Iranian EFL High School Students' Perceptions Regarding Written Grammar Feedback

Mina Jodaie

Khosrowshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khosrowshah
jodaiemina@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper reports on a study that investigated Iranian EFL high school students' perceptions of written grammar feedback to specify their reasons for preferring comprehensive or selective feedback and choosing some feedback strategies. A questionnaire was administered to 100 EFL intermediate high school students who were selected based on their scores on a proficiency test. Moreover, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 of them. The results showed that the students had a strong desire for receiving written grammar feedback and favored direct feedback comprehensively on each draft. However, the correction of errors in word and verb categories was more important to them than that of other grammatical errors. They also had common evaluations of written corrective feedback strategies. The findings of this study have some implications for EFL writing instruction.

Keywords: Written corrective feedback, Comprehensive written grammar feedback, students' perceptions

Introduction

Recently, current research in second language acquisition has revitalized the role of grammar and explicit attention to particular linguistic forms in L2 communicative language classes. In fact, meaning - focused approaches alone have been found insufficient to enable learners to attain full communicative competence in target language (Ellis et al., 2008; Long, 1991). Therefore, great important has been attached to Focus on Form, i.e., the approach that induces a learner to attend to linguistic form while maintaining an overall emphasis on meaning within a communicative context (Long, 1991). This approach has led second language acquisition researchers to give more attention to corrective feedback in classes and to consider it as an attention - getting device (Yoshida, 2008). In this regard, Pica (2000) maintained that, "learners must selectively attend to the form of the input as well as its meaning. They must produce the L2 and be given feedback in order to modify their production toward greater comprehensibility, appropriateness, and accuracy" (p.7).

However, Truscott (1996) in his article "the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes" questioned the value of providing written grammar feedback and claimed that it was not only ineffective but also harmful. Truscott (1999, 2007) continued supporting his belief in the ineffectiveness of corrective feedback in writing classes. Such a claim has attracted criticism from some researchers and classroom practitioners (Chandler, 2004; Ferris, 1999, 2002, 2004) and generated a considerable number of studies on written corrective feedback. Truscott (1999) maintained that the students' preferences for and beliefs about grammar correction could not be major factors for writing teachers because these positive perceptions have been reinforced by teachers' instructional practices. Consequently, Truscott (1999) advised them to follow a ''correction-free teaching" (p.116) to change students' false beliefs in grammar correction.

While providing corrective feedback on students' written errors, teachers need to make a decision whether 1) to correct or not correct errors, (2) to identify or not identify error types, and (3) to locate errors directly or indirectly (Lee, 2003b). In other words, they have to make a choice between

direct or indirect feedback. Direct feedback occurs when teachers locate errors and provide the correct forms. Indirect feedback, on the other hand, occurs when teachers indicate in some way that an error exists but do not provide the correct linguistic form or structure. Lee (2003a) made a distinction between two types of indirect feedback: direct prompting of error location (i.e., direct location of errors) and indirect prompting of error location (i.e., indirect location of errors). Direct prompting of error location can be subdivided into indirect, coded feedback and indirect, uncoded feedback. For direct prompting of error location, teachers just locate errors by underlining or circling the errors, or they put correction codes right above or next to the errors underlined or circled to indicate error types. The latter is referred to as indirect, coded feedback as opposed to indirect, uncoded feedback where errors are underlined or circled only (Lee, 2003b). For indirect prompting of error location, teachers may put a correction code or a symbol like a question mark in the margin to indicate an error on the specific line.

As Ferris (1999) stated, it seems that no single form of grammar correction can work for second language learners of all levels. For example, direct feedback has the advantage of providing beginner students with explicit information about their errors. Indirect feedback can also be considered as a means to involve students in problem solving and encourage them to take responsibility for their own learning (Ashwell, 2000; Ferris, 2002). By actively engaging learners, this type of feedback promotes learner autonomy. Another fundamental question teachers are faced with is whether to mark all student errors. Some researchers (Ferris, 2002; Lee, 2003a, 2003b, 2008) have supported selective feedback (i.e., marking only some major patterns of error) since it makes students attend to their more serious problems in writing. Other researchers (e.g., Lalande, 1982) have argued that students need comprehensive feedback (i.e., marking all written errors) because they may be misled by selective feedback. Some researchers have substituted unfocused and focused feedback for comprehensive and selective feedback respectively (see Ellis et al., 2008). In the support of selective (focused) feedback, Ellis (2009) maintained that "processing corrections is likely to be more difficult in unfocused CF as the learner is required to attend to a variety of errors and thus is unlikely to be able to

reflect much on each error"(p.101). On the whole, selective feedback seems to be a much more viable option. Therefore, L2 teachers have been advised not to mark all errors (Ellis et al., 2008; Ferris, 2002; Lee, 2003a, 2003b).

Despite a growing body of experimental research, as Bitchener (2008) asserted, it is still too early to have a final answer to the question of whether corrective feedback is effective in writing classes. However, students' positive attitudes towards such feedback on their written work have been reported in some studies. For example, Radecki and Swales (1988) examined 59 ESL students' attitudes towards feedback in four ESL oriented classes and interviewed eight of them. They found that students wanted their teachers to provide direct feedback on all the surface-level errors. Similarly, Leki (1991) investigated preferences of 100 ESL college- level students for error correction in writing classes and found that they appreciated accuracy and expected all their errors to be corrected by their teacher. However, a majority of students wanted their teachers to locate errors and give them a correction code to show how to correct them (i.e., indirect, coded feedback).

Ferris and Roberts (2001) emphasized the importance of knowing more about students' perceptions of written corrective feedback and noted that students' attitudes, beliefs, and preferences have been neglected in many feedback studies. Therefore, Ferris and Roberts (2001) investigated 72 university students' preferences for grammar correction and reported that students wanted to get indirect, coded grammar feedback on their grammar errors. Hong (2003) investigated secondary students' preferences for direct and indirect feedback on students' writing. Hong found that most of the students favored direct feedback over indirect feedback since they could not self-correct all their errors. Similarly, Chandler (2003) asked 21 ESL students to fill out questionnaires comparing different feedback strategies and reported that students preferred direct feedback because it was the fastest and easiest way for them as well as the fastest way for teachers over several drafts. However, students felt that they learned more from self-correction (indirect feedback). Based on the results of this study, Chandler concluded that direct feedback was more useful that indirect feedback because it helped students internalize the correct forms better. Based on their surveys of students' attitudes towards feedback, Ferris and Roberts (2001) and Leki (1991) also found the same result.

Students' perceptions of learning processes could be important factors in their success or failure in learning a foreign language. Teachers cannot ignore what their students prefer and think about instructional methods. In the case of written corrective feedback, teachers are believed to have the responsibility for selecting the appropriate way of providing such feedback. They also need to be aware of their students' perceptions of writing and corrective feedback and consider their needs in deciding when and how to provide corrective feedback on their errors. As long as there is a gap in perception concerning the nature of corrective feedback between the teachers and students, the provision of such feedback might not be fully beneficial (Diab, 2006, Schulz, 1996).

With respect to the students' preferences for receiving teacher feedback, Ken (2004) found that students had the tendency to value corrective feedback on surface-level errors more than macro level or semantic errors. Interestingly, the results of this study showed that students did not pay much attention to written corrective feedback although it was important to them. Similarly, Lee (2008) investigated the reactions of school students to their teachers' feedback and found that students, irrespective of proficiency level, expected more direct feedback from teachers. However, in this study, Lee (2008) pointed to the paucity of research that includes high school students' perceptions of written corrective feedback and asserted that, "almost all of the feedback studies on student perceptions and preferences have been conducted in college/university settings" (p.145). Iranian EFL high school students' perceptions of teacher grammar feedback have also been left much uninvestigated. Iran is a context with poor L2 input. Iranian students' opportunity to use English and receive feedback seems to be limited to English classes they attend at schools and language institutes. Accordingly, it is necessary to conduct more studies in this area. The reason for focusing on EFL students at the intermediate level is that the language proficiency level of students influences their perceptions (Oladejo, 1993, Rahimi, 2010). Despite a large body of research on teachers' perceptions and their feedback practices, there has been given scant attention to students' preferences, beliefs, and attitudes (Diab, 2005; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Rahimi, 2010). Therefore, to contribute to the research into students' perceptions, this study intended to investigate Iranian EFL high school students' perceptions of written corrective feedback on grammatical errors.

Method

Participants

The private language institute in which the study was carried out is located in the east Azarbaijan province of Iran. In this institute, as students paid tuition, they were generally motivated. The selected students for this study were 100 (57 females and 43 males) EFL intermediate students. These students were studying "Interchange 2" (Richards et al., 2005) or "Interchange 3" (Richards et al., 2005) as the main course books in this institute. These books contain 16 units, four of which were to be covered in 20 sessions. The courses had a writing component although the focus was on developing conversation skills. By the time they answered the survey questions, they had already done about three or four writing tasks in that specific term. The teachers who taught the participant students were non-native speakers of English with a BA or an MA degree in TEFL.

Instrumentation

First, the participants' language proficiency level was measured using Preliminary English Test (PET, 2004). It included 65 questions in reading comprehension, writing expressions and listening comprehension. Second, a questionnaire, originally based on Halimi's survey of Indonesian students' preferences for the surface-level error correction (2008) was used. However, some modifications and revisions were done to make the instrument more comparable with the purposes of this study. For example, the error categories used in the questionnaire were adopted from Ferris and Roberts (2001).

A detailed description of these error categories comes below:

- Verb errors include errors in verb tense or form.
- Noun ending errors include the incorrect or unnecessary use of plural or possessive ending and/or omitting them.
- Article errors contain the incorrect and/or unnecessary use of articles or other determiners (some, any, etc.) and/or omitting them.
- Wrong word includes all types of lexical errors in word choice or form, including preposition and pronoun errors.
- Sentence structure errors refer to all errors related to sentence/clause boundaries, word order, omitting words or phrases from a sentence and/or insertion of unnecessary words or phrases.

The questions in Likert or multiple-choice formats were used to collect student perception data on:

- Grammatical accuracy in students' writing
- Types of grammatical errors that a teacher should correct
- When a teacher should correct grammatical errors
- Comprehensiveness of written corrective feedback
- How a teacher should correct grammatical errors
- Students' attention given to teachers' grammar corrections
- Types of written corrective feedback

The interview with students included three open-ended questions. The English version of the questions is as follows:

1- Do you want your teacher to correct all your grammatical errors or only some errors? Why?
2- Could you describe how you want your teacher to correct your grammatical errors? Why?
3- What do you think about other feedback strategies?

Procedure

The procedures of data collection went through four stages. At the first stage, two professors of English Language Teaching were requested to go through the questions on the questionnaire and the interview guide and provide feedback. Then, the questionnaire was translated into Persian and was pilot-tested with 14 students comparable to the participants of the study. Based on the students' feedback during the pilot study, revisions were again made to some questions. Then, based on the results of their performance in Preliminary English test (PET, 2004), 100 EFL high school students were selected. The third stage of data collection lasted for two weeks. It was agreed that each class which the participant students attended finish about 35 minutes early and only the participant students were requested to stay. In each class, the students were first asked for their ideas about the concept of written corrective feedback on grammatical errors. Five grammatical errors used in the questionnaires were also explained. After this brainstorming stage, when the students had the opportunity to contribute their own ideas, with the help of their students' teachers, the questionnaire was administered

to them. In doing so, under the authority of the teachers, the students answered the survey questions seriously.

At the top of each questionnaire, there were instructions in Persian, which gave the participants enough information as how to answer the questions. Moreover, the description of the grammatical errors used in the questionnaire was printed on a separate sheet of paper so that the participants could easily refer to whenever needed. The students were given enough time to answer the questions but none took more than 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Individual semi-structured interviews with ten students who had already completed the questionnaires were conducted in their classes at the language institute. To create a friendly atmosphere for the students to express and share their views, the interviews were held in Persian.

Results

As indicated above, the students' perceptions of written corrective feedback on grammatical errors were explored through seven categories of analysis. For the questions in the questionnaire, percentages were determined. The interview data that provided rich and interesting information were analyzed qualitatively. To ensure that students stay anonymous, the respondents received an alphabet letter. The results are provided below:

a. Grammatical accuracy in students' writing

The participants were requested to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with grammatical accuracy in their writing. As illustrated in Table 1, 98% of the students thought that there should be as few grammatical errors as possible in compositions, and this was important to them.

Table 1
Perceptions of Grammatical Accuracy in Students' Writing

Grammatical accuracy	Students Percent
Strongly agree/agree	98%
Neither agree nor disagree	2%
Strongly disagree/ disagree	0%
Total	100%

b. Types of grammatical errors that a teacher should correct

The data presented in Table 2 reveal that most of students agreed about the types of grammatical errors that should be corrected. Priority of the students' preferences for grammatical errors was observed in the word choice, followed by sentence structure, verb category, noun endings, and articles, respectively.

Table 2
Perceptions of Types of Grammatical errors that a Teacher Should Correct

	Grammatical errors				
	Verb errors	Noun ending errors	Article errors	Wrong word	Sentence errors
Responses	S	S	S	S	S
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Strongly agree / agree	94%	76%	78%	95%	88%
Neither agree nor disagree	6% (6)	10%	13%	5%	10%
Strongly disagree/ disagree	0%	14%	9%	0%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Note: S: Students, %: Percent

c. When a teacher should correct grammatical errors

Table 3 presents the students' perceptions of when grammatical errors should be corrected. The results indicate that a majority of students (72 %) expected their teachers to provide written corrective feedback on every draft. Moreover, 18% preferred to receive grammar feedback on the first draft, 7% preferred to receive it on the second draft, and 3% preferred to receive it on every draft.

Table 3
Perceptions of When a Teacher Should Correct Grammatical Errors

Drafts	Students Percent
On the first draft	18%
On the second draft	7%
On the final draft	3%
On every draft	72%
On other drafts	0%
Total	100%

d. Comprehensiveness of written corrective feedback

Table 4 presents the students' perceptions of the comprehensiveness of written corrective feedback. The results indicate that most of the students (86%) favored comprehensive feedback (i.e., addressing all grammatical errors). Only a small number of them (14%) preferred selective feedback (i.e., addressing only a few significant grammatical errors).

Table 4
Perceptions of Comprehensiveness of Written Corrective Feedback

Comprehensiveness	Students percent
Comprehensive feedback	86%
Selective feedback	14%
No grammar feedback	0%
Total	100%

In the interview, the students stated interesting reasons for preferring comprehensive feedback over selective feedback. Some examples of their comments were as follows:

"To my mind, grammatical accuracy is very important part of a composition. While writing a composition, although I try to write sentences correctly, I make some errors like incorrect use of present perfect tense and definite article. To help me not o make such errors again, the teacher should remind me about all of them" (STUDENT A).

The following two quotations show that the students' preferences for comprehensive feedback have been influenced by their teachers' feedback practices.

"I think it is a part of the teachers' responsibility to mark all errors and remind us. They always mark all errors in the compositions" (STUDENT C).

"In general, we write to practice language structures, so all grammatical errors need to be marked. My teacher's main focus is on how correctly we use language structures, so if there are any errors in my composition, the teacher should mark all of them so that I try not to make them again" (STUDENT D).

The students who favored selective feedback also stated some interesting points. Some examples of their comments were reported as follows:

"Even the teachers mark all my grammatical errors; I do not attend to all of them carefully. Each time, I only pay attention to some serious errors" (STUDENT B).

"I do not like to get back my compositions full of marked errors and comments. This causes me to lose my self - confidence" (STUDENT H).

"My teacher does not need to mark all errors because some errors like noun ending ones can be found if I myself pay attention to my compositions carefully" (STUDENT I).

e. How a teacher should correct grammatical errors

Table 5 displays the students' perceptions of how grammatical errors should be corrected. The results indicate that direct feedback (i.e., underlining/circling and correcting errors) was the most preferred approach by a majority of students (80%). Moreover, 6% of students favored only indirect, uncoded feedback (i.e., underlining/circling errors without coding them), 14% preferred indirect, coded feedback (i.e., underlining/circling and coding errors), and no single student chose a combined feedback strategy. None of the students stated that they preferred other ways of correcting grammatical errors.

Table 5
Perceptions of How a Teacher Should Correct Grammatical Errors

Feedback strategies	Students Percent
Direct feedback	80%
Indirect,uncoded feedback	6%
Indirect, coded feedback	14%
Indirect prompting of error location by marks (e.g., a cross)	0%
Indirect prompting of error location by correction codes	0%
Combined (a direct-indirect, uncoded feedback	0%
Other (direct feedback + oral feedback in class on common errors)	0%
Total	100%

In the interview, the students, who had preferences for receiving direct feedback, stated some reasons. On the whole, it seems that these students tend to leave power to their teachers and to be told what to do.

"When we see the correct works or structures next to the errors, we can easily remember them" (STUDENT C).

"Sometimes, I cannot be sure about the correct words or structures of my errors such as vocabulary errors, so it is better that the teacher takes the responsibility for correcting errors" (STUDENT A).

"*Working out the correct words or structures is time – consuming, so the teacher should write them next to the errors"* (STUDENT K).

"It is the easiest way to see what is incorrect and what its correct word or structure is. You do not need to spend time working out the correct structures of difficult errors" (STUDENT E).

Interestingly, two students' reasons for choosing indirect, coded feedback reveal that they want to take some responsibility for their learning.

"*Instead of reading passively the teacher's corrections, we need to think about the types of errors we have made and work out the correct words or structures. This helps us learn language structures deeply"* (STUDENT G).

"I think if the teacher write correction codes above the errors, I can self correct my errors. Accordingly, I can improve my linguistic knowledge" (STUDENT F).

The students who preferred indirect, uncoded feedback provided some reasons. For example, one stated that *"Although it is time - consuming, if I myself work out the correct words or structures, I will remember them easily"* (STUDENT H).

Interestingly, another student gave a rather convincing response and said that *"To work out the correct words or structures, I need to use my grammar book and dictionary. It will take some time, but in addition to correct forms of errors, I will learn other important points"* (STUDENT I).

Therefore, this student seems to know that there are other ways to deal with the written corrective feedback that he does not understand, and that he is responsible for his own learning to a certain extent. All of the students interviewed had negative attitudes towards indirect prompting of error location by marks (e.g., a cross) or correction codes and stated that this method is confusing. However, one student interestingly sated that *"I think putting correction codes or other symbols in the margin to indicate my errors can confuse me. I do not like my teacher uses this way, but if he wants, instead of symbols like question mark I hope he uses the codes. Otherwise, without knowing the type of error, I have to search all the line or sentence to find it. That would be very difficult"* (STUDENT I).

f. Students' attention given to teachers' grammar corrections

Table 6 displays the percent of students' attention given to teachers' grammar corrections. The results indicate that 23% of students maintained that they read all grammar corrections carefully. A majority of students (60%) felt that they looked at some grammar corrections more carefully than at others, whereas 13% of them thought that they mainly paid attention to direct corrections. A much smaller percent of the students (4%) also believed that they mainly paid attention to corrections showing directly where the errors were (i.e., direct prompting of grammatical error location).

Table 6
Students' Attention Given to Teachers' Grammar Corrections

Teachers' grammar corrections	Students Percent
All grammar corrections	23%
Some grammar corrections	60%
Direct grammar corrections	13%
Direct prompting of grammatical error location	4%
Indirect prompting of grammatical error location	0%
Other	0%
Total	100%

g. Types of written corrective feedback

Table 7 displays the teachers and students' perceptions of types of written corrective feedback.

Table 7
Perceptions of Types of Written Corrective Feedback

	Types of written corrective feedback				
	Direct feedback	Indirzect, uncoded feedback	Indirect, coded feedback	Indirect prompting of error location by marks (e.g., a cross)	Indirect prompting of error location by correction codes
Responses	S (%)	S (%)	S (%)	S (%)	S (%)
Very good/ good	91%	14%	77%	5%	14%
Neither good nor bad	2%	11%	11%	10%	5%
Very bad/bad	7%	75%	12%	85%	81%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Note: S: Students, %: Percent

The results reveal that direct feedback (i.e., underlining/circling and correcting errors) and indirect, coded feedback (i.e., underlining/circling and coding errors) received positive evaluations from most of the students (91% and 77% respectively). A majority of students (75%) also provided a negative evaluation of indirect, uncoded feedback strategy. Moreover, indirect prompting of error location by marks (e.g., a cross) and correction codes received a negative evaluation from most of the students (85% and 81% respectively).

Discussion

The present study set out to explore Iranian EFL intermediate students' perceptions of written grammatical errors to specify their reasons for preferring comprehensive or selective feedback and choosing some feedback strategies. The results revealed that most of the students approved having as few grammatical errors as possible in their writing. This finding is akin to those in Diab (2006), Halimi (2008), and Deng (2010). Moreover, they agreed on the types of grammatical errors that should be corrected and looked at some grammar corrections more carefully than at others. That is, the correction of errors in word and verb categories was more important to them than that of other grammatical errors. This result partially confirms those of Ferris and Roberts (2001). Their study showed that one of the most problematic grammatical elements in writing for those L2 student-writers who had limited prior exposure to English outside the language classroom belonged to word choice categories. In Rahimi's (2010) study, L2 students also showed highest preferences for receiving feedback on this error type. English verb tenses and aspects also appear to be difficult for the Iranian learners of English. Rahimi (2009) found that verb errors can be considered difficult to be self-corrected, at least for the Iranian learners of English unlike what Ferris and Roberts (2001) claimed.

Most of the students in the present study were also found to prefer direct feedback as the only best technique and agree on comprehensive feedback on each draft. Similarly, Deng (2010) reported the students' strong desire for receiving direct feedback on grammatical errors. Moreover, the students' preferences for comprehensive feedback in this study confirm those obtained by Deng (2010), Lee (2005, 2008), and Leki (1991).

Among its major findings, this study also revealed that the students had positive attitudes towards direct feedback and indirect, coded feedback and negative attitudes towards indirect prompting of error location and indirect, uncoded feedback. These results confirm those of Lee (2008). In his study, most of the high school students opted for the combination of direct feedback and indirect, coded feedback and expected their teachers not to locate errors indirectly (i.e., indirect prompting of error location).

Taken together, the results of the study suggested that the participants had a positive attitude towards teacher written feedback on their grammatical errors. In this respect, these findings are consistent with those of studies that have investigated EFL/ESL students' attitude towards grammar feedback (Deng, 2010; Ferris & Robert, 2001; Hamouda, 2011). Although, in this study, the teachers' feedback practices seem to be an important factor, Schulz (1996) provided the following three other explanations for strong attitudes that students have towards grammar and corrective feedback:

▪ Student perceptions may be based largely on a myth regarding the usefulness of grammar study.
▪ Student perceptions may be strongly shaped by grammar - based curriculum and discrete - point testing methods, which cause them to think that they need to focus on forms to learn a language.
▪ Student perceptions may be based largely on personal experiences that have caused them to think that their learning is improved by rule awareness and corrective feedback.

Because of the small sample size, no generalization can be drawn based on the results. Despite this drawback, it can be argued that the findings of this study provide useful information that may contribute to our understanding of students' perceptions of classroom corrective feedback. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers devote some time to listen to students' ideas about corrective feedback. In doing so, the types of feedback strategies preferred by the students, the kinds of errors they like to be corrected, and the effectiveness of teachers' actual feedback strategies could be determined.

As mentioned above, researchers (Leki, 1991; Lee, 2008; Saito, 1994, Schulz, 1996) have also asserted that there needs to be an agreement

between teachers and students because differences between their perceptions may obviously hamper the effectiveness of corrective feedback. However, due to the limited knowledge or experience, some students may have unrealistic perceptions regarding writing and corrective feedback (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990). For example, although most of the students in this study expected their teachers to provide direct feedback on their grammatical errors comprehensively, provision of more indirect feedback has been found to be useful in some previous studies (Ferris &Roberts, 2001; Makino, 1993). Consequently, in addition to investigating students' perceptions and views, they should help students modify their unrealistic expectations and perceptions about written corrective feedback.

References

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.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 102–118.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267-296.

Chandler, J. (2004). A response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 13*, 345-348.

Cohen, A., and Cavalcanti, M. (1990).Feedback on written compositions: Teachers and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, (pp.155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deng, K. (2010). *Rethinking error feedback on L2 writing*. Retrieved December 5, 2011 from http://www.jalt-publications.org/proceedings/2009/.

Diab, R. (2005). EFL university students' preferences for error correction. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *44*, 53-55.

Diab, R. L. (2006). "Error correction and feedback in the EFL writing classroom: Comparing instructor and student preferences". *English Teaching Forum, 44 (1)*, 2-13

Ellis, R., (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 67- 107.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in English as a foreign language context. *System, 36,* 353–371.

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. (2002).*Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan press.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The grammar correction debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*, 49-62.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161–184.

Halimi, S. S. (2008). Indonesian teachers' and students' preferences for error correction. *Wacana, 10*(1), 50-71.

Hamouda, A. (2011). 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.

Hong, P. C. (2003). *Investigating teachers' and secondary students' preferences towards direct or indirect feedback on students' writing: Which way is more helpful*. Retrieved December 5 2011 from http://www2.ied.edu.hk.

Ken, C. K. (2004). An investigation into students' preferences for and responses to teacher feedback and its implications for writing teachers. *Hong Kong Teachers' Centre Journal, 3,* 98 - 115.

Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal 66.2*, 140–149

Lee, I. (2003a). How do Hong Kong English teachers correct errors in writing? *Education Journal, 31* (1)153-169.

Lee, I. (2003b). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing, 8*, 216 - 237.

Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 144-164.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*(3), 203 - 218.

Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. De Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39–52). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Makino, T. (1993). Learner self- correction in EFL written compositions. *ELT Journal , 47*(4), 337-341.

Oladejo, A. J. (1993). Error correction in FSL: Learners' preferences. *TESL Canada Journal ,10* (2), 71-89.

Pica, T. (2000). Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. System, *28*, 1–18.

Radecki, P. M., & Swales, J. M. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System, 16* (3), 355–65.

Rahimi, M. (2010). Iranian EFL students' perceptions and preferences for teachers' written feedback: Do students' ideas reflect teachers' practice? *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *2*(2), 75-98.

Richards, J. C., Hull, J. & Proctor, S. (2005). *Interchange Student's Book 2*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., Hull, J. & Proctor, S. (2005). *Interchange Student's Book 3*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Satio, H. (1994). Teachers' and students' preferences for feedback on second language acquisition: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal, 11* (2), 46 - 68.

Schulz, R. A. (1996). "Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar". *Foreign Language Annals, 29*(3), 343-364.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 103-110.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8,* 111-122.

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

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78 - 93.

Appendix

Student Questionnaire

What are your perceptions of written corrective feedback on grammatical errors?

Part I.

Directions: Please show your opinion about each statement by circling one of the numbers from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). There are no right or wrong answers. I am simply interested in your opinions.

Questions	Strongly agree	agree	Neither agree nor disagree	disagree	Strongly agree
1. It is important to me that I have as few grammatical errors as possible in my compositions.	1	2	3	4	5
2. It is important to me that my teacher points out :					
a. verb errors in my compositions.	1	2	3	4	5
b. noun ending errors in my compositions.	1	2	3	4	5
c. article errors in my compositions.	1	2	3	4	5
d. word choice errors in my compositions.					
e. sentence structure errors in my compositions.	1	2	3	4	5

Part II.

Directions: Please answer the following questions. There are no right or wrong answers. I am interested in your opinions.

3. If your teacher requires you to revise your compositions, when do you expect him/ her to provide feedback on your grammatical errors? (Please circle only ONE answer.)

a. On the first draft

b. On the second draft

c. On the final draft

d. On every draft

e. On other drafts (Please specify)

4. To what extent do you want your teacher to provide corrective feedback on your written grammatical errors? (Please circle only ONE answer.)

a. He/ she addresses all grammatical errors that I make.

b. He/ she addresses only a few significant grammatical errors.

c. He/she does not provide any corrective feedback on grammatical errors.

5. How do you want your teacher to provide corrective feedback on your written grammatical errors? (You can circle more than one answer.)

a. By underling/circling what is incorrect and writing the correct word or structure, e.g., has ate ^{eaten}

b. By only underling/circling it, e.g., has ate

c. By showing where the error is and identifying the error type by a correction code, e.g., has ate $^{V\,Form}$

d. By indicating that there is an error on a specific line by for example putting a cross (×) in the margin

I buy a cookbook for my mother last year.	×

e. By indicating that there is an error on a specific line by putting a correction code in the margin, e.g., by writing 'V Tense' in the margin, the teacher shows me that there is a verb tense error on a specific line

I buy a cookbook for my mother last year.	V Tense

f. Other (Please specify).

6. In general, how carefully do you think you look at the teacher's grammar corrections in your compositions? (Please circle only <u>ONE</u> answer.)

a. I read every correction carefully.

b. I look at some corrections more carefully than at others.

c. I mainly pay attention to direct corrections given by the teacher (e.g., has <u>ate</u> ^{eaten}).

e. I mainly pay attention to corrections showing directly where the errors are (e.g., has <u>ate</u> or has <u>ate</u> ^{V Form}).

d. I mainly pay attention to corrections showing indirectly where the errors are (e.g., a cross (×) or a correction code in the margin).

f. Other (Please specify)

Part III.

Directions: The following sentence has been corrected in various ways by different teachers. Look over the different possible corrections and rate each one. If you think, it is a very good way to provide corrective feedback on a grammatical error, circle 1. If you think it is a very bad way to provide corrective feedback on a grammatical error, circle 5. If you think it is somewhere in between, circle the number between 1 and 5 that best represents your opinion.

	Very good	Good	Neither good nor bad	Bad	Very bad
have been 9. Since I arrived this city, I <u>am</u> very lonely.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Since I arrived this city, I <u>am</u> very lonely.	1	2	3	4	5
V Tense 11. Since I arrived this city, I <u>am</u> very lonely.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Since I arrived this city, I am very lonely.	1 ✕	2	3	4	5
13. Since I arrived this city, I am very lonely. V Tense	1	2	3	4	5

Description of the grammatical errors that have been used in this questionnaire comes below:

Grammatical errors	Meaning	Examples
Verb errors	Errors in verb tense or form	- I <u>meet</u> her last week. - We have not <u>complete</u> the project yet.
Noun ending errors	Noun ending (plural or possessive) missing or wrong	- These book ø are mine. - My father ø car is new.
Article errors	Article (a, an, the) or other determiner (some, any, much,...) missing or wrong	- There are <u>much</u> books on the table - I live in <u>the</u> Tabriz.
Wrong word	All types of lexical errors in word choice or form, including preposition and pronoun errors	-My mother <u>learned</u> me how to ride a car bike. - I was very interested <u>at</u> history.
Sentence structure errors	Errors related to sentence/clause boundaries	- My father took the <u>bus. Because</u> the bank was not near.
	Wrong word order	- What <u>you are</u> doing?
	Omitting words or phrases from a sentence	- I know ø he is. He is at the park.
	Insertion of unnecessary words or phrases	- The woman whom I saw <u>her</u> was my teacher.

Biodata

Mina Jodaie holds an M.A in TEFL from Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch. She has been teaching at different universities as well as language institutes. Her research interests include EFL teachers' and students' perceptions of different feedback types, learning strategies, and affective factors.