The Impact of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Accuracy, Fluency and Complexity

Victoria Sayad Deghatkar
Department of English Language
Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University
Tonekabon, Iran
Email: victoriadeghatkar@yahoo.com

Mohammad Reza Khodareza[*]
Department of English Language
Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University
Tonekabon, Iran
Email: m.khodareza@toniau.ac.ir

Valeh Valipour
Department of English Language
Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University
Tonekabon, Iran
Email: v_valipor@toniau.ac.ir

Abstract. The current study intended to assess the impact of dynamic written corrective feedback (WCF) on helping Iranian EFL learners to write better narrative essays in English. In fact, this study investigated the impact of dynamic (WCF) on writing abilities such as accuracy, fluency and complexity with respect to conditional sentences as the newly learned grammatical instruction. The participants were fifty-four EFL learners from intermediate level from two classes in English language department of Academic Centre for Education, Culture, and Research (ACECR)-Guilan Branch. They were allocated to two treatment groups, first an experimental group that received dynamic (WCF), and second a control group that were taught based on traditional writing

approach. The treatment time was eight forty-minute sessions for both groups. The subjects were tested before treatment, and after the treatment. In order to answer the research question, independent t-tests were run and it proved that dynamic (WCF) affected students' performance on writing accuracy, fluency and complexity with regard to conditionals more. In addition, data from eight face-to-face interviews with EFL teachers at Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research (ACECR), experienced in teaching at different language proficiency levels have been analyzed and compared in an effort to discover the type of corrective feedback EFL teachers believe help learners in developing various writing skills. Participants from this study supported the incorporation of a combination of direct and indirect written corrective feedback methods recently known as dynamic WCF when assessing foreign language writers.

Keywords: Accuracy, complexity, dynamic written corrective feedback, fluency

1. Introduction

Of all the language skills, writing is the most difficult challenge for English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers, as the learners have less experience with written expressions. Stimulated by audio-visual materials throughout their lives, EFL learners are novices in the discipline of writing. In fact, in this case, it is a more challenging task to create a piece of English writing without error. The most common challenges EFL learners face are learning the language without a goal, boredom because of traditional learning methods, feelings of embarrassment, and lack of interaction with native speakers. There are a large number of studies in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Error Analysis (EA) that reveal that EFL students' written work contains several types of errors (Huang, 2006; Rattanadilok Na Phuket and Othman, 2015; Sermsook et al., 2017; Zafar, 2016; Zheng and Park, 2013). Among those errors, grammatical ones can cause questionable difficulties for EFL students since the grammatical rules of English and those of their native language are relatively diverse (Nonkukhetkong, 2013). These grammatical errors reduce a learner's writing performance and can lead to writing misunderstandings. A large number of researchers accept the effective role of corrective feedback (CF) as well as different types of written corrective

feedback (WCF) in the use of language features. As EFL learners assimilate the parallel use of English grammar with similarities to their native language, language educators aim to equip students with the appropriate vocabulary, grammar, and procedural instructions to current and future writing tasks. Because of the constant application of educational technology as an effective writing tool, academic writing has not advanced in competency and fluency, as Chen et al. (2017) mentioned. This trend has attracted the attention of researchers as they have studied the causes of weakness in the field of writing skill. Ferris, Brown, Liu, Eugenia, and Stine (2011) noted that there is an increasing number of EFL students enrolled in academic writing courses. According to Lo et al. (2009) writing is an essential skill for professional and personal use, which can be developed for usual or academic purposes.

In terms of the importance of writing accuracy, fluency, and complexity in language learning, this quasi-experimental research may be a step forward in examining the effect of dynamic (WCF) on improving the performance of Iranian EFL learners in writing accuracy, fluency, and complexity with respect to conditional statements as the newly learned grammatical instruction in their narrative writing task. In addition, data from face-to-face interviews with EFL teachers have been analysed and compared in an effort to discover the type of corrective feedback EFL teachers believe can help learners in developing various writing skills.

1.1 Dynamic written corrective feedback as the new writing strategy

Recently some studies have tried to investigate the effectiveness of different types of WCF especially in Iranian context (Jalali & Abedi, 2011; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2011; Hashemzade & Mohammadnejad, 2012; Farrokhi & Chehrazad, 2012). Most of the time, students studying in a language institute in Iran or in universities are asked to write paragraphs depending on the requirement of the course as home assignments, since in general Iranian EFL students are taught with traditional writing approaches. In fact, the assignments are graded holistically in red marks that can be highly disappointing, but what is certain the teacher focuses a lot on grammar. Actually, grammatical errors play a significant role in

the grades obtained by the students. It means that writing teachers are more subjective. In an effort to provide EFL teachers with guidance and assistance on the best methods for teaching foreign language writing, several studies over the past decades have examined the effects of error correction or written corrective feedback and its subsequent effects on the field of language learning. For example, some researchers, such as Trascott (2007), see the WCF as a "clear and dramatic failure." Ferris (1999) disputed this claim, insisting 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 were well defined and constant, it would work. Nevertheless, a growing body of evidence suggests that WCF can improve writing accuracy in limited contexts. Sheen (2007) examined the impact of written corrections on intermediate ESL learners' use of English 'articles' in narratives and compared direct CF alone and direct CF in combination with metalinguistic CF. Overall, the results of this study showed that direct CF in combination with metalinguistic CF was more effective than direct CF. Bichner (2008) examined and compared three types of direct corrective feedback: an integration of direct feedback and written and oral metalinguistic explanation; direct feedback and written metalinguistic explanation; and direct feedback only. Students who received corrective feedback immediately after the test were considered to perform better than students in the control group who received no corrective response using referential definition "the" and indefinite referential "a". The results of this study revealed the positive effects of corrective written feedback on specific linguistic features of students' writing. Ellis et al., (2008) investigated and compared the impacts of focused and unfocused WCF on the accuracy of students in Japan who used the English indefinite and definite articles to denote anaphoric reference in written narratives. The unfocused group received correction of 'article' errors alongside corrections of other errors while the focused group received correction of just 'article' errors on three written narratives. The CF was similarly efficient for the focused and unfocused groups. This study found that written CF is efficient, at least where English 'articles' are concerned, and thus strengthens the argument for teachers providing written CF.

Considering all these investigations, it is believed that there is a need for a new writing instruction and feedback strategy to be used for Iranian EFL learners to help them improve their grammatical accuracy in writing. It seems that both teachers and learners would benefit from an approach that would focus on shorter writings, fewer corrections along with more frequent feedback. Hartshorn (2008) used such an approach to writing pedagogy and it was shown some promise in helping students improve their grammatical accuracy in writing. Therefore, dynamic WCF has been chosen to examine if they may leave any significant effect on grammatical improvement. Following that, this research tries to figure out the type of feedback that would best suit Iranian learners for fulfilling their needs for better writing from EFL teachers' perspectives.

1.2 Research questions
The following research questions will be investigated in this study:

Q (1): Will the dynamic WCF produce greater linguistic accuracy, fluency and complexity in EFL learners' use of "conditional sentences" when compared to the traditional instructional method?

Q (2): Which method(s) of written corrective feedback do teachers believe strengthens foreign language writing tasks?

Accordingly, the following null hypothesis was formulated:

H0 (1): Dynamic WCF will not produce greater linguistic accuracy, fluency and complexity in EFL learners' use of "conditional sentences" when compared to the traditional instructional method.

2. Methodology

2.1 Participants
The student participants in the quantitative section of this study were fifty-four Iranian EFL learners in English language department of Academic Centre for Education, Culture and Research (ACECR)-Guilan Branch. Their ages range between twenty four to twenty nine years. The participants were divided randomly into two classes. Therefore, the researcher used one class as experimental and the other class as control group. The experimental group was made up of 30 students and

the control group included 24 students. The researcher also conducted eight face-to-face interviews with EFL teachers in English language department of Academic Centre for Education, Culture and Research, (ACECR)-Guilan Branch. All eight interviews were audio recorded and stored. The interviewees were full-time teachers teaching different levels of language proficiency; including three teachers teaching elementary level learners (all females), three teachers teaching intermediate level learners (one male and two females), and two teachers teaching advanced level learners (one male and one female).

2.2 Instrumentations

2.2.1 Proficiency tests
In order to determine the learners' level of general English language proficiency and ensure the homogeneity of the participants, a sample of the Nelson English Language Test (section 200 A), adapted from Fowler and Coe (1976) was used. The other instrument utilized in the present study was the multiple choice grammar test administered to the students in both control and experimental groups to make sure that subjects were not familiar with 'conditional' statements.

2.2.2 Target structure
Conditionals were chosen as the target structure due to their syntactic and semantic complexities for EFL learners, as stated by Chou (2000). The existence of two clauses (main clauses and subordinate clauses) contributes to the syntactic complexity especially for EFL learners (Lord, 2002). Mindt (1996) also asserted that the learning/acquisition of conditional sentences for EFL learners both in their first and second language is problematic. In sum, conditionals are the hardest to grasp for EFL learners because they encompass almost all English verb tenses and require learners to use any of them spontaneously at any given time and in any given context.

2.2.3 Writing tests
To ensure the reliability and validity of writing tests, two samples of TOEFL independent essays were administered at the beginning and the end of the study to find out whether the students have improved

the quality of their narrative writing with regard to the newly learned grammatical structure (conditionals) from the pre- to post-test or not. In the writing tasks, the students had been given obligatory occasions to generate conditional statements.

2.2.4 Face-to-Face interview

The interview consisted of eight questions. Q1-Q4 focused on teachers' beliefs about suggesting corrective feedback and Q5-Q8 were about how teachers apply corrective feedback and how that corrective feedback affects students' future writing tasks. The questionnaire became a model after Spradley's (1979) guidelines, used to emerge information by asking a various range of question types.

2.3 Data collection procedure

This study was mixed in terms of the nature of the data and was organized into two parts: quantitative and qualitative. In fact, this study is a quasi-experimental pre-test post-test control type in which we investigated the cause-effect relationship between adapting the dynamic (WCF) and EFL learners' writing performance. Two groups at intermediate level of language proficiency were pre-tested using a narrative essay topic given obligatory occasions to generate conditionals. Then, the experimental group was taught conditionals receiving dynamic WCF, while the control group worked with product centred approach or traditional way of learning and practicing writing skill. After eight weeks, the two groups wrote on the writing post-test, which was the same test as the pre-test. In fact, this study involves an exploratory design with quantitative data collection and analysis in which the impacts of the two independent variables, dynamic (WCF) and traditional writing approach, on the writing scores (dependent variable) were measured. In this experimental study, the control variable was the students' intermediate language proficiency level. For quantitative data, the scores from the experimental and control groups (dependent variable) were used to find out whether the students improved their narrative writing with regard to the newly learned grammatical structure (conditionals). After the data collection, and scoring we used an independent t-test in order to determine if the means of two groups were significantly different from

one another.

Also, data from eight face-to-face interviews with EFL teachers at Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research (ACECR)-Guilan Branch experienced in teaching at different language proficiency levels had been analyzed and compared in an effort to discover the type of feedback EFL teachers believe help learners in developing various writing skills. Therefore, the research adopted a mixed-methods research approach with concurrent design where both quantitative (quasi-experiment) and qualitative (face-to-face interview) data were collected concurrently.

3. Results

To make sure that the learners' scores in writing pre-test and post-test were reliable estimates of their ability and to explore the consistency of the scores, the inter-rater reliability of the scores was assessed through Spearman-Brown through SPSS (.64 for pre-test; .69 for post-test). The learners' writing accuracy scores were measured using two different kinds of measures: holistic scoring and the percentage of correct usage of target structure. In accordance with Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998) in order to assess writing fluency, the total number of structural units written in 20 minutes was measured and in order to measure complexity, the total number of dependent clauses written in 20 minutes per total clauses was calculated. Group means and standard deviations were then calculated for each group on pre-test and post-test occasions. Tests of statistical significance were carried out by means of independent t-test.

Information from teachers' interviews were analysed qualitatively. The eight questions planned by the researcher focused on seeking information about the sort of feedback EFL teachers believe aids foreign language learners. Q1-4 (Appendix B) were used to gain background information with respect to how teachers plan the stage to motivate EFL students to express themselves in writing tasks; Q1-8 (Appendix B) focused on answering research question 2. The analysis was solely based on data recorded in the transcripts and clarification responses that were returned. In analyzing data, the researcher examined each question individually. Teacher's answers were tallied to discover significant, recurring

terms. Repeated words or phrases across these levels directed attention towards a theme, which was subsequently analysed and compared. In Q8, data were tallied in Table 14 regarding teacher responses to which type of feedback they believe results in the greatest amount of learning. Tables were not deemed necessary for the other questions.

Initially, to make sure participants were homogenized, a sample of the Nelson English Language Test was administered. The results of descriptive statistics were given in table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics: Nelson English Language Test

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental	30	33.60	34.00	33.6553	.13763
Control	24	31.50	33.59	33.279	.65898

The first research question investigated the effect of dynamic (WCF) on writing accuracy, fluency and complexity with regard to conditionals as the newly learned instruction. A t-test was conducted for experimental and control groups before the treatment to compare the means of two groups. As illustrated in Table 2, the mean scores of pre-tests in the experimental and control groups were 11.90 and 11.81 respectively. The Standard Deviations of the experiment group was 0.73 and that of control group was 0.84. As Table 3 demonstrates, there is not any significant difference in the mean scores of experimental and control groups since the t-test analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference ($t=0.40$).

Table 2: Group statistics
Pre-writing accuracy t-test for experimental and control groups

Group Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	30	11.9000	.73578	.13434
Control	24	11.8125	.84458	.17240
Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)				

Table 3: Independent samples test

	Independent Samples Test								
	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
Equal variances assumed	.584	.448	.407	52	.686	.08750	.21519	-.34431	.51931
Equal variances not assumed			.400	45.969	.691	.08750	.21856	-.35244	.52744
* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)									

As obvious from Table 4 for the post-test in writing accuracy with re-gard to conditionals as the newly learned grammatical instruction, the performance of the two groups differed widely. As the experimental Group's mean (18.10) is higher than the control group's mean (13.77). It can be claimed that the participants in the experimental group had a better performance than the participants in the control Group as the t-test on the post-test (20.92) showed.

Table 4: Group

Post-writing accuracy t-test for experimental and control groups

	Group Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ntal	30	18.1000	.51528	.09408
	24	13.7708	.97779	.19959
nt at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)				

Table 5: Independent samples test

	Independent Samples Test								
	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
Equal variances assumed	7.478	.001	20.921	52	.000	4.32917	.20693	3.91392	4.74441
Equal variances not assumed			19.620	33.061.	.000	4.42500	.22065	3.88028	4.77805
* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)									

The first research question also investigated the effect of dynamic (WCF) on writing fluency with regard to conditionals as the newly learned instruction. A t-test was conducted for experimental and control groups before the treatment to compare the means of two groups. As illustrated in Table 6, the mean scores of pre-tests in the experimental and control groups were 11.88 and 11.77 respectively. The Standard Deviations of the experiment group was 0.80 and that of control group was 0.77. As table 7 demonstrates there is not any significant difference in the mean scores of experimental and control groups since the t-test analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference (t=0.51).

Table 6: Group statistics
Pre-writing Fluency t-test for Experimental and Control groups

Group Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	30	11.8833	.80605	.14716
Control	24	11.7708	.77990	.15920
* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)				

Table 7: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test									
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
Equal variances assumed	.005	.944	.517	52	.607	.11250	.21761	-.32416	.54916
Equal variances not assumed			.519	50.093	.606	.11250	.22521	-.32293	.54793
* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)									

As obvious from Table 8 for the post-test in writing fluency, the performance of the two groups differed widely. As the experimental Group's mean (18.03) is higher than the control group's mean (13.66). It can be claimed that the participants in the experimental group had a better

performance than the participants in the control Group as the t-test on the post-test (23.82) showed.

Table 8: Group statistics
Post-writing fluency t-test for experimental and control groups

Group Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	30	18.0333	.52413	.09569
Control	24	13.6667	.81650	.16667

* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)

Table 9: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test								
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
Equal variances assumed	8.043	.006	23.820	52	.000	4.36667	.18332	3.99881	4.73452
Equal variances not assumed			22.721	37.437	.000	4.36667	.19218	3.97742	4.75592

* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)

In order to investigate the last item in the first research question, complexity was defined as the number of dependent clauses divided by the total number of C-units for a given essay. A t-test was conducted for experimental and control groups before the treatment to compare the means of two groups. As illustrated in Table 10, the mean scores of pre-tests in the experimental and control groups were 11.88 and 11.72 respectively. The Standard Deviations of the experiment group was 0.66 and that of control group was 0.84. As Table 11 demonstrates there is not any significant difference in the mean scores of experimental and control groups since the t-test analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference (t=0.75).

Table 10: Group statistics

Pre-writing complexity t-test for experimental and control groups

Group Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	30	11.8833	.66544	.12149
Control	24	11.7292	.84672	.17284

* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)

Table 11: Independent samples test

Independent Samples Test									
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
Equal variances assumed	2.010	.162	.750	52	.45	.15417	.20568	-.25856	.56690
Equal variances not assumed			.730	43.016	.470	.15417	.21127	-.27189	.58022

* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)

As shown in Table 12 for the post-test in writing complexity, the performance of the two groups differed widely. As the experimental Group's mean (17.91) is higher than the control group's mean (13.81). It can be claimed that the participants in the experimental group had a better performance than the participants in the control Group as the t-test on the post-test (15.14) showed.

Table 12: Group statistics

Group Statistics				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Experimental	30	17.9167	.60291	.11008
Control	24	13.8125	1.32544	.27055

* Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)

Table 13: Independent samples test

								95%Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Independent Samples Test									
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**		**Lower**	**Upper**
Equal variances assumed 4.557	.038	15.140	52	.000	4.10417	.27108		3.56021	4.64812
Equal variances not assumed		14.051	30.580	.000	4.10417	.29209		3.50811	4.70022
Significant at the 0.05 level (p<0.05)									

Data from interview questions 1-8 (Appendix B) has been used to answer RQ2 about which method(s) of corrective feedback teachers believe strengthens second language writing tasks. Throughout this research, teachers reported using direct written feedback, indirect written feedback or a combination of direct and indirect feedback known as dynamic feedback when evaluating written tasks. They articulated specific methods of feedback depending on student's age and competency. Overall, teachers expressed that they made a great effort in getting to know their students' styles and strategies. They emphasized the importance of articulating a specific goal for each writing task that focused on developing a specific skill and making sure that students have a clear understanding of the necessary expectations. They also stressed the importance of modelling good writing for students.

Data from Table 14 represents how teachers responded when asked to rate, in order, the type of feedback they found most useful with language learners.

Table 14: Feedback Reported as Most Effective

	Most Effective	Less Effective	Least Effective
Indirect	0	1	7
Direct	1	7	0
Combination	7	0	1

4. Discussion

With regard to the main purpose of this study, and as the tables illustrate, the null hypothesis has been appropriately rejected at the 0.05 level of significance. In fact, the analysis of acquired data strongly recommended that using dynamic (WCR) feedback during teaching narrative writing and correcting grammatical errors of Iranian EFL learners accelerated the progress of their writing skill. The quantitative findings of this study are consistent with Ellis' (2009) statement that "dynamic WCR has the advantage that it supports learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors" (p.99). The present study also showed that Iranian EFL students at intermediate English level benefited from dynamic WCR more because they may not know the correct form or they may not be able to self-correct themselves. The result of the present research generally provided support to the results of previous studies (Archibald, 2001; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1999) that error correction has noticeable impacts and helps EFL learners to improve their writing accuracy, fluency and complexity. According to the result, corrective feedback is essential as it helped teachers and learners identify and focus on the common errors made in the writing assignments with regard to the conditionals as the newly learned grammatical instruction. Written corrective feedback is usually applied to correct grammar and spelling mistakes in language classes. The current study also agrees with sheen's (2009) finding that corrective feedback is functional for learners at elementary or intermediate level because they are not competent enough to detect the correct form and they may ignore the errors at lower levels.

In answering RQ2, one first needs to discover whether teachers believe corrective feedback is beneficial (Q8, Appendix B)? Responses to Q8 supported the practice of offering feedback, with conditions. Teacher participants mentioned the use of various direct feedback methods. They discussed the incorporation of a rubric or checklist on formal tasks that clearly delineated expectations for that particular essay. When assessing, teachers restricted their concentration to two or three major categories of errors. Teachers did their best to protect students from becoming

overwhelmed by the immensity of the task of correcting every error. Seven out of eight participants overwhelmingly believed, according to Q7, that offering a combination of indirect and direct feedback known as dynamic (WCF) aided students in becoming better writers. Using a rubric, reading a sentence or essay aloud and asking students to listen to determine whether it sounded correct, projecting student work on a screen with no name attached and asking students to double-check for errors, conferencing individually or as a group, or beginning with a small list of requirements and gradually adding to that as a checklist for components needed to complete each assignment represented how teachers offered combination feedback. Combination feedback, according to teachers, encouraged metacognitive processing as students began to discover for themselves the reasons behind some of their errors. Teachers believed that offering a combination of direct and indirect feedback ensured that students encountered a safe environment to write. With regard to distinguishing between indirect and direct feedback, at times, there was confusion regarding whether the type of feedback a teacher mentioned was direct or indirect. The reasoning behind this discrepancy could be because it had been a long time since teachers had studied the technical terms for the types of feedback they felt achieved the most learner uptake. Other confusion may arise at the mention of free writing opportunities in conjunction with writing that is purposeful.

5. Conclusion

When taking all data from this study together, we can conclude that the application of dynamic WCF had a noticeable impact, and empowered the EFL learners to utilize the conditional sentences with more accuracy, fluency and complexity over the eight forty-minute sessions of treatment time. These signs of progress are observable between writing samples taken from the beginning and end of the treatment time. This noticeable impact on the learners' accuracy, fluency and complexity over the eight forty-minute sessions of treatment is obvious proof of the potential for dynamic (WCF) to assist EFL learners with obtaining highlights of conditionals and their usage in foreign language narrative writing. Indeed, Iranian EFL students' involvement in the process of learning conditional

sentences within their narrative writing task using dynamic (WCF) provides detailed information to teachers as to which linguistic features they may find more problematic. While working with EFL students, learners can be informed with the intention of providing feedback and on which specific error type they will focus. Therefore, dynamic WCF is more applicable and practical than traditional methods of teaching writing for EFL learners with regards to enhancing the quality of linguistic accuracy, fluency and complexity. The quantitative findings of this study also demonstrate the benefit of focusing on a single error category rather than using an all-grouping of grammar errors. The outcomes show that in order to support Iranian EFL writers in decreasing linguistic errors in their writing tasks, it may be more helpful to focus on one or two language errors rather than an unfocused approach. This assists learners to increase their focus on a few errors and learn to implement in future writing and in response to the question whether to correct or not. In fact, leaving the errors unnoticed might result in the fossilization of incorrect structures, especially for EFL learners.

Consequently, the researchers seriously disagree with too much error negligence and subsequently believe that errors should be corrected or revised immediately or with delay. Teachers can explore different varieties of CF strategies that might be more suitable based on their own contexts. According to Gunette (2007), the success of any type of corrective feedback will be dependent on the teaching and learning context, the students' age, the sort of mistake students make, their level of language proficiency, the genre of writing they are expected to do, and a collection of other variables that are yet undetermined. Teacher participants of this study also reported that they believe that offering corrective feedback on written tasks aids students in their written production. It was discovered that the majority of teachers believed that offering a combination of direct and indirect feedback or simply called dynamic written corrective feedback assisted the development of metacognitive strategies when implementing changes in current and future written assignments. Instructors embraced the practice of offering corrective feedback on written tasks in an effort to equip students with appropriate grammatical and procedural instruction. The feedback that is purpose-

ful, individualized and positive provides motivation for new writers to continue in the assimilation of the English language and culture.

References

Abedi, R., Latifi, M., and Moinzadeh, A. (2010). The effect of error correction vs. error detection on Iranian EFL learners' writing achievement. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 168-174.

Archibald, A. (2001). Targeting writing second language proficiencies: Instruction and areas of change in students' writing over time. *International Journal of English Studies, 1*(2), 153-174.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 101-118.

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.

Chen,Y., Carger, C. L., and Smith, T. (2017). Mobile-assisted narrative writing practice for young English language learners from a fund of knowledge approach. *Language Learning & Technology, 21*(1). 28-41.

Chou, Ch. L. (2000). Chinese speakers' acquisition of English conditionals: Acquisition order and L1 transfer effects. *Second Language Studies, 19*(1), 57-98.

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

Ellis, R. (2009a). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *Second Language Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Farrokhi, F. and Chehrazad, M. (2012). The effects of planned focused on form on Iranian EFL learners' oral accuracy. *World Journal of Education, 2*(1), 70-81.

Farrokhi, F. and Sattarpour, S. (2011). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy of Iranian EFL learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1*(12), 1797- 1803.

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), 1-10.

Fowler, W. S. and Coe, N. (1976). *Nelson English language tests.* Thomas Nelson Ltd.

Gunette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(1), 40-53.

Hashemzadeh, H. and Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A case for direct and indirect feedback: The other side of coin. *English Language Teaching, 5*(3), 230-239.

Hartshorn, J. (2008). *The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy.* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Brigham Young University. United States.

Huang, S. J. (2006). A case study of EFL students' writing errors on a web-based writing program [Paper presentation]. *International Conference & Workshop on TEFL and Applied Linguistics,* Ming Chuan University, China.

Lord, C. (2002). Are subordinate clauses more difficult? In J. Bybee, & M. Noonan (Eds.), *Complex sentences in grammar and discourse* (pp. 224-233). John Benjamins Publishing.

Mindt, D. (1996). English corpus linguistics and the foreign language-teaching syllabus. In Thomas, J. and Short, M. (Eds.), *Using corpora for language research* (pp. 232-247). Longman.

Nonkukhetkhong, K. (2013). *Grammatical error analysis of the first-year English major students,* Udon Thani Rajabhat University [Paper presentation]. Asian Conference on Language, Osaka, Japan.

Rattanadilok Na Phuket, P. and Othman, N. B. (2015). Understanding EFL students' errors in writing. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(32), 99-106.

Sermsook, K., Liamnimitr, J., and Pochakorn, R. (2017). An analysis of errors in written English sentences: A case study of Thai EFL students. *English Language Teaching, 10*(3), 101-110.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(2), 255-283.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing 16*(4), 255-272.

Wolfe-Quintero, K. Inagaki, S., and Kim, H. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity.* Hawaii: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Zafar, A. (2016). Error analysis: A tool to improve English skills of undergraduate students. *Procedurals-Social and Behavioural Science, 217,* 697-705.

Zheng, C. and Park, T. (2013). An analysis of errors in English writing made by Chinese and Korean university students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(8), 1342-1351.

Appendix A
Background questions

Name:

Address:

Phone:

Do you have any objections to mere cording the interview for future reference?

Number of years teaching EFL classes:

Institutes where you teach (or have taught):

Institution or type of EFL training received:

Please describe EFL classroom characteristics: (age, English level, male/ female, etc.)

Which level(s) do you enjoy teaching the most?

Appendix B
Teacher interview questions

1. What kind of training have you received concerning giving feedback on ESL writing tasks? How has the training influenced your feedback strategy?

2. Compare and contrast differences between native writers and EFL writers.

3. Could you describe when and what kind of assignment (inter-sentential, dialogue journal, or essay) you might give as a first writing assignment for an intermediate ESL class?

4. Tell me a story of how you prepare writing classes before assigning graded work, in building atmosphere and safe spaces?

5. Could you tell me a story of how you would assess each type of writing task (inter-sentential, dialogue journal, or essay) concerning the types of feedback (direct or indirect) you would offer?

6. Could you tell me a story of how you would assess grammatical errors using direct feedback that identifies the location and type of error in an inter-sentential task? Dialogue journal? Essay?

7. Please rate in order of effectiveness (1 as the least effective, 3 as the most effective) which type(s) of feedback (direct feedback, indirect feedback, or a combination of direct and indirect feedback) you believe results in the greatest improvement. Why?

8. Do you believe future EFL writing improves as a direct result of corrective feedback? If so, please tell me a story about a type(s) of feedback you believe has helped improve writing?