



Journal of Arts & Humanities

English Learners Perception on Lecturers' Corrective Feedback

Titien Fatmawaty Mohammad¹, Tryanti Abdul Rahman²

ABSTRACT

The importance of written corrective feedback (CF) has been an issue of substantial debate in the literature and this controversial issue has led to a development in latest studies to draw on foreign language acquisition (FLA) research as a way to further comprehend the complexities of this issue particularly how students and teachers perceive the effectiveness of written corrective feedback. This research has largely focused on students' perception on Lecturers' corrective feedback, perceives the usefulness of different types of corrective feedback and the reasons they have for their preferences. Qualitative data was collected from 40 EFL students in 6th semester, by means of written questionnaires, interview and observation. Four feedback strategies were employed in this research and ranked each statement by using five-point Likert scale. Findings showed that almost all students 81.43 % want correction or feedback from lecturers for the mistakes on their writing. For the type of written corrective feedback, students prefer lecturers mark their mistakes and give comment on their work with the percentage as follows: 93% students found that giving clues or comment about how to fix errors can improve their writing ability, 76.69% of the students found that error identification is the most useful type of feedback, and 57.50% of students have a positive opinion for the provision of correction which is accompanied by comment. Those percentages of students perspective is supported by students' explanation in an open ended question of questionnaire. Pedagogical implications of the study are also discussed.

Keywords: Lecturers, students' perspective, written corrective feedback.

Available Online: 16th April, 2016.

This is an open access article under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, 2016.

¹ Lecturer, Department of English, State University of Gorontalo, Indonesia, Email: titien@ung.ac.id.

² Lecturer, As Syafi'iyah Islamic University, Indonesia, Email: tia_nikirei85@yahoo.com.

1.0 Background

In the process of language development it is unavoidable that learners will produce mistakes and produce errors. However, that process can be lessened through recognizing the errors and working on them based on corrective feedbacks given to the learners. Corrective feedback is an area that links the concerns of teachers and SLA/EFL researchers. Teachers tend to be focused on whether or not to correct the learners' errors and when and how to correct the errors, while, SLA researchers are focused more on the effect of corrective feedback on the learners' language development and the most effective types of corrective feedback.

Some teachers and researchers of second language believe that corrective feedback could help learners to acquire and demonstrate their ability in the use of target language rules. Yet, some teachers may find their students are unable to apply the correction that has been applied to their work. This leads to doubt whether or not corrective feedback should be applied. The case happened could be caused by teachers ignored the appropriate corrective feedback given to students. Therefore, it might be useful to investigate students' perception teachers' corrective feedback in English classrooms.

English Language teachers are bound by expectations and perceived responsibility of giving feedback. Feedback is principally given to point out whether students' answers, opinions or any outputs are right or appropriate, or on what and how students must improve. Therefore, several approaches have been engaged in providing both oral and written feedback in language classrooms.

The aim of this section is to review current theory and practice about the implementation of corrective feedback. Some studies found that students view that corrective feedback can improve their competency (Ferguson, 2011; Kagimoto & Rodgers 2007). An extensive review of academic databases and libraries have been read and widely used in this paper. This section is going to discuss the types of feedback and followed by the discussion of issues relation to the effect of feedback.

1.01 Types of feedback

Kagimoto & Rodgers (2007) mentions that there are 6 types of corrective feedback. They are: Explicit correction, Recasts, Clarification request, Metalinguistic feedback, Elicitation and repetition Understanding types of feedback, providing feedback for students can be done orally and in written form. While giving corrective feedback orally can be done direct and indirect without time consuming, for writing lecturers, giving written feedback can be a daunting task because giving such feedback is very time consuming and challenging (Ferris, 2007). Teachers spend significant amounts of time and effort in giving written feedback. Leki (1990) states that writing teachers are compelled to provide such feedback because of the need to assess students' written outputs as well as to support and explain those assessments. In addition, he claims that one of the most common written feedback given by instructors is on language use, known as written corrective feedback, error correction or grammar correction. She claimed that writing instructors focus not only on ideas but also on how ideas are presented or structured, i.e. language forms, because the label "writing teacher" entails the expected responsibility of teaching how to write in a particular language.

1.02 The effect of corrective feedback on learners competencies

Corrective feedback has become a greatly controversial issue in second language acquisition. Different schools of thought in relation to correcting the errors committed by the learners occur from SLA researchers. Some researchers viewed that corrective feedback should be abandoned; because it is harmful (Truscott, 1996) and some studies found corrective feedback did not help learners to improve their language competency (Kepner, 1991, Polio, Fleck and Leder 1998). While some found that correcting learners' errors could help learners improve their language competency, (Ferris, 1999, Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener and Knock, 2008; Sheen 2007).

Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998) conducted an experimental study at Michigan State University to find out whether or not English-as-a-second-language (ESL) students' sentence-level error in revised essay could be reduced when they were or not given additional editing instruction.

Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998) gave a clear conclusion that corrective feedback did not affect students' language accuracy. Truscott (1996) has a similar perspective to the Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998) study. Truscott argues that corrective feedback especially in grammar correction in second language classes should be neglected. He claims that evidence shows that grammar correction does not work to improve students' writing ability. He proposed some of the findings from Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) and Hillocks (1986) which found that grammar correction was not effective in L1 learning. Truscott's arguments in his article were refuted by Ferris (1999). It is found that there are three major problems with the research review section in Truscott's paper. Ferris argues that the subjects in the various studies in Truscott's article are not comparable. The L2 error correction studies referred by Truscott examined very diverse groups of subjects. Therefore Ferris argues that Truscott should not claim that grammar correction is useless. Bitchener (2008) conducted pre-test to all groups. This study shows corrective feedback is useful to improve learners' accuracy in writing.

Another study that also provides the efficacy of corrective feedback had been conducted by Sheen (2007). In this study Sheen evaluated the effect of types of written feedback and the level of which language analytic ability mediates the effect of corrective feedback on the acquisition of articles by intermediate adult ESL learners. Sheen examined 91 adult intermediate ESL learners with various nationality backgrounds in six intact classrooms in the American Language Program (ALP) of a community college in the United States. Data show that written corrective feedback had a positive effect on the learning of English articles. More specifically, meta-linguistic feedback demonstrated to be helpful in improving students' accuracy in all three sets. Similar findings also occur when delayed test was administered four weeks after the immediate-post test. Developing Sheen's study to its logical conclusion shows that learners' accuracy will be improved when corrective feedback is given.

To answer the question on what type of corrective feedback were more effective to improve learners' accuracy, some studies have been conducted (Ellis, Loewen and Erlam, 2006, Erel and Bulut, 2007, Dabaghi, A, 2008 and Liu, 2008). Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) carried out a study to find out the effect of explicit corrective feedback in the form of meta-linguistic information and implicit error correction in the form of recast. To measure the students' abilities, three tests; an oral elicited imitation test, a grammaticality judgment test and a test of meta-linguistic knowledge had been conducted. There were three testing times in this study; a pretest, immediate post test and delayed test with the target of test being past tense -ed. The result of this study found that those who received explicit feedback (meta-linguistic explanation) out performed the group who received implicit feedback in L2 grammar competency. In other words this study reveals direct corrective feedback is more effective than indirect corrective feedback.

Overall, Ellis, Loewen and Erlam (2006) study is a well-designed study. The test is not only in written form but also in oral form. This might complete previous studies which focused only on written form of corrective feedback. More important, this study demonstrated a clear idea that the effectiveness of two different types of corrective feedback, compared to previous studies that have been discussed in this paper which only focus on one type of corrective feedback. Further research with a control group is needed to prove the effect of types of feedback. Erel and Bulut (2007) conducted a four-month study to find out the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback in L2 writing. Thirty seven of students who were enrolled in EFL writing class in a Turkey university were investigated. Participants were categorized into indirect coded feedback group and direct feedback group. The students were asked to write one or two compositions every week in writing class. There are 830 students compositions that were analyzed in this study and 18 error categories were used. Analysing Erel and Bulut (2007) data shows that indirect coded group committed less error than direct group. In other words, this study reveals that indirect or implicit corrective feedback is more effective than direct or explicit feedback.

1.03 Aims and significance of study

There are some aims of this study:

1. To find out students' perceptions on teachers corrective feedback on their work. This can establish baseline approaches for implementing corrective feedback.
2. To establish students' preferences on types of corrective feedback for them that assumed to be the most usefulness feedback.

Corrective feedback is an area that links the concerns of teachers and SLA researchers. Teachers tend to be focused on whether or not to correct the learners' errors and when and how to correct the errors, while, SLA researchers are focused more so on the effect of corrective feedback on the learners' language development and the most effective types of corrective feedback. In relation to the effectiveness of different types of feedback, researchers also have different findings on the efficacy of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on learners' accuracy (Ellis, Loewen and Erlam, 2006, Erel and Bulut, 2007, Dabaghi, A, 2008 and Liu, 2008).

Although many studies have investigated the usefulness of corrective feedback, students perception on teachers feedback sometimes are ignored by the teachers. There are also only few studies which investigates this topic. Therefore it would be useful to carry out this research at English department since lecturers were assumed rarely pay attention on the types of feedback given whether or not can affect students understanding or improve their achievement in English skills. By paying attention on students' perception towards lecturers' corrective feedback it is expected they may find students preferences on types of feedback, therefore lecturers will find out the best types of corrective feedback for their students in order to improve their English skills.

1.04 Research question

1. What are students' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback?
2. What types of feedback do students prefer in learning process?

2.0 Methodology of research

2.01 Participants

The participants of this study are the representative of Semester 6 Students of English Department of Universitas Negeri Gorontalo which consists of 40 students.

2.02 Research instruments

The instrument used in this study is a questionnaire. The survey asks students about their perception on lecturers 'corrective feedback. The questionnaire was a paper-based survey; in other words the survey was given directly to students. To obtain more details about the data gathered, an interview will be conducted directly. The interview questions were similar to those in the questionnaire. Questions related to students' questionnaire answers were explored in interviews.

2.03 Procedure

The Head of English Department was contacted to explain the purpose of this research and to obtain a permit to conduct the study at this department. Consent forms were distributed to the students and once the consent forms were returned, the questionnaires will be distributed to participants directly. As noted earlier, to gain more detailed information informal interviews were conducted directly. These

were direct interviews in which the interviewer could control the development of the interview. These interviews were recorded and transcribed.

3.0 Analysis

The completed questionnaires were recorded into documents and analyzed qualitatively. Data from interviews students was also analyzed qualitatively using coding strategies outlined. The interview coding was the same as the questionnaire coding.

4.0 Findings and discussion

4.01 Findings

Given the extensive data collected in this study, all data are presented but only the most prevalent patterns in participant responses are presented and explained in detail. As noted, every effort has been made to accurately describe patterns reflected in the survey results. The results of this research are discussed here with respect to the research questions posed in this study, and the students' responses toward four items in the survey are discussed throughout. The survey results are presented in four main sections: amounts of written corrective feedback, types of written corrective feedback, explanations for correction of different types of errors and error with comments, and open ended questions. Data from 40 completed questionnaires that obtained were only utilized and explained qualitatively to answer the above-mentioned research questions. The students' responses to the survey on their perception toward feedback are summarized in Table 1. The columns showed the percentages of responses to the statements. The students ranked each statement according to the five-point Likert scale by circling the appropriate number: 1—strongly disagree, 2—disagree, 3—not sure, 4—agree, 5—strongly agree. For the sake of brevity, both positive responses “strongly agree” and “agree” and negative responses “strongly disagree” and “disagree” are added up. This approach does not interfere with the data. On the contrary, it allows displaying the findings in a compact way.

Table 1: The results of descriptive statistics of part A “the amounts of written corrective feedback”.

State Ment	Frequency									
	Strongly Agree	%	Agree	%	Neutral	%	Disagree	%	Strongly Disagree	%
1	18	51,43	12	30,00	6	15,00	2	5,00	2	5,00
2	2	5,00	8	20,00	20	50,00	9	22,50	1	2,50
3	1	2,50	8	20,51	19	48,72	9	23,08	2	5,13
4	1	2,56	11	27,50	7	17,50	18	45,00	3	7,50
5	3	7,50	13	32,50	14	35,00	9	22,50	1	2,50
6	2	5,00	8	20,00	13	32,50	15	37,50	2	5,00
7	15	37,50	18	45,00	6	15,00	1	2,50	0	0,00
8	10	25,00	15	37,50	12	30,00	3	7,50	0	0,00
9	9	22,50	17	43,59	12	30,77	1	2,56	0	0,00
10	7	17,95	10	25,00	21	52,50	2	5,00	0	0,00
11	4	10,00	6	15,00	11	27,50	12	30,00	7	17,50
Avg	6,55	16,99	11,45	28,78	12,82	32,23	7	18,47	1,64	4,10

Table 1 reports the results obtained from learners' responses with percentages of students selecting each alternative. After the data-gathering process, the next step was to synthesize and analyze the results. With respect to the nature of error production, Question 1, the vast majority of students 51.43 % (strongly agree) and 30 % (agree) preferred to be corrected on as many errors as possible. Although

most students agreed to have all errors marked, there was about 10 % (5 % strongly disagree and 5 % disagree) of students felt that as unpleasant condition. This does not necessarily mean that they do not wish to be corrected.

Question 2, 3, 4, 5, and six emphasized to which type of correction that students prefer. Question 2 asked students their opinion how if teachers mark all major errors but not minor ones and the results indicate that 50 % of students chose neutral, 22.50 % disagree and 2.50 % of students chose strongly disagree. However, 25 % of students are likely preferred that teacher should mark all major errors but minor ones. Furthermore, when the students are asked their perspective if teachers mark most major errors but not necessarily all of them on students' work, they tend to stand in neutral position (48,72%) and the nearly 28.21 students prefer to disagree while 23.01 % of them agree with this statement.

Unlike the result of question no 3, question no 4 shows that 27.50 % of students agree if teachers only mark a few of the major errors while nearly half of population 45 % disagree with this statement. It can be said that this result consistent with the result of question number 1 in which vast majority of students agree that teachers should mark all errors. Additionally, question no 5 generates 32.05 % of students agree if teachers mark only errors that interfere with communicating ideas, 35 % of them stand in neutral position, and almost 22.50 % disagree with this opinion. In terms of marking no errors and responding only to ideas as proposed by question number 6, 42.50 % students choose disagree (37.50 % disagree and 5 % strongly disagree), 32.50 % students agree (5 % strongly agree and 20 % agree), and 32.50 % of students mark neutral.

Moreover, Question no 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 emphasize on students' preferences on the sequence or procedure of giving corrective feedback particularly in writing. Vast majority of students come to an agreement (37.50 % agree and 45 % strongly agree) that they would appreciate and want to know the correct forms of correction. As regards to students preferences on the procedures of marking errors, more than half students (25 % strongly agree and 37.30 % agree) agree that teachers should correct all errors first then focus on repeated ones. Interestingly enough, only 1 student did not agree if the teachers mark major errors, and later focus on minor errors, while 22.50 % chose strongly agree, 43.59 % agree and several students (30.77%) chose neutral. In addition, only 32.95 % of students (17.95 strongly agree and 25 % agree) considered that the teacher should respond to content and organization while more than half students stay in neutral position (52.50 %) and 5 % of them disagree. In line with the result of question number 1 and 4, 47.50 % of students disagree if teacher only mark the error for one example and students should do the rest. However, there is about 25 % who agree and 27, 50 % stay neutral.

Table 2: The results of descriptive statistics of part B "Different types of written corrective feedback"

State ment	FREQUENCY											
	Very Useful	%	Useful	%	Does not matter	%	Not useful	%	Not useful at all	%		
12	21	53	16	40,00	0	0,00	2	5,00	1	2,50	40	
13	15	38	11	27,50	11	27,50	3	7,50	0	0,00	40	
14	16	42,11	12	31,58	9	23,68	1	2,63	0	0,00	38	
15	3	7,50	7	17,50	7	17,50	16	40,00	7	17,50	40	
16	1	2,56	3	7,69	4	10,26	12	30,77	19	48,72	39	
17	4	10,00	11	27,50	16	40,00	7	17,50	2	5,00	40	
18	2	5,13	3	7,69	11	28,21	12	30,77	11	28,21	39	
19	2	5,13	9	23,08	19	48,72	8	20,51	1	2,56	39	
20	10	25,00	15	37,50	14	35,00	1	2,50	0	0,00	40	
21	12	30,00	16	40,00	10	25,00	2	5,00	0	0,00	40	
22	3	7,50	11	27,50	11	27,50	6	15,00	9	22,50	40	
23	2	5,00	7	17,50	18	45,00	12	30,00	1	2,50	40	
24	3	7,69	21	53,85	11	28,21	4	10,26	0	0,00	39	
Avg	7,2308	18,28	10,92	27,61	10,85	27,43	6,62	16,73	3,92	3,92	9,96	

Based on the table above, the majority of students (93 %= 53% very useful and 40 % useful) placed value on the importance of clues or direction on how to fix an error, hence written corrective feedback can improve students' writing. Several students (65.50%) also thought that error identification is useful to be applied in giving written corrective feedback while 23.68 % students thought that does not matter. For error correction by the teacher, the majority of students 76.69 % thought this type of feedback is useful, while 23.68% rate does not matter and only 2.63% (1 student) thought it is not useful.

Furthermore, results of questions number 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 showed students' preferences on error correction with a comment. The finding for statement number 11 is quite straightforward: over half of students (57.50 %) answered "not useful" if teacher give comment with no correction while 24.50 % students considered useful and 17.50 % thought it does not matter. On the contrary, the majority 79.49% students (30.77% not useful and 48.72 % not useful at all) considered that feedback is a great deal in learning. For personal comment on content, 40 % students marked "does not matter" while 37.50 % thought it is useful and the rest of them consider it is not useful. More than half students 58.98% showed negative trend (30.77 % no useful and not useful at all 28.21 %) when comments provided by teachers are too confusing, and they do not understand them while 28.21 % students marked "does not matter".

For comments only work if students are dedicated and motivated, only 28.21 % of students believed it is useful and 48,72 % chose neutral. Surprisingly enough, when students are asked their opinion that comments are not enough and teachers must correct the errors, nearly 62.50 % chose useful and only 2.50 % (1 student) thought it is not useful. Essentially, a great number of students 70 % believed that they will remember better with comments and self-correction. For comments are rude, 27.50% chose neutral, 35 % indicate agreement (27.50 % agree and 7.50 % strongly agree) and 37 % select to disagree (22.50 % strongly disagree and 15 % disagree). Around 45 % students indicate neutral in terms of comments are useful for fluency but not accuracy, 22.50 % determine agree and 32,50 % chose disagree (30 % disagree and 2.50 %strongly disagree). Last but not least, as many as 61.54 % students thought that comments are useful if they are exploratory, 28.21 % chose neutral, 10.26 % disagree and none of them chose strongly disagree.

Table 3 Explanation for correction of different types of errors

Statement	Frequency										Total Frequency
	Strongly Agree	%	Agree	%	Neutral	%	Disagree	%	Strongly Disagree	%	
25	19	47,50	18	45,00	2	5,00	0	0	1	2,50	40
26	7	18	13	32,50	15	37,50	5	12,50	0	0	40
27	4	10,00	11	27,50	20	50,00	5	12,50	0	0	40
28	7	17,50	17	42,50	14	35,00	2	5,00	0	0	40
29	14	35,00	16	40,00	8	20,00	2	5,00	0	0	40
30	18	46,15	11	28,21	8	20,51	2	5,13	0	0	39
31	7	17,50	23	57,50	10	25,00	0	0	0	0	40
32	4	10,00	13	32,50	20	50,00	3	7,50	0	0	40
Average	10,00	25,14	15,25	38,21	12,13	30,38	2,38	5,95	0,13	0,31	

Table 3 indicates that students' response for error types and shows their comment on the written corrective feedback types that they believe are more useful. From question number 25, the largest number of students 92,50% (47.50 strongly agree and 45 % agree) consider that content and ideas are important so students learn to be understood. On the other hand, 50.50 % (18 % strongly agree and 32.50% agree) of students comment that "grammar, spelling, and vocabulary are more important than organization and ideas." Almost 37.50 % students indicate that grammar is important than spelling and punctuation while half of students (50 %) chose neutral. In terms of their preferences toward the types of feedback, majority of students 75 % considered that all types of feedback are useful and they appreciate all types of feedback. Nearly 74.56 % students demonstrated in their option that vocabulary is most important.

4.02 Discussion

As noted earlier, the results of this research are discussed here with respect to the research questions posed in this study, and students' responses to the essay questions are discussed throughout.

1. What are students' perceptions of lecturers' corrective feedback?

The first research question asked students' perception of teachers' corrective feedback. Results indicate students believed that giving correction on as many errors as possible is useful for them. This assumption is also emphasized by number of students who rejected the choice in which the teacher marks only a few errors, mark only errors that interfere with communication, responds only to content and ideas, or does not repeatedly mark a repeated error. To ensure the accuracy of these research findings, this section will explore students' explanation through open-ended questionnaire.

When students are asked for their explanations in open ended question (questionnaire part D) about the essential of error correction in the learning process, they are fairly consistent, believing that seeing their errors marked will help them learn and remember them better than if their errors are not marked. Data in this study shows that almost all students perceived corrective feedback is an essential part in learning process and can improve their writing skills. This is further supported in some previous studies that correcting learners' errors could help learners improve their language competency, (Ferris, 1999, Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener and Knock, 2008; Sheen 2007). Here are some examples of students' statement in questionnaire part D:

"Yes, because by error correction students can be able to know their mistakes and they will correct it based on teacher's feedback"

"Yes, I think error correction is an important part of the learning process. Because error correction can help us to know our mistake in writing. In addition, can help us to improve our writing style"

"Error correction from the teacher is very vital for the progress of a student. A student can overcome the errors from the correction and also learn in the same time"

"Extremely yes, cause students can learn more from the correction"

Even though the data presented in Table 1, 2 and 3 reveal different percentages of responses, the data obtained are consistent enough to draw overall conclusions. In fact, several questions generated high percentages of agreement which by some means confirm the need and pedagogical value of corrective feedback in classroom settings.

2. What types of feedback do students prefer in learning process?

Regarding to the second question of this research, students thought that correcting errors is teachers' responsibility. Among all types of feedback, students' shows that error correction with a comment and over correction by the teacher is the most useful type of feedback.

From the data gained above, students answered obviously that written corrective feedback from the teacher will allow them to remember their errors and understand how to fix them. This assumption is also proved by their explanation as follow;

"Yes, because when the lecture correct our assignment, we know our mistake and our capability"

"Yes, because we will know that our writing is correct or not and it will improve our writing"

"Of course, I do really need the lecturer's correct in writing assignment."

"Yes, that's important for students to repair their error."

With regard to these findings; the fact is that corrective feedback plays a facilitative role in learning English. 40 of students surveyed supports the effectiveness of corrective feedback by stating their preferences to get written corrective feedback on their work both correction and comment. In terms

of the perceived usefulness of different feedback types, many students preferred that *a clue with no correction* is not useful because they need more specific correction and comment on their mistakes. Moreover, the data also displayed that students are motivated by the correction and it even leads them to self-correction, which similar to the fact that self-correction has been found to be useful in some previous studies (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Hendrickson, 1980; Makino, 1993).

The results of this study suggested that teachers need to pay more attention to explicit forms of feedback and the right time to give feedback in the classroom. When students are asked their opinion about the best time to provide correction on their writing, vast majority of students prefer to be corrected in the preliminary version of their writing. Below are some examples of their explanation:

"Yes, because the first draft is the basic, so you can be better for the next draft"

"Yes, if the students don't be corrected by a lecture, they cannot go ahead for their draft"

"Yes, from draft the students will be good writing, and then lecturer can see how will write."

The findings of this research shows that over half of students preferred to have correction in the first draft. In response to best time of giving corrective feedback, whether or not errors should be corrected in the first draft, the fact is that leaving students' errors untouched particularly in their first draft of writing might lead to the fossilization of ill-formed structures. Moreover, an assumption can be drawn from students' explanation above that they consider the value of teacher corrective feedback is important and they tried to incorporate teachers' comments and use the corrective feedback to revise their draft. This finding corroborates Hyland's (2003) findings in which students reportedly tried to combine most of their teacher's comments, and that most students used written corrective feedback in the immediate revision of their compositions.

However, some students admit that giving correction on their first draft is time consuming not only for them but also teacher who devote considerable time and energy to error treatment. Ideally, corrective feedback should be individualized, even though this would evidently involve an enormous challenge for the teachers. The following statements are taken from students answer regards to their objection on error correction in the first draft:

"No, in my opinion, teacher should provide the correction when they submitting in their second draft."

"No, because I think it's too long time."

Findings in this research also showed that students have strong preference for getting corrective feedback on their writing as earlier as possible. Yet, the resulting data also suggest that some written corrective feedback may at times obstruct or discourage students because they may feel seriously inhibited and embarrassed, particularly when teacher use red pen to correct their work. Here are some examples of students' explanation toward the use of red pen on error correction and comment by the teacher.

"Yes, it is have a negative effect and its can make our confidence is bad."

"Yes, I do. I will feel bad and afraid. It is like the lecture intimidates me by her/his corrections."

However, some students have positive attitude toward the issue of using red pen to correct their mistakes and give comments. The data obtained somehow suggest that the students consider the red pen a tool to bring their attention to specific points rather than a method to discourage them from learning. Accordingly, the use of a red pen, or rather, corrections in red do not seem to have the negative effect that has been assumed it has, at least for this sample of population surveyed.

"No, it will be better because we can learn from our mistake"

"No, I can see the mark or correction easily"

"No, using the red pen. It would make the student aware on their mistake"

In addition to the students' preferences on fixing the errors on their writing assignment, some students prefer that teacher would use the same color of pen to correct their mistakes. With regards to students' preference on the importance of correcting content and ideas in their writing (questionnaire part C question number 25) results showed that most students indicated positive opinions about the usefulness of written corrective feedback on ideas or content of the writing. However, they demonstrated mixed agree, neutral and negative opinions about the usefulness of written corrective feedback on grammatical errors, punctuation, errors, spelling errors, and vocabulary errors. These result proved that most students are focusing on conveying interesting and coherent ideas in their writing rather than focusing on error free writing as the goal to perfect English. These findings are somehow approve Truscott (1996) and Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998) claim that corrective feedback especially in grammar correction in second language classes should be neglected since that does not work to improve students' writing ability.

In terms of students' preferences on providing all information or using a code to tell them the type of their mistakes so they may checked it by themselves, a great number of students consider that they need all information and some thought that teacher could use code then give the information. Most students rejected if teacher only use code without giving the information. Interestingly enough, only one student, believed, in contrast that the teacher should use a code to indicate students the type of mistake they have made and check it themselves. *"Just give us the clue and it's our responsibility to get the point and also to check our understanding more, but it depends on the student or level students"*

Lastly, when the students are asked their preferences on which method will help them most to understand the reason why they have made the mistake and consequently, to avoid in the future, the combination of both explanation and examples gained the highest score, being the preferred option, followed to a lesser extent by the explanation and then examples. In contrast, both direct correction without any explanations and self-correction are not useful for this sample of students surveyed. Below are the examples of students answer.

"A combination of both. Because the theory will not work without practicing."

"A combination of both. I choose C, since we need explanation to make the material more clear and we need example as the references to finish the assignment"

Overall, results of this study were able to answer the research questions in which teacher feedback highly necessary and helpful in learning process in order to improve students' ability in learning English. Even though students found corrective feedback important, perspective and attitudes towards corrective feedback seem to vary among them. Results showed that although corrective feedback is desired and accepted by most students who need feedback on how well they are doing sometimes students do not always receive the corrective feedback that they expect and or prefer. In addition, even though corrective feedback had generally been found to be beneficial to students learning, what seems to be still unclear is the timing of correction, or rather, whether corrective feedback should be provided right after the error is detected or preferably once students have already finished. As results in this study obtained students preferences and comments on corrective feedback, it can be assumed that students' attitudes towards corrective feedback should not be neglected because those students who constantly receive negative comments from teachers seem to have more negative attitudes towards language learning than those who receive positive feedback. Regarding to the positive attitudes of students toward written corrective feedback, it occurs probably due to the belief that corrective feedback is valuable. Findings in this research showed that students believed written corrective feedback helped them notice their errors and that continuous corrective feedback would eventually result in their improvement.

5.0 Conclusion, implications, and limitations

As can be seen from the results and discussion, the following conclusions have been drawn. First, corrective feedback is an important part of learning English, since it significantly increases the accuracy of learner output. Second, students believe that in order to improve writing skills, it is necessary to receive as many as correction and feedback from teacher on their written works. Third, students preferred to get correction from the teacher and followed by clues and comments on how to fix the error. Finally, it is important to find out what students responses to teacher feedback on their written work. All the things considered above might help students to be successful in improving language skills. Apparently, the amount and frequency of corrective feedback should be adapted to the objective of the lesson, the activity and the needs of students.

In spite of the valuable findings generated by this study, it is admitted that limitations and additional questions raised should be explored in further research. First, recalling that many of the measures examined in this study were based on self-reporting by students. While believing this approach generated results that were both valid and insightful for the study's specific context and purpose, it is important to encourage additional researchers to also use external measures to examine both students and teachers' written corrective feedback practices. It should also be noted that students provided multiple reasons and answer regarding to each situation and depends on what type of corrective feedback given by teacher on particular assignment.

Similarly, comparing the written corrective feedback practices, exploring students and teachers perspective toward written corrective feedback from students or teachers of various regions may also be of interest. Thus, research is needed to find out how the differences between teachers' and students' expectations can be best addressed for optimal pedagogy.

Findings in this study suggested that teachers need to openly discuss the use of written corrective feedback with the students including the code and explanation of code in feedback. Moreover, teachers also need to ensure that students understand the purpose of written corrective feedback and take on responsibility for error correction (self-corrected). Accordingly, it is a good idea for teachers to communicate with students in regards to corrective feedback practices as well as adapt their feedback practices to promote learner autonomy, and at the same time consider students' preferences so as to motivate and encourage students to be in command of their language learning. Teachers must become aware of any differences in opinion about what types of written corrective feedback that preferred by students, so that both students and teachers can modify their expectations accordingly. Lastly, it should not be forgotten that it is always beneficial to correct students' errors in a positive manner and assure them that due to the wrong forms, the correct ones will be better noticed and remembered in the further processes of English learning.

References

- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102–118
- Bitchener, J., & Knock, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research* 12 (3) 409– 431
- Chang, Y. F. (1997). *Topic familiarity and second language learner's oral performance*. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. AAT 9801659
- Dabaghi, A. (2008) A comparison of the effect of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on learners' performance in tailor-made tests. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 8(1), 1-13
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, S. (2006). Implicit and explicit Corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368

- Erel, O. S., and Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context, *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Sayı 1*, 397-415
- Ferguson, P (2011). Students' perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assesment and evaluation in higher education*. Vol. 36, No. 1, January 2011, 51–62
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in l2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11
- 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.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). The treatment of error in written work. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 216-221.
- Hillocks, G. Jr. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composition process. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 16, 261-278.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31 (2), 217-230.
- Kagimoto, E & Rodgers, M.P.H (2007). Students' perception of corrective feedback. *JALT, Conference Proceeding*.
- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75 (3) 305–313
- Knoblauch, C.H., & Brannon, L. 1981. Teacher Commentary on Student Writing: The State of the Art. *Freshman English News*. 10(2)
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (ed.) *Second Language Writing: Insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, Y., (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. *Arizona working Paper in SLA & Teaching*, 15, 65-79
- Makino, T. Y. (1993). Learner self-correction in EFL written compositions. *ELT Journal*, 47, 337-341
- Polio, C., Fleck, N., & Leder, N. (1998). "If only I had more time": ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7 (1) 43–68
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41 (2), 255-283
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Wang, P. (2008). "Exploring Errors in Target Language Learning and Use: Practice Meets Theory." *English Language Teaching*. (2): 182-187. Available from <<http://www.ccsenet.org/journal.html>> [12/03/31].