TEACHERS' CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON ENGLISH STUDENTS' WRITING

Nguyen Thi Thanh Thao,
Le Hai Duy
Dong Thap University, Vietnam

Abstract:

This investigates the participants' attitudes towards corrective feedback as well as the types of corrective feedback on learners' performance by questionnaires for both students and teachers. Fifty–eight 2nd-year students and 5 teachers of English at a university in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam participated in the study. The results indicated that students had a positive attitude towards teachers' corrective feedback. Besides, with the analyzed data, correction with comments and teacher correction was considered as the most useful strategy when giving feedback in the learners' performance. The outcomes of the study suggest a widespread employment of corrective feedback in teaching writing at universities and colleges in the region.

Keywords: corrective feedback, writing, error, student, teacher

I. Introduction

Corrective feedback (CF) is considered as a key feature in teaching and learning writing. According to Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad (2012), error treatment is considered as "*an inseparable part of writing skill*". The contribution of written feedback helps learners have more chances to revise their writing in class immediately after they have received written corrective feedback on their texts. It is a useful technique for the learners to become more independent and more responsible for the linguistic quality of their writing. Additionally, students will be more motivated if received positive feedback from the teachers, and the classroom atmosphere will be more interesting, too.

Kao (2013) also suggested that the teachers should pay more attention to the precise content of the feedback and the precise errors' type targeted with the given feedback since they were major features in determining the effectiveness of the

corrective feedback on the learners' written products. Furthermore, the researcher also stressed that the focus on providing CF on specific linguistic features had a greater benefit to not only the learners' accuracy in the final product but their communication as well.

Whereas the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on the learners' performance has been confirmed through various studies all over the world, questions about the students' perspectives on corrective feedback on their writing and the type of feedback perceived to be more effective to develop writing ability of second-year students of English remain to be unanswered. For this reason, the present study, especially in EFL classes in the Vietnamese context. Thus, the present study aims to investigate the participants' attitudes to corrective feedback on their writing and the type of feedback believed to be more effective in developing the writing ability of second-year students of English. Additionally, this study also aims to identify to what extent corrective feedback affects the learners' written text. Then, the teachers are able to select an appropriate strategy to employ when giving feedback on the learners' performance.

II. Literature review

1. The nature of writing

Klein (1985) refers to writing as the ability to put pen and paper to express ideas through symbols. In this respect, representations on the paper can support the writer in communicating to other people effectively with meaningful form and obvious content. Moreover, writing is more than making our thoughts and ideas visible and concrete (Ghaith, 2002). Writing is also a form of thinking; it is thinking for particular audience, and for a particular occasion. Writing is also an important language expression activity, so writing is process of thinking and feeling and of shaping experiences, and it is an important medium for self-expression, for communication, and for the discovery of meaning.

According to Jarvis (2002), mechanical aspect is the main feature of the product-oriented approach. In other words, the correctness is paid more attention to in the final product. Besides, the learners are asked to make a copy with the model and have an appropriate style to the given topics. Meanwhile, in the process-oriented approach, the students are taught the way to develop and organize ideas logically and smoothly in the written product. In the process writing (Sarhady, 2015) learners are able to acknowledge the way to cooperate in problem-solving tasks. Through drafting ang redrafting, the learners' writing ability improves. Besides, peer feedback and revision are also vital in the cycle of process writing.

2. Corrective feedback

Ellis (2009) argues that corrective feedback has a vital role in second language (L2) learning and language pedagogy. In other words, corrective feedback is considered as a medium to encourage the learners to acquire profound linguistic accuracy. Besides, with the support of CF, teachers are able to acknowledge the method and the suitable time to correct the learners' written texts. With regards to the effect of CF, providing CF will prompt the learners to organize, structure and modify knowledge. Furthermore, CF is a useful way to preserve the knowledge about grammatical features in a long term memory (Maleki & Eslami, 2013).

Direct corrective feedback is considered as a strategy to help learners correct their errors by providing the correct form of the target language. Some researchers have studied the effects of direct CF on the learners' grammatical accuracy and writing quality. In Zareil and Rahnama's study (2013), in terms of grammatical accuracy, the participants were able to achieve better performance with the support of direct CF. Similarly, Kao (2013) ensured that learners got a significant improvement in employing English articles correctly when direct corrective feedback was given. In other words, in terms of accuracy in learners' writing, direct corrective treatment is actually a valuable means (2013). Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad (2012) also conducted a survey on the effect of direct and indirect feedback on the learners' written products. The participants were the third -year ESL students. Two experimental groups were formed with two kinds of CF, direct CF and indirect CF respectively. Direct corrective feedback was given by identifying both the error and providing the target form. And then indirect corrective feedback was used in the form of codes. The text book, Academic Writing Course, was applied in the present study. This instrument is about specific steps to write from paragraph structuring to essay writing through a process approach. A variety of writing tasks and models was given to help the participants have remarkable improvement in writing skill. With a detailed investigation, the findings showed that the learners in the direct CF group were able to acquire the knowledge of grammatical points profoundly. Particularly, the direct CF ensures the learners have more accuracy when employing the past simple tense, relative pronouns and the preposition in new writing tasks.

Indirect corrective feedback occurs when an incorrect form is made, but no direct correction is made. Indirect corrective feedback also plays an important role in improving learners' proficiency level in writing an essay or composition. Zareil and Rahnama (2013) investigated the effect of corrective feedback on the grammatical and lexical writing accuracy. In the current study, the participants were the students who major in English. Their proficiency level ranged from lower-intermediate to intermediate. They were formed into six intact groups. X considered as the control

group with no CF. A version of the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (MTELP) was provided in the pretest. The current test was applied in order to ensure the knowledge of the learners about gramma, lexicon and reading. In addition, the learners were requested to complete the writing test in the posttest. The main goal of the posttest was to confirm the effect of various types of CF on grammatical and lexical accuracy utilized in the study. The findings show uncoded CF, a kind of indirect feedback, has more remarkable importance in improving the learners' lexical accuracy in their writing tasks.

3. The focus of the feedback

Focused written CF is applied by underlining the error, writing the target form above it with the errors in a specific target structure (i.e. prepositions). Then unfocused written CF gives direct written CF on the errors in a range of linguistic structures (i.e. articles, prepositions, verb tenses). Sheen et al. (2009) studied the differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. The participants were native-English speaking teachers and intermediate level students in an ESL program. During the research, all students were taking an intermediate reading or writing course. Four groups were divided – one control and three experimental groups. Focus written CF, unfocused written CF and writing practice were the main issues in the experimental groups. The grammatical target for the focused CF group was the use of English definite and indefinite articles whereas the target for the unfocused CF group was articles, "be", regular past tense, irregular past tense and preposition. Two written CF experimental groups were asked to complete two written narrative tasks separately. Other two written tasks were also given to Written Practice group. The results of the study indicated that the focused CF group achieved the best performance. In this sense, focused written error correction helps the learners have more accuracy in their written tasks than unfocused correction addressed in a range of grammatical errors.

4. Electronic corrective feedback

Electronic feedback uses computer as a means to give written CF to the learners. In this sense, with the useful tools in the computer, the learners are able to receive completely precise feedback about spelling, grammatical features. Chang et al. (2012) claimed that in their online survey, with three closed-ended questions and two open-ended questions, undergraduate participants preferred e-feedback for its accessibility, timeliness, and legibility. McGrath and Leadbeater (2016) conducted two studies about the acquisition and the attitude of the learners about the use of digital media for writing composition; especially electronic feedback. In both studies, the instructors' comments

and interviews were employed on electronic copies of the students' written drafts that could be revised and resubmitted. The analysis of Study 1 revealed that unexplained editing changes made the learners more confused. In contrast, the learners had more responsibilities in revision session in their written product with the support of detailed comments. On the other hand, in Study 2, the learners had a positive attitude about the convenience, legibility, organization, and quantity of feedback when provided electronically. The final results in the current studies revealed that the learners are able to make an improvement in writing skill if the teachers or instructors employ more electronic feedback in their written text.

5. Reformulation

Reformulation is also considered as a technique in giving feedback. Reformulation is employed by rewriting the correct form of the target language, but the original text is kept. Several studies were conducted to investigate the effect of reformulation strategies in the field of writing. Kadkhodaei et al. (2013) emphasizes the role of reformulation tasks including comparison, paraphrasing, and copying activities in improving EFL learners' accuracy when an essay is composed. Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) examined how direct feedback (reformulations) and indirect feedback (editing symbols, i.e. providing the codes above the errors) affected the learners' written text. The study was carried out with 12 pairs. The first experimental group received feedback in the form of reformulation; the other one with the form of editing. After completing three separate sessions and comprehensive analysis, the researcher concluded that the learners outperformed when editing was applied to their written product. In this sense, reformulation has a little help in encouraging the learners acquire the knowledge of grammar and word meanings. In another study of Ibarrola (2013), the researcher compared the effectiveness of two correction strategies (reformulation and self-correction) for EFL writing. The study was carried out in two sessions with the mentioned strategies. All types of errors were coded including grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and errors of coherence and cohesion. Reformulation of every student's production is not easily applicable to the classroom due to time limitations and task difficulty for the teacher. The statistical analysis demonstrated that reformulation and self-correction helped the learners reduce more errors in the composition. Especially, reformulation had more positive effect than the other strategy in correcting errors. On the other hand, when employing reformulation in EFL classroom, the teacher should be more carefully since it is able to be a time-consuming strategy.

III. Methods

1. Research questions

To draw out the conclusion about the participants' attitudes towards teachers' corrective feedback in their performance, the researcher made an attempt to answer the following questions:

1. *What are the EFL students' attitudes towards teacher corrective feedback in their writing?*
2. *What amount of corrective feedback do the students think is most useful?*
3. *Which type of feedback is more effective to develop the writing ability of second–year students of English?*

2. Participants

The sample for the present study was 5 teachers of English and 58 students from two writing classes at Dong Thap University (Vietnam). The teacher participants belonged to the Faculty of Foreign Languages at Dong Thap University. Their experience of teaching English ranged between one and fifteen years. The student participants were the second – year students. They also majored in English in the Faculty of Foreign Languages. It means that they were at the same level of English proficiency. There are some reasons for selecting these students. First, they were equipped with the basic knowledge about writing skill. Second, they were not actually able to acquire the error treatment in their final product. In other words, they were not able to make their written texts more understandable and attractive to the readers.

3. Research instruments

For this study, the questionnaire was adapted from Amrhein & Nassaji (2010) and Mubarak (2013). The questionnaire on students' attitudes towards corrective feedback (see Appendix 1) was developed to acknowledge what the students thought about corrective feedback. The first section was used to introduce to the study and emphasize the role of the participants. The second section investigated participants' background information including the academic specialization and the academic year. The third section focused on the participants' overview of feedback. It included one multiple choice and three questions designed in a five – point Likert scales from *Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely* to *Never*. The following section consisted of four questions about the learners' attitudes towards corrective feedback with the Likert scales items: *Strongly agree, Agree, Don't know, Disagree, Strongly disagree*. The last section focused on feedback practice with a multiple choice question, yes – no question and Likert scales items: *Not useful at all, Not useful, Doesn't matter, Quite useful, Very useful*.

The questionnaire on teachers' attitudes towards corrective feedback (see Appendix 2) modified from the students' questionnaire was used to collect the data on teachers' attitudes towards corrective feedback. This questionnaire was not significantly different from the students' version in content but there were some minor changes in the wording to make it valid for the ultimate aim. For example, like students' questionnaire, the first section of the teachers' questionnaire stressed the important role of the participants. However, the second section had a little difference such as adding the information about academic degree; and changing from academic year to years of teaching experience. Similar to students' questionnaire, there were also three sections on the following clusters: the participants' overview of feedback; the learners' attitudes towards corrective feedback; and feedback practice.

4. Procedure of data collection

The data on the students' and the teachers' attitudes towards corrective feedback was collected by the researcher within two weeks in February, 2016. Fifty – eight copies were delivered to 58 majored – English students from two writing classes, Faculty of Foreign Languages. The questionnaire was implemented after the participants completed their lessons in the classroom. Careful instructions were employed in order to have the reliable results.

Firstly, the students were presented the purpose of the study as well as the way to supply their background information in the first section of the questionnaire. Then, they were explained to respond to each item by checking for their appropriate degree of agreement on a five – point Likert scale ranging from *Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely* to *Never* and select the best answer for the given multiple choice question. Continually, the participants were asked to pay more attention to the questions about the attitudes towards corrective feedback since the current item had a different Likert scale. They were organized from *Strongly agree, Agree, Don't know, Disagree* to *Strongly disagree*. Finally, the last section was actually the complicated issue for the participants. Since they not only provided the appropriate statements for each item but give more explanation for their given choice. However, the students were encouraged to ask any questions if they have any difficulties in understanding the questionnaire. As a result, it took the participants about twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire.

Unlike the process of collecting students' questionnaire, teachers' questionnaire was selected by e-mails. Particularly, the teacher participants would be shortly explained the purpose of the study. It is clear the current participants have a right understanding for each questionnaire item. They were willing to complete twelve items on the questionnaire. Then, their responses were collected after one week.

5. Data analysis

First, the data obtained from the questionnaire was transferred to Statistic Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for data analysis. The five – point scales were coded, from Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely to Never, from Strongly agree, Agree, Don't know, Disagree to Strongly disagree and from Not useful at all, Not useful, Doesn't matter, Quite useful to Very useful respectively. The three major features of the questionnaire were analyzed with Descriptive Statistic Test for quantitative data.

IV. Findings

Table 1: Students' Responses to Question 1, 3, 4

Question	Students' Reponses									
	Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Does your instructor return your writing?	24	41.4	27	46.6	6	10.3	1	1.7	0	0
3. Do you get feedback on your writing from the teacher?	28	48.3	21	36.2	8	13.8	1	1.7	0	0
4. Does the teacher discuss your writing errors with you after he/she returns your writing?	20	34.5	30	51.7	7	12.1	0	0	1	1.7

Table 2: Students' Responses to Question 2

Question 2	Students' Reponses							
	A. During the same class in which the writing is handed		B. The following class		C. No later than one week		Later than (A), (B) and (C)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
When do you normally get your writings back from the teacher?	24	41.4	27	46.6	6	10.3	1	1.7

From the table 1 & 2, it indicated that teacher's responsibility was expressed clearly. Returning students' writings, giving feedback on their writings, discussing the errors with them after returning the writings and discussing achieved the same percentage: 98.3%. It was found that the teacher respected students' papers. Teacher effort actually had a great help in making students have a profound knowledge about the errors. Additionally, teacher effort was made so that students reinforced their performance in writing skill.

Table 3: Students' Responses to Question 5, 6, 7, 8

Question	Students' Reponses									
	Strongly agree		Agree		Don't know		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5. I prefer getting feedback.	36	62.1	18	31.0	4	6.9	0	0	0	0
6. My teacher's feedback makes me unwilling to do the task again.	3	5.2	2	3.4	9	15.5	29	50	14	24.1
7. My teacher's feedback helps me improve my writing.	24	41.4	29	50	3	5.2	1	1.7	1	1.7
8. I would like to receive more feedback on my writing in the future.	28	48.3	25	43.1	5	8.6	0	0	0	0

Table 3 shows more than 90% students preferred getting feedback (Strong agree and Agree), and would like to receive more feedback on their performance in the future. Furthermore, with the teachers' corrective feedback, 74.1% claimed that they wanted to compose their following writings, and 91.4% showed that they were able to make an improvement from the support of the teachers' feedback.

Table 4: Teachers' Responses to Question 1, 2, 3, 4

Question	Teachers' Reponses									
	Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Do you give feedback on your students' writing?	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Do you write comments at the end of the students' writing?	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0
3. Do you make students hand in a second draft of their writing?	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0
4. Do students consult you for more explanation after receiving feedback?	2	40	1	20	2	20	0	0	0	0

With the given responses, the results showed that the teachers had a strong agreement with corrective feedback on the learners' performance. It means that they were willing to give feedback with specific comment at the end of the students' writing. Moreover,

they were able to give more explanation if the problems about the feedback were raised. However, 60% teachers rarely asked their students to hand in their second draft writing. On the other hand, teachers claimed that they should have responsibilities in giving more explanation for students' writing. That would help the students acknowledge their errors profoundly and avoid making the same errors in the future.

Table 5: Teachers' Responses to Question 5, 6, 7, 8

Question	Teachers' Reponses									
	Strongly agree		Agree		Don't know		Disagree		Strongly disagree	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5. *Students benefit from the feedback I give them on their writing.*	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. *In general, students do not benefit from written feedback.*	0	0	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40
7. *It is preferable not to give feedback to students at all.*	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60
8. *It is the duty of teachers to always provide feedback on students' writing.*	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	0	0

From table 5 above, it demonstrates that teachers are responsible for providing feedback on students' writing. Besides, with the help of corrective feedback, teachers are also able to give the students more opportunities to improve their written product. It means that teachers acknowledged their important role in helping the students review their errors and enhance their understanding about the mentioned errors profoundly. On the other hand, in terms of care from the teachers for their students' writing, giving feedback helps the students have more motivation and make a remarkable progress when they learn specific skill.

Table 6: Responses to Question 9

Options	Students		Teachers	
	No.	%	No.	%
mark all errors	46	79.3	1	20
mark all major errors but not the minor ones	10	17.2	0	0
mark most of the major errors, but not necessarily all of them	3	5.2	3	60
mark only a few of the major errors	2	3.4	1	20
mark only the errors that interfere in imparting your ideas	24	41.4	3	60
mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content	0	100	0	100

In terms of the students' view, it could be easy to recognize that marking all errors made up the highest percent with the frequency of 46. In contrast, 60% teachers emphasized correcting most of the major errors. It means that if marking all errors in the students' writing product makes students more passive in their learning process. Hence, most teachers should pay more attention to correct the errors in order that teachers are not able to reduce students' motivation in producing their written texts. On the other hand, ideas have a significant role in rectifying errors in students' assignment. 41.4% was the percentage that should have a look. Similarly, teachers also expressed their agreement in the current solution. In other words, applying the present feedback helps students acknowledge the way to make the ideas in the essay or in the paragraph logically.

Table 7: Students' Responses to Question 10

Type of feedback	Students' Reponses									
	Not useful at all		Not useful		Doesn't matter		Quite useful		Very useful	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Look at Section 2 in grammar book A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.	5	8.6	11	19.0	6	10.3	21	36.2	14	24.1
B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.	6	10.3	17	29.3	5	8.6	27	46.6	2	3.4
C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been (wrong tense)*	4	6.9	5	8.6	5	8.6	15	25.9	27	46.6
D. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been*	2	3.4	11	19.0	7	12.1	22	37.9	15	25.9
E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. **WRONG TENSE**	8	13.8	20	34.5	9	15.5	17	29.3	2	3.4
F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely.	40	69.0	15	25.9	1	1.7	1	1.7	0	0
G. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely.	39	67.2	7	12.1	7	12.1	4	6.9	0	0

From table 7, for option A, 60.3% students thought that the teacher gave clues or directions on how students are able to correct their work usefully or quite usefully. Giving directions helped students perceive their errors easily. Meanwhile, for option B only around 50%. The table also indicated that correction with comments and/or teacher

correction made up the agreement (*Quite useful* and *Useful)* with 72.5%, 63.8 %, 32.7% respectively (option C, D, E). Particularly, 94.9% agreed (option F) that with no feedback on errors, the teacher did not have any responsibility/provide any usefulness for their assignments. In addition, it was rather complicated for students to search and rectify their errors. Furthermore, this somehow suggests that no error was made in students; thus they would ignore their papers and no improvement was made.

Finally, approximately 80% participants expressed their disagreement with giving personal feedback on the ideas or contents of the writing assignment (Option G). Clearly, the teacher's comment was rather general; since the participants need more information about the writing more than the personal comment.

Table 8: Teachers' Responses to Question 10

Type of feedback	Teachers' Reponses									
	Not useful at all		Not useful		Doesn't matter		Quite useful		Very useful	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Look at Section 2 in grammar book A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u>	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20
B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0
C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been (wrong tense)*	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40
Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been*	0	0	1	20	0	0	3	60	1	20
E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. **WRONG TENSE**	0	0	1	20	1	20	3	60	0	0
F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely.	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
G. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely.	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	0

Up to 80% teachers argued (option A) that clues or directions on how to fix an error had a great help for students. Since students are able to look back at their lessons and review what they have learned or at least when the teacher point out the error or give suggestion for correcting the error. Besides, only 40% teachers claimed (option B) that the teacher points out where the errors occur but without correction is quite useful. They would like their students will probably need to review their lessons to find out the

way to correct their mistakes. The current solution also gives them opportunities improve their knowledge about the errors. With 100% and 80% respectively, teachers argued that correction with comments and teacher correction are the best options for correcting errors in the students' writing products. It means that giving specific correction is really of great help because of the following reasons. Meanwhile, 60% teachers argued that making comments about errors without correction also has a little help in the students' writing. Finally, no feedback on an error or a personal comment on the writing content is not a useful way in writing feedback chosen by 100% teachers.

V. Conclusion

According to the statistical data, correction with comments and teacher correction are considered as direct feedback. The present options are effective ways to give feedback in the students' writing. Applying these solutions, not only help the learners improve the accuracy in their writing but also have a profound knowledge about grammatical points. These findings correspond to the research Zareil and Rahnama (2013); Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad (2012). These researches emphasizes the important role of direct feedback when the researchers correct the errors about English articles, past simple tense, relative pronoun and prepositions. On the other hand, in terms of teacher's view, clues or directions on how to fix an error, referred as indirect feedback, is really helpful for the students. In the research of Zareil and Rahnama (2013); Purnawarman (2011), these researchers states that using the current option help the learners make improvement in the second revision and a new essay in the future.

Also, students have positive attitude towards corrective feedback. Both teachers and the students are willing to provide and receive corrective feedback in students' writing. In terms of teachers, it emphasizes teachers' care in the students' performance. Hence, it will make an active and comfortable atmosphere in the classroom and then the students have more interest in learning process. In terms of students, they will be more independent in looking for the appropriate data in order to correct their errors. Consequently, they will have a great understanding about the errors and make an increase in their writing. With the fluency and the logic in the writing, their readers will be attracted.

Regarding the amounts of corrective feedback in the students' writing, students prefer to receive as much feedback as possible. It means that their performance has more teachers' attention. Then, their errors will not take place in the following writing assignment. However, there is also a drawback. If there are many given feedbacks in the students' writing, it will discourage them. It is certain that they do not have any improvement. Therefore, in terms of teachers' view, they claim that most of the major

errors should be corrected. Besides, teachers should consider the errors related to the ideas since the ideas also play vital role in the students' works. If the ideas are arranged in a logical way, their writing will get more attention from the readers. Finally, in students' view, correction with comments and teacher correction are the best options. Since they are appropriate method to help, the learners acknowledge the errors effectively. Similarly, in the view of teachers, clues or directions on how to fix an error, correction with comments and teacher correction are also a great help for students. Applying the present options, the students are able to know exactly the related information and correct the errors by their own.

Additionally, both teachers and students disagree that no feedback on errors and a personal feedback should not be applied in the students' written products. Firstly, the students will be confused that their writing assignment is right or wrong and if this situation continues for a long time, the motivation for learning will be make a decrease. Then, since no information about their errors is given; therefore, the students' belief on teacher' professional level will not increase. Consequently, teachers should be carefully when giving feedback in the students' performances. In other words, teachers should consider the following aspects related to the students: the behavior, the preference and the proficiency level. If the current aspects are applied logically and effectively, the students' written products will get more improvement.

VI. Recommendation

First, teachers are not required to give feedback on learner writings all the time or on every aspect. Short, simple and necessary feedbacks are good. After any students' works, teachers can give simple or motivated feedbacks to students or even short and light remarks so that students are able to notice that their teachers are paying attention to their works and encourage them. Effective feedbacks can much motivate the learning process. Hence, teachers should be aware of selecting the appropriate feedbacks to learners. Secondly, teachers should involve the students more in the process of giving feedback. Teachers should not let students react passively to the feedback. It means that teachers are able to request students to give their ideas about their friends' works. Hence, teachers should encourage them to take part in feedback activities and avoid criticizing them even when they give wrong remarks. In addition, teachers are able to give some situations related to students' errors and ask them for their feedbacks. From those activities, students are able to be acquainted with giving feedbacks themselves and notice their errors easier.

References

1. Amrhein, H., Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics (CJAL),* 13(2), 95-127.
2. Chang, N., Watson, A. B., Bakerson, M. A., Williams, E. E., McGoron, F. X., and Spitzer, B. (2012). Electronic feedback or handwritten feedback: What do undergraduate students prefer and Why? *Journal of Teaching and Learning with Technology,* 1(1), 1-23.
3. Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal,* 63(2), 97-107.
4. Ghaith, G. M. (2002). Using cooperative learning to facilitate alternative assessment. *English Teaching Forum,* 40(3), 26-31.
5. Hashemnezhad, H. and Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A case for direct and indirect feedback: The other side of coin. *English Language Teaching,* 5(3), 230-239.
6. Ibarrola, A. (2013). Reformulation and self-correction: Insights into correction strategies for EFL writing in a school context. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics,*10, 29-49.
7. Jarvis, D. (2002). The process writing method. *The Internet TESL Journal,* VIII (7), available from http://iteslj.org/
8. Kadkhodaei, N., Gorjian, B., Pazhakh, A. (2013). The role of reformulation tasks in EFL learners' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World,* 4(4), 51-57.
9. Kao, C. (2013). Effects of focused feedback on the acquisition of two English articles. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language,* 17(1), 1-15.
10. Klein, M. (1985). *The writings of Melanie Klein*. London: Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis.
11. Maleki, A., Eslami, E. (2013). The effects of written corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' control over grammatical construction of their written English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 3(7), 1250-1257.
12. McGrath, A., Leadbeater, K. (2016). Instructor comments on student writing: Learner response to electronic written feedback. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal,* 8(3), 1-16.
13. Purnawarman, P. (2011). *Impacts of teacher feedback on ESL/EFL students' writing*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, USA.

14. Sheen, Y., Wright, D., Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556-569.

15. Storch, N., Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing: case studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303-334.

16. Zareil, A., Rahnama, M. (2013). The effect of written corrective feedback modes on EFL learners' grammatical and lexical writing accuracy: from perceptions to facts. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 1(3), 1-14.

APPENDIX 1

Questionnaire for Students

This questionnaire is used to investigate teachers' corrective feedback on the writing of second-year students of English at the university in the Mekong Delta. The following questionnaire is a very crucial part in my study. Your answers will be a basic foundation for my study results. All the personal information will be kept confidential.

Section 1: Background information
Academic Specialization:
Academic year (1st/ 2nd/ 3rd/ 4th):

Section 2: General Overview of Feedback
Please put a tick (✓) that best describes your response to the questions:
1. Does your instructor return your writing?

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

2. When do you normally get your writing back from the teacher?
☐ A. During the same class in which the writing is handed
☐ B. The following class
☐ C. No later than one week
☐ D. Later than (A), (B) and (C)

3. Do you get feedback on your writing from the teacher?

Always	*Often*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*

4. Does the teacher discuss your writing errors with you after he / she returns your writing?

Always	*Often*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*

Section 3: The Attitudes towards Feedback

5. I prefer getting feedback to no feedback.

Strongly agree	*Agree*	*Don't know*	*Disagree*	*Strongly disagree*

6. My teacher's feedback makes me unwilling to do the task again.

Strongly agree	*Agree*	*Don't know*	*Disagree*	*Strongly disagree*

7. My teacher's feedback helps me improve my writing.

Strongly agree	*Agree*	*Don't know*	*Disagree*	*Strongly disagree*

8. I would like to receive more feedback on my writing in the future.

Strongly agree	*Agree*	*Don't know*	*Disagree*	*Strongly disagree*

Section 4: Feedback Practice

9. If there are many errors in your writing, what do you think your English teacher should do? You can check more than one.

☐ A. Teacher should mark all errors.

☐ B. Teacher should mark all major errors but not the minor ones.

☐ C. Teacher should mark most of the major errors, but not necessarily all of them.

☐ D. Teacher should mark only a few of the major errors.

☐ E. Teacher should mark only the errors that interfere in imparting your ideas.

☐ F. Teacher should mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content.

Please explain the reason for your choice (s).

…………………………………………………………………………………

10. The following sentences all have the same errors and a teacher has given a different type of feedback for each. Please put a tick (✓) that best describes the usefulness of the feedback for students.

Type of feedback	Not useful at all	Not useful	Doesn't matter	Quite useful	Very useful
look at Section 2 in grammar book A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.					
B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.					
C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been (wrong tense)*					
D. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been*					
E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. **WRONG TENSE**					
F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely.					
G. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. *I'm sorry to hear that*					

Appendix 2

Questionnaire for Teachers

This questionnaire is used to investigate teachers' corrective feedback on the writing of second-year students of English at the university in the Mekong Delta. The following questionnaire is a very crucial part in my study. Your answers will be a basic foundation for my study results. All the personal information will be kept confidential.

Section 1: Background Information
Academic Degree:
Academic Specialization:
Years of Teaching Experience:

Section 2: General Overview of Feedback

Please put a tick (✓) that best describes your response to the questions:

1. Do you give feedback on your students' writing?

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

2. Do you write comments at the end of the students' writing?

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

3. Do you make students hand in a second draft of their writing?

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

4. Do students consult you for more explanation after receiving feedback?

Always	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never

Section 3: Attitudes towards Feedback

5. Students benefit from the feedback I give them on their writing.

Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree

6. In general, students do not benefit from written feedback.

Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree

7. It is preferable not to give feedback to students at all.

Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree

8. It is the duty of teachers to always provide feedback on students' writing.

Strongly agree	Agree	Don't know	Disagree	Strongly disagree

Section 4: Feedback Practice

9. If there are many errors in students' writing, what do you think is most useful to do? Please check all that apply.

☐ A. mark all errors

☐ B. mark all major errors but not the minor ones

☐ C. mark most of the major errors, but not necessarily all of them

☐ D. mark only a few of the major errors

☐ E. mark only the errors that interfere in imparting the ideas

☐ F. mark no errors and respond only to the ideas and content

Please explain the reason for your choice (s).

……………………………………………………………………………………………

10. The following sentences all have the same errors and a teacher has given a different type of feedback for each. Please put a tick (✓) that best describes the usefulness of the feedback for students.

Type of feedback	Not useful at all	Not useful	Doesn't matter	Quite useful	Very useful
Look at Section 2 in grammar book A. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.					
B. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely.					
C. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been (wrong tense)*					
D. Since I arrived in Victoria, I <u>am</u> very lonely. *have been*					
E. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. **WRONG TENSE**					
F. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely.					
G. Since I arrived in Victoria, I am very lonely. *I'm sorry to hear that*					

…………………………………………………………………………………………………..