

## Exploring the Preferred Corrective Feedback and Practiced Corrective Feedback among Pakistani ESL Secondary School Students and Teachers in Writing Class: Matches and Mismatches

MUHAMMAD NAWAZ (0000-0001-8326-4447)

(Corresponding Author)

*Faculty of Arts, Design, and Social Sciences*

*Iqra University*

*Karachi, Pakistan*

*memuhammadnawaz@gmail.com*

SADAF AZFAAR HUSSAIN (0000-0003-4162-4824)

*Dow Institute of Health Professionals Education*

*Dow University of Health Sciences*

*Karachi, Pakistan*

*sadafazfaar110@gmail.com*

FARAZ ALI BUGHIO (0000-0001-6487-4346)

*Department of Academic Literacy & Social Sciences*

*Botswana International University of Science and Technology*

*Palapye, Botswana*

*bughiof@biust.ac.bw*

### ABSTRACT

*This study sought to ascertain the preferred corrective feedback of ESL students and practiced corrective feedback of their teachers and to determine whether there were any matches or mismatches between preferences of ESL secondary school students and the practices of their ESL teachers for corrective feedback. The study used a quantitative research design. 200 ESL students enrolled in private secondary schools in Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan were given the adopted questionnaire by Ganapathy et al. (2020), which contained forty-four closed-ended items with a range of "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." In SPSS (version, 22), both descriptive statistics and t-tests were used to analyze the study's two research questions. According to the findings of the first research question, comprehensive corrective feedback was most frequently given by ESL school teachers to their students followed by focused corrective feedback as the second most preferred and practiced corrective feedback. The results of the second research question showed no significant difference between preferred and practiced corrective feedback. The results of this study have important implications for ESL students and teachers. They are also pertinent to language teaching in terms of using corrective feedback in writing class.*

*Keywords: Corrective Feedback, English as Second or Foreign Language, ESL Writing, Preferences of Students, Practices of Teachers.*

To cite this article: Nawaz, M., Hussain, S. A., & Bughio, F. A. (2023). Exploring the Preferred Corrective Feedback and Practiced Corrective Feedback among Pakistani ESL Secondary School Students and Teachers in Writing Class: Matches and Mismatches. *International Journal of Language, Literacy and Translation* 6(1), 31-45. <https://doi.org/10.36777/ijollt2023.6.1.062>

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.36777/ijollt2023.6.1.062>

Received: 5 October 2022

Accepted: 9 January 2023

Published Online: 31 March 2023

## INTRODUCTION

The status of the English language has witnessed a drastic change recently. Many studies on the status of the English language highlighted the importance of English as an international language (e.g. McKay, 2012; Alam, 2020; Smith, 2022). Considering the perspective of English as an International Language (EIL), the majority of the English varieties came into being due to a large proportion of second language learners (Crystal, 2004; Brown, 2017). In this manner, EIL is seen as a variety of English as well as a particular way of using English language for communication purpose (Cameron and Galloway, 2019). This varied idea of EIL has raised the question of the ownership of the English language. The native speakers are not the owner of the English language alone; whosoever uses the English language for communicative purposes may hold the ownership of it (McKay, 2002; Mastuda, 2003; Zia, 2021). Researchers also argued that it has brought drastic changes in SLA and TESOL methodology (Marlina, 2014; Sharifian 2009; Khan, 2022). As a linguistic tool, it enables educators, scholars, and researchers to modify their concepts, approaches, and strategies regarding language teaching (Marlina, 2014, Hussain, 2021). Therefore, the previous models on which the TESOL methodology was based are being challenged due to research on EIL. Theoretical contemplations about EIL have revealed insights into the status of English, its nature, and its usage in multilingual settings for communication purpose (Holliday, 2006; Ali, 2018). Not only has the evaluation of the native speakers' false notions brought into question (Ahmed, 2019) and appropriateness but it has additionally raised a problem concerning varieties, instruction models, and standard methods (Selvi and Yazan, 2013; Tajeddin and Adeh, 2016; Hashmi, 2022).

English language has a prominent position in Pakistani society. A person cannot perceive his/her significant success in terms of social and financial gains without being literate in English language (Qureshi & Shamim, 2009). Generally there are two segments of educational institutions categorized by the medium of instruction: English-medium high-quality institutes for the upper class and Urdu low-quality institutes for the middle or lower class. Similarly, government Urdu-medium school students start learning English after passing their fifth grade. It enables private sector schools to establish their institutes or academies to attract parents for the enrollment of their children because those private schools offer English-medium classes from grade one (Channa, 2017). Though Shamim (2008) claimed that offering English-medium from earlier grades by these private schools outperformed government Urdu- medium

schools, they do not completely employ English as a medium of instruction (South Asian Forum for Educational Development, 2010). Therefore, it can be observed that students with better access to English language are more likely to flourish in economic and social positions by gaining better employment opportunities in Pakistan. Consequently, the knowledge of English makes people strengthen their network with those who have influential positions at social, economic, and political arena (Nawaz, Hussain, & Qureshi, 2022).

Developing writing abilities is a prominent component of communication abilities (Graham, 2018). Achievement in this domain is guaranteed by educators' appropriate guidance and instructions. These instructions are achievable with proper feedback. By giving pupils distinct types of constructed corrective feedback, such as indirect, direct, unfocused, and concentrated criticism, teachers can assist their learning (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012). However, pupils may not be able to enhance their writing skills due to the incompetence and lack of expertise of teachers and their inexperience (Nilaasini, 2015; Ganapathy et al., 2020). Possessing strong writing skills may increase students' chances of progress (Alexander, 2008). Writing is an essential component of communication while discussing the significance of writing. The variety of written discourse should be considered in instructional activities, tactics, and proficiency development in any language education plan (Khan, 2017).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Language learning and teaching involve corrective feedback as a tool in formal classroom learning (Nawaz, Hussain, & Qureshi, 2022). It is a widely practiced activity by ESL teachers to keep track of their students' language learning and achievement (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Different types of corrective feedback are practiced at different levels; initially a parent or guardian uses corrective feedback in the form of spoken correction when a child mispronounces a word or phrase. Although it has been used extensively, its efficacy is still up for debate. Two schools of thought have existed historically about the significance and necessity of corrective feedback. One set of academics contends that corrective feedback is ineffective and time-consuming, making it more appropriate for revision than for progress (Truscott, 2007; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Panova & Lyster, 2002). When Truscott (1996) suggested that feedback is harmful and has little to no impact on error correction, the debate about the function of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) began. He underlined that there should be alternatives to spending time and effort on developing one's writing skills. When given feedback on their grammar errors, students are more likely to avoid learning complicated concepts (Truscott, 2007). Another school of thought on corrective feedback, on the other hand, welcomes and defends the notion of offering feedback on students' errors since they believe that doing so will increase the effectiveness and caliber of writing abilities. Truscott's opinions are not developed enough to stop using corrective feedback because there is not enough data on WCF efficacy to make a judgment about it. Each person learns differently. Different learners have different levels of comprehension, which has an impact on their engagement, drive, and perception. In addition to having different cognitive abilities, learners also have different beliefs, attitudes, and perspectives. More research is needed to fully understand all these issues (Hartshorn et al., 2010; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ferris, 2010).

#### DIRECT AND INDIRECT FEEDBACK

When the instructor highlights the errors and uses the appropriate phrases instead of the incorrect ones, this is known as direct corrective feedback. Due to their inability to address their language problems, pupils with lower proficiency particularly appreciate this form of corrective feedback. In direct feedback, teachers correct students' writing by using precise language for each error. Direct CF is a type of categorical written correction that teachers provide to pupils about poor grammatical usage in their writing (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). With their constructive criticism, teachers hope to help pupils improve their writing skills. Due to their inability to address their language problems, pupils with lower proficiency particularly appreciate this form of corrective feedback. However, because of the students' lower intellectual level, researchers believe that it hinders deep learning (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2003; Jamalinesari et al., 2015). Embedding an expression or morpheme, cutting out superfluous words, providing the right word structure, or inserting spoken metalinguistic clarification are all examples of direct feedback (Gholaminia & Marzban, 2014).

A teacher's indirect response to students' work is referred to as indirect corrective feedback (CF). This refers to the instructor's display of feedback offered to draw attention to students' errors without providing the proper form or structure. The feedback is given in an implicit way that could lead to a response, but the recipient may not directly respond to the feedback because the teacher is giving it to the learners in an implicit manner (Ellis, 2009). According to Bitchener (2008) the type of indirect feedback may vary depending on how explicit it is, such as through coding or underlining errors. More distinction is established for the use of code, and coded feedback separates the errors and the types included, whereas encoded feedback highlights the errors but allows the learners to interpret the error (Jamalinesari et al., 2015). The benefit of the feedback offered in code is that it enables students to view error as a working process, which may improve their learning (Westmacott, 2017). To do so, students must engage in directed learning and critical thinking activities that allow for reflection on semantic structures and promote deeply ingrained learning (Lalande, 1982).

#### FOCUSED AND UNFOCUSED FEEDBACK

According to Bitchener (2012), focused feedback may be beneficial for students with low proficiency levels because they can quickly understand and identify the few specific areas where instructors provide feedback, while unfocused feedback is preferable for students with higher proficiency levels because it focuses on a wider variety of grammatical errors. Similarly, focused and unfocused feedback should be offered to students depending on their proficiency levels (Mollestad & Hu, 2016). Focus feedback examines grammatical elements that are based on rules rather than forms, demonstrating that this type of correction could be applied with ease (Ferris, 2002). However, unfocused feedback uses a disjointed approach to fix errors. Although this kind of feedback may lower students' motivation and confidence levels to use other writing approaches, it helps them learn the language and become proficient in it, which increases their accuracy and decreases the variety of mistakes they make in their drafts (Fazilatfar, Fallah, Hamavandi, & Rostamian, 2014). It validates the findings of Aseeri's (2019) study, which found that instructors and students preferred using general feedback rather than specific correction.

In his study of indirect and unfocused input, Karim (2020) determined how second language learners should employ punctuation, verb tenses, and subordination. The outcome demonstrated that input on grammatical correction was negatively impacted and that students who received unfocused feedback outperformed those who received indirect feedback. Martinez's (2015)

findings were completely at odds with one another, showing that students who received feedback that was focused performed better than those who did not. Numerous studies supported and showed the advantages of focused feedback over unfocused input, particularly for lower-level students. Higher-level students were thought to benefit from integrated types of feedback. Those who received focused input, however, were more likely to be driven and calmer than those who received unfocused feedback (Bakri, 2015).

#### METALINGUISTIC FEEDBACK

According to Ellis (2009), metalinguistic feedback refers to teachers' comments to directly point out students' written mistakes by using specific codes, symbols, and grammatical justifications. As stated by Bitchener and Cameron (2005), metalinguistic (coded) feedback identifies the precise location and type of the error; in encoded correction, the teacher draws attention to the estimated location of errors to fix them. On the other hand, indirect metalinguistic feedback is the second type of correction. A succinct grammatical description is another type of feedback where the instructor clarifies the error. The feedback that is both written and spoken is referred to as metalinguistic feedback. While instructors provide written feedback with descriptions of errors on paper, oral feedback comprises brief discussions with the entire class (Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener, 2008). By using different languages, such as the mother tongue, to provide metalinguistic feedback, instructors can more easily point out and discuss the problems of L2 novices, which could improve communication (Aseeri, 2019).

Knowledge of metalinguistic feedback enables students to generalize various kinds of mistakes in various new settings and contexts (Golaminia, 2014). As Minnen (2001) investigated the learners' usage of verb stems and noun forms. The findings indicated that participants who received direct or indirect metalinguistic feedback on their mistakes outperformed the experimental group participants in different settings. Hassan et al. (2022) made a comparison between direct rectifications with metalinguistic feedback and observed that participants who were given direct metalinguistic feedback significantly improved the results in post-test assessment. Bitchener (2008) also investigated the influence of metalinguistic feedback on the improvement of students' definite and indefinite article usage. Participants who were given the integrated metalinguistic feedback with direct rectification and participants who were given only direct feedback outshined the experimental respondents. It indicated the ineffectiveness of oral metalinguistics when integrated with a written one. In contrast, Rezazadeh, Ashrafi, and Foozunfar (2018) observed that the integrated form of written and oral feedback ameliorated learners' accuracy in writing but shows less accuracy when applying only one type of feedback. Nevertheless, learners responded affirmatively to all kinds of corrections.

#### ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

Electronic feedback is spreading significantly in academia as the technology is replacing the traditional practices of teaching and learning; instructors and learners are adopting such innovations in the ESL context (Smith, 2020). A significant proportion of educators, during pandemic, were practicing e-feedback by preparing online quizzes and assignments with digital tools and required learners to submit through online medium and assign their marks through electronic feedback. The instructor could indicate the mistakes through hyperlinks and suggest accurate use (Bakri, 2015). The process of giving e-feedback may help in producing quality writing and managing a substantial amount of information (Tuzi, 2004, Sullivan & Pratt, 1996).

Integrating technology in education might also inspire learners to acquire more in terms of learning (Bellés-Calvera & Bellés-Fortuño, 2018).

According to Ware and Warschauer (2006), due to the advancement of technology, e-feedback generated by software may replace direct feedback given by people. By keeping in view, the context of L2 writing, evaluative studies were conducted in which conventional physical feedback was compared with advanced software-generated feedback. Nostatzadeh and Hosseini (2014) examined ESP students' grammar accuracy by comparing print and electronic kinds of feedback. The results concluded that in online feedback learners modified changes and revised their corrections more than traditional print feedback.

## RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the preferred corrective feedback of students and practiced corrective feedback of their ESL teachers in writing class.
2. To determine if there are any statistical matches or mismatches between students' preferred corrective feedback and teachers' practiced corrective feedback in writing class.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

A quantitative research design was adopted for this study. According to Dornyei and Ushioda (2013), the quantitative technique is regulated, systematic, and rigorous, focusing on measurements and producing reliable, repeatable data that can be used in different contexts.

## RESEARCH SAMPLE

200 ESL students from five different private secondary schools in Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan, made up the sample.

## RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

The questionnaire, which had five sections and forty-four items, was adapted from research by Ganapathy et al (2020). The distribution of the questionnaire's items against each component is shown in the following table:

**Table 1**

*Distribution of items in the questionnaire*

<b>Feedback Constructs</b>	<b>Items in the Questionnaire</b>
How the Teacher Marks Students' Errors	Table 2. 1,2,3,4,5,6
Teachers' Marking of Essays	Table 3. 1,2,3,4,5,6
Teachers' Expectations after Marking of Essays	Table 4. 1,2,3,4,5

Types of WCF by Teachers	Table 5. 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21
Students' Preferences about Teachers' WCF	Table 6. 1,2,3,4,5,6

### PILOT STUDY

The questionnaire was pilot tested on 30 ESL students from two private secondary schools in Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan, to ascertain the reliability of the instrument. SPSS was used to test the item's reliability. The readings obtained from the “Cronbach’s alpha test” was 0.81 which is considered acceptable (Creswell & Clerk, 2007).

### DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

The questionnaire was distributed to Pakistani ESL secondary school students in Karachi after receiving official consent from the students of all the secondary schools. Additionally, the nature of the study was explained to them, and they received guarantee about the privacy of their answers. In the presence of the researcher, they had 80 minutes to answer all the questionnaire items.

### DATA ANALYSIS

The mean, frequency, and percentage of the participant's responses were calculated using descriptive statistics in SPSS (Version 22) to answer the study's first research question. The Independent-Samples t-test was used in SPSS to examine whether there was any statistically significant mismatch between the preferred corrective feedback of students and the practiced corrective feedback of their teachers in writing classes at private secondary school students in Karachi. This was done to answer the second research question of the study. Pallant (2013) claimed that the Independent-Sample T-test can be used to compare two groups' differences across many constructs.

## FINDINGS

### DATA ANALYSIS FOR FIRST RESEARCH QUESTION

**Table 1**

*ESL Teachers' Marking on Errors*

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
All errors	2	1.00	58	29.00	37	18.50	97	48.50	6	3.00
Major errors	1	0.50	75	37.50	32	16.00	83	41.50	9	4.50
Most but not all	1	0.50	75	37.50	23	11.50	94	47.00	7	3.50
Specific errors	1	0.50	79	39.50	31	15.50	84	42.00	5	2.50

Ideas related errors	2	1.00	60	30.00	32	16.00	91	45.50	15	7.50
No marking.	47	23.50	145	72.50	4	2.00	4	2.00	0	0.00
Mean (%)		4.50		41.00		13.25		37.75		3.50

The Table 1 above reveals how teachers mark students' errors. Marks all errors (Percentage=51.50) was generally the agreed feedback practice followed by most but not all errors (P=50.50) as the second most agreed feedback practice by ESL teachers in writing class. However, no marking (P=2.00) was the least practiced feedback. It can be concluded that ESL teachers were practicing comprehensive corrective feedback and were also using focused feedback in ESL writing classroom to mark students' errors.

**Table 2**

*ESL Teachers' Practiced Feedback*

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Codes and symbols.	1	0.50	33	16.50	44	22.00	118	59.00	4	2.00
WCF with codes and symbols.	1	0.50	18	9.00	38	19.00	136	68.00	7	3.50
Comprehension of codes and symbols	3	1.50	25	12.50	34	17.00	133	66.50	5	2.50
Inclination for receiving WCF with codes and symbols.	2	1.00	39	19.50	41	20.50	108	54.00	10	5.00
Comprehensive WCF.	1	0.50	13	6.50	25	12.50	145	72.50	16	8.00
Always WCF	3	1.50	36	18.00	38	19.00	118	59.00	5	2.50
Mean (%)		0.92		13.67		18.33		63.17		3.92

Table 2 above shows teachers' practiced feedback on ESL writing. Comprehensive WCF (P=80.50) was the highly practiced feedback followed by WCF with codes and symbols (P=71.50) as the second most practiced feedback by ESL teachers in writing class. It can be observed that ESL teachers' practiced feedback was focusing on comprehensive corrective feedback along with certain codes and symbols to check essay writing of ESL secondary school students.

**Table 3**

*ESL Teachers' Follow-ups*

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Do not do anything.	21	10.50	147	73.50	17	8.50	13	6.50	2	1.00
General discussion with all	3	1.50	12	6.00	28	14.00	140	70.00	17	8.50
Individual discussion	9	4.50	82	41.00	41	20.50	64	32.00	4	2.00



Check revised draft	1	0.50	16	8.00	32	16.00	137	68.50	14	7.00
Ask for error checklist.	5	2.50	30	15.00	31	15.50	126	63.00	8	4.00
Mean (%)		3.90		28.70		14.90		48.00		4.50

Table 3 above demonstrates ESL teachers' follow-ups of students' writing. General discussion with all (P=78.50) was the commonly practiced way of addressing the errors of learners followed by check revised draft (P=75.50) as the second common practice by ESL teachers in writing class. On the contrary, do not do anything (P=7.50) was the least practiced way of feedback. It can be understood that ESL teachers were mainly involved in general discussions and checking revised drafts of their ESL learners to rectify their mistakes in writing class.

**Table 4**

*ESL Teachers' Focus*

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Introduction	0	0.00	6	3.00	46	23.00	123	61.50	25	12.50
Thesis statement	0	0.00	7	3.50	40	20.00	130	65.00	23	11.50
Topic sentence	0	0.00	2	1.00	27	13.50	146	73.00	25	12.50
Discourse markers	0	0.00	6	3.00	26	13.00	150	75.00	18	9.00
Appropriate reasons	0	0.00	7	3.50	61	30.50	106	53.00	25	12.50
Conclusion	1	0.50	4	2.00	10	5.00	151	75.50	34	17.00
Unity and organization	0	0.00	3	1.50	17	8.50	149	74.50	31	15.50
Quality of language	0	0.00	12	6.00	81	40.50	85	42.50	22	11.00
Focus on relevant topic	0	0.00	3	1.50	15	7.50	155	77.50	27	13.50
Comprehension is priority	0	0.00	7	3.50	35	17.50	137	68.50	21	10.50
Avoid unnecessary information	1	0.50	4	2.00	34	17.00	144	72.00	17	8.50
Relevant examples	1	0.50	2	1.00	27	13.50	149	74.50	21	10.50
Varieties of structures	1	0.50	9	4.50	25	12.50	152	76.00	13	6.50
Cohesion	0	0.00	10	5.00	20	10.00	155	77.50	15	7.50
Clarity	0	0.00	0	0.00	19	9.50	156	78.00	25	12.50
Coherence	0	0.00	5	2.50	18	9.00	153	76.50	24	12.00
Accuracy of words	0	0.00	2	1.00	10	5.00	161	80.50	27	13.50
Explanation of difficult words	0	0.00	10	5.00	30	15.00	141	70.50	19	9.50
Spelling	1	0.50	0	0.00	9	4.50	160	80.00	30	15.00
Punctuation	0	0.00	3	1.50	17	8.50	155	77.50	25	12.50
Correct capitalization	0	0.00	2	1.00	8	4.00	170	85.00	20	10.00
Mean (%)		0.12		2.48		13.69		72.10		11.60

Table 4 indicates ESL teachers' areas of focus during the provision of corrective feedback on writing task. Majority of the learners showed their agreement to all items. Correct capitalization and spelling (P=95.00) were the highly focused areas of teachers followed by accuracy of words (P=94.00) as the second highest area of focused by ESL teachers in writing assessment. It can be assumed that ESL teachers were paying attention to all errors in general and correct capitalization and spelling in particular.

**Table 5**

*ESL Students' Preferred Corrective Feedback*

Items	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly Agree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Grammar	0	0.00	4	2.00	7	3.50	130	65.00	59	29.50
Vocabulary	0	0.00	6	3.00	22	11.00	142	71.00	30	15.00
Content	0	0.00	7	3.50	37	18.50	125	62.50	31	15.50
Organization and structure	0	0.00	7	3.50	25	12.50	139	69.50	29	14.50
Cohesion and coherence	0	0.00	13	6.50	21	10.50	131	65.50	35	17.50
All errors	1	0.50	3	1.50	2	1.00	112	56.00	82	41.00
Mean (%)		0.08		3.33		9.50		64.92		22.17

Table 5 above highlights the preferred corrective feedback of the students. All errors (P=97.00) were mostly preferred corrective feedback by the students followed by grammar (P=94.50) and vocabulary (P=86.00) respectively. It can be concluded that comprehensive feedback was the highly preferred corrective feedback by ESL secondary school students in writing class.

#### DATA ANALYSIS FOR SECOND RESEARCH QUESTION

**Table 1**

*The Result of Independent Samples T-test*

Corrective Feedback	Students Mean	SD	Teachers Mean	SD	t	Df	P
Overall Constructs	164.60	25.06	164.54	22.21	-.608	94	.545

*Note.* Difference is significant at  $p < 0.01$ .

#### DISCUSSION

The major aim of the study was to investigate the ESL students' preferences and teachers' practices of corrective feedback on ESL writing. The findings revealed that the majority of the students preferred comprehensive corrective feedback followed by focused feedback and then metalinguistic feedback from the teachers to identify their mistakes. Students were fully aware of the assessment criteria in terms of marking their essays as they have an examiner's report card which covers every aspect of the language and helps students to figure out their writing performance.

Teachers also remark comprehensively and specifically on students' written work in a similar manner. Lee (2020) discovered that students preferred detailed corrective feedback since it would strengthen their capacity to improve their writing skills with higher efficiency and precision (Brown, 2015). Additionally, it is in line with Ganapathy's (2020) observations

that tutors typically employ unfocused and coded WCF while assessing ESL writing. Students could develop their writing skills more quickly by considering their preferences for corrective feedback as ESL teachers evaluated students' works using comprehensive corrective feedback, unfocused feedback, and metalinguistic feedback using special symbols and codes (Lee, 2009; Kirgoz, 2015).

According to the findings, most instructors fix students' mistakes by giving them comprehensive corrective feedback, focused feedback, and then metalinguistic feedback because they thought it to be thorough and supportive in students' writing development. All teachers employed the Cambridge assessment criteria to mark the essays of their pupils. Additionally, students wanted their teachers to critique their written work in length and with relevance.

The findings of this study are in line with Bimba's (2016) suggestions for detailed written corrective feedback, which implies that this kind of feedback may enable students to participate in long-term and deeply entrenched learning (Westmacott, 2017). This is also consistent with Rajagopal's (2015) findings that instructors used unfocused and coded written corrective feedback when evaluating ESL writing; in that study, instructors used symbols and codes to review their students' errors; taking this into account, such types of feedback may be beneficial for learners' deep learning (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Poorebrahim, 2017).

## CONCLUSION

This research study aimed to explore the preferences and practices of ESL teachers and students regarding WCF and this study supports the practices of written corrective feedback and requires teachers to know about various kinds of written corrective feedback and use suitable feedback in their pedagogical practices. Even though instructors were also providing appropriate feedback about the preferences of their learners, they should be aware of different feedback strategies which help learners ameliorate their writing skills and performance.

The present study aims at assisting ESL instructors who are teaching at the school level (public or private). The instructors may prepare themselves with effective educational practices about corrective feedback as per the needs of the context and the preferences of the learners. Taking this into account, schools and other stakeholders expect students to achieve a certain proficiency level in the English language to effectively pass their exams. Moreover, the implication of this research emphasizes the development of the writing skills of ESL learners and useful teaching practices of instructors at the school level and facilitates instructors to select their written corrective feedback as per the learners' requirements. Future research could be conducted on electronic corrective feedback with different language skills.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by a short-term grant provided by HI-SCORE Institute (Grant No: 5)

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. (2008). Culture, dialogue and learning: Notes on an emerging pedagogy. *Exploring talk in school, 2008*, 91-114. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446279526.n6>
- Aqeel, R. M., & Sajid, M. A. (2014). A study of organizational problems faced by Pakistani student writers. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 3(11), 258-261.
- Aseeri, F. M. M. (2019). Written Corrective Feedback as Practiced by Instructors of Writing in English at Najran University. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(3), 112-121. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v8n3p112>
- Bakri, H. (2016). The role of individual differences in second language writing corrective feedback. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Vol, 6*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2843943>
- Bellés-Calvera, L., & Bellés-Fortuño, B. (2018). Written corrective feedback with online tools in the Medicine classroom: Bombay TV. *López-García & Manso (Eds.), Transforming education for a changing world*, 106-119.
- Bellon, J. J., Bellon, E. C., & Blank, M. A. (1992). Teaching from a research knowledge base. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76(547), 121-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019263659207654720>
- Bimba, A. T., Idris, N., Mahmud, R. B., & Al-Hunaiyyan, A. (2016, November). A cognitive knowledge-based framework for adaptive feedback. In *International conference on computational intelligence in information system* (pp. 245-255). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48517-1\\_22](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-48517-1_22)
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203832400>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language teaching research*, 12(3), 409-431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bryman, A., & Cramer, D. (2009). *Quantitative data analysis with SPSS 14, 15 & 16: A guide for social scientists*. Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bughio, F. A. (2013). *Improving English language teaching in large classes at university level in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex).
- Cameron, A., & Galloway, N. (2019). Local thoughts on global ideas: Pre-and in-service TESOL practitioners' attitudes to the pedagogical implications of the globalization of English. *RELC Journal*, 50(1), 149-163. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218822853>
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom*, 13(2), 155-177. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524551.015>
- Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Sage publications.

- Crystal, D. (2004, December). Creating a world of languages. In *Introductory Speech presented at the 10th Linguapax Congress, Barcelona, FIPLV (International Federation of Language Teacher Associations), World News* (Vol. 61, pp. 22-35).
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5070/L2.V1I1.9054>
- Eslami, E. (2014). The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 445-452. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.438>
- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Tuioti, E. A. (2010). Written corrective feedback: the practitioners' perspective. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 47-77. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119191>
- Fareed, M., Jawed, S., & Awan, S. (2018). Teaching English Language at SSC Level in Private Non-Elite Schools in Pakistan: Practices and Problems. *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, 5(1), 80-95. <https://doi.org/10.22555/joeed.v5i1.1756>
- Fazilatfar, A. M., Fallah, N., Hamavandi, M., & Rostamian, M. (2014). The effect of unfocused written corrective feedback on syntactic and lexical complexity of L2 writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 482-488. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.443>
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607201>
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181-201. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990490>
- Ferris, D., & 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- Ganapathy, M. N., Lin, D. T. A., & Phan, J. (2020). Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback in the Malaysian ESL Classroom. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, 17(2), 103-136.
- Ganapathy, M., Tan, D. A. L., & Phan, J. (2020). Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Malaysian ESL Secondary Students' Writing Performance. *3L, Language, Linguistics, Literature*, 26(3), 139-153. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2020-2603-11>
- Graham, S. (2018). A revised writer (s)-within-community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53(4), 258-279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406>
- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, D. I. A. N. E., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *Tesol Quarterly*, 44(1), 84-109. <https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.213781>
- Hassan, A., & Abbas, A. (2022). The Impact of Written Corrective Feedback on Second Language Composition in English. In *English Language Teaching in Pakistan* (pp. 181-201). Springer, Singapore. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7826-4\\_13](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-7826-4_13)
- Gholaminia, I., Gholaminia, A., & Marzban, A. (2014). An investigation of meta-linguistic corrective feedback in writing performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 316-320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.214>
- Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT journal*, 60(4), 385-387. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl030>

- Hussain, S. A., Nawaz, M., & Bhatti, T. N. (2022) The Contemporary English Language Teaching Techniques Used by Secondary Teachers of Sindh: Challenges and Solutions. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language*, 9(1), 67-79.
- Hyland, F. (2010). Future directions in feedback on second language writing: Overview and research agenda. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 171-182. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119251>
- Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A. (2015). The effects of teacher-written direct vs. indirect feedback on students' writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 116-123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018>
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>
- Kirgoz, Y., & Agcam, R. (2015). Teachers' perceptions on corrective feedback in Turkish primary schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 574-581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096>
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66(2), 140-149. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1982.tb06973.x>
- Lee, I. (2020). Utility of focused/comprehensive written corrective feedback research for authentic L2 writing classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 49, 100734. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2020.100734>
- Lee, I. (2009) "Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice." *ELT journal* 63(1), 13-22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn010>
- Mari, V. (2018). Using the Linguistic Landscape to Bridge Languages. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 37-39). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20037.
- Marlina, R. (2014). The pedagogy of English as an international language (EIL): More reflections and dialogues. In *The pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 1-19). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06127-6\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-06127-6_1)
- Martinez Agudo, J. D. D. (2015). How do Spanish EFL learners perceive grammar instruction and corrective feedback?. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 33(4), 411-425. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16073614.2015.1061890>
- Matsuda, A. (2003). Incorporating world Englishes in teaching English as an international language. *Tesol Quarterly*, 37(4), 719-729. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588220>
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McKay, S. L., Hu, G., & Renandya, W. A. (2012). *Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language* (Vol. 711). L. Alsagoff (Ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Minnen, G., Carroll, J., & Pearce, D. (2001). Applied morphological processing of English. *Natural Language Engineering*, 7(3), 207-223. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1351324901002728>
- Nawaz, M., Hussain, S. A., & Qureshi, F. S. (2022). An Investigative Study of Pakistani ESL Secondary School School Students' Perceptions and Teachers' Practices of Written Corrective Feedback in Writing Class. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language*, 9(1), 341-352.

- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3588241>
- Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: the native speaker's burden?. *ELT journal*, 46(1), 12-18. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/46.1.12>
- Poorebrahim, F. (2017). Indirect written corrective feedback, revision, and learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 184-192. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v6i2.4843>
- Rajagopal, N. (2015). A teacher's written corrective feedback: beliefs and practices/Nilaasini a/p Rajagopal (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- Rezazadeh, S., Ashrafi, S., & Fozunfar, M. (2018, April). The Effects of Oral, Written Feedback Types on EFL Learners' Written Accuracy: The Relevance of Learners' Perceptions. In *Second National Conference on English Language Studies: Applied Linguistics Perspectives on EFL, Azerbaijan*.
- Selvi, A. F., & Yazan, B. (2013). *Teaching English as an International Language*. TESOL International Association. 1925 Ballenger Avenue Suite 550, Alexandria, VA 22314.
- Sharifian, F. (Ed.). (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues* (Vol. 11). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691231>
- Tafazoli, D., Nosrathzadeh, H., & Hosseini, N. (2014). Computer-mediated corrective feedback in ESP courses: Reducing grammatical errors via Email. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 355-359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.05.341>
- Tajeddin, Z., & Adeb, A. (2016). Native and Nonnative English Teachers' Perceptions of Their Professional Identity: Convergent or Divergent?. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4(3), 37-54.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, 46(2), 327-369. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1996.tb01238.x>
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of second language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003>
- Tuzi, F. (2004). The impact of e-feedback on the revisions of L2 writers in an academic writing course. *Computers and composition*, 21(2), 217-235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2004.02.003>
- Westmacott, A. (2017). Direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: Student perceptions. *Íkala, revista de lenguaje y cultura*, 22(1), 17-32. <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v22n01a02>