

Written Corrective Feedback: Comparing Bhutanese Middle Secondary ESL Student and Teacher Perspectives

Yonten Jamtsho¹ & Sonam Zangpo Sherpa²

³ABSTRACT

Numerous studies have investigated and advocated the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF) on L2 students' writing. The researchers are presently more interested in uncovering the perceptions that the teachers and the students have about the usefulness of WCF. A large number of studies have focused on students' perspectives about WCF, whereas, very few studies accounted for teachers' perspectives and compared the former with the latter. In the Bhutanese context, there is a paucity of WCF research altogether. This study, conducted in a Bhutanese Middle Secondary School, investigated the perceptions of ESL students and teachers on (1) amount of WCF, (2) types of WCF, and (3) types of errors to be marked. This study also attempts to gauge the differences in the students' and teachers' perceptions about WCF and the reasons thereof. Six English as Second Language (ESL) teachers and 42 ESL students were selected using purposive, and stratified random sampling respectively. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected by means of parallel written questionnaires. The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics such as percentages and means, whereas the qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis. The findings reveal that there are areas where both the students and the teachers share common preferences and views but also areas where they express disagreements. Pedagogical implications and the limitations of the study are discussed.

Keywords: written corrective feedback, errors, perspectives, Bhutanese students and teachers

INTRODUCTION

A considerable amount of research has examined the effectiveness of corrective feedback for L2 writing. The perception of learners and teachers about the usefulness of written corrective feedback (WCF) is a crucial area of focus for many researchers (e.g., Diab, 2005; Leki, 1991; Schulz, 2001). Understanding teachers' and students' perceptions about written corrective feedback as a teaching and learning tool is crucial as any discrepancy in their perceptions can affect learning. Many

1. Principal, Tashidingkha Central School, Punakha yontsho7@education.gov.bt
2. Teacher, Tashidingkha Central School, Punakha szangpo88@education.gov.bt

previous studies already have investigated teachers' and students' perceptions about WCF. However, most of them investigated students' perspectives, with fewer studies cross-examining students' and teachers' perspectives. Particularly, there is a paucity of studies that explored students' and teachers' choices for various types of WCF and their reasons for the stated preferences. This study examines and compares Bhutanese ESL students' and teachers' perceptions of different types and amounts of WCF, and also investigates the reasons thereof.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Many studies on the effectiveness of WCF on errors in ESL context revealed varying results (Truscott, 2010). The scholars are divided into two schools regarding the value of WCF – one supporting WCF for second language teaching (Bitchner & Ferris, 2012; Bitchener & Storch, 2016) and another questioning its value, are against the use of it (Truscott, 2010; Truscott and Hsu, 2008). Some early research found WCF to be ineffective in language learning, while some found it useful in L2 writing.

However, there is recent research evidence in support of written corrective feedback. The effects of different types of WCF (e.g., error identification, direct and indirect error correction, comments on errors, metalinguistic feedback, comments on content) have been studied by various researchers (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Hartshorn, 2008; Sheen, 2007; Sachs & Polio, 2007). While WCF research worldwide has shown some positive effects in a general sense (Ferris, 2004), they have also presented conflicting findings regarding which WCF strategy is most effective. Sheen (2007) for instance, found that WCF targeting a single structural feature improved learners' accuracy. While, Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) found that a combination of WCF and conference feedback improved accuracy levels in some structures, but found no overall effect on accuracy improvement. Another study (Hartshorn, 2008) found that WCF helped improve overall structural accuracy. While there are numerous studies (e.g., Ferris, 2006) which found indirect WCF more effective than direct WCF, there are also studies (e.g., Van Beuningen, Jong, & Kuiken, 2012) which concluded otherwise.

Since there are evidences both for and against the use of WCF, researchers also have explored different ways to explain why different types and amounts of WCF might be ineffective. Research hints that the incongruity of the findings springs from the issue of perspectives held by

the practitioners – teachers and students. For instance, a teacher corrects learners' language and provides WCF according to what they presumably perceive learners want to or should say, but often there is a mismatch in the ideas and language-use between what learners' perceive as correct and that which teacher assumes is correct (Ferris, 1995). Further, in some cases, students fail to comprehend the WCF provided and therefore, the interpretation and use may mismatch the implied expectations of the teachers. Students' preferences for different types and amounts of WCF may also determine how effectively they use it for their learning. For instance, a student's strong conviction over one type of WCF may result in him or her investing more attention and effort in using the WCF for learning as he or she prefers and believes in its usefulness (Schulz, 2001).

Students' preferences for type and amount of WCF have differed over time. Semke (1984) found that students prefer WCF in the form of comments on content and ideas rather than on grammatical and structural errors. However, Leki (1991) found that students prefer comments on content and ideas as well as direct WCF on their grammatical and structural errors. Lee (2005) found that students preferred comprehensive WCF rather than selective WCF, and that students approved of direct correction as well as indirect WCF such as coding.

Another issue is whether or not students' expectations are met by the teachers' WCF. While some studies showed agreements between students and teachers in a number of areas, others have found significant variance. For example, Montgomery and Baker (2007) found that ESL teachers' and students' perceptions of the use of local and global WCF actually matched. Whereas, Diab (2005) compared beliefs about the effectiveness of various types of WCF and found that the students' views on the effectiveness of teachers' feedback strategies conflicted with that of the teacher's.

This incongruity in students' and teachers' perceptions regarding the usefulness of different types and amounts of WCF are pedagogically challenging. For example, a teacher may provide a particular kind of WCF intending to help the students, but actually rendering more harm as students may not agree with it. Therefore, it is important for both teachers and students to explicitly communicate their expectations regarding the type and amount of WCF that works best for them. Thus, researchers advocate the need of mutual agreement between teachers and students and perhaps negotiate students' expectations with what is most effective for improving their writing competency (e.g., Diab, 2005; Schulz, 2001). One way that can possibly alter the students' inadequate perceptions is conducting studies that not only cross-examines students' and teachers'

opinions about WCF, but also investigate teachers' and students' reasons for preferring particular types of WCF.

What aggravates the problem further in the Bhutanese context is, teachers' tendency to hide behind the inadequacies of the education system, such as, overcrowded classroom, vast syllabus, exam oriented curricula etc. as an excuse for not administering any kind of feedback on student's writing. There is also evidence of incorrect implementation of feedback processes. Therefore, understanding their perspectives, opinion and beliefs about the use of WCF is crucial to set forth any kind of change in the mindset of the teachers as well as the students. The purpose of this present study is embedded in the following research questions:

Research questions

1. What amount of WCF do Bhutanese Middle Secondary ESL students and teachers think is most useful, and why?
2. What types of WCF do Bhutanese Middle Secondary ESL students and teachers think are most useful, and why?
3. What types of errors do Bhutanese Middle Secondary ESL students and teachers think should be corrected?
4. Are there differences between students' and teachers' preferences and reasons regarding the usefulness of different amounts of WCF, types of WCF, and types of errors to be corrected?

METHODOLOGY

A five-item questionnaire was used to collect both quantitative and qualitative data drawing participants' opinions about the usefulness of different types and amounts of WCF and also the reasons for their choices. Item one used a multiple choice question with six options to determine the different amount of WCF teachers and students preferred. Item two used a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (not useful at all) to 5 (very useful) to determine the value teachers and students place on seven different types of WCF. Item three elicited open-ended reasons for the choice of different types of WCF in item two. Item four elicited a "Yes or No" response for the requirement of marking an error every time it occurs and the reasons thereof. Item five used 5-point Likert scale from 1 (not useful at all) to 5 (very useful) to determine the students and teachers preference of seven different types of errors to be marked. Parallel questionnaires were constructed in order to compare the perspectives of the two groups. The questionnaire items were based on items from

questionnaires used in previous studies that examined similar research questions (Ferris, 1995; Leki, 1991; Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010).

Participants

This study involved 48 participants: 42 middle secondary ESL students and six ESL teachers from Yangdon Middle Secondary School (pseudonym), Punakha, Bhutan. The school offers general English curriculum for six to seven hours per week. English is the medium of instruction in the school which is the norm in Bhutan. The student participants ranged from grades seven to 10. The teacher participants are trained English teachers holding qualifications like Bachelors of Education and Post Graduate Diploma in Education. The students have 8 to 11 years of in-the-school exposure to English as it is the medium of instruction. All teachers have field experience of 4 years and above.

Analysis

The questionnaire responses were recorded in an excel spreadsheet for statistical analysis. For the quantitative data, the frequencies of responses on the questionnaires were calculated, converted into percentages and then compared. As the participants comprised of two groups with different cohort sizes, percentages were used for comparative analysis of perspectives between the teachers and students. For the questionnaire items that included Likert scales, the means of participants' responses were calculated for comparison between two groups. The participants' explanatory responses (from the open-ended questions) are analysed using qualitative 6-step analytic method called Thematic Analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006) define Thematic Analysis as a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. The responses were 'read repeatedly' to search for 'meanings and patterns'. Any interesting features were annotated with codes manually on the questionnaire. The codes then were collated into potential themes and compared between teachers and students.

RESULTS

The questionnaire results are presented in three sections corresponding to the first three research questions. The findings for the fourth research question pertaining to differences in preferences of the students and the teachers are highlighted under each section.

RQ1 - What amount of WCF do Bhutanese Middle Secondary ESL students and teachers think is most useful, and why?

Item one asked the participants whether they think that teachers should mark all errors, just some, or none at all and respond only to the ideas and content. The participants were permitted to check more than one option. As Table 1 shows, the option *Mark all errors* was the most popular choice for both students (100%) and teachers (50%). The second most popular option for students was *mark all major errors but not minor ones* (42.9%). The remaining teachers were divided equally over option B, C and D (16.7%). All these three options B, C and D refer to the marking of major errors to different degrees: *all*, *most* and *only a few* respectively. No students chose these options. Both the students and the teachers did not agree with the idea of *marking only the errors that interfere with communication* (E) and *responding only to the ideas and content, and mark no errors* (F).

Table 1

Participants' Responses to Different Amounts of Written Corrective Feedback

Options	Students		Teachers	
	n	%	n	%
Mark all errors	42	100	3	50
Mark all the major errors but not the minor ones	18	42.9	1	16.7
Mark most of the major errors, but not necessarily all of them	0	0	1	16.7
Mark only a few of the major errors	0	0	1	16.7
Mark only the errors that interfere with communication	0	0	0	0
Mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content	0	0	0	0
Total Responses	60	143	6	100.0

*Participants were allowed to choose as many options as they like. Therefore, total responses add to more than 100%.

The teachers' and students' explanations for their preferences are shown in Table 2. The majority of the students (85.7%) considered it important to see all of their errors marked, so that the WCF acts as both a learning tool and an aid in avoiding the errors in the future. Most students explained that "students must see all of their errors in order to improve their writing." Only two students pointed out that, marking only some errors will provide students with opportunities to do self-correction, hinting towards student autonomy. The majority (50%) of teachers corresponds to the

students, in their opinion of marking all errors to instil awareness in the students, while a segment of teachers (33.3%) also explained that “marking only few major errors will not confuse the students.”

Table 2

Explanations for Different Amounts of Written Corrective Feedback

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
A It’s very important for students to see all errors to avoid them in the future.	Exposure	36	85.7	3	50
B Marking only some errors will provide students with opportunities to work on their own.	Student autonomy	6	14.3	0	0
C Marking only few major errors will be effective as it will not confuse the students	Procedure	0	0	2	33.3
D Mark only major errors as they interfere communication.	Purpose	0	0	1	16.7
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

Item four also on the amount of WCF further asked, “If an error is repeated in a writing assignment more than once, do you think it is useful for the teacher to mark it every time it occurs?” It was found that comparatively more students (57.1%) and teachers (66.7%) perceives that a repeated error should be marked every time it occurs (Table 3).

Table 3

Participants' Responses for Correction of Repeated Errors

		No	Yes	Total Responses
Students	n	18	24	42
	%	42.9	57.1	100
Teachers	n	2	4	6
	%	33.3	66.7	100

The participants’ explanations for this item is shown in Table 4. The majority of both students (57.1%) and teachers (67%) consider WCF to be a learning tool when they explained that a repeated error should be marked each time it occurs “as several reminders can provide deeper realization of the error and avoid repetition.” Some teachers (17%) also explained that marking all errors will discourage students and prohibit self-correction. An equal percent (17%) of teachers advocated student autonomy and suggested to “... mark initial ones and provide instruction to enable student self-correction.”

Table 4
 Explanations for Correction of Repeated Errors

	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
A Yes, as several remainders can provide deeper realization of the error and avoid repeating it.	Learning tool	24	57.1	4	67
B No, Marking all errors will be discouraging for students as well as it won’t provide the opportunities for self-correction	Educational psychology and Learner autonomy	12	28.6	1	17
C No, the teacher should mark initial ones and provide instruction to enable students to do self-correction	Procedure	6	14.3	1	17
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

RQ 2 – What types of WCF do Bhutanese Middle Secondary students and teachers think are most useful, and why?

Item two on a 5-point Likert scale format seeks to examine participants’ views on the usefulness of different types of WCF. The types of WCF were represented by an example of each and participants rated them (1= not useful at all, 2 = not useful, 3 = doesn’t matter, 4 = quite useful, and 5= very useful). Table 5 shows students’ and teachers’ overall mean ratings for each type of WCF.

For *clues or directions on how to fix an error* (e.g., direction to a certain section of a grammar text), both students (4.3) and teachers (2.8) demonstrate an overall positive rating, however, students’ opinion was more positive. For *error identification*, both students (2.3) and teachers (2.2) demonstrate an overall negative rating. For *error correction with a comment*, both students (4.3) and teachers (4) demonstrate overall positive ratings. For *overt correction by the teacher*, both students (3.6) and teachers (4.2) demonstrate an overall positive rating, however, teachers’ expressed their opinion more strongly. For *comment with no correction*, the mean response from teachers was negative (2.3), while, students demonstrated a positive (3.7) rating. For *no feedback* on an error and for *a personal comment on the content* of the writing, the mean response from students (1.3), (1.9) respectively and from teachers (1.0), (1.2) respectively, were unfavourable.

Table 5

Participants' Responses for Different Types of Written Corrective Feedback

Item	Feedback type	Means	
		Students	Teachers
2A	Clues and directions on how to fix an error	4.3	2.8
2B	Error identification	2.3	2.2
2C	Error correction with a comment	4.3	4.0
2D	Overt correction by the teacher	3.6	4.2
2E	Comment with no correction	3.7	2.3
2F	No feedback	1.3	1.0
2G	Personal comment on content	1.9	1.2

Tables 6 to 10 presents explanations provided by the participants for the above feedback types. Table 6 shows explanations provided for *clues or directions on how to fix an error*. The majority of students (71.4%) supported student autonomy and explained that clues or directions are useful because “it is important for students to know how to self-correct so they remember their errors.” In contrast, the majority of teachers (50%) expressed clues are not useful and students need specific feedbacks for proper follow-up. Likewise, a number of students (28.6%) also expressed that clues are not useful. Many teachers (33.3%) agreed with the majority of students on the importance of

student autonomy in correcting errors stimulated by the teacher’s clues and directions. Few teachers believed that clues are useful only for high-level students.

Table 6

Explanation for Clues or Directions on How to Fix an Error

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Clues are not useful. Students need specific advice. Only few students may do the follow up.	Teacher responsibility	12	28.6	3	50
b) It's important for students to know how to self-correct by referring to sources, so they remember their errors.	Student autonomy	30	71.4	2	33.3
c) Clues are useful only for high level students.	Student competency	0	0.0	1	16.7
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

Table 7 shows explanations provided for *error identification*. The majority of students (85.7%) expressed that it is teachers’ responsibility to correct and provide constructive feedback as error identification does not help. However, all the teachers (100%) considered that students are not competent enough to understand the errors identified and rectify themselves. They asserted “Error Identification leaves students confused not knowing what to do.” None of the students provided this explanation

Table 7

Explanation for Error Identification

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Error identification is not useful. Correction is best.	Teacher Responsibility	36	85.7	0	0

b) Guides student in self correction, which allows students to better remember the errors.	Student-autonomy/ Learning tool	6	14.3	0	0
c) Error identification leaves students confused not knowing what to do.	Student Competency	0	0.0	6	100
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

Table 8 shows explanations provided for *error correction with a comment*. Students regarded this type of WCF as a learning tool. They explained that “comments are useful for students to see why the error exists and how to fix it” (57.1%), and that “students will remember better with comments” (14.3%). Whereas, some students (28.6%) believed that this may not help in learning because all work is done by the teacher. All the teachers (100%) believed that “Comments are useful for students to see why the errors exist and how to fix it.”

Table 8

Explanation for Error Correction With a Comment.

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) May not help in learning as all work is done by the teacher	Learner autonomy	12	28.6	0	0
b) Comments are useful for students to see why the error exists and how to fix it.	Learning tool	24	57.1	6	100
c) Students will remember better with comments	Learning tool	6	14.3	0	0
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

Table 9 shows explanations provided for *overt correction by the teacher*. About half of the students (42.9%) regard this type of WCF as a learning tool and explained that “teacher correction is important so that students see their errors and learn”. Almost half of the students (42.9%) also demonstrated that they believe it is the teacher’s responsibility to provide correction accompanied by comments, as correction alone is inadequate. Some students (14.3%) asserted that “Students don’t pay attention to teacher correction.” The majority of the teachers’ (67%) correspond with the

students’, in their opinion of importance of teacher correction to make the students see the errors and cause learning. Also, some teachers believe that teacher correction should be followed by comments to make the errors more explicit (17%) and teacher correction will be more effective only to low achievers (17%).

Table 9

Explanation for Overt Correction by the Teacher

Explanations	Category	Students		Teachers	
		n	%	n	%
a) Teacher correction is important so that students see their errors and learn	learning tool	18	42.9	4	67
b) Teacher correction should be accompanied by comments to cause learning.	Teacher responsibility	18	42.9	1	17
c) Students don’t pay attention to teacher correction.	Student competency	6	14.3	0	0
d) Teacher correction will be more effective only to the low achievers.	procedure	0	0	1	17
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

Finally, Table 10 shows explanations provided for *comment with no correction*. Majority of students (71%) expressed that this kind of WCF can make students curious to look for errors and self-correct it, whereas, none of the teachers expressed this view. Some students (28.6%) expressed that ‘*comment with no correction*’ can be confusing.

However, the majority of teachers (66.7%) expressed *comments without error correction* can confuse students. Some teachers (33.3%) believe that comments alone can only work with committed students.

Table 10

Explanation for Comment with No Correction

Explanations	Category	Students	Teachers
--------------	----------	----------	----------

		n	%	n	%
a) Comments with no correction can make students curious to look for errors and self-correct it.	Learning tool	30	71.4	0	0
b) Comments are confusing, students don't understand them.	Student Competency	12	28.6	4	66.7
c) Comments only work with committed students.	Student Competency	0	0.0	2	33.3
Total Responses		42	100	6	100

RQ 3 - *What types of errors do Bhutanese Middle Secondary students and teachers think should be corrected?*

On item five, participants rated (1= not useful at all, 2 = not useful, 3 = doesn't matter, 4 = quite useful, and 5= very useful), the usefulness of WCF on six different types of errors. Table 11 shows students' and teachers' mean ratings for each type of WCF.

Table 11

Participants' Responses for Correction on Different Types of Errors

Item	Feedback Type	Means	
		Students	Teachers
A	WCF on Organization Errors	4.3	4.3
B	WCF on Grammatical Errors	4.7	4.8
C	WCF on Content and Ideas	4.0	4.3
D	WCF on Punctuation Errors	3.9	4.5
E	WCF on Spelling Errors	4.4	4.5
F	WCF on Vocabulary Errors	4.3	4.7

For all feedback types the means of the responses from both the students' and teachers' demonstrated overall positive responses. However, for WCF on punctuation, the teachers' (4.5)

mean rating is comparatively more positive than the students' (3.9) rating. All teachers demonstrate that all feedback types are important.

DISCUSSIONS

The first research question explored what amount of WCF students and teachers think is most useful, and the reasons thereof. The findings reveal that the students consider it most useful for teachers to purvey WCF on as many errors as possible. The students disregarded the options like; teacher marks only a few errors, marks only errors that interfere with communication or responds only to content and ideas. Students surmised that greater the amount of feedback, more beneficial it would prove for learning. Likewise, teachers also viewed that WCF should be provided on all errors. Similarly, in a study by Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) majority of the students and teachers expressed the view of marking all errors. However, in the current study, around 50 % of teachers shared the idea of marking the major errors only. They expressed that teachers should gauge if an error is a major one impeding communication or not.

The findings show that the students and the teachers disagree regarding the amount of WCF. While the students desired WCF on all types of errors, most teachers proposed using WCF selectively only on major errors. Most of the students reasoned that marking all errors will help them avoid the errors in the future. It is worthwhile to note that a good percentage of teachers also stipulated the same reasoning. Some teachers based their responses on the fact that fewer is better as it is less confusing to the learners while the others thought marking the major errors as they interfered with communication. This shows that teachers were divided on the amount of correction they identify as necessary and they were divided on their reasons as well.

Regarding repeated correction of errors each time they occur, both the majority of teachers and students saw WCF as a learning tool and thought that a repeated error should be consistently marked each time it occurs, and several students and teachers proposed a common explanation that "...several reminders can provide deeper realization of the error and avoid repeating it." These findings are not in line with the previous research findings that suggest benefit of allowing students to correct at least some of their own errors (e.g., Ferris & Roberts, 2001), and if a teacher marks a repeated error every time it occurs, students are deprived of autonomy to self-correct. However, a very small fraction of both the teachers and the students were of the view that marking all errors

will be demotivating and wouldn't provide opportunities for self-correction, postulating the theme of learner autonomy.

The second research question explored the types of WCF students and teachers think are most useful, and the reasons thereof. The vast majority of students in this study thought that it was very important for them to receive clues and directions to self-correct errors positing student autonomy and freeing teachers from the tedious labour of marking all errors. This aligns to the findings of some previous studies which found self-correction to be useful (e.g., Ferris & Roberts, 2001). But the majority of teachers believe otherwise, they disapprove of the use of clues and directions asserting 'only few students may carry out the follow-up on the directions'.

Both teachers and students disapprove error identification and propose a similar reason. They claim that error identification alone is not useful and it can be confusing to the students as it doesn't provide the what-next directions. Both parties are positive pertaining to error correction with a comment. However, all teachers think that comments are useful for students to see why the error exists and how to fix it, while some students believe that correction with comments may not help, as all work is done by the teachers disparaging learner autonomy. They also share a favourable outlook on the overt correction by teacher and claims it to be a learning tool.

A major contradiction occurred between the two groups regarding the comment with no correction. The students were favourable to this as they think it will foster learner autonomy, claiming that 'comments with no correction can make students curious to look for errors and self-correct it'. Whereas, the majority of teachers think that comments are confusing and students don't understand them and some think that comments only work with committed students. This also contradicts the previous research which found self-correction useful for student learning (Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

The third research question explored what types of errors students and teachers think should be corrected. Both students and teachers were excessively favourable on all kinds of errors. Students preferred all the kinds of errors to be addressed. This finding is consistent with what was found by Leki, (1991) that 'students equate good writing in English with error free writing and that they expect and want all errors in their papers to be corrected.' However, even the teachers approved correction of all errors leaving no avenue for student autonomy. These findings indicate that teachers as well as the students wish and attempt to make learner writing error free. However,

teachers as practitioners should consider if this is practically possible. There is a place here for the teacher and the students to negotiate and identify focus areas for WCF administration.

Overall, participants' responses and explanations showed several differences between the opinions of the two groups. Although students' explanations showed that they understand and value some student autonomy, for the most part their responses showed that they value large amounts of WCF from the teacher. The majority of the teachers disapproved throughout to entertain student autonomy in learning which contradicts with many of the contemporary educational beliefs and viewpoints which propose learner autonomy for better teaching and learning.

CONCLUSION

The contradiction in the perspectives of the teachers and the students found in this study should probe if WCF should be provided in line with what is proven to be beneficial, what teachers think is beneficial, or what learners prefer. This mismatch in the perspectives can stand as a hurdle for WCF practice. For example, the difference between the students and teachers on their preference for learner autonomy portrays that the teachers are lagging behind in what students see as an opportunity to be more student-centred. As the contemporary pedagogy recommends learner autonomy, the teachers could forge a strategy to foster learner autonomy and experiment to see if it works, instead of assuming that learners are not ready to indulge in self-learning. Thus, more research is needed to find out how the differences between teachers' and students' expectations can be best addressed for optimal pedagogy.

Pedagogically, the findings suggest that teachers need to make the WCF process more student oriented by giving more opportunities for students to self-correct their work. Moreover teachers also need to openly discuss the use of WCF with students, and ensure that students understand the purpose of WCF and shoulder responsibility for error correction and not just keep on believing that they will not do any follow up on the feedback. Students and teachers must negotiate any viewpoint differences about what constitutes a useful WCF, and accordingly change their expectations (Leki, 1991).

It is also crucial to take into account students' preferences for a particular type of WCF; however, teacher should also gauge contextual setting and practicality in WCF implementation and effect on learning. For instance, it will not be feasible to mark all errors all the time or provide

comprehensive WCF where class sizes are large. It can be a tedious affair for the teacher as well as overwhelming for the students to attentively attend to all the corrections at a go. While students' preferences should not be idealized as they may not necessarily be more effective for being preferred (Brown, 2009), completely ignoring them may also demotivate the students (Leki, 1991). Thus, it is necessary for teachers to demonstrate and explain the use of effective types of WCF, including those types which initially may not be preferred by students.

However, as this study investigated students' and teachers' perceptions regarding WCF and not the effectiveness of WCF, we must acknowledge that error correction is a complex issue. Many variables such as the nature of the WCF, type of error, how and when it should be corrected needs to be considered for any WCF strategy to be effective. Besides, factors such as sociocultural context, individual learner needs and differences, and learner motives should also be considered.

There are also some limitations to be considered for this study. The number of participants was limited and drawn from only one school. Therefore, further research with larger sample size drawn from different instructional contexts can enhance the generalizability of the findings to diverse contexts. As this study dealt with complex notion of errors, participants understanding of errors may have been varied and inconsistent. For example, the participant may have failed to differentiate between the different types of errors. The open-ended answers revealed that some participants considered major errors to be the same as errors that interfere with communication. Moreover, some participants hinted that they considered errors pertaining to ideas and content not as errors requiring WCF. Therefore, to establish clear, consistent and uniform understanding of errors, future research should define the errors clearly and make participants aware of it.

In addition, the current study gathered perceptions of teachers and students about the usefulness of WCF and their preferences. These findings on perceptions held by teachers and students may not align exactly with what happens in the classroom. For instance, although the majority of the teachers believe that error identification alone will confuse the students, yet in reality most of them just identify the errors without further directions. Thus, studies that investigate the (mis)alignment of teachers' opinions with their actual practices would be more helpful.

REFERENCES

- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why?. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95-127.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Routledge
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008) The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback, *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 409-431.
- Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). Written corrective feedback for L2 development. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- 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, 191-205.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3:2, 77-101, DOI: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Brown, A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46-60.
- 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, 267-296.
- Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23, 28-43.
- Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL quarterly*, 29(1), 33-53.
- Ferris, D.R. (2004). The “grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime . . .?) *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49–62.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 81104.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second language Writing*, 10, 161-184.

- Hartshorn, K. (2008). The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. Master's thesis, Brigham Young University. Retrieved from <http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/ETD/image/etd2575.pdf>
- Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 22, 1-16.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.
- Montgomery, J., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 82-99.
- Sachs, R., & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29, 67-100.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.
- Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(3), 195-202.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-284.
- Truscott, J. (2010). Some thoughts on Anthony Bruton's critique of the correction debate. *System*, 38, 329-335.
- Truscott, J. & Hsu, A.Y-P. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292-305.
- Van Beuningen, C., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in Dutch multilingual classrooms. *Language Learning*, p 1-41.