

Libyan MA Students' and Teachers' perspectives towards direct and indirect written corrective feedback in writing skill

■Mansour, Eman *

● Received:12/01/2025

● Accepted: 27/03/2025

■ Abstract:

This study explored the perspectives of MA students and teachers regarding direct and indirect written corrective feedback (WCF) in L2 writing instruction at a Libyan university, employing a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative data from an online questionnaire, administered to 33 students, revealed a strong preference for direct feedback, characterized by explicit error correction and detailed comments on language and organization. Qualitative data, gathered from semi-structured interviews with four teachers, highlighted their use of a combination of direct and indirect methods, influenced by time constraints and pedagogical beliefs. The findings revealed a discrepancy between student preferences for clear, specific guidance and teachers' challenges in providing exhaustive corrections, emphasizing the need to align feedback practices with student expectations.

The research underscores the importance of WCF in enhancing L2 writing skills, while highlighting the necessity for educators to adjust their feedback strategies to better match student preferences. It suggests that professional development programs focusing on effective feedback techniques, coupled with institutional support for streamlining feedback processes, could significantly enhance writing outcomes. Furthermore, the study suggests that incorporating strategies such as peer editing, automated feedback tools, and structured rubrics can help alleviate the burden on teachers. Ultimately, this research contributes valuable insights into the dynamics of WCF, emphasizing the importance of fostering a responsive and structured feedback approach that caters to the needs of both students and instructors.

Key Words: Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), Direct Feedback, Indirect Feedback, MA Students, Feedback Strategies

*Assistant Lecturer, Zawiya Language Center, University of Zawiya, E-mail: e.mansour@zu.edu.ly

■ المستخلص:

تناولت هذه الدراسة استكشاف وجهات نظر طلاب الماجستير ومعلميهم فيما يتعلق بالتغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الكتابية المباشرة وغير المباشرة في تعليم الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية كلفة ثانية في جامعة ليبية. استخدمت الدراسة منهجية مختلطة، حيث تم جمع بيانات كمية من خلال استبيان عبر الإنترنت من 33 طالبًا، وبيانات نوعية من خلال مقابلات شبه منظمة مع أربعة معلمين. كشفت النتائج عن تفضيل كبير بين الطلاب للتغذية الراجعة المباشرة، التي تتميز بالتصحيح الصريح للأخطاء والتعليقات التفصيلية حول اللغة والتنظيم. وأظهرت البيانات النوعية أن المعلمين يستخدمون مزيجًا من الأساليب المباشرة وغير المباشرة، متأثرين بعوامل مثل ضيق الوقت والمعتقدات التربوية. كشفت النتائج عن وجود تباين بين تفضيلات الطلاب للتوجيه الواضح والمحدد والتحديات التي يواجهها المعلمون في تقديم تصحيحات شاملة، مما يؤكد على الحاجة إلى مواءمة ممارسات التغذية الراجعة مع توقعات الطلاب.

يؤكد البحث على أهمية التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الكتابية في تحسين مهارات الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية كلفة ثانية، مع تسليط الضوء على ضرورة قيام المعلمين بتعديل استراتيجيات التغذية الراجعة الخاصة بهم لتتوافق بشكل أفضل مع تفضيلات الطلاب. ويقترح البحث أن برامج التطوير المهني التي تركز على تقنيات التغذية الراجعة الفعالة، إلى جانب الدعم المؤسسي لتبسيط عمليات التغذية الراجعة، يمكن أن تعزز بشكل كبير نتائج الكتابة. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تشير الدراسة إلى أن دمج استراتيجيات مثل تحرير الأقران، وأدوات التغذية الراجعة الآلية، والقواعد المنظمة يمكن أن يساعد في تخفيف العبء على المعلمين. في نهاية المطاف، يساهم هذا البحث برؤى قيمة في ديناميكيات التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الكتابية، مع التأكيد على أهمية تعزيز نهج تغذية راجعة مستجيب ومنظم يلبي احتياجات كل من الطلاب والمعلمين.

● **الكلمات المفتاحية:** التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية الكتابية، التغذية الراجعة المباشرة التغذية الراجعة غير المباشرة، طلاب الماجستير، استراتيجيات التغذية الراجعة

■ Introduction

Feedback is widely recognized as a crucial element in second language (L2) writing classrooms, contributing to both learning and student motivation (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Research has explored the alignment between students' preferences and teachers' perspectives on feedback, with the assumption that greater agreement enhances effectiveness while discrepancies reduce it (Cohen & Calvacanti, 1990; Saito, 1994; Diab, 2005a; Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Hamouda, 2011). Studies confirm that both teachers and students view feedback as essential for writing development, yet differences exist regarding its delivery. Teachers commonly provide written corrective feedback, which students generally appreciate, but the debate continues over

which type—direct or indirect—is most effective. Some studies suggest that direct feedback, where teachers correct errors explicitly, is preferred by students for its clarity (Ahmadi et al., 2015; Chen, Nassaji & Liu, 2016). Others argue that indirect feedback, which highlights errors without correction, fosters learner autonomy and deeper learning (Ferris, 2002). Given this debate, understanding students' preferences and teachers' approaches to feedback remains a critical issue in L2 writing instruction.

The effectiveness of written corrective feedback in improving students' writing accuracy is a major topic in language teaching research. While some scholars question whether it significantly enhances writing skills (Truscott, 1999; Kepner, 1991), others emphasize its essential role in error treatment and language development (Ferris, 1999; Tsao, Tseng & Wang, 2017). The distinction between direct and indirect feedback is particularly relevant, as studies show that coded indirect feedback, which identifies errors with symbols or codes, is slightly more effective in helping students revise their work than simple underlining (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). At the same time, perspectives on error correction vary, with Krashen advocating against it entirely, while Vigil and Oller support it when errors interfere with communication. Recent research has focused on determining which types of feedback are most effective for different error types (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Chandler, 2003; Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener, 2008). This study aims to examine the preferences of MA teachers and students' perspectives on the use of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in L2 writing instruction.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Teachers employ various strategies in the classroom to help students identify their errors and provide corrective feedback. Error treatment is a crucial aspect of second language (L2) writing instruction, and it remains a central issue for both teachers and researchers. There has been ongoing debate about whether error feedback effectively enhances L2 students' writing accuracy and overall quality (Kepner, 1991; Truscott, 1999; Ferris, 1999). Some scholars argue that corrective feedback plays a vital role in helping students recognize and rectify their mistakes, ultimately leading to improved writing skills. Others, however, question whether extensive error correction

actually contributes to long-term writing development or whether it might hinder students' confidence and fluency in writing.

As a teacher in training courses, it has been observed that the feedback provided by writing teachers often falls short of addressing their students' actual needs. Many students require more detailed and individualized feedback to effectively improve their writing skills, yet the extent and quality of feedback given may not always be sufficient. This discrepancy could be due to factors such as large class sizes, time constraints, or varying teaching philosophies regarding the role of error correction. Additionally, while some students may benefit from direct feedback that explicitly corrects their errors, others may need more guided, indirect feedback that encourages self-correction and independent learning. Understanding and addressing these gaps in feedback provision is essential for enhancing the effectiveness of L2 writing instruction and ensuring that students receive the support they need to develop their writing proficiency.

1.2 Aims of the Study

This study aims to:

1. Investigate MA students' perspectives and preferences regarding written corrective feedback (WCF), specifically the direct and indirect methods.
2. Examine MA teachers' perspectives on the use of direct and indirect error correction in teaching writing skills.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This study aims to explore EFL teachers' and students' background knowledge regarding direct and indirect written feedback. Additionally, it seeks to understand the connection between teachers' beliefs and their actual feedback practices, as well as the factors that shape these beliefs and approaches. The findings of this research may provide valuable insights and recommendations to help teachers enhance the effectiveness of their feedback in improving students' writing skills. Furthermore, this study is significant in examining EFL students' perspectives on written feedback, shedding light on the reasons behind their preferences. It will also investigate whether students' experiences influence their preferences for feedback.

2. Literature Review

Writing is a fundamental skill in language learning, yet it is often considered the most challenging. Unlike speaking, writing requires precision, clarity, and structure since it leaves a permanent record (Hilton & Hyder, 1992). Scholars emphasize its role in reinforcing language learning, developing cognitive abilities, and ensuring academic and professional success (Krashen, 1984; Harmer, 2015). Various approaches exist for teaching writing, including the product, process, and genre approaches, each with distinct benefits. While the product approach focuses on structured output, the process approach emphasizes drafting and revision, and the genre approach considers the linguistic and social context. Research suggests that a combination of these methods is most effective (Badger & White, 2000), with teacher feedback playing a crucial role in helping students refine their writing skills (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005).

Corrective feedback (CF) is an essential element in writing instruction, helping students recognize and correct errors. Defined as input from a teacher, peer, or other sources, CF informs students about their mistakes and guides them toward improvement (Keh, 1990; Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Scholars have described it using various terms such as “comments,” “response,” or “correction” (Kepner, 1991), and it is widely acknowledged as a key factor in second language acquisition (Ellis, 2005). By providing knowledge about errors and strategies for correction, CF helps bridge the gap between students’ current abilities and their learning goals. Despite debates about its effectiveness, CF remains a critical pedagogical tool for improving students’ writing proficiency and language accuracy.

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is essential in second language (L2) writing, helping students identify strengths and weaknesses in their writing. It can come from various sources, including teacher-student conferences, peer feedback, and computer-mediated feedback, each contributing to students’ cognitive and linguistic development (Hyland & Hyland, 2006a; Schmidt, 1990). Teacher feedback, in the form of praise, questions, and advice, motivates students and guides their improvement (Yang, 2008). WCF can be either direct, where errors are corrected explicitly, or indirect, where

errors are highlighted for students to correct themselves, encouraging deeper cognitive engagement (Ellis, 2009; Lalande, 1982). While research on the effectiveness of feedback is mixed, some studies suggest that well-structured, clear feedback can significantly improve writing accuracy and support long-term learning (Ferris, 1999; Bitchener et al., 2005).

Research on students' and teachers' perspectives on written corrective feedback (WCF) reveals a variety of views and preferences. Students generally report that teachers focus on grammar and mechanics but prefer more comprehensive feedback covering content, organization, mechanics, and vocabulary. They tend to favor direct feedback for its ease but believe indirect feedback is more beneficial for long-term improvement. Studies on teachers' beliefs about WCF show a mixed outlook; some teachers are concerned about grammar accuracy and believe their feedback is effective, while others are uncertain about its value or inconsistent in their approach. Factors influencing teachers' beliefs include their prior experiences, education, and classroom practices, and these beliefs may not always align with their classroom practices. Some teachers may be sensitive to student needs, while others may be less attuned to how their feedback is received. This inconsistency and the complexity of teacher beliefs make the implementation of WCF challenging and varied across contexts.

3. Previous Studies

Studies on students' preferences for direct versus indirect error correction in L2 writing classrooms show varied results across different contexts. Some students, like those in Leki (1991) and Ferris and Roberts (2001), prefer indirect feedback, such as indicating errors or providing clues, as it helps them self-correct their mistakes. Conversely, Lee (2005) found that EFL students favored direct feedback, as it helped them easily correct their errors. Many students also appreciate error codes, believing these help them identify and understand their mistakes. Diab (2005) found that students wanted indirect feedback on early drafts and direct feedback on final drafts, reflecting a balance between self-correction and teacher intervention. In the debate over the effectiveness of feedback types, Ferris (2003) argued for the superiority of indirect feedback, while Chandler (2003) advocated for direct feedback.

Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) explored the effects of direct and indirect feedback on error types like the definite article and past tense. They found that direct feedback, especially when combined with oral feedback, led to greater accuracy in these areas, suggesting that direct feedback can be more effective for correcting specific grammatical errors.

4. Research Methodology

This study used both quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the perspectives of master's degree students and teachers on direct and indirect written corrective feedback (WCF) at a Department of English in postgraduate studies. The quantitative data was collected through a structured online questionnaire that focused on students' background and their views on WCF. The qualitative data was gathered through semi-structured interviews.

The study includes 33 Master's students specializing in English at Zawia University who possess basic knowledge of academic writing in English and are actively involved in writing assignments. It also included five teachers who teach academic writing in the postgraduate studies.

4.1 Data Collection

The questionnaire used in the study was designed to gather students' perspectives on direct and indirect written corrective feedback (WCF). It consisted of two parts: the first part collected background information about the students and their awareness of WCF, including 11 yes/no questions. The second part included 25 items that assessed students' perspectives on WCF, using a Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree) to gauge how frequently they experienced various feedback practices. This part aimed to understand the students' preferences and attitudes towards the feedback types they received. The data from the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively using SPSS software.

The semi-structured interviews, on the other hand, were conducted with four teachers to capture their views on direct and indirect WCF. The interviews featured seven open-ended questions, which allowed for flexibility

in exploring deeper insights. While the questions provided a framework for the discussion, the interviewees were encouraged to elaborate on related topics, offering a more personalized understanding of their perspectives. The responses were transcribed, analyzed thematically, and organized around key themes to reveal the teachers' attitudes toward WCF. Thematic analysis was used to interpret the qualitative data from the interviews.

4.2 Procedure

The data collection for this study employed two main methods: a structured online questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The online questionnaire was distributed to students via Google Forms and consisted of two sections. The first section included 11 yes/no questions aimed at gathering background information on the students' awareness of written corrective feedback (WCF). The second section featured 25 Likert-scale items (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree) to assess students' perspectives on direct and indirect WCF. The responses were analyzed quantitatively using SPSS software to determine students' preferences and patterns regarding the types of WCF they received in writing instruction.

In addition to the questionnaire, semi-structured interviews were conducted with four teachers. The interviews were guided by a set of seven open-ended questions, focusing on teachers' views regarding direct and indirect WCF in the writing process. While the questions provided a framework, the interview format allowed for flexibility, encouraging participants to expand on their responses and discuss related topics. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed thematically to identify key themes and variations in the teachers' perspectives. This combination of quantitative and qualitative methods provided a comprehensive understanding of both students' and teachers' perspectives on written corrective feedback in L2 writing classrooms.

4.3 Research Questions

The questions that the current study is conducted to answer are as follows.

1. What are the MA students' preference of feedback?
2. What are the MA teachers' perspectives towards direct and indirect written corrective feedback?

4.4 Data Analysis

SPSS software programs were used to analyze the quantitative data and the thematic analysis method was utilized to analyze the qualitative data.

The first part of the questionnaire focused on gathering background information about students' familiarity with direct and indirect feedback. The data from the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistical methods, and the results are presented in two main sections: students' background information on WCF and their perspectives on using direct and indirect feedback in improving their writing skills. Interview data is analyzed using thematic analysis to uncover patterns in participants' experiences, focusing on their views of feedback.

4.5 Integration of Findings

The results from both the qualitative and quantitative analyses were combined to offer a thorough understanding of English language teachers' attitudes and experiences with technology integration in language teaching. By using a mixed-methods approach, the study was able to triangulate the data, which strengthened the validity and reliability of its findings.

5. Discussion and Findings

The detailed findings provided below shows the students' background information on WCF.

Table 1: Background Information

| No | Question | Yes | No |
|----|---|-----|-----|
| 1 | ?Does your teacher provide you with written feedback | 71% | 29% |
| 2 | ?Does your teacher use written feedback | 52% | 48% |
| 3 | ?Does your teacher use indirect written feedback | 79% | 21% |
| 4 | ?Is your teacher's feedback legible | 58% | 42% |
| 5 | Does your teacher give you clean and understandable written ?feedback | 28% | 72% |

| No | Question | Yes | No |
|----|---|-----|-----|
| 6 | ?Does your teacher correct every mistake you made | 36% | 64% |
| 7 | Do you prefer your teacher's way of providing you with writ- ?ten feedback | 20% | 80% |
| 8 | Does your teacher's feedback help you to provide your writ- ?ing skills | 83% | 17% |
| 9 | ?Do you find direct feedback more useful to you | 75% | 25% |
| 10 | ?Do you find indirect feedback is more useful to you | 30% | 70% |
| 11 | Do you prefer your teacher to mark all your errors when re- ?ceiving written feedback on your written work | 88% | 12% |

The findings indicate that while most students receive written feedback from their teachers, a significant portion still does not. Direct written feedback appears to be fairly common, with responses almost evenly split between students who report receiving it and those who do not. However, indirect written feedback is less frequently used, as the majority of students' state that their teachers do not employ this method. A notable concern emerging from the data is the clarity of feedback, with 58% of students finding their teachers' written comments illegible. This lack of clarity may hinder students' ability to improve their writing skills effectively. Additionally, many students report that their teachers do not correct every mistake, which contributes to dissatisfaction with the feedback process.

Despite concerns about feedback clarity and thoroughness, most students acknowledge its role in improving their writing. However, only a small percentage express satisfaction with their teachers' current feedback methods, indicating a need for improvement. A significant majority of students find direct feedback more useful than indirect feedback, reinforcing the preference for explicit corrections rather than hints or coded feedback. In contrast, only a small portion of students consider indirect feedback beneficial. Additionally, most students prefer that teachers mark all their errors in written feedback, emphasizing the need for more comprehensive and detailed error correction.

Table 2 Students' Preferences and Perspectives of Direct and Indirect WCF

| No | Statement | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|----|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 1 | Providing feedback on my written work is useful | 50% | 33% | - | 10% | 7% |
| 2 | The only feedback I trust is from my teacher | 30% | 15% | 18% | 41% | 22% |
| 3 | It is useful to write more than one draft | 21% | 46.5% | 19% | 13.5% | - |
| 4 | I prefer my teacher to work all of my errors | 36% | 36.5% | 6.5% | 21% | - |
| 5 | I like my teacher to show where the error is in my written text | 61.5% | 36% | - | 2.5% | - |
| 6 | I like my teacher to underline and number the errors | 14% | 46% | 11.5% | 26% | 2.5% |
| 7 | I prefer my teacher to give me feedback orders in structure that were discussed in classroom | 28.5% | 44% | 13% | 12% | 2.5% |
| 8 | I prefer my teacher to focus on the organization of my written work | 25% | 40% | 28% | 7% | - |
| 9 | I prefer my teacher to focus on the language of my written work | 25% | 60% | 10% | 5% | - |
| 10 | I prefer my teacher's comments take the form of one word | - | 46.5% | 36% | 11.5% | 6% |
| 11 | I prefer my teacher's comments to take the form of questions | 8.5% | 35% | 21.5% | 26.5% | 8.5% |
| 12 | I prefer my teacher's comments to take the form of statements | 22.5% | 50% | 20% | 7.5% | - |
| 13 | I prefer my teacher's commands take the form imperatives | 16% | 49% | 24% | 11% | - |

Libyan MA Students' and Teachers' perspectives towards direct and indirect written corrective feedback in writing skill

| No | Statement | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|----|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| 14 | I prefer the teachers comments to take the form of exclamations | - | 25.5% | 27% | 32.5% | 15% |
| 15 | I prefer my teacher to use general comments | 12% | 50.5% | 27% | 10.5% | - |
| 16 | I prefer my teacher to use detailed and specific comments | 30.5% | 47% | 16% | 6.5% | - |
| 17 | I prefer my teacher to use positive comments | 37% | 40.5% | 17% | 3% | 2.5% |
| 18 | I prefer my teacher to use negative comments | 5% | 10% | 25% | 35% | 25% |
| 19 | I prefer my teacher to use suggestions | 45.5% | 42% | 12.5% | - | - |
| 20 | I prefer my teacher to correct my work using direct feedback | 40% | 55% | - | 2.5% | 2.5% |
| 21 | I prefer my teacher to correct my work using indirect feedback | 7.5% | 17.5% | 20% | 45% | 10% |
| 22 | I prefer my teacher only to show where the error is in my written .text (Indirect feedback | 12% | 23% | 20% | 37.5% | 7.5% |
| 23 | I prefer my teacher to cross out or underline the error and write in the correct form (Direct feed-.back | 45.5% | 42% | 7.5% | 5% | - |
| 24 | I prefer my teacher to underline or circle the errors and provide .me with correction codes | 34.5% | 50.5% | 7% | 8% | - |
| 25 | I prefer my teacher to underline or circle the errors and provide .me with correction codes | 42% | 30.5% | 15.5% | 12% | |

The findings indicate that students highly value feedback on their written work, with 83% acknowledging its usefulness. However, reliance on teacher feedback varies, as 41% disagree that their teacher is the only trusted source. Most students (67.5%) believe writing multiple drafts is beneficial, emphasizing the importance of revision in their learning process. Regarding error correction, a significant majority (72.5%) prefer teachers to indicate errors, while 87.5% favor direct correction methods such as crossing out or underlining mistakes with the correct form. Additionally, students express a strong preference for structured feedback, with 77.5% favoring detailed and specific comments over general ones. Positive feedback is also preferred (77.5%), whereas negative feedback is largely rejected (only 15% agree with its use).

In terms of feedback style, students favor statements (72.5%), imperatives (65%), and suggestions (87.5%), while exclamatory comments are the least preferred, with 47.5% opposing their use. There is a clear preference for direct feedback (95%) over indirect methods, as only 25% support the latter. Similarly, students prefer corrective methods that involve underlining errors and providing correction codes (81%) rather than simply indicating mistakes without correction (35%). Overall, the findings highlight that students appreciate explicit, constructive, and solution-oriented feedback, reinforcing the importance of clear and positive teacher guidance in improving their writing skills.

Based on the interviews with the teachers, each has unique perspectives and practices regarding feedback on students' writing. The four educators share a strong belief in the importance of feedback in developing students' writing skills, though their approaches differ. One emphasizes criterion-based and direct feedback, providing detailed corrections and additional explanations to ensure clarity. Another focuses on creating a positive learning environment while using indirect feedback methods, such as symbols and abbreviations, to guide students. A more flexible approach combines direct and indirect feedback, encouraging independent exploration and utilizing peer editing to reinforce understanding. A structured approach balances form and content while adjusting feedback based on student needs and time constraints.

Feedback practices also vary, with some addressing all aspects of writing, others prioritizing grammar and vocabulary in advanced levels, promoting a mix of methods, or ensuring both grammatical accuracy and coherence.

Despite their different methods, all strive to ensure students understand and value feedback. One checks comprehension through discussions, another facilitates class-wide conversations, while peer editing allows students to review each other's work and find additional errors. Individual consultations and guided self-correction strategies further enhance understanding. To encourage students to value feedback, some reinforce learning from mistakes with positive reinforcement, while others gently remind students of past errors or motivate them with extra credit for identifying unmarked mistakes. Self-reflection strategies help students analyze their common errors. Ultimately, the goal is to create a supportive classroom environment that fosters student growth and improvement in writing.

6. Conclusion

The findings highlight a shared recognition of the importance of written corrective feedback (WCF) in improving writing skills among both teachers and students. However, a gap exists between students' strong preference for direct feedback and teachers' use of a mix of direct and indirect methods. While students favor detailed and specific comments on organization and language, teachers acknowledge the challenge of providing comprehensive feedback due to time constraints.

This study emphasizes the need for educators to adjust their feedback strategies to better match student preferences, enhancing WCF's effectiveness in developing writing skills. The findings also suggest that similar research in other educational settings could provide deeper insights into feedback dynamics in language learning. Ultimately, fostering a more responsive feedback approach could improve writing outcomes for MA students in Libya and beyond.

7. Recommendations

To enhance the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF), educators should align their feedback strategies with student preferences by

incorporating more direct feedback while maintaining a balance with indirect methods. Providing detailed and specific comments on both organization and language use can improve clarity and effectiveness. Given the time constraints teachers face, institutions should explore strategies such as peer editing, automated feedback tools, and structured rubrics to streamline feedback without reducing quality. Additionally, encouraging students to actively engage with feedback through revisions, discussions, and self-reflection can maximize its impact on writing improvement.

Professional development programs should be implemented to equip teachers with effective feedback techniques that balance directness, specificity, and efficiency. Further research on feedback practices across different educational settings can provide deeper insights into optimizing WCF for diverse learning environments. By fostering a more responsive and structured feedback approach, educators can improve students' writing proficiency and overall learning outcomes, benefiting both learners and language education programs.

■ References

- Ahmadi, D., Moinszadeh, A., & Dehghan, S. (2015). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' spelling improvement. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(3), 581-587. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0503.09>
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95-127.
- Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/54.2.153>
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Chen, S., Nassaji, H., & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from Mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1(5). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y>

- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, 155-177.
- Diab, R. L. (2005a). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23(1), 28-43.
- Ellis, R. (2005). Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review. Report to the Ministry of Education, New Zealand.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(99\)80110-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6)
- Ferris, D. (2002). Treatment of error in second language student writing. University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (2005). Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D., & 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128-141.
- Harmer, J. (2015). The practice of English language teaching (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hilton, D., & Hyder, S. (1992). Effective writing for the English classroom. Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444806003399>
- vKeh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294-304.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.
- Krashen, S. (1984). Writing: Research, theory, and applications. Pergamon Press.
- Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140-149.

- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22(2), 1-16.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218.
- Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11(2), 46-70.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129-158.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Tsao, J.-J., Tseng, W.-T., & Wang, C. (2017). The effects of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 36, 36-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2017.06.001>
- Vigil, N. A., & Oller, J. W. (1976). Rule fossilization: A tentative model. *Language Learning*, 26(2), 281-295.
- Yang, M. (2008). Teacher and student perceptions on students' self-assessment. *Assessing Writing*, 13(3), 174-190.