A Qualitative Investigation of Iranian EFL Students' Attitude toward and Cognition of their Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback

Hamdi, Hoda

Department of TEFL, Faculty of Literature and Foreign Language Teaching and Translation. Islamic Azad University Karaj Branch

Abstract

Researchers studying the impact of feedback have traditionally compared groups of students who received different sorts of feedback. However, because there will be individual answers to any educational treatment within a group of students, and the impacts of feedback can vary drastically even among participants who received the same type of feedback in the same investigation, the current study used a qualitative case study approach and techniques such as narrative construction and qualitative comparative analysis to see students' attitude and cognition toward their teachers' written corrective feedback. Eight participants were chosen through purposeful sampling. The participants were IELTS preparation learners from different online classes. The interview questions were adapted from Silver and Lee (2007). Their assignment and the feedback received by the instructor serves the main data of this study. Moreover, an individual narrative profile was conducted for each student. Three different texts from each learner were collected. The texts were five-paragraph essay type writings, each provided by written feedback including correction tips on linguistic aspects of their texts. The results showed that learners are mostly willing to receive positive, organized, constructive, encouraging, detailed and clean feedbacks. Feedbacks in which the comments and instructions are clear are valued by the learners. Furthermore, teachers' make sure that the technical words used in the feedback are understandable to all the learners.

Keywords: Written Feedback, Corrective Feedback, Learner's Attitude, Learners' Cognition

1. Introduction

To fully comprehend the significance of Corrective Feedback (hereafter CF) in ESL classrooms, researchers must first evaluate whether individual variations such as apprehension and learners' attitudes have an impact on the effects of various types of CF. Learning results may

be influenced by learners' attitudes toward error corrections, which may be influenced by their cultural and educational backgrounds (among other things). According to Oxford and Shearin (1994), six elements influence language learning: attitude, self-perceptions, learning environments, involvements or participation in the language learning process, environmental support, and personal attitude. CF, defined as evaluative information and judgment offered on a student's linguistic performance, is widely recognized to assist students and improve the quality of their learning (Larsen Freeman, 2003). The objective, processes, and impact of feedback, as well as its different functions such as "degrees of explicitness (direct vs. indirect), timing (immediate vs. delayed), manner of delivery (e.g., handwritten vs. delivered using technology), the source (self, teacher, or peers), and even the visual presentation (i.e., the color of feedback)," were all studied in this tradition (Elwood & Bode, 2014, p. 334). One aspect worth emphasizing is that corrective feedback has not been without debate, with experts such as Truscott (1996, 1999, & 2009) claiming that error correction is damaging and should be abandoned because it does not fully meet its potential. On the other hand, cognitive theorists believe that corrective feedback must always accompany instruction since it plays an important role in facilitating the students' engagement and acquisition (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). In the same vein, most approaches to second language writing pedagogy have specified a primary role for feedback practice and writing instructors in many education institutions around the world have equipped themselves with the knowledge of effective feedback strategies and offer this valuable asset to their learners with the intention of pointing out their errors and resolving their problems while engaging in the act of writing. However, research undertaken regarding the role of feedback in L2 writing classrooms has referred to the fact that "there are no simple [and conclusive] answers to questions such as which activities merit feedback, how and when to give feedback and what the benefits of giving feedback are" (Long & Richards, 2006, p. xiii).

1.1 Teacher Written Feedback

According to Mack (2009), teacher written feedback includes any comments, queries, or corrections written on students' assignments. These comments might take many different forms, such as queries, corrections, accolades, and so on. A survey of the literature suggests that there are three sorts of feedback that can be used for revision: peer feedback, conferences, and teachers' remarks. Teacher written feedback, according to Hyland and Hyland (2006), is solely

informative, serving as a route for the teacher to channel comments and advice in order to assist students in improving. When teacher written feedback is more specific, idea-based, and meaning-level in several drafts, it encourages students to revise not just in L1, but also in L2 (Paulus, 1999). Furthermore, written feedback from teachers is important in offering a reader response to students' writing efforts, assisting them in becoming better writers and justifying the grade assigned to them (Hyland, 2003, cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2006). The impacts of three types of integrated instructor written feedback on students' revision are investigated in this study: criticism, praise, and suggestion (Hyland & Hyland, 2001).

1.2 Types of Teachers Written Feedback

Assessment of teacher written feedback in L2 writing courses, there are three categories of teacher written feedback that are often used: 1) form-specific feedback, 2) content-specific feedback, and 3) combined feedback since Truscott (1996) stated that grammar correction in L2 classes should be abandoned, the case of form-focused feedback or input on students' grammar has gotten a lot of attention. He came to the conclusion that grammar correction in L1 and L2 courses is unsuccessful based on past research. Ferris (2004) on the other hand, disputes this assertion. More research, according to Ferris (2004), is needed to determine whether or not error feedback is beneficial. The second sort of feedback, content or meaning-based evaluation, is concerned with the quality of the material and the organization of the students' writing. Teachers will reflect on elements of the work that do not make sense without pointing out specific grammatical problems in this form of feedback (Park, 2006). In a study conducted in the Philippines by Alamis (2010), it was discovered that students prefer comments on content/organization above vocabulary and language use/grammar. Integrative feedback is the third sort of written feedback. This sort of feedback is created when grammar correction is combined with content-related input. Ashwell (2000) looked at four different types of feedback: form feedback only, content-based feedback only, feedback mixed with two types in a different sequence, and two types of feedback at the same time. The study's findings refuted Zamel's (1985) argument that content input should be offered on the first draft, followed by form comments on the second iteration. Interestingly, his findings contradicted Fathman and Whalley's (1990) and Ferris' (1997) assertions that providing integrative feedback can be hazardous. Studies in this field are still growing and being carried out, resulting in new findings.

Reviews and fresh results, on the other hand, can provide new insights that can help teachers determine the optimal type of feedback for their educational setting.

1.3 The Role of Teacher Written Feedback on Students' Writing Performance

Writing is akin to swimming, according to psycholinguist Eric Lenneberg (1967), in that both are culturally distinctive, learnt behaviors. Because writing is not a natural talent, teachers must play an important role in assisting pupils in becoming better writers. Teachers' expected authoritative stance have sparked research into their role as responders to students' writing (Brown, 2001). This has also sparked a number of researches aimed at emphasizing the teacher's function as a responder. Teacher's written feedback allows teachers to play the role of responder. Written feedback is a continuous procedure. This implies that it should occur continuously throughout the teaching and writing processes in order to produce the ultimate outcome (Ravichandran, 2002). This leads to the conclusion that professors should provide comments on students' drafts so that they can make adjustments and enhancements to their work. While other feedback tactics, such as peer feedback, exist, a research conducted by Paulus (1999) on eleven ESL university students found that not only did instructor feedback have a greater impact on enhancing students' writing, but it was also preferred by the students over peer input. Similarly, Hyland (2003) discovered that students value form-focused feedback from teachers and believe that this type of feedback will assist them in identifying their mistakes and making adjustments. University courses frequently ask students to submit graded writing as part of the course requirements. Similarly, university students value their grades since they can forecast their overall grade at the end of the term. Teacher written comments can be utilized as one technique to help students improve their grades in order to address this issue. This is because the teacher's written criticism focuses on the most significant areas of the student's writing that need to be addressed. Students are allowed to make revisions to their grades as a result of this (Vardi, 2009). Despite the fact that previous researchers such as Hillocks (1986), Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) believed that written commentary on students' writing is generally ineffective, Silver and Lee (2007) found that written feedback from teachers is critical for ESL students' revision process because it helps to pinpoint their strengths and weaknesses. Aside from assisting students with revision, teacher written feedback can also assist students in becoming more motivated to write. Ravichandran (2002) claims that when professors are more concerned in their

content rather than their language forms, students are more encouraged to engage in writing activities. Ferris (2004), on the other hand, claims that pupils value teacher feedback on mistakes. "The lack of such feedback may cause worry and resentment, lowering motivation and decreasing trust in their lecturers," (Ferris, 2004, p.56).

1.4 Issues in Teacher Written Feedback and Educational Implications

Although most prior researches have shown that instructor written feedback has resulted in good changes in students' writing as well as motivation, feedback alone is insufficient in assisting students in improvement. This could be due to the students' lack of metacognitive understanding on how to revise effectively depending on the criticism provided (Silver & Lee, 2007). As a result, it is the teacher's responsibility to ensure that students comprehend the feedback given to them so that they are aware of the areas that need to be improved. Furthermore, Silver and Lee (2007) asserted that insufficient English proficiency and a lack of appropriate ways for offering explanations may prevent students from successfully revising despite receiving feedback. The findings of a case study conducted by Hyland (1998) support this theory, as one of the participants' writing problems was linked to inadequate use of writing strategies as well as a lack of English proficiency. As a result, it is evident that developing pupils' writing skills requires more than just offering textual feedback. To improve their writing, students must combine their customized approach with the feedback supplied by their teachers (Paulus, 1999). Not only that, but grammar and strategy training are also required to assist pupils improve their writing skills (Ferris, 2004). Teachers should be mindful that the nature of their feedback has an impact on students' affective responses. A corrected copy with red ink all over the page may not be the best technique to provide feedback because it may increase the students' anxiety (Ravichandran, 2002). While praise is effective in increasing students' passion for writing, it did not motivate pupils to revise their second draft (Silver & Lee, 2007). Critique as feedback, on the other hand, causes students to have negative feelings (Silver & Lee, 2007). Finally, teachers should make an effort to express their written criticism to their pupils, as this will encourage successful modification and progress. Students will be able to enhance their writing if they are exposed to oral and corrected feedback on a regular basis, according to Bitchener et al. (2005). Teachers should also demonstrate the comments to students so that they are aware of the areas that need to be improved.

1.5 Review of the Related Literature

Several studies have previously addressed the topic of teachers' written corrective feedback and its connection with learners' attitude as well as their perception and belief about the concepts. Moreover, several studies have looked at teachers' feedback and how it affects learner's writing performance.

1.5.1 The impact of Cognitive and Affective Aspects on Feedback

The vast majority of CF studies have overlooked learner characteristics, focusing instead on the link and effect of specific CF tactics and learning outcomes according to Ellis (2010). Ferris (2010) also emphasizes the importance of personal characteristics and individual differences in the response of L2 learners to corrective feedback, claiming that some students benefit more from CF than others, for a variety of reasons such as motivation, learning style, and metalinguistic background knowledge. Individual differences such as learners' linguistic backgrounds and affective factors such as their beliefs and attitudes, their levels of motivation, and cognitive competencies, according to Storch and Wigglesworth (2010), can greatly impact the result of any writing interventions as well as the learners' uptake and retention of the feedback received.

In terms of the impact of cognitive individual differences on writing, it is hypothesized that students with high levels of metalinguistic skills and good deductive skill (i.e., a high aptitude) as well as those who have a sufficient level of working memory capacity are better able to allocate their attentional resources to different aspects of writing and can more effectively use their metalinguistic knowledge in consciously monitoring the linguistic accuracy of a piece of writing (Kormos, 2012). However, just a few studies have looked into the impact of cognitive and affective aspects on feedback processing. Sheen (2007) investigated the association between language learning aptitude and written corrective feedback in one of these experiments. The researcher looked into the relationship between language analytic ability, which is one of the most important components of the language learning aptitude construct, and uptake from direct correction with or without metalinguistic feedback. According to the findings of the study, learners with a high level of aptitude (in this case, strong language analytic ability) profited more from feedback in both scenarios, and they were even more favored when metalinguistic input

was provided. It had also been proposed that learners with a high level of linguistic aptitude could learn and consolidate their L2 knowledge more easily through feedback.

Shintani and Ellis (2013) investigated how learners' comprehension of varied textual corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation is influenced by their language analytic ability (conceptualized as one primary component of language learning aptitude). The findings revealed that language analytic ability was successful in processing both metalinguistic and direct feedback; however, this influence was contingent on factors such as "kind of feedback, whether learners are requested to revise, and the nature of the grammatical target" (p. 118). It is also possible that L2 writers with varied working memory (WM) capacities process and profit from different sorts of feedback in different ways. Indeed, it is claimed that WM can influence, explain, and predict how students respond to corrective feedback (e.g., Mackey, et al., 2010; Trofimovich, Ammar, & Gatbonton, 2007).

Payne and Whitney (2002) discovered that learners with high working memory capacity benefit more from face-to-face feedback and create more modified output, whereas individuals with poor working memory capacity benefit more from feedback supplied via computer-mediated communication. In the literature, some case studies have been published that used think-aloud and/or retrospective interviews to investigate individual student writers' responses to written corrective criticism (e.g., Ferris, et al., 2013; Hyland, 2011; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

Ferris et al. (2013), for example, conducted a multi-case longitudinal study in which 10 ESL university students composed four in-class texts, updated them after getting written correction feedback (hereafter WCF), and completed retrospective interviews after each three writing and revision sessions. They wanted to look into the students' self-monitoring processes while they wrote and revised their writings, as well as the individual and environmental aspects that might influence their writing progress. They discovered that the applied techniques (focused WCF, revision, and one-on-one discussion about errors) were highly beneficial to the students, and they suggested that "teachers should take a more finely tuned approach to corrective feedback, and that future research designs investigating WCF should go beyond consideration of only students' written products" (p. 307).

Furthermore, Rahimi (2015) investigated the immediate and long-term effects of L2 learners' field reliance and writing motivation (as two major individual differences variables) on their learning from and memory of a teacher's written corrective feedback. The findings revealed a strong link between field independence style and students' successful short- and long-term recall of corrections in later compositions; however, writing motivation could only affect and enhance short-term corrective feedback retention.

Mallahi (2019) investigated how learners with varying levels of writing self-efficacy reacted to various sorts of corrective feedback on the linguistics parts of their written works. A qualitative comparison of the learners' performances revealed that each individual can benefit from the learning potential of corrective feedback in various and unique ways.

Han and Hyland (2019) looked into two students' emotional reactions to instructor WCF and discovered that they had several discrete emotions with varying object foci, valence, and activation, and that these feelings shifted throughout the writing process, especially during revision. Academic writing professors should also "consider the appropriateness of their WCF tactics in local contexts, invite students to express and reflect on their WCF-evoked emotions, and raise students' understanding of the usefulness of academic emotions," (p. 29).

Furthermore, by performing an in-depth case study on two Chinese low-proficiency students, Zheng, Yu, and Liu (2020) aimed to better understand the patterns of low-proficiency students' involvement with instructor corrective feedback in writing. The researchers discovered that their engagement was distinct in terms of self-engagement being relatively extensive, especially in the affective aspect, while the other's engagement was relatively limited, characterized by negative emotions and scant cognitive engagement, after analyzing teacher WCF, students' written drafts, their immediate oral reports, and retrospective interviews. Han and Hyland (2015) have emphasized the importance of IDs in learners' multi-faceted cognitive, behavioral, and affective engagement with WCF. Han (2019) looked into how learner and contextual factors can affect individual learners' engagement with WCF in L2 classes. He maintained that learners' engagement individually with WCF can be understood as a process of perceiving and acting upon embedded learning opportunities afforded by WCF, and highlighted the importance of establishing an alignment between affordances and learnability by using an ecological heuristic

perspective to conduct the study and after analyzing the collected data from multiple sources such as students' writing, verbal reports, interviews, field notes, and class documents.

1.5.2 Learners' Perceptions of Error Correction and Corrective Feedback

According to research, social and psychological factors such as attitude and motivation play a significant influence in learning a second or foreign language. For example, (Gardner, 1985) created the "Attitude/Motivation Test Battery (AMBT)" socio-educational model to measure several characteristics connected to individual variations. Motivation in second or foreign language learning, on the other hand, encompasses three basic elements: a desire to learn the language, effort put in to learn the language, and positive attitudes toward learning the language (Gardner, 1990). Corrective feedback, depending on learners' and teachers' attitudes toward error correction and the type of CF, has been suggested to help or hinder the processing and development of language learning. Several studies have discovered differences in teachers' and students' opinions toward CF.

In a similar vein, (Ancker, 2000) conducted a survey of teachers' and students' perceptions in 15 nations, with the goal of determining whether teachers should correct every mistake pupils make when using English. Teachers received a 25 percent good reaction, while students received a 76 percent positive response. Teachers were concerned about the harmful influence of corrections on students' confidence and drive, even if the students desired corrections to speak English correctly. Given that CF can be given implicitly, overtly, or in combination, it is worth investigating whether learners' attitudes and perceptions of different types of corrective feedback differ. (Sheen, 2006) created a questionnaire using a (1-6) Likert scale to assess language anxiety, attitudes toward error correction, and grammatical accuracy, as well as whether students think teacher correction is helpful and necessary. The results revealed that the explicit group had more positive opinions toward error repair and grammatical precision than the implicit group. As a result, metalinguistic feedback was more beneficial to learners than recasts. Sheen claimed that if learners are unaware that they are being corrected, attitudes toward error correction and grammatical precision cannot be anticipated to have any mediating influence.

In a study conducted by Amador (2008), twenty-three novices of English from the University of Costa Rica's School of Modern Languages expressed a preference for explicit CF. Twenty distinct correction approaches for errors that occurred in interactional discussion between teacher

and student or student and student were provided to students. Students were instructed to circle the letter of their choice to signify their selection.

1.6 Research Questions

RQ1: What are the learners' attitudes towards their teachers' written corrective feedback on their writings?

RQ2: What is the learners' cognition of their teachers' written corrective feedback on their writings?

RQ3: How do the learners' benefit from their teachers' written feedback on their writings?

2. Methodology

The current study attempted to explore what the learners' different attitude and cognition is toward corrective written feedback received on their writing assignment.

2.1 Participants

In order to investigate the effect of students' attitude and cognition towards corrective written feedback on their writings, the researcher chose 8 students of IELTS online classes through purposeful sampling. The learners were of different cities in Iran. All the students received instructions on writing different academic essay's style by the instructor. All the students were required to write different essay type writings and they received written feedback on their writings. Data were gathered from students' interview regarding the feedback they have received on their writings.

2.2 Instruments

The questionnaire used in the present study was adapted from Silver and Lee (2007). To conduct the interviews, both online and face-to-face interviews were carried out. The interview questions were as follows:

1) Do you like and enjoy writing compositions?
2) Which types of feedback do you like best? Why?
3) Which type of feedback do you dislike most?

4) Do you like your teacher to give you detailed and specific comments on your writings? Why?

5) Do you think that your teacher's feedback on your writings is really helpful to improve your writing skill? Why?

6) Can you easily read and understand your teacher's feedback?

7) Do you ignore your teacher's feedback on your writings? Why?

8) How does your teacher's feedback on your writings make you feel? Why?

9) Do you rewrite your writings according to your teacher's feedback?

As previously noted, the students received instructions on different essay writing styles and academic writing techniques including paragraph development. Their assignment and the feedback received by the instructor serves the main data of this study. Moreover, an individual narrative profile was conducted for each student.

The students were asked to write 3 essay type writing based on different topics given by the instructor.

2.3 Procedure

The target of current study is to shed light on learners' attitude and their cognition toward written feedback they were received on their writings. Three different texts from each learner were collected. The texts were five-paragraph essay type writings, each provided by written feedback including correction tips on linguistic aspects of their texts.

As for analyzing and reporting the data, at first the researcher, as the class instructor, created data narratives for each of the 8 participants based on their revised texts and their performance which showed the responses and learning from the feedback as well as their answers to an open-ended interview questions to their attitude and cognition toward the feedback their received. The narrative approach which provides a systematic procedure to organize various pieces of information regarding each participant was selected. In fact, a qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) technique was used to compare each individual's narrative.

2.4 Data Analysis

The researcher classified the participants' responses based on their themes for the qualitative data. Key words have been selected as codes to classify the answers. Each answer was categorized under the label of the related theme. All the answers were provided in 2 tables. The significant findings of the questionnaire will be described in the next section.

3. Results

To answer the research questions, the researcher used the data which included 9-questions interview regarding the participants' attitude and cognition toward their teachers' written corrective feedback as well as the teachers' written corrective feedback and the participants' writings. To this end the researcher used the Qualitative Research analysis (QLA), initiated by coding the data provided within the interviews. Moreover, the participants' writings and their grades have taken into account. It is worth mentioning that the writings have been graded by two raters and the written corrective feedbacks have been given to writings. Within the four weeks of time the participants delivered four essay type writings each.

Research Question 1: What are the learners' attitudes towards their teachers' written corrective feedback on their writings?

To answer the first research question regarding the learners' attitude, the researcher elicited the information provided in interview questions: 1,2,3,5 and 8. the data provided in Table 1 shows the participants' answers to these questions. The researcher categorized the answers regarding the codes allocated to the key points elicited from the participants' answers.

Table 1
Participants' Answers to Learners' Attitude Questions

	Interest in writing compositions	Feedbacks are liked	Feedbacks are disliked	Helpful feedbacks	Feelings towards the Given Feedback
Participant 1/Male 38	Yes	Provide information/suggestions recommendations	Not Constructive/ repetitive	Not all the time	Good/Discouraged/ Feeling of enhancement
Participant 2/Female 33	No	Inspiring/ strength are taken into account Supporting organized	Discouraging/ Point out mistake only/ Not organized	Yes really helpful	Negative Defensive
Participant 3/Female 18	Can't say for sure	with positive view	Neutral	yes	happy

Participant 4/Female 39	Yes	encouraging	Neutral	Always helpful	Feeling bad
Participant 5/female 32	Yes but not every topic	directive	Negative feedbacks	yes	Feel confident
Participant 6/Male 25	No	Constructive encouraging	Not detailed/ no instructions	yes	Happy/ sad
Participant 7/Female 40	No	Inspiring With suggestions	Negative/discouraging	yes	Discouraged/ happy
Participant 8/Male 36	No	Shows the correct answers	Are not detailed	yes	Confident/ discouraged

As shown in Table 1 the learners' attitudes are summarized toward their writings' feedback by the keywords they use.

Research Question 2: What is the learners' cognition of their teachers' written corrective feedback on their writings?

To answer this research question, the researcher elicited the answers to 3 questions regarding the learners' cognition toward their writings' feedbacks. The result is provided in Table 2.

Table 2
Participants' Answers to Learners' Cognition toward their Teachers' Writings' Feedbacks Questions

Participants	**Do you like detailed feedbacks?**	**Easily understand and read the feedbacks**	**Ignore the feedbacks**
1	Yes	Not really/don't know some words	Depends on the time I have
2	Yes/ it shows teacher cares	Most of the time yes	No
3	Yes	Yes when it is clear	No
4	Yes	Yes	No
5	Yes, it is very helpful	Sometimes yes/sometimes no	No they are helpful
6	Yes/it's useful	Yes	No
7	Yes	Yes when it's clear	No
9	Yes	Yes	No, never

Table 2 indicates the summery of the participants' answers to three questions regarding their cognition toward their teachers' written corrective feedback on their writings as it is shown, the learners like detailed feedbacks and they understand the feedback when it is clear. Moreover, it can be seen that the learners do not ignore the teacher's feedback on their writings.

Research question 3: How do the learners' benefit from their teachers' written feedback on their writings?

To answer this question, the information provided in Table 1 and Table 2 has taken in consideration. It can be indicated that learners are mostly willing to receive positive, organized, constructive, encouraging, detailed and clean feedbacks. Feedbacks in which the comments and instructions are clear are valued by the learners. Furthermore, teachers make sure that the technical words used in the feedback are understandable to all the learners.

4. Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to inspect the Iranian EFL learners' attitude and cognition toward their teachers' written corrective feedback on their writings. The result of the qualitative data analysis of the interview shows that learners are mostly willing to receive positive, organized, constructive, encouraging, detailed and clean feedbacks. Feedbacks in which the comments and instructions are clear are valued by the learners. Furthermore, teachers make sure that the technical words used in the feedback are understandable to all the learners.

Thi and Nikolov (2021) in their study revealed that there are different advantages and disadvantages to both feedback treatments and textual accuracy measurements. Divergent difficulties also arise when several types of writing tasks are used, each of which necessitates distinct cognitive and linguistic efforts on the part of the learner. The findings of this study support the significance of allowing for learners' particular qualities in pedagogical interpositions.

The current findings support earlier research on a self-study by Min (2013) described a critical self-examination by the current teacher/researcher of her ideas about how to write comments and the relationship between her beliefs and written feedback practices at the beginning and end of the semester. The data revealed that the writing teacher's beliefs evolved over time as she became more aware of the hierarchical relationships between the guiding principles, resulting in a shift in her written comments. Her ongoing contemplation, as well as the explicit articulation and illustration of her ideas through peer review training, helped to align her feedback practices with her beliefs at various times in time.

Furthermore, the result of this study is in line with the findings of a research by Faqeih (2015). According to Faqeih (2015), learners' attitudes toward corrective feedback varies widely. The findings revealed that learners favor error correction, interactional activities, and various sorts of

CF. It also hinted at the importance of learners' attitudes in modulating linguistic accuracy to some extent. Such findings confirm the result of the present study.

Another study by Sazideh and Mallahi (2021) found that students with greater levels of aptitude and working memory were better able to solve difficulties and improve their writing as a result of receiving feedback. Overall, the results of this study support the importance of taking into account learners' specific qualities in any pedagogical intervention.

5. Conclusion

The present study was an attempt to investigate what are the Iranian EFL students' attitude toward their teachers' written corrective feedback and their understanding of it. To this end an interview was performed. The learners answered to 9 questions on learners' attitude and cognition. The qualitative data analysis of the interview reveals that the majority of learners are open to receiving positive, organized, constructive, encouraging, thorough, and clean feedback. The learners value feedback that includes clear remarks and directions. Furthermore, teachers ensure that all learners can understand the technical terms used in the comments.

References

Alamis, M. M. P. (2010). Evaluating students' reactions and responses to teachers' written feedback. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 5, 40-57.

Amador, Y. A. (2008). Learner attitudes toward error correction in a beginner's English class. *Revista Comunicación*, 29(1), 18-28.

Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum*, 38(4), 20-25.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227-257.

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.

Ellis, R. (2010). A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 335-349.

Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2014). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System*, 42, 333-343.

Faqeih, H. I. (2015). Learners' attitudes towards corrective feedback. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 664-671.

Fathman, A. K., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (And what do we do in the meantime...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(1), 49-62.

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://www.jstor.org/stable/44488126

Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6-23.

Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 307-329.

Gardner, R. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation*. Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. (1990). Attitudes, motivation, and personality as predictors of success in foreign language learning. In T. S. Parry & C. W. Stansfield (Eds.), *Language aptitude reconsidered* (pp. 179-221). Prentice Hall Regents.

Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual learners. *System*, 80, 288-303.

Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255-286.

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 185-212.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and sources. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83-101.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge University Press.

Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294-304.

Knoblauch, C., & Brannon, L. (1981). Teacher commentary on student writing: The state of the art. *Freshman English News*, 10(2), 1-4.

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 390-403.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Heinle/Thomson.

Lenneberg, E. H. (1967). The study of language and language acquisition. [PDF document].

Min, H. T. (2013). A case study of an EFL writing teacher's belief and practice about written feedback. *System*, 41(3), 625-638.

Oxford, R., & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(1), 12-28.

Park, E. (2006). Review article on "The effectiveness of teacher's written feedback on L2 writing." *English Language Teaching*, 19(1), 5-8.

Park, E. S., Song, S., & Shin, Y. K. (2016). To what extent do learners benefit from indirect written corrective feedback? A study targeting learners of different proficiency and heritage language status. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(6), 678-699.

Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(3), 265-289.

Rahimi, M. (2015). The role of individual differences in L2 learners' retention of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Response to Writing*, 1(1), 19-48.

Ravichandran, V. (2002). Responding to student writing: Motivate, not criticize. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 2(3), 12-24.

Sazideh, K., & Mallahi, O. (2021). How might cognitive factors affect Iranian EFL learners' response to feedback provided on writing? An individual differences perspective. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(5), 42-55.

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.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkle (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 593-609). Taylor & Francis.

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 286-306.

Silver, R., & Lee, S. (2007). What does it take to make a change? Teacher feedback and student revisions. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, 6(2), 25-49.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Sage Publications.

Thi, N. K., & Nikolov, M. (2021). Feedback treatments, writing tasks, and accuracy measures: A critical review of research on written corrective feedback. *TESL-EJ: Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 25(3).

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.

Truscott, J. (2009). Arguments and appearances: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(1), 59-60.

Vardi, I. (2009). Improving student writing with effective feedback. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(1), 69-79.

Zheng, Y., Yu, S., & Liu, Z. (2020). Understanding individual differences in lower-proficiency students' engagement with teacher written corrective feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 25(3), 1-21.