

Understandings of Vietnamese EFL Students' Preferences on Written Corrective Feedback: A Case Study

Tran Van Ty*

* Faculty of Information Technology and Basics, Binh Thuan Vocational College, Vietnam

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.12.08.2022.p12816

<http://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.12.08.2022.p12816>

Paper Received Date: 15th July 2022

Paper Acceptance Date: 31st July 2022

Paper Publication Date: 6th August 2022

Abstract— Written corrective feedback (WCF) is significantly important for students at all levels as it can help them enhance their second language writing ability after making errors in writing. However, without urgent understandings of students' preferences, the effectiveness of WCF definitely weakens. This study, thus, aimed at investigating students' preferences for WCF. To achieve this aim, relevant literature on WCF in terms of value, timing, sources, strategies, amount, and focus of WCF and students' preferences were reviewed. Based upon this conceptual framework, the survey study with a questionnaire was conducted at Binh Thuan Vocational College in Vietnam with the participation of 35 IT-majored students. The findings of this study showed that these students had positive perceptions and preferences of WCF in their writing learning. Based on the research findings, the paper concluded with pedagogical implications and a recommendation for further study in the line of research on WCF.

Index Terms— EFL students, preferences, WCF, vocational college, Vietnam

INTRODUCTION

Learning in a collaborative context embracing the provision of corrective feedback on learners' performance is much favored by most of language learners. Indeed, learning is pillared by a set of processes, one of which is feedback uptake (Al-Bakri, 2016). The root of providing written corrective feedback (WCF) in an educational environment is viewed as to consolidate and stimulate learning, which is vastly admitted by an increasing number of researchers in the field of second language writing. Such feedback "can help

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Definitions of WCF

In the field of second language acquisition, "the term corrective feedback [refers] to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of language form" (Russell & Spada, 2006, p. 134). WCF, which is also called error correction, has been regarded as a typical way of enhancing students' writing accuracy and a vital part of the writing curriculum (Truscott, 1999). WCF is also defined as information provided by teachers to help students notice the errors or breakdowns of their performance

learners notice their errors and create form-meaning connections, thus aiding acquisition" (Ellis, 2009, p. 6), as well as enables the learners to make improvements (Askew & Lodge, 2000) in the future use (Harmer, 2004). Given the importance claimed in the literature for the role of feedback in language acquisition generally, it is no exception that feedback is also central to the development of writing performance (Grami, 2010; Alnasser, 2013). Its importance in this regard was first recognized when learner-centered approaches to writing instruction were developed in the 1970s (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Noticeably, students have different learning styles and preferences for teaching instructions (Katayama, 2007). Some scholars align to this assumption and argue that students' undesirable feedback might not be effective for developing their writing ability since it may frustrate and demotivate them. In other words, understanding students' preferences on WCF is crucial for maximizing the effectiveness of feedback on developing students' writing ability (Lee, 2013; Hamouda, 2011). Therefore, this paper aimed to investigate the vocational college students' preferences, studying at Binh Thuan Vocational College of Vietnam, for the different aspects of WCF in terms of feedback value, strategies of providing feedback, sources of feedback, amount and types of corrected errors, and time of feedback. To achieve this objective, the research question was posed as follow: *What are the IT-majored students' preferences of WCF in EFL writing classes?*

(Nicol & Macfarlane, 2006). In brief, WCF is the information or comments that the teachers deliberately utilize to facilitate the student writers' recognition of their written errors, and develop their better writing performance without errors, if any.

B. Value of WCF

In academia, giving WCF to students' errors is of great importance in improving their writing performance (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Providing WCF on student writing is one of the pedagogical practices of language teachers who hope that this interactive practice might support the students in ameliorating their writing accuracy (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Bitchener, 2008). Besides, according to Al-Bakri (2016), WCF

helps increase the students' positive attitudes and motivation to learn writing. However, there have long been controversial views on the effectiveness of WCF in improving students' foreign language writing ability. Some researchers argue that WCF is effective in foreign language writing practice (e.g. Chandler, 2003; Sheen, 2007; Bitchener, 2008), while others claim that WCF should not be utilized in foreign language writing education (e.g. Kepner, 1991; Truscott, 2007). Facing these controversial views, educational practitioners may feel hesitant about the utilization of WCF in their instructional practice. Meanwhile, researchers of foreign language writing may still want to continue proving whether or not WCF is useful in writing. In short, the improvement of students' writing performance and learning motivation is the ultimate goal of the provision of WCF.

C. Strategies of WCF

When describing the way in which WCF may be provided, the literature has chiefly divided the discussion into two main strategies of delivery: direct and indirect (Jamoom, 2016). Bitchener and Ferris (2012) define direct WCF as an "[explicit] correction that not only calls attention to the error but also provides a specific solution to the problem" (p. 148). By contrast, indirect feedback is defined as "indicating an error through circling, underlining, highlighting, or otherwise marking it at its location in a text, with or without [...] an error code, and asking students to mark corrections themselves" (Ferris, 2002, p. 63). In relation to sub-categories of indirect WCF, Bitchener and Knoch (2009a) suggest three ways: underlining or circling an error; describing the numbered errors at the bottom of the text; using a code to show where an error has occurred and what type of error it is. In another point, error codes are instruments that provide learners with feedback on their writing which allows the students to revise their understanding of certain linguistic items. In this way, students identify errors or what they believe are errors about the form and function of a variety of lexical and grammatical elements (Balderas & Cuamatzi, 2018). Direct WCF has the advantage that it provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. This is clearly desirable if learners do not know what the correct form is (i.e. are not capable of correcting the errors themselves). Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggest direct WCF is probably better than indirect WCF with student writers of low levels of proficiency like junior secondary school students in the current study. In the same line, Ellis (2008) claims that to student writers of higher levels of proficiency, indirect feedback where the exact location of errors is not shown might be more effective than direct feedback where the location of the errors is shown, as students would have to engage in deeper processing.

D. Sources of WCF

Despite widely acknowledging that teacher correction is the most common and key way of responding to the students' writing performance (Hyland & Hyland, 2006), many researchers advocate the alternative use of peer correction (i.e. peer feedback) or self-correction. Liu and Hansen (2002) defined peer correction as using students "as sources of information and interactions for each other" (p. 1) in a way that makes students adopt the role and responsibility of a

teacher or editor as they comment on each other's writing in both written and oral forms. Meanwhile, self-correction draws the students' conscious attention to their individual errors which pushes them not only to notice their errors but to correct them by themselves (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005).

E. Timing of WCF

Timing of providing WCF is a debatable issue among researchers (Jamoom, 2016). Ferris (2002) notes that "many theorists believe strongly that premature attention to error may short-circuit students' ability to think, compose, and revise their content" (p. 61). Some researchers argue that providing WCF on the students' final draft is ineffective as students concern only about their grades, so that WCF better occurs in the middle of the writing process (e.g., Leki, 1991; Ferris, 1995b). Others insist that correction and comments should be given during the different writing processes such as revision, edition and final draft for students to improve their writing performance (e.g., Tribble, 1996; Mack, 2009). However, Frakenberg-Garcia (1999) believes that students need WCF immediately at the time they are trying to transform their ideas into written sentences on papers because they face many problems regarding language and content as they write. Hattie and Timperley (2007), furthermore, warn that giving students their texts with WCF after one week is late. WCF will be more beneficial if students receive it after a short time of submitting their writing (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Mack, 2009).

F. Amount of WCF

One important decision a writing teacher must make is whether to mark a few specific error categories in a focused manner (i.e., selective WCF) or to mark all errors (i.e., comprehensive WCF) in an unfocused manner (Ferris, 2002; Ellis, 2008). There is an argument in favor of selective WCF and a counterargument in favor of comprehensive WCF. Advocates of selective WCF (e.g., Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Lee, 2013) warn against marking all student errors because they believe that improving the students' self-editing strategies, that is process-writing, is more important than the form of the final product. However, an important counterargument in favor of the comprehensive WCF was recently done by Evans, Hartshorn, McCollum and Wolfersberger (2010), stating that in the real world, accuracy should be valued and perfection must be expected. Students thus need to learn to edit their entire texts, not only for anywhere two or three selected error patterns, and comprehensive error feedback can help to focus the writers' attention on the range of problems that their texts may incur.

G. Focus of WCF

Another important question a writing teacher faces is the type(s) of errors to be focused on: local errors which relate to language form or global ones which relate to the content and organization. In most studies (e.g. Sheen, 2007; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009a; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Lee, 2013), the errors can be dealt with content as "the information you provide in your essay", organization as "the way in which these ideas are organized", and language form as "the correct use of mechanics" (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997, p. 23). While most students favored receiving more comments on language form (e.g. Norton, 1990; Ferris, 2002; Bitchener &

Ferris, 2012), the studies on teachers' beliefs and practices revealed inconsistent findings. Whereas some studies (e.g. Zacharias, 2007; Lee, 2013) reported teachers' beliefs according to which there is more to good writing than language form, other studies (e.g. Jodaie & Farrokhi, 2012) found the opposite, by indicating that teachers placed more emphasis on language form and believed that there should be as few language errors as possible. Such inconsistent findings in the same realm seem to be related to the differences in contexts and teachers' personalities. In other words, it can be expected that the difference of contexts and subjects will be reflected in different beliefs and practices as well.

H. Students' Preferences

In definition, students' preferences consist of affective reactions, and they can be conveyed through verbal and non-verbal processes (Baker, 1992). Under a cognitive perspective, when preferences are stimulated, the behavioral responses of an individual will be surely affected (McKenzie, 2010). It means that this individual will become ready to or keen on receiving the instruction (e.g. WCF) or resistant to it. Under a psychological stance, preferences can exert a huge influence on the psychological needs of individuals (McKenzie, 2010). Perloff (2003) illustrates that learners' preferences can predict that whether an individual likes or dislikes the evaluative object. In general, Bohner and Wanke (2002) posits that preferences act as a predictor that determines an individual's behaviors, and formation of behavioral routines. It is obvious that studying the students' preferences during the language learning process is of great significance; however, the teachers often fail to interpret their students' preferences regarding to three situations (Long, 1997). First of all, the teachers do not know the existing problems or issues confronted by the students since they do not obtain enough feedback from their students. Secondly, many students still keep on their learning process even within negative attitudes and low preferences, which may result in unsatisfactory outcomes and low motivation among these students in the future. Lastly, the teachers may not respond to the students' needs and interests exactly. In sum, an extensive understanding of the students' preferences of an instructional technique or method is

J. Research Site and Participants

The study was conducted at Binh Thuan Vocational College, situated at Truong Chinh Street, Phu Tai ward, Phan Thiet City, Binh Thuan province. There are 10 classes with the total number of 450 students categorizing into different majors. The teacher staff includes 72 teachers, six of whom are EFL teachers. The EFL teachers ranged from the age of 30-41; all of them are local residents of Binh Thuan province. Regarding the qualifications of EFL teachers, five of them got Bachelor of Arts (B.A), and only the other one obtained Master of Arts (M.A). Most teachers are extremely keen on their noble teaching career. In the school year 2021-2022, Binh Thuan Vocational College drew a special attention from the People's Committee of Binh Thuan Province. The school is sponsored lots of advanced equipment, which helps teachers and students to have many chances to work or study.

Thirty-five students of the IT-majored class, including 34

instrumental to the teachers' more effective pedagogical decisions.

I. Previous Studies and Research Gaps

Ferris and Roberts (2001) conducted their study to examine students' preferences regarding WCF on 63 university ESL students. The findings showed that the students' preference to receive WCF on local issues and that students considered errors in language form as serious and negatively affected their writing. The students favored the indirect WCF with error codes. Diab (2005a) explored 156 EFL university students' preferences regarding effective WCF at the American University of Beirut (AUB). Most students wanted to have as few errors as possible in their text. As for the focus of WCF, students believed that teachers' WCF should cover language form, organization and content. Moreover, most students believed in the direct WCF, believing that teachers should locate the errors, give correction, clue to correct. Zhu (2010) examined 58 EFL students' preferences at Polytechnic University (China) toward error correction by using questionnaire. 70% of the students appreciate their teacher to correct all the errors in their work, while 30% of the students want their teacher to correct only their serious errors. Those who like selective error correction said that we might lose confidence if we find our papers full of the corrections. It is clearly noticed that depending on different contexts and kinds of participants, the students' preferences were various regarding WCF. Alternatively saying, the students' preferences, attitudes on WCF in EFL/ESL writing classes were still open to debate. Thus, the writer decided to investigate the vocational students' preferences on WFC. In addition, some of the previous studies only reported the students' preferences on a few aspects of WCF; therefore, the writer intentionally probed the student participants' preferences on different aspects of WCF such as value, strategies, sources, timing, amount and focus of WCF to get a fuller picture of what they wanted in a systematic way.

METHOD

males and 1 female, took part in the study. Although they are neither the same age nor the same backgrounds, they were obliged to take the same course (General English Writing). The participants were required to pass the general English exam in the first semester. The majority of students for IT specialization were male, which accounted for 97.1% out of the whole quantity. Besides, they had different ages ranking from eighteen to over twenty. Also, the time for their learning of English was not the same. Because of the discrepancy mentioned above, the preparation for the lesson was frequently suited students' levels and interests. Overall, 21.3% of the whole student sample did not know at all about WCF, 75.9% knew a little bit about it, and only 2.8% knew much about this interactive technique. One-quarter preferred the product-approach-driven lessons (25.5%); on the contrary, up to three-quarters showed their preference on the writing lessons under the process approach (74.5%).

K. Questionnaire: Rationale, Description, Collection and Analysis

The researcher decided to employ a two-section questionnaire to collect data for the present paper due to three advantageous reasons. To the first reason, questionnaires are easy to manage with large numbers of subjects (Dörnyei, 2010). To the second reason, questionnaire results appear to be more reliable since this tool encourages greater honesty from respondents (Hopkins, 2008). To the third reason, the procedure of both collecting and analyzing questionnaire data consumes less time and effort (Denscombe, 2008). In detail, the first section was designed to gather the student participants' background information such as age, gender, general knowledge of WCF and English learning styles, which is presented above. The second section with total 19 items numbered from 1-19 focused on the students' preferences on WCF in writing classes under different aspects such as value (3 items), timing (2 items), sources (3 items), strategies (4

items), amount (2 items) and focus (5 items) of WCF. All these items of this main section are rated on a five-point Likert scale: 1=totally disagree; 2=disagree; 3=uncertain; 4=agree; 5=totally agree.

On the chosen dates, the questionnaire copies which had been translated into Vietnamese beforehand were delivered to 35 participants. On the receipt of questionnaires from the respondents, the researcher found that all 35 copies (100%) were valid and accepted. Finally, the researcher employed Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 to analyze the descriptive statistics of the collected questionnaires in terms of percentage (P), mean (M) and standard deviation (S.D.). Besides, the English-majored sophomores' responses to the questionnaire items were inspected according to the rating intervals: 1.00-1.80: strongly disagree; 1.81-2.60: disagree; 2.61-3.40: moderately agree; 3.41-4.20: highly agree; 4.21-5.00: strongly agree (Pallant, 2007).

RESULTS

L. Perceptions about Value of WCF

TABLE 1. IT-MAJORED STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS ABOUT VALUE OF WCF

Preferences	P(%)					M	S.D.
	SD*	D*	U*	A*	SA*		
I1: I think that WCF in my writing is important.	4.3	8.5	15.6	27.7	44.0	3.99	1.15
I2: I reckon that WCF makes my writing performance better.	8.5	18.4	16.3	22.7	34.0	3.55	1.35
I3: I reckon that WCF motivates me to learn English writing.	9.9	27.0	24.8	25.5	12.8	3.04	1.20

(*): SD=Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; U=Uncertain; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree

As can be seen from Table 1, the large number of the students (44.0% strongly agree, 27.7% agree) thought that WCF in their writing was of importance (I1, M= 3.99, S.D.= 1.15). In specific, more than half of the student sample (34.0% strongly agree, 22.7% agree) considered that WCF made their

writing performance better (I2, M= 3.55, S.D.= 1.35). In addition, only more than one-third of the response community (12.8% strongly agree, 25.5% agree) reckoned that WCF motivated them to learn English writing (Item 3, M= 3.04, S.D.= 1.20).

M. Preferences about Timing of WCF

TABLE 2. IT-MAJORED STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ABOUT TIMING OF WCF

Preferences	P(%)					M	S.D.
	SD*	D*	U*	A*	SA*		
I4: I want my teacher to correct errors in the middle of writing process.	5.0	17.0	31.9	30.5	15.6	3.35	1.09
I5: I want my teacher to correct errors at the end of writing process	1.4	5.7	12.1	23.4	57.4	4.30	0.98

(*): SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; U: Uncertain; A: Agree; SA: Strongly agree

From Table 2, considering timing of WCF, it seemed that at the end of writing process was viewed as the best point of time to provide WCF in EFL writing classes, divulged by four-fifths of the students (I5, M= 4.30, S.D.= 0.98, 57.4%

strongly agree, 23.4% agree). Interestingly, there was still nearly half of the student (15.6% strongly agree, 30.5% agree) who also wanted their teacher to provide WCF) in the middle of writing process (I4, M= 3.35, S.D.= 1.09).

N. Preferences about Sources of WCF

TABLE 3. IT-MAJORED STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ABOUT SOURCES OF WCF

Preferences	P(%)					M	S.D.
	SD*	D*	U*	A*	SA*		
I6: When I make errors in writing, I want my teacher to correct them directly.	0.0	1.4	5.0	24.8	68.8	4.61	0.65
I7: When I make errors in writing, I want my teacher to let me correct them with my classmates.	5.0	4.3	14.2	27.0	49.6	4.12	1.12
I8: When I make errors in writing, I want my teacher to let me correct them by myself.	4.3	16.3	13.5	39.7	26.2	3.67	1.16

(*): SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; U: Uncertain; A: Agree; SA: Strongly agree

As Table 3 indicates, with reference to sources of WCF, all three possible sources of providing WCF in writing classrooms were preferred by the student participants. Evidently, all three items labeled I6, I7, and I8 had their mean value greater than 3.40, i.e. M= 4.61 (S.D.= 0.65), M= 4.12 (S.D.= 1.12), and M= 3.67 (S.D.= 1.16), respectively. In comparison, it seemed obvious that the student sample preferred teacher correction most (I6), acceded by peer correction (I7) and self-correction (I8), respectively. More specifically, nearly all of the student respondents (68.8%

O. Preferences about Strategies of WCF

strongly agree, 24.8% agree) hoped that when students made errors in writing, the teacher should correct directly. In addition, beyond three-quarters of this sample (49.6% strongly agree, 27.0% agree) expected that when students made errors in writing, the teacher should allow them to correct with their classmates. Finally, around two-thirds of the sample (26.2% strongly agree, 39.7% agree) was in need that when students made errors in writing, the teacher should let them correct by themselves.

TABLE 4. IT-MAJORED STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ABOUT STRATEGIES OF WCF

Preferences	P(%)					M	S.D.
	SD*	D*	U*	A*	SA*		
I9: I want my teacher to provide the correction to my errors.	3.5	14.9	4.3	39.7	37.6	3.93	1.16
I10: I want my teacher to underline or circle errors for me to correct.	5.0	17.0	31.9	30.5	15.6	3.35	1.09
I11: I want my teacher to number the errors, then describe the errors at the bottom of the text, and ask me to correct them.	19.1	37.6	12.8	19.9	10.6	2.65	1.29
I12: I want my teacher to use error codes (e.g. n=noun, v=verb) to indicate errors and ask me to correct them.	9.9	27.0	24.8	25.5	12.8	3.04	1.20

(*): SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; U: Uncertain; A: Agree; SA: Strongly agree

From Table 4, it seemed patent that the majority of the students (37.6% strongly agree, 39.7% agree) still preferred teacher direct correction most, proven by the highest mean value (I9, M= 3.93, S.D.= 1.16). Other three strategies were not much preferred by the large quantity of the students. Evidently, only less than half of the student sample (15.6% strongly agree, 30.5% agree) favored their teacher underlining or circling errors for them to correct (I10, M= 3.35, S.D.=

1.09). Similarly, only roughly one-third of the respondents (12.8% strongly agree, 25.5% agree) wanted their teacher to use error codes to indicate errors for them to correct (I12, M= 3.04, S.D.= 1.20). Finally, only approximately thirty percent of the student sample (10.6% strongly agree, 19.9% agree) expected their teacher to number the errors, and then to describe the errors at the bottom of the text for them to correct (I11, M= 2.65, S.D.= 1.29).

P. Preferences about Amount of WCF

TABLE 5. IT-MAJORED STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ABOUT AMOUNT OF WCF

Preferences	P(%)					M	S.D.
	SD*	D*	U*	A*	SA*		
I13: I want my teacher to correct all errors in my writing.	24.1	27.7	14.2	17.0	17.0	2.75	1.43
I14: I want my teacher to correct only focused errors in my writing	4.3	17.0	7.8	29.8	41.1	3.87	1.24

(*): SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; U: Uncertain; A: Agree; SA: Strongly agree

Table 5 depicts that approximately three-quarters of the student informants (41.1% strongly agree, 29.8% agree) preferred their teacher correcting only focused errors in their writing (I13, M= 3.87, S.D.= 1.24). However, only around one-third of the respondents (17.0% strongly agree, 17.0%

agree) wanted their teacher to correct all unfocused errors in their writing (I14, M= 2.75, S.D.= 1.43). It means that the big proportion of the students preferred WCF on some focused errors to that on all unfocused errors.

Q. Preferences about Focus of WCF

TABLE 6. IT-MAJORED STUDENTS' PREFERENCES ABOUT FOCUS OF WCF

Preferences	P(%)					M	S.D.
	SD*	D*	U*	A*	SA*		
I15: errors on content in my writing need correcting.	9.9	27.0	29.8	21.3	12.1	2.99	1.17
I16: errors on organization in my writing need correcting.	9.2	12.1	27.7	32.6	18.4	3.39	1.19
I17: errors on vocabulary in my writing need correcting.	2.8	12.8	9.9	24.1	50.4	4.06	1.17
I18: errors on grammar in my writing need correcting.	2.8	13.5	6.4	37.6	39.7	3.98	1.12
I19: errors on mechanics in my writing need correcting.	7.8	7.1	6.4	15.6	63.1	4.19	1.29

(*): SD: Strongly disagree; D: Disagree; U: Uncertain; A: Agree; SA: Strongly agree

As Table 6 depicts, with reference to focus of WCF, there were certain variations in the students' preferences of WCF focus or types of corrected errors. In general, most of the students preferred receiving WCF on local errors (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, mechanics) to receiving WCF on global

errors (i.e., content, organization). More specifically, approximately four-fifths of the student sample (63.1% strongly agree, 15.6% agree) wanted their teacher to correct errors on mechanics (I19, M= 4.19, S.D.= 1.29). By the second highest mean level, around three-quarters of the

student respondents (50.4% strongly agree, 24.1% agree) expected that lexical errors should be corrected (I17, M= 4.06, S.D.= 1.17). Another type of local errors to be corrected, that is, grammatical errors, was also much preferred by roughly three-quarters of the student sample (I18, M= 3.98, S.D.= 1.12, 39.7% strongly agree, 37.6% agree). On the contrary,

only half of the respondents (18.4% strongly agree, 32.6% agree) expected their teacher to correct errors regarding textual organization (I16, M= 3.39, S.D.= 1.19). Furthermore, less than one-third of the respondents (12.1% strongly agree, 21.3% agree), considered that errors on content in their writing needed correcting (I15, M= 2.99, S.D.= 1.17).

CONCLUSION

Generally speaking, the large number of the students realized the importance of WCF in their writing. As for timing of WCF, the majority of the respondents showed their stronger preference of WCF at the end of writing process. About places of WCF, many students preferred their teacher providing WCF in their writing on the margin of the paper near the errors. To sources of WCF, the student participants preferred teacher correction most, then peer correction, and self-correction, respectively. Relating to WCF strategies, the majority of the students still preferred teacher direct correction most, compared to other three strategies, including underlining or circling errors, using error codes, and numbering and describing the errors at the bottom of the text. As for amount of WCF, most of the student informants preferred their teacher correcting only focused errors in their writing in lieu of all unfocused errors in their writing. About WCF focus or types of corrected errors, a big part of the students favored receiving WCF on local errors (i.e., vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics) rather than receiving WCF on global errors (i.e., content, or organization).

REFERENCES

- [1] Al-Bakri, S. (2016). Written Corrective Feedback: Teachers' Beliefs, Practices and Challenges in an Omani Context. *Arab Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 44-73.
- [2] Alnasser, S. M. N. (2013). *A new form of peer feedback technique: An investigation into the impact of focusing Saudi ESL learners on macro level writing features* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). UK: Newcastle University.
- [3] Askew, S., & Lodge, C. (2000). Gifts, Ping-pong and Loops- Linking Feedback and Learning. In: S. Askew (ed.). *Feedback for Learning*. London: Routledge Falmer (pp. 1-18).
- [4] Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [5] Balderas, I. R., & Cuamatzi, P. M. G. (2018). Self and peer correction to improve college students' writing skills. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 20(2), 179-194.
- [6] Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102-118.
- [7] Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 204-211.
- [8] Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. New York and London.
- [9] Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191-205.
- [10] Bohner, G. & Wanke, M. (2002). *Attitudes and Attitude Change*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- [11] 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.
- [12] Diab, R. (2005a). EFL university students' preferences for error correction and teacher feedback on writing. *TESOL Reporter*, 38(1), 27-51.
- [13] Dörnyei, Z. (2010). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing* (2nd ed.). London, Routledge.
- [14] Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- [15] Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18.
- [16] Evans, N.W., Hartshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 445-463.
- [17] Ferris, D. R. (1995b). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33-53.
- [18] Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of Errors in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- [19] Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161-184.
- [20] Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 155-182.
- [21] Frankenberg-Garcia, A. (1999). Providing student writers with pre-text feedback. *ELT Journal*, 53(2), 100-106.
- [22] Grami, G. M. A. (2010). *The Effects of Integrating Peer Feedback into University-Level ESL Writing Curriculum: A Comparative Study in a Saudi Context* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). UK: Newcastle University.
- [23] Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128-141.
- [24] Harmer, J. (2004). *How to Teach Writing*. New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- [25] Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112.
- [26] Hopkins, D. (2008). *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- [27] Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83-101.
- [28] Jamoom, O. (2016). *Teachers' Beliefs and Practices of Feedback and Preferences of Students for Feedback in University Level EFL Writing Classrooms* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). UK: University of Southampton.
- [29] Jodaie, M., & Farrokhi, F. (2012). An Exploration of Private Language Institute Teachers' Perceptions of Written Grammar Feedback in EFL Classes. *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 58-69.
- [30] Katayama, A. (2007). Students' perceptions toward corrective feedback to oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 289-305.
- [31] Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing class. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- [32] Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(3), 305-313.
- [33] Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108-119.
- [34] Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218.
- [35] Liu, J. & Hansen, J. (2002). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- [36] Long, R. (1997). Investigating and Responding to Student Attitudes and Suggestions for Course Improvement. *The Language Teacher*, 21(10), 23-29.
- [37] Mack, L. (2009). Issues and Dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL Learners? *Polyglossia*, 16, 33-39.
- [38] McKenzie, R. (2010). *The Social Psychology of English as a Global Language*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- [39] Nicol, D. J., & D. Macfarlane-Dick. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199-218.
- [40] Norton, L. S. (1990). Essay writing: What really counts? *Higher Education*, 20(4), 411-442.
- [41] Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Guide: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows*. Open University Press, New York.

[42] Perloff, R. (2003). *The Dynamics of Persuasion* (2nd ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

[43] Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. In J. Norris (Ed.), *Synthesizing Research on Language Learning and Teaching* (pp. 133-163). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

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

[45] Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford University Press.

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

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

[48] Zhu, H. (2010). An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching* 3(4), 127-130.

AUTHOR BIBLIOGRAPHY

Tran Van Ty was born in Nui Thanh District, Quang Nam Province (Vietnam) on February 10th, 1976. He earned his B.A. degree in English Language from Hue University (Vietnam) in 1998. In 2018, he accomplished his M.A. degree in TESOL from Ho Chi Minh City Open

University (Vietnam). He has been teaching English for over ten years. Currently, he is working as a full-time English teacher at Binh Thuan Vocational College (Vietnam). His research fields include writing instruction and learner autonomy.