new linguistic knowledge, and that collaborative dialogue in the peer interaction can maximize the deliberating noticing. These findings suggest that teachers should provide feedback that can arouse students" attention to the linguistic features to be acquired and facilitate the acquisition process through implementing interaction in it. However, since the numbers of the "non-treatable errors" were not significantly reduced after the treatments, developing feedbacks based on SLA theories focusing on these domains of a language can be a focus for further research

Valizadeh (2021) made a quantitative experimental study, which followed a pretest-treatment-posttest-delayed posttest design, investigated the effects of revision versus attention mediation on the efficacy of the written indirect coded feedback to improve the EFL learners' syntactic accuracy of their essays of opinion-led type. Eighty-six Turkish university learners were assigned to three groups: comprehensive indirect coded corrective feedback plus a revision requirement (ICF/+R), comprehensive indirect coded corrective feedback plus a time to pay careful attention to the received feedback (ICF/+A) and the control group that received only the comprehensive indirect coded

feedback without any extra assignment (ICF). Each group received three sessions of treatment. The existence of any statistically significant differences among the three groups with regard to each received treatment was investigated in the short and long term. The indirect coded CF proved to be effective in improving the grammatical accuracy. Moreover, it was found that both revision requirement (ICF/+R) and careful attention requirement (ICF/+A) significantly outperformed the group that only received the ICF. Nevertheless, it was also proved that the group that was required to pay careful attention to and study the feedback (ICF/+A). Furthermore, this study showed that the comprehensive indirect coded feedback improved the grammatical accuracy of the learners' writing which also remained after the two-week interval. This finding was different from what Karim and Nassaji (2020) found, but corroborates some previous studies, which also proved the effectiveness of the indirect feedback (Aliakbari & Toni, 2009; Lalande, 1982; Sheppard, 1992; Storch, 2005; Tan & Manochphinyo, 2017; Tang & Liu, 2018; Tootkaboni & Khatib, 2014). This effect could occur because such indirect coded feedback engages learners in problem-solving learning and as a result helps them to become independent learners (Ferris, 2006). Therefore, in this study, like the one done by Tang and Liu (2018), the indirect coded feedback can be considered as an attention-getting CF device that provided the participants with linguistic scaffold on the language issues. As for the mediating effects of the revision and attention on the efficacy of the indirect coded CF, this study revealed that both revision requirement (ICF/+R) and attention requirement (ICF/+A) significantly contributed to the efficacy of the ICF. This finding is in line with the argument that even if teachers provide sufficiently clear and useful feedback, students will benefit more if they are engaged with the WCF and pay attention to the provided feedback (Elwood & Bode, 2014; Han & Hyland, 2015; Polio, 2012; Soltanpour &Valizadeh, 2018; Stefanou & Révész, 2015). That revision requirement showed promising results confirms the argument that written revision can be a good technique to engage the learners with the WCF and hold them responsible for their learning (Brown, 2012; Ferris, 2006; F. Hyland, 2003; Shintani & Ellis, 2015; Storch& Wigglesworth, 2010) especially because via revising the texts based on the provided feedback, learners have more time to think carefully about and process the received feedback (Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2010; Guénette, 2007). Several researchers have already included the revision in their studies and found positive results (Chandler, 2003; Diab, 2015; Frear, 2012; Shintani et al., 2014; Suzuki, 2012; Van Beuningen et al., 2012). However, like what Soltanpour and Valizadeh (2018) found, this research demonstrated that requiring the learners to pay careful attention to the provided feedback was even more effective than the revision requirement, which corroborates Ellis's (2009), Polio's (2012) as well as Shintani and Ellis (2015)'s arguments, which stated that even under the condition of no revision opportunity, WCF can be effective and learners can succeed in noticing corrections as long as learners are required to notice and process the received corrections; for example, the learners can be required to look over the received feedback and carefully examine their errors (Ellis, 2009; Polio, 2012). In brief, the three utilized strategies in this study: the comprehensive indirect coded feedback (ICF), the ICF plus either revision or attention requirements probably helped the participants notice their grammatical errors which not only resulted in notice the gap in their current interlanguage system, but this also led to what Rosa and Leow (2004) described as noticing at the level of understanding, which is the highest level of noticing. As a result, such learning outcomes probably sustain in future writings, which was also found in the participants' delayed posttests, too. As the concluding remarks, it is highly recommended that the explored issue be investigated considering the important factor of individual differences because as Hanaoka and Izumi (2012, p. 333) stated, there are several "learner internal factors such as learners' aptitude, developmental readiness, and various affective factors", which can promote or inhibit learners' noticing.

Mahmoud (2000) believes provision of corrective feedback is a long standing tradition in language teaching some teachers believe that it is useful others feel that they are obliged to respond to their students production even if the students do not ask for feedback still other teaches correct deviations simply because the students need feedback and ask for it but they themselves may not be convinced of its usefulness teachers respond to their students deviations in a variety of ways the most frequently used techniques are mere under lining providing symbols providing rules and explanations and direct correction mere indication of the location of the deviation may confuse the students and lead to the

replacement of an incorrect form by another incorrect one explanations and direct correction may be a waste of time and effort since not all deviations are errors the students may not understand the rules and explanations or may not be able to do what they are instructed to do direct correction deprives the students of the opportunity self-correction and problem solving in the face of these and other drawbacks EFL teachers may choose to provide corrective feedback by using simple and clear correction symbols this technique can save the teachers time and effort especially in large classes it addresses the students need for self-correction and respects the individual differences between them in view of the obligation to respond to the students deviations and the scepticism surrounding the effectiveness of this practice the use of coded corrective feedback may help the teachers arrive at a compromise

According to Liu and Tang (2017), though studies have shown the benefits of oral corrective feedback (CF), there is a paucity of research exploring the potency of indirect written CF. Studies have indicated the need of further research on indirect written CF and teacher comments as a way to encourage L2 learners to be better writers. To this end, this study investigated if indirect coded correction feedback (ICCF) and short affective comments were more effective than ICCF alone in enhancing L2 learners' writing performance, uptake, and motivation. L2 learner participants (n = 56) received the two aforementioned feedback modes and completed three writing tasks at successive times. Analyses of the writings showed a significant improvement in overall writing performance and learner uptake irrespective of the feedback mode they received. This seems to indicate that adding affective comments to ICCF did not significantly boost L2 learners' writing; however, further analysis of the participants' questionnaire data showed that the addition did foster a positive mind-set motivating them to take further actions to improve their writing and that the pedagogical potency of ICCF and short affective comments seems to be complementary. Pedagogical implications and applications for how ICCF and short affective teacher comments can impact L2 writing are provided. The above findings indicated that ICCF by itself is an instrumental tool in helping comparison group participants become better writers in immediate and delayed writing tasks that were given a few days after the initial task and that ICCF on its own was found to be both useful and encouraging. These findings give further support to previous literature that has shown how ICCF-alone improves writing performance and learner uptake (e.g., Aliakbari & Toni, 2009; Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011)

Deng, Lin, Wang, Xieand Xuan (2022)'s study employed a mixed-method approach including a classroom experiment and 24 in-depth interviews, to investigate the effects of two feedback techniques (coded focused and unfocused written corrective feedback) on L2 learners in a self-financed tertiary institute in Hong Kong. Three intact classes of 47 students served as the experiment and control groups; the control group only received feedback on content and organization, whereas the two experiment groups also received focused and unfocused linguistic feedback respectively. The feedback intervention was conducted over an eight-week intensive summer course, focusing on three grammar errors (articles, singular/plural nouns, and verb forms). Altogether students wrote six pieces, among which four were analysed for the present research. The study found that students who received focused WCF significantly outperformed the other two groups, though the effects vary across error types. Meanwhile, no significant differences are found between the unfocused and control group. In-depth interviews explored how individual learners' metalinguistic understanding and engagement affect the usefulness of WCF. The results reveal that learners who received focused feedback developed a deeper understanding of the linguistic nature of specific error types. Learners' English proficiency and engagement strategies also played a role. Implications for pedagogical practice are discussed. Furthermore, this study has found that coded and focused WCF with explicit metalinguistic support can significantly enhance writing accuracy in terms of the use of articles and singular/plural nouns among L2 learners with low to intermediate language proficiency. A combination of circumstances, for example, the nature of the target grammatical structures and learners' understanding and ways of engaging with WCF, is also necessary for WCF to become a tool for learning. Despite these insightful findings, some limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study was of short duration, and its sample was relatively small. Therefore, future research should investigate larger samples over longer periods of time. Second, although the three intact classes had a similar English proficiency level, the interviewees from the un-focused group had weaker proficiency

than those from the focused group. Future qualitative studies should use participants with equivalent language proficiency to examine the extent to which language proficiency mediates the effective-ness of WCF.Finally, this study has some implications for classroom pedagogy, addressed briefly here. Because not all errors deserve equal attention, teachers and students should consider how feedback can be used more effectively, particularly in areas where comprehensive feedback is considered obligatory. When teaching students with limited language proficiency, it is recommended that, rather than providing a wide range of error corrections, teachers provide focused feedback complemented with carefully designed metalinguistic support.

Wicaksono (2018) believes feedbacks have been seen as an effective way to help language learners acquire second language competence. This study aims to find out how the written corrective feedback (CF) has been used in the adult ESL classroom. In this study, the data were generated through the learners writing. Then the data were put into direct, coded and uncoded type of the written corrective feedback. In addition, those types of feedback were categorized into content and form category to find the scope of the written corrective feedback. As the result, the direct written corrective feedback was mostly used by the teachers. Interestingly, the teachers only used the uncoded written corrective feedback when it refers to the content of the writing. Besides, the dynamic corrective feedbacks that occur several times can be a proof that the teachers not only focus on the form the writing but also the content.

SeçılandVarnosfadrani (2010) investigated the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback in terms of its contribution to student uptake and acquisition. Thirty students in two classes, one control and one experimental participated in the study. In order to discover the effectiveness of repetition as corrective feedback, the classes of the control and the experimental group were observed and videotaped. The feedback episodes in the two classes were transcribed, analyzed, and coded. Grammar tests were created based on these feedback episodes. The test results of the two classes were compared. The results revealed that the experimental class, which was exposed to repetition as corrective feedback, achieved higher scores. The findings of the study indicated that repetition as a correction technique is effective in terms of its contribution to uptake and acquisition. Furthermore, the results revealed that the students in the experimental class, who were exposed to repetition as corrective feedback in response to their errors, did better on their grammar test than the students in the control class, who received the teacher's usual responses to errors, did on their grammar test. Repetition ended in more uptake moves in the experimental class than the other types of feedback that were used in the control class. It is highly likely that this difference in the two classes was due to the difference in feedback types that were used in the two classes. These results are consistent with the results of Lyster and Ranta''s (1997) study in which repetition was one of the feedback types that led to more uptake moves compared with the explicit feedback. These findings are also similar to those of Tsang (2004). In his study, it was also discovered that explicit feedback was the most frequent type of feedback used by the teacher, but repetition was the type of feedback which ended in the highest number of uptake moves. As for repetition and its relation to acquisition, it can be concluded that repetition led to more correct answers in the test, which showed that when it is compared with other types of feedback, repetition contributes more to acquisition. The findings of this study are similar to those of Havranek''s (2002) study, in that his study also revealed that implicit feedback contributed to better results on the test. However, the present study contradicts with Kim and Mathes'' (2001) study, in that their study did not result in a difference in terms of acquisition between the group who received explicit feedback and the group who received implicit feedback. This contradiction may be due to the fact that explicit feedback was followed by metalinguistic explanation, and implicit feedback was provided in the form of recasts in their study. As the findings of the present study also indicated, the one time that explicit feedback was accompanied by metalinguistic explanation, it resulted in a correct answer on the grammar test, while explicit feedback alone never resulted in a correct answer. It can also be argued that, when compared with the control class, not only the students who erred in their utterances but also their peers benefited from repetition as corrective feedback in the experimental class, even though they were not involved in the feedback episodes that formed the basis of the test items. This result is consistent with Havranek's (2002) study, in that his study showed that not only the student who was involved in the feedback episodes but also his/her peers benefited from the episodes and gained high scores in the grammar test. More interestingly, his study also

revealed that corrective feedback benefited the peers more than it did the students who were involved in the feedback episodes. The reason for the higher scores in the experimental class might be due to the time allotted for error correction. When repetition was used as feedback, students were allowed to think, notice their errors, and correct their errors after noticing. This result is consistent with McGuffin et al.'s (1997) study. The findings of their study al so indicated that self-correction benefited the students more than explicit correction did. In the control class in the present study, however, the students were not able to think about their errors, because they were not given the time required, and their teacher corrected their errors whenever they erred. Moreover, it is possible that they were not even aware of the errors they made until they were corrected by their teacher. As the results suggest, explicit feedback was the most frequently used feedback type in the control class, and always resulted in incorrect answers on the test. Explicit feedback alone may have negatively affected the students" ability to learn the structures, which can be the reason for the scores of the students in the control class; however, the one occasion when explicit feedback was combined with metalinguistic feedback ended in a correct answer in the control class. It might be beneficial for students to be corrected by their teacher if he/she uses metalinguistic feedback instead of explicitly correcting the errors without an explanation. This study also revealed that uptake cannot be regarded as a good predictor of acquisition; i.e. uptake does not necessarily lead to acquisition. The findings showed that not all the successful uptake moves resulted in correct answers in the test, and some, no uptake moves ended in correct answers. The results of the present study, in this respect, contradict with Lyster and Ranta's (1997) and Loewen's (2005) studies. The former study revealed that uptake was a good predictor of acquisition as most of the feedback episodes that resulted in uptake moves ended in acquisition. Moreover, Loewen's study also showed that successful uptake was the most significant variable of acquisition among others, such as response, emphasis, timing, complexity and so on. The contradictory results described here are drawn from an extremely small scale study, and the conclusions were drawn based on a small number of feedback episodes, whereas the above-mentioned studies were based on more episodes.

Kim, Choi, Kang, Kim and Yun (2020) made a study comparing the role of direct and indirect SWCF during collaborative writing tasks on the learning of Korean among high beginning-level students stating that from a sociocultural perspective, collaborative writing tasks offer opportunities to negotiate in decision-making processes while also sharing responsibility for the production of a single text (Storch, 2013, Collaborative writing in L2 classrooms. Bristol: Multilingual Matters). Although research has found benefits for such tasks (Storch, 2019; Taguchi & Kim, 2016), variation in how different types of synchronous written corrective feedback (SWCF) in such a setting impacts students' language learning and their perception of SWCF has not been examined. The study was conducted during an existing beginning level Korean course and focused on three textbook units over 6 weeks. Fifty-three learners of Korean were assigned to one of three conditions: no feedback, indirect SWCF, or direct SWCF. All students completed a pretest, two collaborative writing tasks, a posttest, and a survey for each unit. At the end of the third unit, students in the feedback groups also participated in an exit interview session. The study targeted a total of 12 linguistic features (e.g., auxiliary verbs), which were the focus of the three textbook units. The amount of feedback and students' responses to the feedback were analyzed in terms of the accuracy of resolution on their writing. Students' learning of these linguistic features was measured using written production tests, and their responses were coded for suppliance of target forms and accurate production of them. Our findings indicate that direct SWCF was more useful in helping students produce accurate writing, but both feedback types were effective in promoting learning of new linguistic features through collaborative writing. In terms of students' perceptions, there seemed to be no difference between the two feedback conditions. The findings of the study are discussed in light of effective ways to implement collaborative writing tasks as well as the provision of SWCF. Providing written corrective feedback (WCF) has been viewed as a time-consuming task for writing instructors. Yet, what is the most effective use of this time for improving accuracy in learners' writing? How can feedback be most useful? The current study operationalized WCF as teachers' provision of error correction while students are engaged with collaborative writing tasks (i.e., synchronous written corrective feedback [SWCF]) and compared indirect and direct SWCF in its role in facilitating language development. The findings suggest both direct and indirect SWCF can be useful and time-efficient way to address learner errors.

Malekzadeh, Sadat, Sadatand Zarifi (2015) made a study aimed at investigating the extent to which different types of feedback on EFL learners' grammatical errors would affect the level of their grammatical accuracy and retention of the structure of conditional sentences (Types I, II, III). 90 intermediate English female students in an EFL context were selected in an English language institute. This population was randomly divided into two experimental groups, one of which received indirect uncoded correction feedback and the other one indirect coded correction and the third group, control group, received direct error correction feedback. In conducting a quasi-experimental design, the present study was designed to investigate the effectiveness of three error correction strategies (Direct, Indirect coded and Indirect uncoded) through pre-test, post-test and Delayed post-test in a time span of 10 weeks. The results obtained by One Way ANOVA indicated that the students who were exposed to indirect coded correction feedback outperformed the students who were provided with direct correction feedback or indirect uncoded feedback. In addition, the findings in delayed post-test also showed that there were significant differences between the performance of the participants who were subject to indirect coded and direct error correction strategies. Furthermore, the results showed that indirect coded grammar correction strategy group performed better than the other two groups in post-test and also delayed post-test by attention to their level of accuracy based on gained scores. Although the post-test revealed progress in the mean score of all groups , the most effective one in this stage was indirect coded corrective feedback ($p < 0.0001$). The results for the second research question revealed that the rate of retention measured by delayed post-test was also high for the indirect coded correction group in comparison to the other groups. The difference between coded and uncoded groups and also between coded and direct groups was significant because the obtained value is lower than the acceptable value ($p < 0.05$). Despite the shortcomings associated with small-scale studies like this, the findings encourage us to suggest that both coded and uncoded error correction strategies are likely to improve learners' knowledge to figure out and correct their grammatical errors, and also make correct forms in subsequent pieces of writing. Coded correction appear to be more helpful and successful at this and it could be due to learners involving in problem solving which caused long time retention of the target structures or information. If learners pay more attention to their errors and find the correct answers by studying or taking a look at their notes, then retention of thought materials can be reached. However, the process of getting familiar of the correct forms is non-linear, and factors such as teaching input, natural orders of acquisition and individual differences can be effective.

Li (2010) made a study reporting on a meta-analysis on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. By establishing a different set of inclusion/exclusion criteria than previous meta-analyses and performing a series of methodological moves, it is intended to be an update and complement to previous meta-analyses. Altogether 33 primary studies were retrieved, including 22 published studies and 11 Ph.D. dissertations. These studies were coded for 17 substantive and methodological features, 14 of which were identified as independent and moderator variables. It was found that (a) there was a medium overall effect for corrective feedback and the effect was maintained over time, (b) the effect of implicit feedback was better maintained than that of explicit feedback, (c) published studies did not show larger effects than dissertations, (d) lab-based studies showed a larger effect than classroom-based studies, (e) shorter treatments generated a larger effect size than longer treatments, and (f) studies conducted in foreign language contexts produced larger effect sizes than those in second language contexts. Possible explanations for the results were sought through data cross-tabulation and with reference to the theoretical constructs of SLA.Furthermore, in response to the mushrooming of empirical research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 learning, this meta-analysis was undertaken to present a summative description of previous findings by investigating the magnitude of related effect sizes across primary studies. It was intended to be an update and complement to previous meta-analyses that are related to corrective feedback in one way or another. To achieve this purpose, a series of methodological moves were taken. These moves include establishing a different set of inclusion/exclusion criteria to sharpen the study focus and minimize publication bias, presenting the results from both the FE and the RE model, using Q-tests to detect group differences and identify moderator variables, controlling for sample size inflation, and so on. The introduction of these moves was expected to make the results more robust and trustworthy, which might, in turn, provide useful information and reference for interested L2 researchers and educators. By performing these moves, it was also hoped that this meta-

analysis can provide some methodological implications for SLA meta-analysts. This meta-analysis explored some issues that have not been or have been insufficiently investigated in previous meta-analyses. It revealed that explicit feedback worked better than implicit feedback over a short term and that the effects of implicit feedback did not fade or even increased over a long term. It also identified some significant moderators such as research context, research setting, task type, treatment length, and interlocutor type. The results concerning these moderators as well as the ones that were found to be nonsignificant moderators but that generated interesting findings were extensively and intensively discussed, and interpretations were sought. This analysis identified the following issues to be addressed in future research. First, the presence of availability bias in this meta-analysis shows that more research is needed on corrective feedback. As far as specific feedback types, although there is a relatively large amount of research on recasts, less attention has been paid to explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, and even less to negotiation moves such as clarification and elicitation, which makes the comparison of effect sizes among different feedback types difficult. For instance, effect sizes were not calculated for the immediate and short-term effects of clarification, the short- and long-term effects for explicit correction, or the long-term effect of metalinguistic feedback simply because there were not sufficient related studies. The unbalanced representation of individual feedback types in the data set, in turn, limits the conclusion concerning the differential effects of different feedback types. Second, the fact that primary researchers operationalized feedback, particularly specific feedback types, in different ways poses a great challenge to meta-analysts when they try to disentangle the effects of different varieties of feedback. Therefore, a call needs to be made for researchers to observe more consistency in defining and operationalizing different types of feedback. Third, it was found that a few studies did not provide learners' pretest scores or did not measure learners' knowledge about the target structures prior to instructional treatments. This makes one wonder about the extent to which the obtained effects were derived from the treatments. The categorization of the meta-analyzed studies according to their learner characteristics and methodological features revealed some gaps to be filled, and the existence of these gaps affected the identification of moderator variables. Specifically, more research is needed that involves child learners, that investigates speakers and learners of languages other than English, that involves language learners of higher proficiency (as most of the studies are about beginners), that is conducted in L2 contexts, and that is implemented in the computer mode. There is also a dearth of research examining the variables that moderate the effects of corrective feedback on SLA, such as age, gender, proficiency, L1 transfer, culture, complexity of the target structure, or interlocutor type, to name only a few. This suggests that now that the effect of corrective feedback has been established, researchers should embark on the mission of investigating the factors constraining its effectiveness.

Abidahand Ratih (2022) conducted a research presenting the students' preference for feedback in deciding what specific feedback will be valuable and positively affect the students' writing performance. There might be a mismatch betweenstudents' preferences and lecturer's practice from a few past studies. Aquantitative research design was utilized in this study. It was conducted in Muhammadiyah Malang University with 70 English Language Education Department students as the participants. A data set of 10 questions in the survey for students was adjusted from Aridah et al (2017).Further, the data were scored using the "Feedback Scale" with a scale ranging from 0to 1. The findings showed that the feedback preference of the studentsis direct corrective feedback, in which the mean score was higher (M=6.53) than indirect corrective feedback. The students believed that direct corrective feedback gave moreadditionalclearness. Therefore, this study recommended that the lecturer give feedback based on the students'preference which isdirect corrective feedback to improve their writing skillseasily and effectively.Furthermore, direct and indirect feedback are two sorts of written corrective feedbackthat were ordinarily utilized in the writing classroom. In light of the consequences of the review, the researchers observed that the averagescore of direct corrective feedbackwas higher than indirect corrective feedback. It implies that the understudies like to have direct corrective feedback than indirect corrective feedback.In other words, the students expected that the teachers could provide direct corrective feedback to correct their mistakes in writing because it is the simplest way for the students to correct their mistakes in writing the draft. The findings of this study are suggested to be a reference for the lecturers in giving feedback, especially in writing skills. Inthis case, the lecturers can consider the students' needs based on the findings, since the students prefer to have direct corrective feedback to make them easily in learning

and correct their errors in writing. This study also can be a reference for the students to know thetypes of written corrective feedback, such as direct and indirect corrective feedback that can be used by the lecturers so that the students can know what kind of feedback is given by their lecturers and also it can enrich their knowledge about the kinds of written corrective feedback. Lastly,it is suggested for further researchers to do a deep investigation about direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback or another written corrective feedback that is related to writing skills. So that, it can give more contribution knowledge in education especially in giving feedback in the writing classroom.

Fatehi Rad and Rahnama(2016) made a study providing an overview of a more effective way of promoting written corrective feedback among peer and teacher feedback, for improving learners' writing quality. Due to the fact that the assessment of EFL writing not only concerns itself with accuracy but also discourse organization, it is significant for EFL teachers to ensure that the learner exhibits successful performance at, coherence and cohesion levels. The researcher attempted to study if there is any superiority over the effect of teacher and peer uncoded feedback on grammatical cohesive devices which specifically contribute to the improvement of cohesion and coherence in students' writing. There is also another point to consider, this study sought to investigate the correction directed at selected cohesive devices (focused feedback), and an additional form of focused feedback may include uncoded feedback because the teacher indicates the existence of an error but does not provide the correction (Ellis, 2009). After that, it assessed the superiority of the effectiveness of teacher and peer focused uncoded written CF on learners' grammatical cohesion and coherence in writing. The results of this study have implications for language teaching, especially in writing courses and classes. It would open new perspectives for language teachers and promote language learning specifically in the skill of writing for both teachers and learners. Furthermore, it was observed that focused uncoded written corrective feedback did have some effect on the writing grammatical cohesion and coherence of intermediate EFL learners. Therefore, the null hypothesis stating that focused uncoded written corrective feedback does not have any significant effect on writing cohesion and coherence, was rejected. The results of the study are important from another angle as well since they point to the validity of the observation that indirect feedback is more effective than direct feedback in helping learners improve their writing. Utilizing focused uncoded written corrective feedback in the experimental group as treatment led to a better writing performance of the students in post-test than the control group. In other words, employing focused uncoded corrective feedback led to significantly more cohesive and coherent writing. So, uncoded corrective feedback can be used for instructional purposes, too. It not only does not waste as much time and energy from the teacher but also involves students more in language learning through noticing and revising. Psychologists have associated better learning with depth of processing, or degree of elaboration, or quality of attention to information. Therefore, noticing on its own does not result in acquisition, when it is followed by revising leads to acquisition because of the increases in the depth of processing and the quality of attention to information. Also, the students learn to be more responsible for their own learning and become more independent learners and develop autonomy. So applying this method in the language learning classes makes them more learner-center, helps us to move attention from teaching to learning and internalize this learning. But it is important for the teachers to pay a lot of attention to help the students overcome their problems and revise their writing texts, so it will be more effective in classes with less number of students. All foreign language teachers and learners see eye to eye on two important issues; learning and teaching writing. Writing received little attention in the past, but gradually its significance became more and more noticeable. Iranian EFL learners attend writing courses with different goals. They try to focus and work on different types of information in different ways and achieve understanding and produce language in different ways. Using appropriate syllabuses, teachers can determine what learning patterns the learners prefer. The results of the present study can be applied in all language learning and teaching centers; language institutes, schools and universities. They have direct or indirect applications for teaching, learning and syllabus design. In addition, they may have some hints for English teachers who pay attention to teaching writing or other language skills since focused uncoded corrective feedback can be used for other major skills: listening, speaking, and reading, too. Based on the findings of this study, it can be concluded that focused uncoded written corrective feedback would be more effective than the traditional based corrective feedback. Therefore, the traditional based written corrective feedback should be replaced

with more effective corrective feedback modes as uncoded CF. But it is important to keep in mind that there is no single feedback strategy which is suitable for all learners, in all situations and with all the categories of errors. So teachers should be aware that each mode of corrective feedback has a different effect on the learners based on their proficiency level and specific writing required. University and institute teachers and professors should help each other to enhance and develop uncoded corrective feedback for all areas of study.

Riwayatiningsih (2017) made a research primarily focused to examine the role of coded and uncoded annotations in enhancing students writing accuracy of intermediate learners. The way on giving corrective feedback whether in coded or uncoded annotations has become a controversy issue among the researcher. Dealing with acquiring language learner errors is an indispensable aspect of classroom pedagogy. The quantitative study is used to measure the accuracy of using language mechanics in students' compositions. Forty male and female of third semester undergraduate students from writing classes in university level participated in the study to determine which kind of corrective feedback affects writing accuracy more. Group one received coded annotations as a written feedback and group two as a control group received uncoded annotations on their writings. The result of the study demonstrated that coded annotations affected students' performance more.Furthermore, when discussing the effects of error feedback in writing, researchers need to clarify which learners they are talking about and what stage of writing they are dealing with. Error feedback benefits adult learners more than children. In general, adults are more concerned about accurate production of language than children as Ellis (1994) pointed out. Error coded annotations as one of the error feedback seems to have the strong effect in the editing phase to help the students' improvement in writing as shown in the findings of the study which corresponds in the literature (Lalande, 1982; Lee's, 2008; Mantella, 1997). Also error coded annotations have effect on leading students to detect and self-correct the errors. This self-discovery approach has an important pedagogical implications, because it raises learners' consciousness about forms, which is believed beneficial for learners to acquire language as Makino (1993) noted.

2.3. Accuracy

Written error correction plays an important role in improving L2 writing accuracy (Brown, 2007; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2004). It is important that teachers focus on the performance and not personal traits of a student when correcting. Teachers want to think about the goal of the activity at hand. When an ELL makes a mistake, is it fluency or content related? The type of error will influence what the teacher corrects.

An increasing number of studies have been investigating whether certain types of corrective feedback are more likely than others to help L2 students improve the accuracy of their writing. In reviewing some of these studies, Truscott (1996) reported that none of them (Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992) found significant differences across any of the different treatment groups (content comments only; error correction only; a combination of content comments and error correction; error identification, but no correction) but when the evidence from studies that have considered other feedback distinctions is examined, it is clear that such a conclusion should at this stage be treated with caution.

A study by Bitchener, Cameron and Young (2005) found a significant effect for the combination of written and conference feedback on accuracy levels in the use of the past simple tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing, but no overall effect on accuracy improvement for feedback types when the three error categories were considered as a single group.

Fan and Ma (2018) argued that corrective feedback is effective in improving L2 student writers' written accuracy, and what educational researchers should be concerned with is not only if corrective feedback should be used in writing practice, but also how. Two studies were analyzed to argue that corrective feedback is beneficial for students' writing performance, but some types of feedback can lead to writing development in some aspects, while can result in negative effects in others. The paper argued that WCF is effective in improving L2 student writers' written accuracy, and teachers should take into more consideration how to utilize it in L2 writing practice. In terms of the empirical evidence, first, Sachs and Polio's (2007) study was used to prove that WCF is useful in the improvement of the students' written accuracy. Second, Hartshorn et al.'s (2010) study was used to

argue that even the same type of WCF instruction strategy can have different effects on the students' writing. Thus, how to use WCF in practice is the question of which the teachers should be more aware. In terms of the theoretical evidence, both the interaction approach and skill acquisition theory are used to prove the effectiveness of WCF. In addition, through the analyses of Van Beuningen et al.'s (2012) study, this paper rebuts the avoidance phenomenon claimed by Truscott. Also, this paper further argues the effectiveness of WCF in L2 writing practice by pointing out the flaw of Sheppard's (1992) study and the weakness of pseudo-learning.

Buyse, Lopez, Speelman and Steendam (2021) stated while the literature on the effect of comprehensive corrective feedback (CF) on overall accuracy is abundant, the body of work employing such a scope to explore error treatability is not, especially when it comes to blended (cf. Ferris, 2010) design studies. Consequently, this investigation extends the analyses from the data set of Bonilla et al. (2018) to report on individual linguistic features. Specifically, to address crucial amenability related questions in need of perusal, the present blended design study explores the effect of two types of comprehensive CF (with direct correction and metalinguistic codes) on the treatability of separate grammatical and non-grammatical structures. To this end, a group of EFL learners (N = 139) were required to do editing that involved error-correction, deferred (on a draft), and focused on language as well as to produce two independent essays (in an immediate and a delayed posttest). Main results from logistic regression (to test the effect in revised essays) and mixed-effect models (to test the effect on independent essays) render seven variables that can explain correctability differences: out of those, three have also explained overall accuracy gains (cf. Bonilla et al., 2018), one has not been identified thus far, and three consolidate themselves as relevant factors under other conditions as well. Theoretical and pedagogical implications are discussed.

2.3.1. T-Unit

Since the index of learners' syntactic development, T-unit was proposed and defined by Hunt (1966) as a minimal terminable unit – one main clause or non-clausal structure that is 13 attached to or embedded in it. T-unit analysis has been widely applied to measure the overall syntactic complexity of speech and writing samples. It has been used both in cross-sectional descriptive studies and in experimental studies to measure the effect of sentence-combining as a curricular activity designed to enhance normal developmental trends in syntactic maturity (Gaies, 1980).

Based on the assumption that increased subordination is an indicator of syntactic development, studies of L2 writing development have, since then, particularly attempted to quantify syntactic complexity by counting text features, such as the numbers of words per sentence, the number of words per clause, the ratio of subordinate clause to all clauses, and the number of words included in T-unit. At the same time, the three measures that Hunt (1966) claimed to be the most reliable indicators of syntactic progression in writing: clause per T-unit, words per clause, and words per T-unit, have encountered doubt and questioning of their reliability to measure syntactic development (Biber, Gray & Poonpon, 2011; Foster, Tonkyn & Wigglesworth, 2000; Gaies, 1980).

Another study on T-unit in learners' written production is Johansson and Geisler's (2011) paper. In order to improve reliability and validity of the traditional methods of T-unit analysis, Johansson and Geisler (2011) adopted an adjusted concept – error-free T-units – as a complementary method, and applied it to measuring the syntactic complexity in written production by Swedish learners of English in junior and senior high school. They claim that the four measures as a whole reflect more accurately students' syntactic development. The outcomes of their study reveal that the frequency of relative clauses and nominal/adverbial clauses appears to be the strongest indicators of increasing syntactic complexity across school levels.

2.4. Empirical Background

Research on teacher feedback started long ago and still ongoing and this being necessitated by the ever changing teaching and learning environment. With new ideas being introduced and gradual changes in economic development, social, political and religious sectors continuously becoming evident in academic circles, students are being exposed to a series of challenges. Such challenges can be identified and dealt with by using written and oral feedback (OF) strategies. In most cases, there is a strong need to continuously improve the effectiveness of feedback strategies. As a result, such an effort can be made possible by engaging in a series of researches.

Pankonin and Myers (2017) did a study that looked at how the use of positive and negative feedback affects students' behaviour. In their argument they highlighted that changes in students' behaviour are determined by the form of feedback provided. That is, as to whether negative or positive feedback has been provided. Their findings showed that negative feedback has a negative effect on students' behaviour. Positive feedback was noted to be having positive effect on students' behaviour. This entails that the use of written and oral feedback will have different effects on students' language skills depending on whether the feedback has been administered in a negative or positive way. That is, students' language skills will positively change with respect to the provision of positive feedback. The opposite is true with regards to negative feedback and the effects of both negative and positive feedback on students' language skills are conditional on their timing, mode and amount.

Pirhonen (2016) did an examination of how students perceive the use of feedback in EFL classes using a sample of 100 students. The descriptive analysis results showed that EFL students consider it a must that teachers ought to provide them with oral and written feedback. With such regards, it was noted that oral and written feedback help to deal with significant EFL problems undermining students speaking, reading and writing abilities. Such a study thus identifies aspects which can be used to assess the effectiveness of feedback strategies in EFL classes. Hence, it can thus be said that providing feedback to EFL students will effectively enhance students' English speaking, reading and writing abilities. Hadzic (2016) placed effort on the impact of written and oral feedback in EFL classes using a mixed research approach. The notableobservation that can be made from this study is that it places concerns over situations under which feedback strategies can be applied. That is, it shows that the contextual situations under which feedback strategies can be applied tend to vary with one another. This, therefore, entails that efforts to improve the effectiveness of feedback strategies in EFL university classes can be boosted by using the right feedback strategy (amount and mode) that matches the EFL class' contextual situation (timing).

Elashri (2013) did a study that looked at the influence of direct feedback strategies on students' writing performance using an experimental design. Evidence collected from the application of the analytic scoring and holistic rubric tests showed that feedback is of significant importance in improving EFL students writing capabilities. Hence, such a notion can be applied to the study of the effects of teacher feedback on students' language skills. Deductions can thus be made that feedback is essential for improving students' language skills.

Ferris (1994) conducted a study that outlined that students are bound to make different types of errors ranging from grammatical, structural and lexical mistakes. The results showed that students often at times prefer teachers to focus on totally different errors. This has implications on the desirability of teacher feedback and how effective it will be in improving students' language skills. This is also tied to circumstances and/or conditions under which teacher feedback will prove to be effective. As such, the timing, mode and amount of feedback provided have a great significant effect on the effective of teacher feedback and students' language skills.

Chandler (2003) examined how the use of different types of error feedback affected the fluency and accuracy of L2 student writers. The results are in support of the use and importance of teacher feedback and consider it to cause an improvement in students' level of fluency and accuracy. Ferris and Roberts (2001) also explored the efficacy of underlining errors in their study and found that it helps students to write accurately.

Arnold and Dobbs (2009) did an analysis of the relationship between preschool teachers' reports of children's behaviour. The study findings were based on an examination of data collected from twenty-four preschools teachers and one hundred preschools children. The findings revealed that giving too much commands to preschool children can cause children to engage in disruptive behaviour. This was noted to be relatively true especially with regards to written feedback which reprimands children a lot and causes them to continue engaging in the disruptive behaviour.

Ahmad, Saeed and Salam (2013) conducted a study on the effect of corrective feedback on academic achievements of students. Using findings obtained from an examination of data collected from 200 teachers, the results showed that feedback is a desirable and an important aspect of teaching and learning. As such, the results consider students who receive feedback to be in a better position to exhibit high performance levels as opposed to students who do not get corrective feedback. The

reason is that feedback helps teachers to examine loopholes affecting the effectiveness of teacher feedback. As a result, corrective action can be taken leading to an improvement in the effectiveness of teacher feedback.

Boyles (2017) did a study that looked at the effect of oral feedback on perceived classroom community on undergraduate students using data collected from sixty-eight undergraduate students. The findings were insupport of the benefits of oral feedback and highlighted that oral feedback is instant and provides detailed information about how students can improve their speaking skills.

All these results are in support of the importance of teacher feedback. This review also shows that teacher feedback does not always cause an improvement in students' language skills (performance). The effects vary according to the type of feedback provided as to whether written or oral feedback has been given. Also, the desirability and use of written or oral feedback is determined by the amount, timing and mode of feedback provided by the teachers. This also includes as to whether the feedback has been provided in a negative or positive way.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 40 students who were studying English as a second language at Kish English Institute- Central Tehran branch. The participants' age was from 18 – 25 years old. Gender was not considered in this study. A 12-week treatment period was provided for both groups. All students wereat intermediate level. In order to have homogenous groups in the beginning of the semester, we had a PET test. Those who got ±1SD over the mean score were chosen for the study. We chose 40 students out of 59 students. They were randomly divided into two experimental groups. For being sure of the homogeneity, we had a Pre-test which consisted of writing about a topic. The first Experimental group received CCF and the second experimental group got NCCF.

3.2. Instrument

The data was collected using a qualitative method. Both groups used the same book and they studied the same courses of the book. The name of the book was Headway written by John and Liz Soars. This book had different parts for conversation, grammar, vocabulary, speaking and writing tasks. A modified PET test including 25 reading and 25 grammar questions was used. We had had a pilot test, so considering students level of language proficiency and time availability, we could have these questions. Topic used in the Pre-test was: "A shopping center is going to be built in your neighborhood. Do you agree or disagree, why?" Topic that used in the Post-test was: "A factory is going to be built in your neighborhood. Do you agree or disagree, why?" Accuracy was assessed through calculating the number of grammatical errors per the total number of T-units.

3.3. Procedure

After choosing two homogenous groups through using a PET test, we selected 40 learners who got ±1SD over mean score and divided them into two groups. The first experimental group received CCF and the second experimental group had NCCF. We had a Pre-test and we asked students to write about a topic. The accuracy of their writing assessed through calculating the number of grammatical errors per the total number of T-units (Gaies, 1980). We had a 12-week treatment. During the treatment sessions, we asked both groups to write about one topic in the book every week, so the book, lessons, topics for writing and number of sessions were the same for both groups. However, in the first experimental group, learners weretaught the selective coded signs for the purpose of providing CCF during the treatment (see table 1).

Table1.

Signs	Kind of Error	Example
V.T	Verb Tense agreement	I watchthat movie yesterday.
C	Capitalization	I will go to Tokyo tomorrow.
P	Punctuation	What did he tell you.
Sp	Spelling	I always admire her Intelligince.
W.F	Word formation	That was an expensivelycar.

^	Adding something	It is -----tree.
Ø	Deleting something	I could not help toher.
W.W	Wrong Word	Please enformme afterwards.
S.V	Subject Verb agreement	They watchesTV.
Pl/Sg	Plural/Singular errors	I have 1 car and 2 bicycle.

However, learners did not receive these instructions in the second experimental group. Learners in both groups wrote about a topic in their book each week and got feedback from their teachers. They wrote about the topic at home. They were supposed to write at least a 150-word composition at home spending 40 minutes at most for writing. They handed in the papers to the teacher. The teacher corrected their errors through CCF or NCCF and handed the papers to the students the next session. For the second experimental group, all the errors were underlined, crossed, or were mentioned in the margin, but for the first experimental group, errors wereunderlined and teacher wrote coded signs over the words. In both groups, learners had 20 minutes to review and read their errors after getting their corrected papers. They had to read and correct their errors. If they were unable to self-correct themselves, they could consult with their partners or teacher. At the end of the semester, both groups were asked to write about a topic for the Post-test. Their accuracy wasassessed.

3.4. Design

Due to the proposed research question, this study required a quasi-experimental method of research. It contained a pre-test, a post test, and two experimental groups. Corrective feedback (coded and non-coded) was the independent variable, which was the major variable hoped to be investigated. Accuracy of written performance was the dependent variable which was observed and measured to determine the effect of independent variable. Students' language proficiency was controlled by taking a PET test and choosing two homogeneous intermediate EFL learners.

3.5. Data Analysis

The data collection was analyzed using SPSS version 21. ANCOVA was conducted to compare the mean scores between two groups' accuracy scores in written performance in the pre-test and post-test.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Introduction

The present Quasi-experimental study was carried out to investigate the effect of coded and non-coded feedback on developing accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' written performance. In Chapter 3, the methodology including participants, instruments, design, procedures for data collection, and data analyses were presented. On the other hand, this chapter represents the results of the statistical analysis of the data collected through the study including the detailed outcomes of the data analysis for a null hypothesis, along with the discussion of the findings of the study based on the research question.

4.2. Results of Proficiency PET Test

In order to begin the study and to make sure about the homogeneity of the participants, the researcher administered the Preliminary English Test (PET) as a proficiency test to 40 participants of the study. Table 4.1 shows the descriptive statistics regarding the participants' proficiency test scores.

Table4.1. *Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Proficiency Test Scores*

	Groups of Corrective Feedback	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Proficiency Test Scores (PET)	Coded Group	20	44.45	1.54
	Non-Coded Group	20	43.05	1.93

As Table 4.1 shows, the mean score of coded corrective feedback group was 44.45 with the standard deviation of 1.54 (M= 44.45, SD= 1.54) and the mean score of non-coded corrective feedback group was 43.05 with the standard deviation of 1.93 (M= 43.05, SD= 1.93). It indicates that the mean score of two groups were close to each other, so two groups were homogeneous in the beginning of the study; however, before conducting the independent samples t-test, it is necessary to check the normality of the distribution of the participants' proficiency test scores. To do so, the researcher used One-sample kolmogorov-smirnov test. Table 4.2 shows the results of normality test.

Table4.2. *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for the Participants' Proficiency Test Scores*

		Proficiency Test Scores (PET)
N		40
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	43.75
	Std. Deviation	1.86
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.178
	Positive	.176
	Negative	-.178
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.128
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.157
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

With regard to the results represented in Table 4.2, the p-value for the proficiency test was higher than .05(p= .157), implying that the participants' proficiency test scores had a normal distribution. As well, in order to check the homogeneity of the participants' proficiency scores, the researcher ran an independent samples t - test. The result of the independent samples t - test is presented in Table 4.3.

Table4.3. *Independent Samples T-test for the Participants' Proficiency PET Scores*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Proficiency Test Scores (PET)	Equal variances assumed	2.804	.102	2.535	38	.215	1.40	.55	-.28	2.52
	Equal variances not assumed			2.535	36.179	.216	1.40	.55	-.28	2.52

With regard to Table 4.3, the significant value in Levene's test for equality of variances was .102, implying that equal variances were assumed and the statistics of the first row should be read. As t (38) = 2.535, p= .215, higher than alpha level .05, it was revealed that there was no significant differences between the participants' proficiency PET scores; In other words, the participants were at the same level of proficiency.

4.3. Results of the Pretest Writing Accuracy

To compare the mean scores of the two raters' writing scores, the researcher used the descriptive statistics. Table 4.4 indicates the results of this test.

Table4.4. *Descriptive Statistics of the Two Raters' Pretest Writing Accuracy Scores*

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Writing Accuracy Rater1 Pretest	2.21	.59	40
Writing Accuracy Rater2 Pretest	2.29	.59	40

As is illustrated in Table 4.4, the mean score of the first raters'pretest writing accuracy score was 2.21(M=2.21) with the standard deviation of .59(SD= .59) while the mean score of the second raters'pretest writing accuracy score was 2.29(M= 2.29) with the standard deviation of .59(SD= .59), respectively.

To ensure the inter-rater reliability of the participants' pretest scores, two raters scored the writing accuracy scores. To do so, the researcher used Pearson correlation. Table 4.5 demonstrates the results of this test.

Table4.5. *Inter-rater Reliability for the Participants' Pretest Writing Accuracy Scores*

		Writing Accuracy Rater1 Pretest	Writing Accuracy Rater2 Pretest
Writing Accuracy Rater1 Pretest	Pearson Correlation	1	.828[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	40	40
Writing Accuracy Rater2 Pretest	Pearson Correlation	.828[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	40	40
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

As is accessible in Table 4.5, according to Cohen's (1988) guideline, there was a strong and significant correlation between the scores of two raters (r= .828), implying the high inter-rater consistency between the two raters for the pretest writing accuracy scores.

After there was a high inter-rater consistency between the two raters' scores, the researcher used the descriptive statistics to compare the mean scores of participants' pretest writing accuracy scores between coded and non-coded groups. Table 4.6 shows the results.

Table4.6. *Descriptive Statistics of Iranian EFL Participants' Pretest Writing Accuracy Scores*

	Groups of Corrective Feedback	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Writing Accuracy Pretest	Coded Group	20	2.24	.59
	Non-Coded Group	20	2.26	.53

As represented in Table 4.6, the mean and standard deviation of the participants' pretest writing accuracy scores in the coded group were M=2.24, and SD=.59, and those of participants in the non-coded group were M=2.26, and SD=.53. In other words, the participants' pretest writing performance scores were close to each other.

Before conducting an independent samples t-test, it was essential to check the normality distribution assumption of the participants' pretest writing accuracy scores in the coded and non-coded groups. To do so, the researcher computed the One-sample kolmogorov-smirnov test. Table 4.7 displays the result of this test.

Table4.7. *One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Iranian Participants' Pretest Writing Accuracy Scores in the Coded and Non-coded Groups*

		Writing Accuracy Pretest
N		40
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	2.25
	Std. Deviation	.57
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.158
	Positive	.129
	Negative	-.158
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.000
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.270
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

With regard to the results represented in Table 4.7, the p-value for the pretest scores was .270 (p= .270 >.05), implying that Iranian participants' pretest writing accuracy scores had a normal distribution. So, the normality assumption was met.

After the normality distribution assumption was met, Independent samples t-test was ran to see whether there was a significant difference between the participants' pretest writing accuracy scores in the coded and non-coded groups or not. Table 4.8 specifies the results of the Independent samples t-test.

Table4.8. *Independent Samples T-test for Iranian Participants' Pretest Writing Accuracy Scores*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Writing Accuracy Pretest	Equal variances assumed	.263	.611	-.076	38	.12	-.01	.18	-.38	-.35
	Equal variances not assumed			-.076	37.845	.12	-.01	.18	-.38	-.35

The results in Table 4.8 reveal that the p-value in Levenes' Test for pretest writing performance scores was .611 > .05. It was revealed that the equal variances were assumed and the statistics of the first row should be read. It was indicated that there was nota significant difference between participants' pretest writing accuracy scores in the coded and non-coded groups, t (38)= -.076, p= .12> .05. So, two groups were homogenous in the beginning of the study.

4.4. Results of the Posttest Writing Accuracy

The first null hypothesis stated that coded corrective feedback and non-corrective feedback have no significant effect on developing accuracy of Iranian EFL learners' written performance.

After the treatment instruction, again the writing accuracy test was administered as a post-test to Iranian participants of both groups. First, to compare the mean scores of the two raters' writing scores, the researcher employed the descriptive statistics. Table 4.9 specifies the results of this test.

Table4.9. *Descriptive Statistics of the Two Raters' Post-Test Writing Accuracy Scores*

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Writing Accuracy Rater1 Post-test	1.04	.34	40
Writing Accuracy Rater2 Post-test	1.12	.49	40

As the results of Table 4.7 shows, the mean score of the first raters' post-test writing score was 65.66(M=65.66) with the standard deviation of 15.08(SD= 15.08) while the mean score of the second raters' post-test writing score was 65.86(M= 65.86) with the standard deviation of 15.07(SD= 15.07), correspondingly.

Moreover, to ensure the inter-rater reliability of the participants' post-test scores, two raters scored the writing accuracy post-test, too. To do so, the researcher used Pearson correlation. The results of this test are displayed in Table 4.10.

Table4.10. *Inter-rater Reliability for the Participants' Post-test Writing Accuracy Scores*

		Writing Accuracy Rater1 Post-test	Writing Accuracy Rater2 Post-test
Writing Accuracy Rater1 Post-test	Pearson Correlation	1	.844[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	40	40
Writing Accuracy Rater2 Post-test	Pearson Correlation	.844[**]	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	40	40
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			

Regarding the results of Table 4.10, there was a significant and strong relationship between the scores of two raters since r=.844. In other words, there was a high inter-rater consistency between the scores of two raters.

Afterwards, the mean scores of the two raters were considered as the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores. For this purpose, the researcher computed the descriptive statistics of the mean score of post-test writing accuracy between coded and non-coded groups. Table 4.11 exhibits the results of descriptive statistics for the post-test scores.

Table4.11. *Descriptive Statistics of the Participants' Post-test Writing Accuracy Scores*

Dependent Variable: Writing Accuracy Post-test			
Groups of Corrective Feedback	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
Coded Group	1.29	.42	20
Non-Coded Group	.87	.22	20
Total	1.08	.40	40

As it is exemplified in Table 4.11, the mean score and standard deviation of the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores in the coded group were 1.29 and .42 (M=1.29,SD=.42), whereas the mean score and standard deviation of the participants in the non-coded group were .87 and .22 (M= .87, SD= .22). In other words, the participants in the non-coded group outperformed the participants in the coded group.

Before conducting One-way ANCOVA, it is necessary to check some preliminary assumptions:

1. Normality assumption

2. Homogeneity of Regression

3. Levene's test of homogeneity of variances

Before employing One-way ANCOVA, it is necessary to see whether the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores were normally distributed, the researcher conducted One- sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Table 4.12 exhibits the results of this test.

Table4.12. *One-Sample-Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for the Participants' Post-Test Writing Accuracy Scores*

		Writing Accuracy Post-test
N		40
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	1.08
	Std. Deviation	.40
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.260
	Positive	.260
	Negative	-.145
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.644
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.159
a. Test distribution is Normal.		
b. Calculated from data.		

As can be seen from Table 4. 12, the p-value of .159 is higher than .05 which revealed that the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores had a normal distribution.

Moreover, it is necessary to see whether the homogeneity of regression slopes was met or not. To yield this purpose, the researcher used test of between-subjects effects. The results of this test are illustrated in Table 4.13.

Table4.13. *Homogeneity of Regression Slopes for the Participants' Post-test Writing Accuracy Scores*

Dependent Variable: Writing Accuracy Post-test					
Source	**Type I Sum of Squares**	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Corrected Model	2.596[a]	3	.865	8.742	.000
Intercept	46.713	1	46.713	472.003	.000
Groups of Corrective Feedback	1.795	1	1.795	18.137	.000
Writing Accuracy Pretest	.685	1	.685	6.922	.012
Groups of Corrective Feedback * Writing Accuracy Pretest	.115	1	.115	1.167	.287
Error	3.563	36	.099		
Total	52.872	40			
Corrected Total	6.158	39			
a. R Squared = .421 (Adjusted R Squared = .373)					

As it is indicated in Table 4.13, since F=1.167, P= .287>.05, it was revealed there was not a significant interaction between independent variable and intervening variable (groups and pretest writing accuracy scores). So, the assumption of homogeneity of regression slopes was met.

Also, to see whether there was a significant difference between the variances of the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores, the researcher used test of homogeneity of variances. Table 4.14 shows the results.

Table4.14. *Test of Homogeneity of Variances for the Participants' Post-Test Writing Accuracy Scores*

Dependent Variable: Writing Accuracy Post-test			
F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.865	1	38	.180

As indicated in Table 4.14, the significant value .180, which was higher than .05, revealed that there was not a significant difference between the variances of the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores in coded and non-coded corrective feedback groups. So, the assumption of homogeneity of variances was met.

After the prerequisite assumptions were met, One-way between Groups Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to check whether there was a significant difference between the participants' post-test writing accuracy scores in the coded and non-coded corrective feedback groups. Table 4.15 reports the results of this ANCOVA test.

Table4.15. *One-way between Groups Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) for the Participants' post test Writing Accuracy scores*

Source	Type I Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2.480[a]	2	1.240	12.473	.000	.403
Intercept	46.713	1	46.713	469.882	.000	.927
Writing Accuracy Pretest	.658	1	.658	6.618	.014	.152
Groups of Corrective Feedback	1.822	1	1.822	18.329	.000	.331
Error	3.678	37	.099			
Total	52.872	40				
Corrected Total	6.158	39				
a. R Squared = .403 (Adjusted R Squared = .370)						

As represented in Table 4.8, there was a significant difference between the independent variable and the dependent variable since p=.000, was lower than .05. Also, the effect size, as mentioned in the partial eta squared column, was .331.

4.5. Discussion

Feedback is seen as a key for encouraging and consolidating learning. Different researchers (e.g. Bitchener, 2008; Ferris, 2006) have argued that feedback plays a central role in learning this skill. Freesman(1987) believes that if students fail in well performance, further feedback is necessary to help them take correct actions on their writing in order to improve it and reach an acceptable level of performance.Writing plays a very important role in language and its developing accuracy has been analysed by corrective feedback which is a frequent practice in the field of learning and achievement.There are different forms of corrective feedback which are used to improve the accuracy of writing. One of these kinds of corrective feedback is indirect written corrective feedback. Ellis (2008) defines indirect corrective feedback as indicating students' errors without actually correcting it and it can be done by underling the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the students' text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. Bitchener, Cameron and Young (2005) stated that indirect corrective feedback is usually divided into coded and uncoded (non-coded) forms.Since Truscott (1996) has argued that any kind of correction will not help learners acquire

knowledge of linguistic forms and structures, debate about corrective feedback has been raised in SLA field. In this study we found out that both coded and non-coded corrective feedback were useful for increasing the accuracy of EFL learners written performance; however, the non-coded group outperformed the coded group in the posttest. In can be concluded that learners may notice their gap and develop their learnings by non-coded corrective feedback.

Based on Cohen's (1988) guideline, there was a moderate effect of corrective feedback groups (coded & non-coded) on the post-test writing accuracy scores. In addition, 33.10 percent of the variance in the post-test writing accuracy was explained by independent variable (i.e., coded & non-coded corrective feedback) . Hence, the first null hypothesis was rejected and the answer to the research question was positive. Additionally, according to this study, both coded and non-coded corrective feedback helped learners to increase their writing accuracy; however, the non-coded group outperformed the coded group.

5. CONCLUSION

5.1. Introduction

The previous chapter presented and analysed data that answer the research gaps of the study. Moreover, the findings were discussed by comparing the previous studies. This chapter includes summary of the study, conclusion, implications of the study, and finally suggestions for further research.

5.2. Summary of the Study

Writing considering as one four skills of a language and a productive skill, involves producing words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs which is important because productive skills are the observable evidence of language acquisition. Therefore, it is needed to write flawlessly. Writing is also important for language learners. Since learners find writing in an L2 a big challenge, they come to class both to improve their language proficiency and become more confident in their writing abilities. Writing which plays a very important role in language and its developing accuracy has been analysed by corrective feedback which is a frequent practice in the field of learning and achievement. In a classroom, teacher is often, if not always, the one guiding the students and giving them instructions. Students, on the other hand, are also responsible for their own learning. However, guidance and feedback from the teacher is always necessary in order for the students to learn and develop further. Feedback as a concept is an essential part of teaching and learning, and thus this study focuses on the different ways feedback is present in the classroom. EFL writing teachers are seeking effective methods of providing learners with feedback that ultimately results in producing future writing that is more competent than their previous writings. Corrective feedback is extremely beneficial to English language learners (ELLs). It is an essential component of learning at any academic and non-academic levels. Thus, its availability, provision and use can help to enhance students' language skills.

Written and oral feedback are the widely used forms of teacher feedback amongst ELLs. Improvement of students' language skills were mainly determined by the amount, timing and mode of the feedback used by teachers.

Corrective feedback has been a part of debate over the last few years due to different sides having different perspectives towards it as we mentioned earlier. There is widespread support for feedback on learners' errors as being conducive to language acquisition, and few language teachers would say that correction does not constitute part of what they do in the classroom

Briefly categorising feedback types, we can have them as direct and indirect feedback. What we gave a try in this article mainly focused on coded and non-coded corrective feedbacks which are parts of indirect feedback. Results of previous studies reveal that indirect feedback has a better effect on students' language acquisition. However, in the Iranian context, teachers still prefer focused and direct corrective feedback and they rarely use indirect feedback to increase noticing in learning among students. Due to these conflicting results, more research is needed to find an effective way for improving accuracy in students writing in the Iranian context.

The significant difference between the present study and the previous corrective feedback studies is that the earlier studies mostly attempted to get the effects of corrective feedback in general; however, no or few studies have been done on coded and non-coded corrective feedback in the Iranian context.

5.3. Conclusion

In this study, we wanted to check the effects of coded and non-coded corrective feedback on the accuracy of written performance. Understanding the results of this study can help us know whether we can further advise combing this method into our writing classes. We performed an statistical analyse for examining the research questions including ANOVA and its assumptions. Our null hypothesis which elaborated in no effects coming from CCF and NCCF on developing accuracy of learners' written performance was rejected and the answer to the research question was positive.

The results of our study in the field of WCF is in favour of Indirect Feedback and corroborate those of Ferris's (2006) study who found that indirect corrective feedback was more beneficial to accuracy development. Learners benefit more from indirect CF because they have to engage in a more profound form of language processing as they are self-editing their output (Ferris, 1995).It is promising to mention ideas of (Lalande, 1982) which comes as Indirect Feedback is often preferred to direct feedback on the grounds that it leads to guided learning and problem solving and encourages students to reflect about linguistic forms. Nevertheless, the debates and disagreements on the usefulness of CF continues to last, resulted by the diverse evidence the researches provided.

Teachers' feedback has been found to influence their relationships with students and students' outcomes, including their academic engagement and aspects of their self-perceptions. Teachers play a critical role in shaping students' academic careers, as they are responsiblefor not only educating their students, but also developing students' motivation to learn. Teachers' use of feedback has both direct and indirect consequences for students' behaviors. Recent studies suggest that indirect feedback has a better effect on students' language acquisition.

Additionally, there is a common assumption that a good piece of writing is often seen from its flawless grammar. Thus, in the world of academic writing, accuracy always becomes the main concern of any writing teachers. Giving feedback, therefore, becomes necessary since teachers could not put aside and disregard grammar (Setyowati, 2015).

5.4. Implications of the Study

Findings of this study gives pedagogical implications for teachers; at most, policymakers and even students.

Respecting the results of the study, it is revealed that corrective feedback has a positive effect on students' language learning process which comes in developing their accuracy in regards to our research. Sadly, using corrective feedback is not common in many schools; therefore, teachers have a difficult task how to implement that and get students intertwined with. Many students may find corrective feedback useless and boring, then try to evade continuing tasks with; however, teachers should incentivise them. They should illustrate them the benefits of using corrective feedback in general at first, then comparing their own scores before/after using this method. At the end, some students get encouraged to use the method.

Including corrective feedback in today educational system is something optional, so that policymakers let teachers decide what to do. Nevertheless, policymakers can embark using this method in schools from elementary to higher levels gradually. Having 2 productive skills in a language makes this process uneasy; therefore, corrective feedback can be added one by one. Corrective feedback comes with responses that learners receive about their linguistic errors made in their oral or written production in a second language (Ellis& Sheen, 2011). According to the results of this study, we can use indirect corrective feedback more than other types of feedback and non-coded corrective feedback should get more attention through the results we gained in this study.

Certain error types appear to be more persistent and more likely to be affected by feedback types such as Verb tense, Capitalization, Punctuation and Spelling errors, etc. Moreover, we should select the type of feedback depending on learners' interlanguage since comprehensive feedback may demotivate and discourage learners from taking risks and trying more sophisticated language forms.

In addition, any type of feedback should consider the variable of motivation. For learners to improve their writing, they have to be provided with appropriate feedback at the right time and in the right context. Learners should notice the feedback and be given opportunities to apply the corrections. However, when everything is said and done, unfortunately, if the learners are not ready to refine their writing skills, they will not, no matter what type of corrective feedback is provided.

Regardless of this study's limitations, the findings hold implications for teachers' practices and classroom policy. Primarily, this study could hold implications for teachers' practices, as it may help them learn about the general impact of their feedback on students' classroom success and be more cognizant of their behaviors when interacting with various students if the findings of this study were shared with them. Further, it may hold implications for policy, as it could be used to influence the creation of a required professional development that educates teachers on effective feedback strategies, as well as the use of classroom assessments that show teachers how they are performing on their feedback.

5.5. Suggestions for Further Research

Analyzing the students' error in writing is just the first step of helping the students to learn better. For students to improve their writing, among other things, they have to be provided with appropriate feedback. Despite of the controversial issue in whether or not giving error corrections, some teachers still find it useful to enhance the students' writing performance. Thus, knowing the recent research in CF will enable teachers to be effective in giving the feedback. However, if everything has been said and done, and they are not improved in their writing, perhaps the problem lies in the motives. As stated by Gue´nette (2007) only students who are committed to improving their writing will be able to better their writing quality. For those who do not, they will not be able to improve anything no matter what type of corrective feedback is provided.

Researches in the field of corrective feedback have different results still. Even the theoreticians have different ideas/perspectives. Doing as many researches as possible is the only way to cope with this situation. One important thing is results can vary from region to region; therefore, it is advised to choose participants from distant places to maximize the output. Researches in this field mostly survey corrective feedback in general and a few go either to directly or indirectly which means coded and non-coded one, so that it is better to include them in our study. Besides, we consider just intermediate level learners, so other language proficiency levels including advanced and elementary learners, also different genders, should be considered in future studies.

We had several limitations in our article. First of all, it is important to note that the participants of this study all came from the same language school which means that this study cannot be generalised to learners in other institutions in Iran and other countries. Further research in other contexts is needed in order to see if students with different language proficiencies and in different schools show a similar correlation between beliefs and uptake. Furthermore, participants were all intermediate level adult English language learners, so once again the results cannot be generalised. Other levels and age groups need to be investigated in order to determine if those factors impact on beliefs and the use of written CF, and also look at if they influence changes in students' beliefs over time. For example, are younger, lower level students more likely to change their beliefs to match those of their teacher than older, higher level students. A larger sample would have provided more convincing results.

Lastly, more studies are needed to examine different contexts and focus on what teachers believe, think, and practice, regarding different types of corrective feedback. These studies may help to reveal the relationship between what teachers believe and what they practice, which can inform teacher training programs, policy makers, and curriculum designers. Moreover, teachers' voices based on their educational beliefs regarding their corrective feedback practices can be shared with other teachers in similar international contexts. Teachers should be empowered by being given some freedom to implement practices that are in line with their educational beliefs with regards to the appropriate corrective feedback approach for their contexts. Studies tackling this area will help raise awareness towards the crucial importance of considering teachers' educational beliefs.

REFERENCES

Abdulkareem, N. (2013). An Investigation Study of Academic Writing Problems Faced by Arab Postgraduate Students at University Technology of Malaysia. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,3*(9), 1559.

Abdullah, B. M. A. (2015). Kurdish students' perception toward communicative language teaching at a university in Kurdistan Region Iraq. *European Scientific Journal,11*(10), 414-426.

Abidah, K., &Ratih, E. (2022). Direct vs indirect corrective feedback for writing improvement: students' preferences. *Wiralodraenglish journal. 6*. 24-35.

Adolphs, S. (2002). *Genre and spoken discourse: probabilities and predictions*.

Ahmad, I., Saeed, M., & Salam, M. (2013). Effect of corrective feedback on academic achievements of students: Case of government secondary schools in Pakistan. *International Journal of Science and Research*, *2*(1), 36-40.

Ahmad, Z., Razak, N.A., & Saeed, M. (2013). Adopting Social Networking Sites (SNSs) as Interactive Communities among English Foreign Language (EFL) Learners in Writing: Opportunities and Challenges. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(11), 187-198.

Ahmadi Azad, Sh. (2014). The Effect of Coded and Uncoded Written Corrective Feedback Types on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*(10), 1001-1008.

Alavinia, P., Javidi, S., &Orujlu, S. (2012). The impact of indirect feedback on improving Iranian EFL learners' writing accuracy.*International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, *3*, (11), 960-967.

Alzahrani, H. F. (2016). Teachers' Stated Beliefs on Coded Unfocused Corrective Feedback in EFL Writing at a Saudi University. *TESOL International Journal*, *11*(1), 52-64.

Askew, S. (2000). Feedback for learning, 6-7.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*, 227-258.

Al-Bahri, K., &Atashian, S. (2018). Towards Arab Students' Grammatical Errors in Academic Writing& their Perceptions. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ).* Proceedings of 1stMEC TESOL Conference 2018. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/MEC1.10.

Banditvilai, C. (2016). Enhancing Students' Language Skills through Blended Learning. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, *14*(3), 220-229.

Betha, N., Rosa, RN., &Hamzah, H. (2021). Exploring Lecturers' Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Research Proposal Writing.*Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 539, 173-178.*

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (Online), *17* (1): 102–118). Retrieved August 18, 2015 from http://www.jimelwood.net/students/grips/ tables _figures/bitchener_2008.pdf.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*, 409-431.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2009). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System*, *37*, 322-329.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2010a). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 193-214.

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2010b). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*, 207-217.

Bitchener, J., Cameron, D., & Young, S. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*, 191–205.

Boyles, J. (2017). The effect of oral feedback on perceived classroom community in undergraduate students. Doctoral Disssertation, Liberty University. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/view content.cgi?article=2565&context=doctoral.

Brown, G. T., Peterson, E. R., & Yao, E. S. (2016). Student conceptions of feedback: Impact on self- regulation, self- efficacy, and academic achievement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *86*(4), 606-629.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Teaching by principles: *An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Bulut, D., &Erel, S. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish context. *Social Sciences Institute, 1*, 397-415.

Burns, A., Freeman, D., Garcia Gomez, P., & Katz, A. (2015). English-for-teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. *ELT Journal*, *69*(2), 129-139.

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

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education,31*(2), 219-233.

Carnell, E. (2000). Dialogue, discussion and feedback – views on secondary school students on how others help their learning. In S. Askew (editor). *Feedback for learning,* 46-61.

Cerezo, R., Núñez, J. C., Rosário, P.,Suárez, N.,Valle, A., &Vallejo, G. (2015). Teachers' feedback on homework, homework-related behaviors, and academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research,108*(3), 204-216.

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.

Chu, M.P.,& Nakamura, T. (2010). A Study of Chinese and Japanese College Students' L2 Learning Styles. *Asian Culture and History, 2*(2), 30-31.

Chuang, W. C. (2009). The Effects of Four Different Types of Corrective Feedback on EFL Students' Writing in Taiwan. *Journal of DYU General Education*, 4, 123-138.

Clark, B. (2007). *Five Grammatical Errors That Make You Look Dumb*. Retrieved from https://copy blogger.com/5- common-mistakes-that-make-you-look-dumb.

Colpitts, B., & Howard, L.S. (2018). A comparison of focused and unfocused corrective feedback in Japanese EFL writing classes. *Lingua Posnaniensis, 60*, 7-16.

Cruz, M., & Mendez, E. H. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers` Professional Development, 14*(2), 63-75.

De Jong, N. H., Kuiken, F., & Van Beuningen, C. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in Dutch multilingual classrooms. *Language Learning*, *62*, 1-41.

DeKeyser, R. (Ed.). (2007). Practicing in a second language: *Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deng, C., Lin, S., Wang, X., Xie, Q., & Xuan, W. (2022). The Effect of Coded Focused and Unfocused Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing Accuracy. *Journal of Language and Education, 8*, 36-57.

Dewanti, D., Laksmi, E. D., &Saukah, A. (2017). The effect of coded and non-coded correction feedback on the quality of Indonesian EFL students' writing. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *7*(2), 247-252.

Dobbs, J., & Arnold, D. H. (2009). Relationship Between Preschool Teachers' Reports of children's behavior and their behavior toward those children. School Psychology Quarterly, 24(2), 95.

Doi, M., &Separ, F., &Wanggai, F. (2021). The Effect of Indirect Coded Versus Indirect Non-Coded Corrective Feedback On Improving Students' Grammatical Accuracy of EFL Writing Class. Edukatif: *JurnalIlmu Pendidikan, 3*, 619-630.

Ellis, N. (2007). The associative–cognitive CREED. In B. VanPatten& J. Williams (Eds.), Theories in second language acquisition: *An introduction* (pp. 77–96). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ellis, N. (2012). Frequency-based accounts of second language acquisition. In S. Gass& A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 193–210). New York: Routledge.

Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 39–60.

Ellis, R., Murakami, M., Sheen, Y., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, *36*(3), 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,* 178-190.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2011). *The formative assessment action plan: Practical steps to more successful teaching and learning*, 2-132.

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

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing 8*, 1–10.

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the shorthand long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), Feedback in second language writing: *Contexts and issues* (pp. 81–104). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second Language Writing Research and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *32*, 181-201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490.

Ferris, D. R., &Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice. Mahwah*, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., &Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions & implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *6*(2), 155-182.

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*(3), 161-184.

Fleck, N., &Leder, N., & Polio, C. (1998). ''If only I had more time'': ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *7*, 43–68.

Foster, P., Tonkyn, A., & Wigglesworth, G. (2000). Measuring Spoken Language: a unit for all reasons. *Applied Linguistics*. *21*(3), 354-375.

Frankfurt international school. (2018*). Understanding mistakes in written language*. http://www.fis.ed.

Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *The Modern Language Journal*, 79(3), 329-344.

Gaies, S.J. (1980) "T-Unit Analysis in Second Language Research: Applications, Problems and Limitations." *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(*1*), 53–60. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586808.

Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 40–53.

Gurzynski-Weiss, L., &Révész, A. (2012). Tasks, Teacher Feedback, and Learner Modified Output in Naturally Occurring Classroom Interaction. *In Language Learning*. University of Michigan: Language Learning Research Club, 62(3), 851–879.

Halabieh, M. (2019). Written Corrective Feedback Major Types: What Type to Use? When to Use?,*i TECH MAG, 2(2020), 41-45.*

Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*, 57-112.

Hatch, E. (1978a). Acquisition of syntax in a second language. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Understanding second and foreign language learning: Issues and approaches* (pp. 34–70). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*. CA: Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, *77*(1), 81-112.

Hedgcock, J., &Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal*, *80*, 287–308.

Hernández, C. (2020). Methods of corrective feedback in second language writing: effects on vocabulary and grammar development, *inted2020 proceedings*, p. 1086.

Hilliard, J., &Westberg, J. (2001). Fostering reflection and providing feedback: Helping others learn from experience. New York: Springer Publishing Company, 13-14.

Hsu, A., & Truscott, J. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 292-305. http://www.awej.org/images/AllIssues/Volume 5/Volume5Number2June2014/19.pdf.

Hunt, K.W. (1966). Recent Measures in Syntactic development. *In Elementary English*. *43*(7), 732-739

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1–19). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Irwin, B. (2018). Written Corrective Feedback: Student Preferences and Teacher Feedback Practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*,*3*, 10-22.

Johansson, C., & Geisler, C. (2011). Syntactic aspects of the wrting of Swedish L2 learners of English. *Corpus-based Studies in Language Use, Language Learning and language Documentation*, 138-155. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

KazemipourKhabbazi, S. (2014). Comparing the Outcomes of Two Types of Corrective Feedback on EFL Classes' Final Exam. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*. 876-881.

Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, *75*(3), 305-313.

Keßler, J., &Pienemann, M. (2012). Processability theory. In S. Gass& A. Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 228–247). New York: Routledge.

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*, 10-19.

Knapp, P. (1997). *Virtual Grammar: writing as affect/effect* (unpublished ph. D. Thesis). University of technology: Sydney.

Kraichoke, C. (2017). "Error Analysis: *A Case Study on Non-Native English Speaking College Applicants' Electronic MailCommunications"* (2017). Theses and Dissertations. 1910.

Krashen, S. D. (1984). Writing: *Research, theory, and application*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: *Issues and implications*. London: Longman.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, *66*, 140–149.

Lantolf, J. (2012). Sociocultural theory: A dialectical approach to L2 research. In S. Gass& Mackey (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 57–72). New York: Routledge.

Lantolf, J. (Ed.). (2000). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Latief, M. A., &Muth'im, A. (2014). The effectiveness of indirect error correction feedback on the quality of students' writing. *Arab World English Journal*, *5*(2), 244-257. Retrieved August 25, 2015 from http://www.awej.org/images/AllIssues/Volume 5/Volume5Number2June2014/19.pdf.

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

Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning, 60*, 309-365.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritche& T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp.413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, and second language acquisition. In Winitz, H. (Ed.), Native language and foreign language acquisition (pp.259–278). *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*.

Long, M. H. (1983). Linguistic and conversational adjustments to non-native speakers. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *5*, 177–193.

Lopez, M. (2021). An Updated Typology of Written Corrective Feedback: Resolving Terminology Issues. *Educación*, *45*(2), 577-592.

Lopez, M., Steendam, E., Speelman, D., &Buyse, K. (2021). Comprehensive corrective feedback in second language writing: The response of individual error categories. *Journal of Writing Research, 13*, 31-70.

Luoma, S. (2004). *Assessing speaking*, 189-190.

Lyster, R., &Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in second language acquisition*. *0*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 32*(2), 265-302.

Mahmoud, A. (2000). Coded Corrective Feedback: In Search of a Compromise. *TESL Reporter, 33, 2,* 10–17.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. 20.10.2015. http://www.merriam-webster.com/.

McLaughlin, B. (1987). Theories of second language learning. London: Edward Arnold.

Moldawa, A., Sheen, Y., & Wright, D. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, *37*(4), 556-569.

Mujtaba, S.M., Parkash, R., & Nawaz, M.W. (2020). Do Indirect Coded Corrective Feedback and Teachers Short Affective Comments Improve the Writing Performance and Learners Uptake? *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *36*, 34 - 47.

Ning, F., &Yingying, M. (2018). The Role of Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Writing Practice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *8*(12), 1629-1635. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0812.08.

Nonkukhetkhong, K. (2013). *Grammar Error Analysis of the First Year English Major Students*, UdonThaniRajabhat University. Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013. (pp. 117-126). Osaka: The International Academic Forum.

Obilor, E. I. (2019). Feedback and Students' Learning. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Education*,*7*, 40-47.

Omar, N. A. (2014).The Effectiveness of Feedback on EFL Libyan Writing Context.*Arab World English Journal*, *5*(1), 326-339.

Pienemann, M. (1989). Is language teachable? Psycholinguistic experiments and hypotheses. *Applied Linguistics*, *10*, 52-79. doi:10.1093/applin/10.1.52.

Pienemann, M. (1998). Language processing and second language development: *Processability theory*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pienemann, M. (2007). Processability theory. In B. VanPatten& J. Williams (Eds.), Theories in second language acquisition: *An introduction* (pp. 137–154). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pishkar, K. (2022). The Relationship between Corrective Feedback and ELT Students' Motivation.

Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *21*, 375–389.

Profozic, M. N. (2013). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback and the role of individual differences in language learning: A classroom study*, 21-23.

Rahnama, M., &Fatehi Rad, N. (2016). Uncoded Written Corrective Feedback and Writing Performance of Iranian Advanced EFL Learners.*Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*, *4*(2), 121-127.

Reitbauer, M., &Vaupetitsch, R. (2013). Corrective feedback in the constructivist classroom. In M. Reitbauer, N. Campbell and S. Mercer (eds.). *Feedback matters: Current feedback practices in the EFL classroom,* 37-54.

Riwayatiningsih, R, (2017). Coded and uncoded annotations on students' writing, *SELL Journal, Vol 2* No 2 (2017). DOI: https://doi.org/10.31597/sl.v2i2.515.

Robb, T., Ross, S., &Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*, 83–93.

Ruiz-Madrid M.N., &Usó-Juan, E. (2006). *Pedagogical reflections on learning languages in instructed settings*, 220-221.

Sadat, T., &Zarifi, A., & Sadat, S. A., &Malekzadeh, J. (2015). Effectiveness of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Accuracy and Retention of Conditional Sentences Types I, II & III. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*,*5*, 20-23.

Salimi, A., &Valizadeh, M. (2015). The Effect of Coded and Uncoded Written Corrective Feedback on the Accuracy of Learners Writing in Pre-intermediate Level. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, *4*(3), 116-122. doi:10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.4n.3p.116.

Sampson, A. (2012). Coded and uncoded error feedback: Effects on error frequencies in adult Colombian EFL learners' writing. *System*, *40*, 494-504.

Seçıl, B., &Varnosfadrani, A. (2010). The Effectiveness of Repetition as Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1(*3), 181-193.

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

Setyowati, L. (2015). Beyond Error Analysis: Solving Efl Student Writing Problems in Accuracy. *JurnalDimensiPendidikan Dan Pembelajaran*, *3*, 54-58.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*, 255–283.

Sheen, Y. (2011). Corrective feedback, individual differences and second language learning. New York: Springer.

Sheen, Y., and Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in the language teaching, in *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, ed. E. Hinkel (New York, NY: Routledge), 593–610.

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

Shute, V. (2008). Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*, 153-189.

Surakka, K. (2007). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake in an EFL classroom.* Master's Thesis, University of Jyväskylä.

Suzuki, M. (2005). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in Adult ESL Classrooms. *Studies in Applied Linguistics & TESOL,4*, 11-20.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, pp. 235-256. New York: Newbury House.

Tang, C., & Liu, Y.T. (2017). Effects of indirectly coded corrective feedback with and without short affective teacher comments on overall L2 writing performance, learner uptake and perceived motivation. *Assessing Writing, 35,* 45-66.

Taras, M. (2013). Feedback on Feedback: uncrossing wires across sectors. In S. Merry, Price, M., Carless, D., Taras, M. (Eds.), *Reconceptualising Feedback in Higher Education: Developing dialogue with students,* 30-40.

Trask, R.L. (2007). Stockwell, Peter (ed.). *Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, *46*, 327–369.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: a response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *13*, 337-343.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*, 255–272.

Valizadeh, M. (2021). Revision vs. Attention Requirements: Impacts on the Efficacy of the Written Indirect Corrective Feedback.*Turkish Online Journal of English Language Teaching,6*(1), 25-43.

Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, *10*(2), 1-27. Retrieved August 18, 2015 from http://revistas.um.es/ijes/article/viewFile/1191 71/112301. In M. Thurlings et al./Educational Research Review 9 (2013) 1–15 Retrieved February 26 , 2017 from http://purl.tue.nl/42228237280279.pdf.

Veliz, L. (2007). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classrooms. *Literatura y lingüística*, *19*, 283-292.

Vyatkina, N. (2010). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback in teaching beginning German. *Foreign Language Annals, 43*(4), 671-689.

Wicaksono, W. (2018). Types and Frequencies of Written Corrective Feedbacks in Adult ESL Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Studies (IJELS), 3*, 60-67.

Wiley, R., &Rodrigo, R. (2019). Determining the Efficacy of Indirect, Coded, Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in a Thai Cultural Context. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science (IJMAS), 5*(4), 40-45.

Yoshida, R. (2009). *Learners in Japanese language classrooms: Overt and covert participation,* 38-127.

Zerin, S. (2007). *Teaching writing to young learners*. BRAC University.

APPENDIX

An example of CCF

An example of NCCF

PET test

1

1-   _____ is really difficult in New York.

1) To commute   2) Commute   3) Commuting

2-   They've got three children. Julia is the middle _____.

1) ones   2) one   3) children

3-   John is _____ husband.

1) Sally's   2) Sally   3) of Sally

4-   Where did you _____ to school?

1) go   2) goes   3) went

5-   I think English is _____ than maths.

1) easy   2) easier   3) more easy

6-   What do you _____ for lunch?

1) eat usually   2) usually eat   3) usually to eat

7-   Paul and Susan _____ the car.

1) didn't bought   2) didn't buy   3) didn't to buy

8-   _____ she your sister?

1) Are   2) Do   3) Is

9-   Where _____ you last weekend?

1) were   2) was   3) did

10- _____ he ever been to France?

1) Has   2) Have   3) Did

11- Those _____ my pens. They're yours.

1) aren't   2) don't   3) isn't

12- How _____ here?

1) she did get   2) did she get   3) she get

13-　This book is for _____.

1)　Hers　　　　　2) she　　　　　3) her

14-　My new bicycle is much _____ than my old one.

1)　more good　　　2) better　　　　3) good

15-　My father _____ move house next year.

1)　going to　　　　2) going　　　　3) is going to

16-　I'm on holiday at the moment but I _____ in an hotel.

1)　'm working　　　2) working　　　3) work

17-　It's not ours, it's _____.

1)　theirs　　　　　2) they're　　　　3) their

18-　My aunt and uncle are very nice. _____ live in Wales.

1)　Their　　　　　2) They　　　　　3) They're

19-　Do you _____ going to restaurants to eating at home?

1)　prefer　　　　　2) like　　　　　3) enjoy

20-　I _____ your father on the train yesterday.

1)　Seed　　　　　2) saw　　　　　3) see

21-　She talks _____.

1)　Soft　　　　　2) softly　　　　3) softer

22-　_____ it a hospital before?

1)　Were　　　　　2) Did　　　　　3) Was

23-　Is he _____ brother?

1)　Your　　　　　2) you　　　　　3) you're

24-　She loves _____ at home at the weekend.

1)　Stays　　　　　2) staying　　　　3) stay

25-　How _____ money have you got in your purse?

1)　Many　　　　　2) Cost　　　　　3) much

Look at the text in each question. What does it say? Tick the correct box A, B or C.   **1**

Once opened, keep in the coldest part of refrigerator and use within five days.

1)

A) The product can last five days after opening.

B) The product should be stored in a refrigerator immediately.

C) The product doesn't have to be kept cool.

We accept cash, cheques, and all major credit cards!
——— • ———

2)

A) We prefer you to pay with a credit card or in cash.

B) You must have a credit card and a cheque as well as cash.

C) You may pay with a credit card, cheque or, cash.

To: Maria
From: David
I know you asked me to fix your laptop on Saturday, but I completely forgot about a meeting I have to go to - terribly sorry.

3) Why is David apologising to Maria?

A) He cannot do the favour he had promised.

B) He hasn't had time to fix her laptop.

C) He won't be able to go to the meeting with her.

° PARKING °
2 hours maximum
£4 per hour
The value of a parking penalty charge notice is £50

4)

A) It costs at least £50 to park here for two hours.

B) There are no parking charges after 2.00 pm.

C) You have to pay a fine if you park here for three hours.

☆ KEEP SILENCE! ☆
EXAMS
☆ IN PROGRESS ☆

5)

A) You mustn't ask questions to the examiner.

B) Please respect others and remain quiet during the examination.

C) Do not talk to the teacher.

2

The people below in **1-5** all want to buy a book. Look at the descriptions of eight books. **(A-H)** Decide which book would be most suitable for each person.

1)

James is looking for a book for his granddaughter's fourth birthday present. Ideally, it should be about animals or elves and be a story he can read to her many times.

2)

Susan is twenty-one and works for a multinational company. She likes romance novels very much, especially if they contain descriptions of fashionable clothes, magnificent houses, and parties.

3)

Andre is from Paris and travels across England on business very often. He would like a book that offers accurate information as he sometimes has time for sightseeing between business meetings.

4)

Tina is a chemistry student, but she would like to read science fiction in her free time. She wants to buy a well-written book with a surprise at the end.

5)

Peter wants to buy a book as a present for his friend Robin. Robin is keen on fishing and likes spending time in nature.

A) Henry Jowett
The Portrait of a Woman
The charming Evelyn Blanchet was a French woman who came to England in the eighteenth century and won the hearts of young men wherever she appeared. This enjoyable romance shows us the elegant evening dresses, the beautiful rooms, and Evelyn's gleaming eyes in an imaginary world full of gardens and palaces.

B) Patience Jones
The English Corner
In a quiet English village by the sea, a young French widow gets a second chance at love. Annabel Ginger hasn't been back to the Village of Abberton since she buried her husband two years ago. Now she's returning with her 4-year-old daughter, Alice.

C) Robin Greene
Migration
In the dark future of Jupiter XI, more than 90 percent of the world's population died. Most people killed themselves or were killed by others who were listening to voices steering their dreadful actions. Those who survived live in a very hostile environment. There are so many different twists or unexpected turns.

D) Ann Kaufman
Baby Dance
This fabulous board book follows five American puppies (including a rather cheeky Yorkie) as they play and dance the day away. Using delightful rhyme and simple language, an American author Ann Kaufman has created a fun, rhythmical story that is a joy to read and alluring to little ears.

E) Bruce Nolan
Landia
Landia is a medieval world filled with pirates and warriors, adventures and battles, and a group of boys trying to find their place in the world. The story focuses on a bunch of naughty boys who, as part of their coming of age, must go through six months of tough, physical training on land and sea to become warriors.

F) Automobile Association
Walks and Tours in England
A free guide (French edition) with practical tips and advice to help you get the most out of your trip to the United Kingdom. The guide includes detailed information on history, museums, galleries, churches as well as some useful information about accommodation. There are suggested tour routes, maps and directions.

G) Izaak Watson
The Perfect Storm
The "Silver Guide" series from St. George's Press has been around since the late '60s and is known for its comprehensive coverage of a wide range of topics related to nature. "The Perfect Storm" is no exception. The book is widely considered to be one of the leading guidebooks for novice and experienced anglers.

H) Doris McCartney
The Princess
Open the book, and you won't be disappointed, for what follows is a fascinating adventure with fantastic places and amazing creatures, all to be found just on the verge of reality, if only you could squeeze through the lavender hedge at the bottom of the garden to find it.

3

For each question, write the correct answer. Use only one word in each gap.

Our Holiday in Spain

Our trip to Spain was wonderful! First, we flew to Valencia, one of the **(1)** ... beautiful cities in Spain. It's a picturesque and elegant port city. We stayed at Hampton by Hilton there for three nights. We went sightseeing and just relaxed at the swimming pool. From Valencia, we flew to Ibiza, arriving **(2)** ... Saturday morning. We went to Las Salinas, **(3)** ... is one of the most popular beaches in Ibiza. The next day, we had a go **(4)** ... water skiing or parasailing. One night, we took a bus tour to a traditional Ibizan village and stayed for dinner and a Flamenco show. We heard Spanish songs for voice and guitar, and we saw traditional dances - it **(5)** ... a very special evening. From Sant Jordi, we drove to San Rafael. We stayed there for two nights. The very next day, we went back to Ibiza and flew back to Valencia. We plan to come back to Spain soon, **(6)** ... for now, we're on our way to Portugal!

1)   2)   3)   4)   5)   6)

Read the text below and choose the correct word (A, B, C or D) for each space.

London Parks

London is famous **(1)** ... its parks and gardens. Some of them belong to the Crown, but they are all open to the public, and the entrance is free of charge. In St James's Park, you can watch and **(2)** ... swans, ducks, geese, and other water birds. Hyde Park **(3)** ... to be a hunting ground and is still popular with horse riders.

Those who like a good argument should go to the Speakers' Corner to listen to individuals **(4)** ... speeches on various subjects. Regent's Park now houses London Zoo and open-air theatre where Shakespeare's plays are staged in summer. Not **(5)** ... the parks are in the city centre. Greenwich and Richmond are located in the suburbs. All these areas of green give the city dwellers an excellent **(6)** ... to enjoy some peace away from traffic and crowded streets.

1. a) by	b) for	c) from	d) with
2. a) feed	b) eat	c) breed	d) lead
3. a) should	b) ought	c) used	d) have
4. a) doing	b) giving	c) taking	d) talking
5. a) each	b) whole	c) every	d) all
6. a) chance	b) knowledge	c) account	d) source

Five sentences have been removed from the text below. For each question (1-5), choose the correct answer (A-H). There are three extra sentences which you do not need to use.

Antarctica is the coldest, emptiest, and driest place on Earth. Ninety-nine percent of Antarctica is covered by ice about 5 metres thick. The coldest temperature ever recorded on Earth was minus 89.2 degrees Celsius, registered on July 21, 1983, at Antarctica's Vostok station. This continent is dry, windy, and very cold. **1)** There is an area called Dry Valleys that has not had rain for more than a million years!

The existence of Antarctica was completely unknown until the continent was first discovered in 1820. Antarctica doesn't have a government and belongs to no country. **2)** There are 30 various countries that operate 80 research stations located around the continent. In summer, more than 4000 scientists from all over the world work in research stations. Tourists arrive here, too. **3)**

Antarctica has no trees or bushes. The only plants that can live in such a cold place are algae, moss, and fungi. **4)** They live close together in large colonies and build their nests on the ice. In the ocean around the continent, you can see seals, whales, and orcas, but there are no big or large native land animals on the continent. **5)**

   A) More than 56,000 people travelled to Antarctica during the 2018-2019 season.

   B) Also hiding under the Antarctic ice is an entire lake called Lake Vostok.

   C) But there are a lot of penguins.

   D) Winds in some places can reach 320 km/h.

   E) But Antarctica hasn't always been an icy land.

   F) It is just too cold!

   G) Antarctica is the land surrounded by the ocean.

   H) It is the only place in the world that is not ruled by any nation.

Write about the following topic:

A shopping center is going to be built in your neighborhood. Do you agree or disagree, why?

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

Write at least 200 words.

Write about the following topic:

Posttest

A factory is going to be built in your neighborhood.
Do you agree or disagree, why?

Give reasons for your answer and include any relevant examples from your own knowledge or experience.

Write at least 200 words.

AUTHOR'S BIOGRAPHY

Milad Mousapour Balegh, is an alumnus of Faculty of Foreign Languages, IAU, Tehran (B.A.) and Tabriz (M.A.) branches – Iran. He obtained his specialisation in ELT (English Language Teaching). He is a freelance English teacher and passionate about languages and foreign travel. His goal is to reflect his yielded experiences through writing articles and contributing to knowledge-expanding websites, as much as possible so other enthusiasts can benefit from it. His research interests include: Language Acquisition, Co-Learning, Feedback, Foreign Travel and Culture.