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ABSTRACT

Many studies have examined how written corrective feedback (WCF) can raise English as a foreign language (EFL) students’ understanding of language concepts. However, not much is known about how students’ perceptions and preferences could influence the effects of WCF. This study examined how Secondary School Certificate (SSC) students and teachers in Pakistan International School, Saudi Arabia, felt about WCF in writing classes. It aimed to identify the WCF aspects of the target language the students preferred. A questionnaire survey was distributed to 30 SSC-level EFL students and 10 teachers at the school who participated voluntarily in the study. The findings revealed that the students had sympathetic perspectives despite having preferences for WCF. They mainly believed that WCF might help them enhance their language knowledge and writing abilities. Through WCF, they learned what to avoid and how to write better. The teachers also found WCF helpful in enhancing the basic understanding of the target language. The findings showed that the students and teachers believed direct WCF to be the most effective technique for improving the former’s writing abilities, followed by indirect strategies such as underlining errors or providing codes. The research was considered relevant and pertinent as it addressed diverse aspects of WCF.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is increasingly becoming the most critical talent for success in many professions and academic fields. Even though writing is essential and helpful for pupils, it is said to be the most challenging and complicated skill to acquire due to many required linguistic factors [1]. Writing proficiency is necessary for teenagers since they are encouraged to write to enhance learning actively. Additionally, writing ability enables pupils to improve their self-expression, communication and academic success. Moreover, it enhances students’ academic performance and learning outcomes [1].

Students are prompted to express themselves in writing by pouring out their ideas and concepts while ensuring that the text is engaging and understandable to the audience. Santangelo et al. [2] elucidated that lack of awareness, ineffective teaching strategies, poor planning content development, revisions and transcription, perseverance and an unrealistic sense of self-esteem cause students’ difficulties with writing. Some past research [3], [4] emphasized the importance of the constructive role of written corrective feedback (WCF) for students’ writing development. WCF makes it easier for them to learn how to employ specific
Differences between students’ and teachers’ perceptions of WCF’s effectiveness have been found in previous studies in this area [5], [6]. Students want precise and detailed feedback, such as direct WCF, whereas teachers prefer indirect WCF to get students to think about the errors they have made [6]. These differences can cause students to feel dissatisfied and suffer from impaired learning [7]. Although previous studies examined both students’ and teachers’ perceptions of the WCF, Miles found that most of the research focused on students’ perceptions, leaving very few studies comparing students’ and teachers’ perceptions [8].

Past studies show students’ perceptions of receiving feedback are related to their writing motivation, self-control and success [9], [10]. Although it seems that indirect WCF is the most frequently used type of feedback in the classroom [11], lower proficiency students do not seem to prefer it. Additionally, regardless of proficiency level, there is evidence that students prefer WCF for grammatical errors over lexical or mechanical errors [12]. According to some research findings [13]–[15], students preferred the direct WCF, whereas in other research investigations, Trabelsi [3] and Iswandari [16] found that students preferred indirect WCF, in which errors were signaled by providing hints rather than being corrected. According to Rummel and Bitchener [17], these findings indicate that students may not gain from WCF if their choice for it differs from teachers’ practices and the preference is related to error categories and skill level.

Writing in proper English is one of the challenges English language students in Pakistan and Pakistanis living abroad confront. They do not have the opportunity to practice English because of a bilingual environment [18]. Most students speak their native language at home, Urdu, at school, and English in English classes. Even in English-teaching classrooms, most students in Pakistani institutions speak Urdu [19]. Through their knowledge of other languages, they attempt to learn English. The rules and regulations of the first and second languages confuse the students [20].

Moreover, English writing instruction has never been offered to students in Pakistani institutions, where exposure to the language is often limited to 4 hours per week. They are worried about proper grammar and vocabulary, how to organize the ideas and develop their writing skills. The students typically lack the knowledge necessary to write an essay relevant to the context and enhance their creative writing abilities. Unfortunately, the institutions’ English curriculum mandates that English instructors rely on grammatical rules, linguistic correctness and the final product of student study rather than natural language abilities. Due to low skill levels, time constraints and lack of motivation, writing is a weakness. According to Pakistani teachers, teaching English writing in Pakistan and Pakistani schools in foreign countries is problematic because it requires strong language proficiency and specialized writing training of the teachers [21].

Only four studies have examined how WCF was perceived in the Pakistani context [21]–[24]. The perception of WCF and teachers’ practices were the main topics of three of these studies [22]–[24]. The fourth one [21] compared how students in urban settings and those in rural areas perceived the WCF. No study examines teachers’ and students’ views of WCF in the Pakistani context. In the same way, no study has addressed the teachers’ and students’ perceptions of WCF in a Pakistani overseas context. Miles calls such a situation an empirical gap [8].

Considering the abovementioned situation, the researcher was determined to understand how non-native Pakistani students of English view the WCF. Thus, the study was conducted to examine the students’ and teachers’ perceptions of WCF and their preferences for the WCF approaches used in writing classrooms. The students’ perceptions, partly impacted by their perceptions of the WCF techniques, showed that it had successfully been implemented in writing classes. The results should enhance teachers’ understanding of persuading students to view WCF favorably and be open to using it to improve their writing skill. With all this in mind, this paper presented the study conducted to examine the students’ and the teachers’ perspectives of WCF and the techniques they valued the most. Thus, the following research questions were constructed: i) How did the Pakistani English as a foreign language (EFL) students and teachers view written corrective feedback in Saudi Arabia?; and ii) Do EFL learners have the same perspectives of WCF as writing teachers?

2. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE ROLE OF WCF IN SLA

When teaching a second language (L2) students, teachers often use corrective feedback (CF), commonly referred to as error correction or grammatical correction. The role of mistake and CF has been the subject of heated discussions for many years, both philosophically and practically. Error is viewed as a sinful act that needs to be eliminated, a concept that early behaviorist techniques introduced. Behaviorist approaches that investigate the causes of error and attempt to eliminate it include contrastive analysis and error analysis. However, they could not explain why students still made mistakes when practicing their language despite numerous forms of instruction (including CF). As a result, the role of CF was entirely disregarded by Gregg and Krashen [25], the author of the first general theory of second language acquisition (SLA), in his Monitor Model. Contrary to Krashen’s assertion, various viewpoints, from cognitive to
sociocultural [26]–[28], perceived the potential of CF in language learning and acquisition. In light of the aforementioned points of view, it makes sense to conclude that the significance of errors and CF was significantly reduced throughout these formative years.

Whether CF or instructions contribute to language development in this natural sequence is still debatable. According to certain researchers [29], [30], CF is one of the variables that might hasten development. According to the Processability Theory [27], supported by empirical data [31], [32], a language processor restricts L2 students’ cognitive capacity for language understanding and production. These hierarchically arranged restrictions produce different stages of growth in L2 learning. According to Pienemann et al. [33], commonly called the Teachability Hypothesis, CF cannot change the natural order.

According to the central tenet of skill-based theory [34], [35], acquiring new skills entails a progression from controlled to automatic processing. The first uses declarative knowledge, the second uses procedural knowledge, and with experience, students go from controlled to automated processing. According to this view, CF functions as a catalyst for knowledge change. However, DeKeyser [26] pointed out that further study was still required to fully understand the quantity and kind of CF experienced during practice.

The interaction approach considers how input, output and feedback, all of which happen during the interaction, affect language development [30], [36]. Students who get CF become aware of a discrepancy between their current level of knowledge and the target language [37]. When students become aware of this gap, they will actively close it and this internalization process permits CF to be transformed into ‘intake’. Overall, CF acts as an accelerator for L2 acquisition in the eyes of interactionists. The aforementioned theoretical viewpoints demonstrate that theorists have not come to a consensus on the value of CF.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

The conceptual framework consists of several essential elements, including direct feedback, indirect feedback and metalinguistic WCF. The framework, shown in Figure 1, illustrates that when a student receives WCF, his perceptions of WCF and teachers’ perceptions of WCF influence the effectiveness of the WCF. The figure also shows that if the perceptions of teachers and students are the same, it impacts the writing accuracy of the students more positively. The study has focused on the learners’ and teachers’ perceptions of WCF to guide the teachers on WCF. More specifically, the study seeks: i) to explore the perception of the EFL students and teachers on WCF; ii) to determine the difference between the EFL learners’ perception and that of writing WCF teachers.

![Figure 1 Conceptual framework of the study](image)

4. METHOD

4.1. Context of the study and respondents

The quantitative research, which used a survey questionnaire, was conducted in Saudi Arabia at the Pakistan International School Taif. The school had approximately 1,000 male and female students at different levels. The demographic profile of the respondents is presented in Table 1. This table demonstrates that 30 Pakistani students with A2 English proficiency levels, ages 15 to 16, and 9 to 10 years of English learning
experience took part in the study. The table further shows that ten Pakistani teachers, aged 40–55, had 10–20 years of teaching experience and a B.A./M.A., B.Ed. Qualification participated in the study.

The study selected 30 EFL students of Secondary School Certificate level and 10 EFL teachers at the school based on purposive sampling. For the selection of student respondents, the criteria included i) students mature enough to give input in the questionnaire; ii) studying in the same class; iii) during the period of study; iv) from Pakistan; v) 15 to 16 years age; vi) studying English as a subject in this school; vii) English proficiency level A2 (Pre-intermediate); viii) studied English as a subject for 9 to 10 years in this school. Only 30 students fulfilled the research criteria and were chosen as research respondents. Secondly, the study described here was a component of a broader research project, and another method-an in-depth interview-that was qualitative - was used to analyze the respondents’ perceptions. Therefore, the sample size was considered enough. However, the questionnaire survey was the primary emphasis of this work.

Meanwhile, the criteria for selecting the teacher respondents were as: i) teaching English in this school; ii) Pakistani nationals; iii) 40 to 55 years of age; iv) English teaching experience in this school 10 to 20 years; v) professional (B. ed) degree holder teachers. More than 22 teachers were teaching different subjects at this school. Only 10 teachers fulfilled the research criteria and were chosen as research respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>English studied in this school (Years)</th>
<th>English proficiency level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>A2 (Pre-intermediate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>40-55</td>
<td>Teaching experience (Years)</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>B. A/M. A, B.Ed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Research instrument

According to Gurbuz [39], survey research has been shown to help determine someone’s attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, expectations, and preferences regarding a particular topic. It explains actions and compiles people’s attitudes, perceptions, ideas, and beliefs around a compulsory subject in education [40]. This research focused on obtaining the students’ and teachers’ perceptions regarding WCF.

There were two questionnaires, one for the students as shown in Table 2 and the other for the teachers as shown in Table 3, were taken from those utilized in the previous study led by Amrhein and Nassaji [41] and served as the study’s instrument. These questionnaires employed a 1 to 5 Likert Scale format with five options for each statement or question (5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neutral, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree). The items in these questionnaires were the independent variables, and the respondents’ levels of agreement with the items were the dependent variables. Some of the items were modified to fulfill the needs of the current study’s respondents. Both questionnaires were sent to two experts to determine the face validity. Changes suggested by the experts were made, which refined the questionnaires.

After establishing face validity to assess the reliability of the questionnaires, they were piloted. This was to ensure that the items constructed were clear and could be answered by the respondents. This resulted in some of the items being modified. Before starting the study, the main researcher approached the principal to get permission and got a consent form filled out by the student and teacher respondents. The Cronbach’s alpha values of both questionnaires were .779 and .772 based on the data from the pilot study.

4.3. Research procedure

When the proper study began, the world was hit with the COVID-19 crisis. The classes were conducted online. Therefore, the research procedure was amended according to the availability of the respondents. The main researcher approached the school principal and informed about the research. The student respondents filled in the questionnaires when they came to school to hand in homework, tests, essays, and assignments.

First, the main researcher described the study’s objectives to each respondent and assured him that the data provided would be used solely for research purposes and would be treated as confidential. Their identities/names would remain anonymous. Then a consent form was delivered to each participant to sign. After collecting the consent form, each participant was delivered a questionnaire containing 24 items. The same process was repeated for the teacher respondents to collect data.

Each respondent took between twenty to thirty minutes to complete the survey. The data collection process continued for about three weeks because student respondents did not attend school for their regular classes due to COVID-19. All questionnaires were collected from the students and teachers upon completion at different times. Data from these questionnaires were compiled on Excel sheets separately.
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Before determining the difference between students’ and instructors’ perspectives on WCF, it was crucial to determine whether there was significant variation among students’ perceptions of WCF. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine how different students’ perspectives were, from each other. The results of Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances are shown in Table 4. The ‘p’ values of the Levene’s test are greater than the significance level ‘.05’ (alpha), indicating no difference between the variances of students’ responses.
The results of one-way ANOVA are presented in Table 5. Each student’s responses to 24 questions were considered as a group. The results of the ANOVA analysis, shown in Table 5, revealed no statistically significant difference among students’ perspectives regarding WCF (F (29, 690) = .561, p=.917) as the ‘p’ value ‘.971’ is greater than the significance level ‘.05’ (alpha).

4.4.2. Teachers’ questionnaire data analysis
Each teachers’ responses to 24 questions were considered as a group. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine how different teachers’ perspectives were from each other. The results of Levene’s Test of Homogeneity of Variances are shown in Table 6. Significance level values of the test are greater than the significance level ‘.05’ (alpha), which shows that the groups are homogeneous.

The results of one-way ANOVA are presented in Table 7. Each teacher’s responses to 24 questions were considered as a group. The results of the ANOVA analysis, shown in Table 7, revealed no statistically significant difference among teachers’ perspectives regarding WCF (F (9, 230) = .574, p=.818) as the ‘p’ value ‘.818’ is greater than significance level ‘.05’ (alpha).

4.4.3. Comparison of students’ and teachers’ questionnaire data
The output of the independent samples T-test is divided into two sections: Group Statistics (Table 8) and Independent Samples Test (Table 9). The first part, Group Statistics, gives basic details on the group comparisons, which includes the sample size (n), mean, standard deviation, and standard error. A total of 10 teachers and 30 students were divided into two groups, as Table 8 demonstrates. The mean value for teachers is ‘3.474’ and for teachers is ‘3.468’.

The results that are most relevant to the independent samples t-test are displayed in Table 9. Levene's test for equality of variances and the T-test for equality of means are the two sections that offer distinct bits of information. Levene's test yields a p-value of ‘.63’, which is higher than significance level ‘.05’ (alpha). This demonstrates that there is no significant difference between teachers’ and students’
variances. The p-value of the T-test for equality of means is printed as ‘.932’, also greater than significance level ‘.05’ (alpha), which shows no significant difference between the means of students’ and teachers’ mean values.

Table 9. Independent samples t-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Levene’s test for equality of variances</th>
<th>t-test for equality of means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>18.766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. RESULTS

The results were prepared based on the mean values of each question (5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neutral, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree). Sullivan and Artino [42] recommended this method to analyze the Likert scale data. For example, 57% of students strongly agreed, and 43% agreed with the first question. No one selected any other option. The teachers’ questionnaire data were also analyzed in the same way. The analyzed questionnaire data regarding students’ and teachers’ perceptions are presented in Table 2 and Table 3, respectively.

Figure 2 shows the results of students’ first six questions. As shown in the Figure 2, students were asked to rate the worth of teachers’ WCF in the first two items. Compared to 47% of students who agreed, 57% of students strongly agreed that the WCF was helpful to them. While responding to items 3 and 4, 77% of students indicated they were happy with the WCF. Students also fully supported the WCF of their teachers (47% strongly agreed, 40 % agreed) compared to peer feedback.

Figure 3 displays the responses to questions 7 through 12. As shown in the Figure 3, items 7 to 12 reveal that most students (63% strongly agreed and 27% agreed) preferred their teachers’ WCF to answer items 8. They were impartial when contrasting group talks with peer CF. They presented various viewpoints on oral comments and indirect CF (13% strongly agreed) but they did not like generic comments (0% strongly agreed).

![Figure 2. Written corrective feedback, students’ perspectives (item 1-6)](image)
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The results of questions 13 through 18 are displayed in Figure 4. As shown in the figure, most of the students (70% strongly agreed) preferred WCF when their teacher corrected every mistake. They even agreed that grammar, vocabulary, punctuation, or prepositions errors should also be fixed. They did not like when only serious or major errors were corrected. They claimed that they had no trouble understanding their teacher’s WCF (27% strongly agreed, 43 agreed). They also concurred that they should ask their peers when they did not understand their instructors’ WCF.
strongly agreed, 13% agreed) confirmed that they asked the teacher. They disagreed (67% strongly disagreed) that they do nothing when they do not understand their teacher’s WCF. Their answers were different when they were asked if they refer to previous essays, try to guess or use the context of the errors when they do not understand their teacher’s WCF.

![Figure 5. Written corrective feedback, students’ perspectives (item 19-24)](image)

Figure 5. Written corrective feedback, students’ perspectives (item 19-24)

Figure 6 displays the answers that the teachers gave for questions 1 through 6. As shown in the figure, the results reveal the teachers’ perspectives of the WCF. While answering the first question, they indicated that they (80% strongly agreed and 20% agreed) find their WCF useful for their students. To answer the second question, (30% strongly agreed, and 70% agreed) that they prefer correcting errors to giving comments on the essays. Moreover, they (30% strongly agreed and 70% agreed) find their students satisfied with their WCF. They (90% strongly agreed, 10% agreed) prefer giving WCF alone instead of telling the students to correct their errors through peer work.

![Figure 6. Written corrective feedback, teachers’ perspectives (item 1-6)](image)

Figure 6. Written corrective feedback, teachers’ perspectives (item 1-6)
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Figure 7 shows the teachers’ responses of questions 7 through 12. As shown in the figure, the teachers were asked whether they prefer to guide the students through group discussions, providing direct WCF, indicating the errors instead of providing direct WCF by using codes and symbols or oral feedback. The figure shows though most students (40% strongly agreed, 20% agreed) liked group discussions, they preferred (40% strongly agreed, 60% agreed) their teacher’s WCF. However, they did not like guiding the students by using symbols, codes, or oral comments.

![Figure 7. Written corrective feedback, teachers’ perspectives (item 7-12)](image)

Figure 8 shows the teachers’ responses to questions 13 through 18. As shown in the figure, the teachers were asked whether their students liked when they corrected all errors, only severe errors, grammatical errors, vocabulary, punctuation, preposition or spelling errors. The results show teachers find the students prefer (50% strongly agreed, 40% agreed) when all the errors are corrected. They do not like it when only severe, grammatical, vocabulary, punctuation, or spelling errors are corrected (10-20% strongly agreed, 30% agreed). Moreover, they find the students understand (30% strongly agreed, 50% agreed) the WCF in its true sense, and the students contact them (40% strongly agreed, 60% agreed) when they do not understand part or all of their WCF.

![Figure 8. Written corrective feedback, teachers’ perspectives (item 13-18)](image)
Figure 9 presents the teachers’ responses to questions 19 through 24. As shown in the given items, the teachers were asked whether the students asked their peers for clarification, looked up past essays, made educated guesses, used context clues, talked with their parents, or did nothing when they did not understand a portion or all of the WCF. The results showed that students preferred to use the context to understand the WCF and asked their parents to understand their teachers’ WCF. They disagreed that they did nothing when they did not understand part or all of their teachers’ WCF.

6. DISCUSSION

According to the research findings about the usefulness of WCF, the students were receptive and in need of WCF. The students acknowledged that the WCF they received was helpful for them. They were satisfied with it as it helped them to write better by providing information about their weaknesses. These findings align with previous studies [3], [43]–[45]. These scholars discovered that the WCF implementation encouraged the students to improve their writing skills because it highlighted their mistakes. It aided them in making the academic progress they had expected. These findings also aligned with Hassan et al. [21], who conducted their research in the Pakistani context and found that the WCF benefitted the students. The teachers also agreed with the students, which was in line with Kencana’s findings [46]; the study stated that the students and the teachers felt that the direct WCF helped increase writing accuracy.

In line with Trabelsi [3], this study also discovered that students felt satisfied with the feedback when the teacher presented its usage and discussed the kinds of feedback strategies and their usefulness. This study found that direct WCF helped pupils develop their writing abilities. As the feedback included corrections on what they did incorrectly in writing and how they improved it, it taught the respondents what to avoid in producing a better essay. They agreed that the feedback they received inspired them to write better and perform better in the future. Teachers’ perceptions also align with Kencana’s findings [46], which stated that teachers and students are satisfied by the effects of direct WCF. However, these findings contrasted with those of Zhang [12], who found that some respondents had unfavorable perceptions of the WCF. They said that they disliked the feedback, which contained several corrections in their essays and remarks regarding the quality of their work. The students became less motivated to study because of their negative perception of its implementation.

The findings of this study regarding the source of WCF were consistent with Al-Ghazali’s [47] findings that there could be no guarantee that peer feedback would be correct. Moreover, these findings aligned well with Eliyanto and Fukazawa’s conclusions [48] that the teachers’ WCF had a more significant influence than peer and self-WCF among Japanese high school seniors. However, the findings of this
research contradicted their findings that peer CF, which a peer provides, was more effective for Indonesian high school students to improve their writing skills than teachers’ WCF.

The findings of this study regarding different types of WCF were consistent with those of earlier studies [13], [15] which found that students prefer receiving direct WCF. Moreover, these findings contrasted with other studies’ results [3], [16], which found that students preferred receiving indirect WCF. Regarding the quantity of WCF, according to past research, students preferred direct WCF, that is, when teachers corrected all student error[13], [15]. This was in line with the results of our study. The results lend credence to Simard et al. [49] observations about the importance of students recognizing errors and WCF in the correct sense.

Study findings regarding the quantity of WCF were consistent with Lee’s findings [50]. Lee claimed that because metalinguistic explanations took time to develop, teachers did not frequently employ them in their lessons. According to other studies, students preferred the direct WCF in which teachers effectively corrected all of the students’ errors [13], [15], which is in line with the conclusions of our study.

Concerning the comprehension of WCF, the findings of this study supported the previous findings [49], who found that students must comprehend errors and WCF in their proper context. These findings also support Lim and Renandya [51] who claim that the learners understand and benefit from the WCF according to their language proficiency. The learners with high language proficiency benefit from WCF more than those with intermediate or low proficiency. These results, however, contradicted the perception that many students could not interpret their teachers’ WCF [14].

7. CONCLUSION

The study demonstrated that all respondents perceived applying the WCF in writing classrooms positively. The use of WCF was discovered to assist students in developing their writing capabilities. The WCF taught students to recognize errors they have made, what to avoid and how to improve their writing. Moreover, giving feedback would make students feel less anxious and more motivated to learn how to write, demonstrating that the WCF is practically valuable. Additionally, direct feedback has been found to be the most successful method for helping students improve their writing. This feedback strategy enables the students to understand and reflect on their errors. Furthermore, by allowing students to interact with the provided feedback, the direct feedback-giving technique does enhance their understanding. All other methods of offering feedback, general comments or indicating errors by using codes look unsuccessful since they confuse and demotivate the students in studying.

In the same way, it is found that the students did not consider peer corrective feedback or group discussions as an alternative to the teacher’s WCF because neither method can guarantee correct feedback. They did not like when only errors were criticized, but positive aspects were not appreciated, or only selected error types were corrected instead of correcting all errors. However, it is felt that this study has some limitations. First, although there were a reasonable number of respondents, they all came from the same school. The findings of this study might not apply to a more extensive range of students and learning contexts. It is recommended that the researchers interested in this topic examine diverse students and teachers in all aspects and communities, particularly in educational backgrounds. Perhaps, a more diverse population of students and teachers might be more insightful regarding the results obtained. Second, there might be some other elements that may affect teachers’ and students’ pre-existing views and preferences. It might be interesting to investigate these issues further to understand how successful feedback-giving practices are viewed more fully through a series of interviews with the respondents.
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