

Saudi Learners' Perceptions of Feedback on Written Tasks

Muhammad Umer, Bashir Ahmad, Abdul Fattah Soomro

Abstract

Constructive feedback is considered vital in addressing students' errors in written tasks. The findings of empirical studies have reported the usefulness of giving feedback in many contexts, but evidence concerning incorporating students' preferences and choices about different approaches of feedback in Saudi tertiary education is still underexplored. The present study reports the perceptions and preferences of Taif University preparatory-year students regarding various methods of feedback for their writing tasks. A forty-item questionnaire was distributed among 150 undergraduates. The participants' responses were SPSS processed for means and standard deviations. The results revealed that the respondents considered their teachers' direct written feedback effective followed by oral conference. Hence, the study bears implications for both assessment policy makers and for teachers to incorporate maximum written feedback supported by face to face interaction in their assessment-based instructions for improved learning outcomes.

Keywords: *Constructive Feedback, Learning Outcomes, Writing Tasks*

1. Introduction

While defining feedback, Ur (1996 p.242-43-93) says: "feedback or correction is the information that students receive because of their performance." It can be done "through explanation or provision of better or other alternatives or through elicitation of these from the learner". Winne and Butler (1994) has defined this term more clearly by stating that "feedback is information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies" (p. 5740). Feedback is divided into various types: direct and indirect, focused and unfocused, peer feedback, oral and written, positive and negative feedback. Indirect feedback students are informed about their errors and are provided with correction whereas indirect feedback is meant to provide learners with a mere indication of errors' existence (Tangkiengsirisin & Kalra, 2016; Bitchener, 2008). Focused feedback focuses on selected errors only; whereas unfocused is comprehensive, targeting all errors (Ellis 2009; Van 2010). The unfocussed approach is related to Schmidt's (1994) 'Noticing Hypothesis' which emphasises the correction of all kinds of errors to promote 'noticing' on the student's part as a wide range of errors not only makes the students pay attention to errors



in the writing but also to the other features of the target language and this process results in improved learning (Black & William, 1998). However, others like Ellis, Loewen and Erlam, (2006) believe that unfocussed approach cannot be effective due to learners' limited processing capacity. Peer feedback is another type of feedback that is imparted by a classmate (Leki, 1992) and it provides students an opportunity to discuss their texts, receive one another's comments and interpretations (Highland & Highland, 2006). By and large peer feedback has been found helpful (Mendonca & Johnson, 1994; Paulus 1999); however, students with weak background of English language cannot identify problem areas and as a result, they offer inaccurate advice (Nelson & Carson, 2006; Horowitz 1986), but Paulus (1999) believes that this issue can be surmounted through effective training. Oral feedback is face-to-face interaction between students and teacher whereas written feedback is provided on students' work that s/he may look at later. Finally, Hyland (1990) has argued that feedback can be positive or negative. Positive feedback is used to reward writers for their writing efforts whereas negative feedback is provided to criticize writing. Luger and Nisi (1996) support the opinion that both positive and negative feedback can enhance learning. However, some view positive feedback as more supportive (Losada, 1999).

1.1. The Significance of Feedback to improve writing accuracy of learners

Though there exists a clear and strong consensus among writing teachers and students that feedback is essential to improve L2 writing accuracy (Al-Sawalha, 2016; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2004; Brown, 2007), empirical evidence is replete with divergent views about its efficacy. The divergence has emerged from the evidence-based debate over the past two decades (see for example, Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999; Chandler, 2003). Results of some studies (Kepner 1991; Truscott & Hsu, 2008) showed that correction of errors was not only useless but also potentially harmful for L2 writing development whereas others reported feedback being quite effective and helpful in developing L2 writing accuracy (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Bitchener, 2007; Brown, 2007; Casanave, 2007; Goldstein, 2008). Irrespective of its utility, feedback provision is still widely practised in English language teaching classrooms and is deemed essential (Lalande, 1982; Ferris, 1995; Zamil, 1985; Highland & Highland, 1996). The following paragraphs will provide what has actually been found out.

Bitchener (2008) conducted a two-month quasi-experimental study regarding the efficacy of feedback on errors on seventy two lower intermediate students. The students were divided into four groups. The findings showed that the learners of the experiment group who received written corrective feedback produced better results than the controlled group. The level of accuracy in their writings was also different. Findings of Bitchener's (2007) study oppose Truscott's (1996) judgment that error correction doesn't promote second language learning. Chandler (2003) investigated the effectiveness of different kinds of feedback helpful in improving L2 writing among the students through a quasi-

experimental study. The results of the study showed that the students who received feedback outperformed those who received no feedback. Highland and Highland (2006) reviewed a recent research related to feedback on L2 students' writing aiming at the role of feedback in writing instruction and discussing different other modes of error correction like, written, oral, peer and computer mediated feedback. According to their findings, teachers felt that they had to write substantial comments on papers because they thought detailed comments were necessary for the improvement of students writing skills. However, Highland & Highland (2006) observed that even though providing feedback occurred frequently in L2 writing classrooms the evidence of its usefulness was still questioned yielding support to Truscott's (1996) argument that correction in L2 writing classes should be abandoned. Truscott's (1996) findings were based on an extensive review of previous studies that showed that grammar correction was unhelpful and ineffective. The study suggested that 'comprehensible input' was sufficient for L2 acquisition, confirming Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis. However, according to Guenette (2007), the variations in the findings of the previous studies might be on account of variations in their research designs and methodologies.

1.2. Students' perceptions and attitudes towards feedback

Considerable empirical evidence can be found concerning students' perceptions and attitudes towards feedback. The evidence suggests that students of writing skills value, expect and really want error correction to achieve accuracy in their writings (Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz 1994; Komura 1999; Leki 1991). It has been pointed out that L2 writing students heavily rely on error correction in order to improve their accuracy in writing (Lee, 2004). However, strong disagreement has been reported regarding feedback delivery. For instance, Ferris (1997, 2001) investigated error rectification. The findings revealed that students' preferred method for rectification was implicit feedback through the use of error codes and they valued the feedback from their teachers, particularly, implicit correction (Saito, 1994; Hyland, 1990). On the other hand there have been studies where students preferred direct error correction (Lee, 2004, 2009). However, factors such as age, educational culture and linguistic proficiency may be important factor which shows how students like their errors to be corrected (Lee, 2009). Students' area of interest may interfere in their preference for feedback. For instance, some students want feedback on content and ideas and others prefer feedback on grammar (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Ferris & Roberts 2001).

1.3 Rationale

In the light above discussions , it can be asserted that effective fusion of constructive feedback helps teachers to address the errors of students in writing

tasks (Ferris & Roberts 2001) and teachers cannot resist from correcting mistakes when going through their students' writing tasks (Casanave, 2004; Ferris, 1999; Hyland, 1990; Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1996). Teachers spend a great deal of time and energy in giving feedback to students on their written work which is a valid investment of time (Ferris, 2004). However, others argue that it is hard to determine if feedback really works (Guenette, 2007; Truscott's 1996). Analysis of previous studies and their divergent findings about feedback together with observations of writing-skill issues of TU students motivated the researchers to conduct the current research. It can be argued that a single feedback method may not work with everyone and all the time. Students' preferences in this regard might vary from context to context and even from student to student. Therefore, the current study was conducted to explore the PYP students' perceptions and preferences regarding feedback on writing tasks with the anticipation to help both teachers and students in the context of this study and elsewhere to access their writing tasks more skilfully. Thus the main objectives of the current study were:

- a. To explore Taif University (TU) preparatory year students' perception of feedback methods in the process of correcting writing errors;
- b. To find out the students' preferred methods of feedback for the rectification of errors in their writing.

To achieve these objectives, the researchers focused on seeking answers for the following research questions

- 1) What is PYP students' perception of feedback methods in the process of correcting writing errors?
- 2) What are the PYP students' preferred methods of feedback to rectify writing errors?

2. Research Design

The PYP undergraduates from the medical college of TU were taken as population. Random sampling method was used. The rationale behind their selection was their better English comprehension of the contents of the questionnaire compared to students from other streams. Since the study was exploratory in nature, and the researcher intended to elicit the opinions of the learners who at least had got some knowledge of what was valuable for them academically. However, the questionnaire was translated into Arabic as recommended by Mackey & Gass (2005) who assert that questionnaires should be translated into the native tongue of the respondents. One hundred and fifty questionnaires were returned. The questionnaire for the students was self-administered in the presence of the researchers as Cohen et al (2007) demands. The data was collected during the class hours, in fact at the start of classes after the participants were duly briefed about the questions.

The instrument went through both reliability and validity check. The instrument piloted among 40 respondents out of the sample, but they were excluded from its final

administration. The pilot responses went through Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient check. The Alpha coefficient was equal to 0.85. For validity assurance, the questionnaire was given to two colleagues with strong research knowhow. Their recommendations were incorporated before its final administration. In the data analysis phase, the students' responses were manually coded and SPSS processed. Descriptive analysis was carried out to identify the participants' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of feedback.

3. Results and Discussion

The first section of the questionnaire relates to the perceived effectiveness of feedback in rectification of errors. In this section, the researcher intends to find out students' attitude and perceptions towards feedback as an effective method to eradicate errors in writing skills.

3.1. Perceived effectiveness of feedback in rectification of errors

TU Students Perceptions on Different Types of Feedback and Analysis of Data

Item	Perceived effectiveness of feedback	Mean	SD
1	Feedback helps students improve their performance in writing.	4.4200	.6050
2	Writing is learnt by committing errors and their rectification.	4.6467	.6360
3	Regular correction of students writing brings positive results	4.6333	.6066
4	Feedback helps students know their progress in writing skills.	4.4867	.6211
5	The students who receive feedback feel confident while writing.	4.2867	.7971
6	Feedback motivates students to improve their accuracy in writing.	4.3667	.6992
7	Over-correction results in loss of fluency in writing.	2.6067	1.2948
8	Feedback on errors and their rectification reduces the rate of committing errors.	4.1467	.9077

The table 1 highlights the perceived perceptions of the participants about the role of feedback in eradication of writing errors. Out of eight items, the students assigned highest means to items 2, 3 and 4. In order of importance the item 2 which is "writing is learnt by committing errors and their rectification" stands out most with the mean of 4.633. The students have confirmed that writing is learnt by committing errors and their rectification. Hence the findings of many studies are confirmed that feedback in both written and oral form is an effective method of improving writing skills (Ferris, 2002; Enginarlar 1993; Hyland1990; Leki, 1991). Brannon, & Knoblauch, (1982) also support feedback by considering it an indispensable tool to motivate, guide and encourage students to learn the writing effectively. However, there are certain researches have shown that students find

teachers' feedback confusing particularly the written feedback. In this regard, researchers argue that even when students understand it, they are usually not able to use it in their revision process (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Goldstein & Khol, 2002).

The variable with second highest mean (4.633) is "regular correction of students writing brings positive results". Like others, writing is a skill which needs regularity and practice to master. The respondents assigned this variable the second highest mean in terms of its importance. There are various reasons for the students to attach importance to this variable. Their weaker background of English language can be an important factor. In order to meet their deficiencies, they want their teachers to correct their errors regularly. This finding is consonant with previous research, i.e., students want and value their teachers' feedback for the sake of improvement in their writing skills (Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1995; Leki 1992; Komura 1999).

TU Students Perceptions about Feedback on Local and Global Errors and Analysis of Data

Sr. No.	Specific methods of feedback	Mean	SD
9	Feedback on local errors (grammar, spelling, and punctuation) is enough to improve students' writing skills.	3.5800	.9502
10	Feedback on global errors (ideas, content and organization of the text) is important in helping students improve their writing skills.	4.0800	.8235
11	Feedback on both types of errors (local and global) is vital to improve overall performance of students in writing skill.	4.2400	.8722
12	Correction of all types of errors is a burden for students.	2.9533	1.0765

Table 2 features the students' perceptions on correction of local and global errors. Feedback on local errors essentially means to give feedback on mechanics of writing, for example spelling grammar, punctuation. On the other hand, feedback on global errors means a feedback that focuses more on the ideas, content and organization of the subject matter (Montgomery & Bakr 2007). Both occupy a valid place in the L2 writing classroom. Montgomery and Baker, (2007) assert that teachers should necessarily pay attention to the cultural aspect of writing too. Interestingly, the students' response in variable 9 not only emphasizes local errors but also has stressed on utility of feedback on both, local and global errors. The statement which got the highest mean (4.2400) was 'Feedback on both types of errors, local and global, is vital to improve overall performance of students in writing skill.' The students seem to have mature perception about the role of feedback in dealing with local and global errors. Any piece of writing either having local or global errors would be incomplete. In learning writing, the cultural aspects are as important as the linguistic aspects of a language.

The second most important variable with the mean of (4.080) was, "Feedback on global errors (ideas, content and organization of the text) is important in helping students improve their writing skills". The third most important preference having the mean value of (3.5800) stands out as the most significant. It states, "Feedback on local errors (grammar, spelling, and punctuation) is enough to improve students' writing skills". Over emphasis or leaning towards one kind of errors, either it is local or global would not yield positive results. A great number of researches have, however, shown that feedback concerned primarily with content may not always help the learners improve their content very well.

The students' Perceptions about Positive and Negative Feedback

Sr. No.	Specific methods of feedback	Mean	SD
13	Feedback becomes boring when the emphasis is on "what is wrong" only.	4.0667	.9530
14	Negative feedback (discouraging remarks on students' writings) creates tension and destroys confidence of students.	4.1867	.9857
15	Negative feedback doesn't help students become good writer	3.9267	1.1707
16	Positive feedback (encouraging remark on students' writings) creates confidence in students to write.	4.4400	.8393
17	Regular positive feedback helps students become an accurate writer.	4.2333	.8855
18	Teachers who start feedback with encouraging remarks are always appreciated.	4.4667	1.0184

Giving feedback is an art. It is not only important for the development of language learning but also has been considered a vital tool for the teachers to create a positive learning atmosphere (Sugai& Horner, 2009). In table 3, the statement which obtained the highest mean (4.46) is, "teachers who start feedback with encouraging remarks are always appreciated". It means that learners appreciate those teachers who provide a feedback which encourages the learners to continue and doesn't hurt their self-esteem. It is because positive feedback reinforces, encourages, appreciates what the learners have produced and encourages the students to correct their errors where it is necessary. The second highest mean (4.440) in order of importance as perceived by the respondents was "positive feedback (encouraging remarks on students' writings) creates confidence in them to write". It supports learning if it is used properly and doesn't injure the self-esteem of the students. According to Hyland (1990), feedback, although is not completely responsible, yet plays an important role in improving students' language accuracy. The third highest mean (4.2333) was assigned to the statement "Regular positive feedback helps students become an accurate writer".

Success in every field of life demands regularity. If any piece of work underway suffering from discontinuity will not yield desirable results and so is teachers' regularity in feedback.

In present times, peer feedback has become very popular among the teachers of both the ESL and EFL writing class rooms (Leki, 1992). It is a method to impart feedback by one student to another. This method of delivering feedback is used in writing classes in order to provide students ample opportunities to learn from one another. Peer feedback is likely to foster interaction among students to discuss their texts and get comments and interpretations of one another (Highland & Highland, 2006). Initially the idea of peer feedback was worked with ESL class rooms but was later adopted for EFL classrooms as well (Nelson & Carson, 2006). Soon it was presumed that the success of peer feedback in L1 classrooms would reflect in L2 classrooms as well. As indicated in Table 4 the participants assigned the highest mean (4.260) to the statement "Teachers' feedback is more convenient and effective than the feedback from the peers".

Taif University Students' Perceptions about Peer Feedback

Sr. No.	Specific methods of feedback	Mean	SD
19	Correction from the fellow students is an effective method of error correction.	3.9200	1.0900
20	Students don't prefer to get correction from the peers feel it against their self-respect.	3.3200	1.2761
21	Feedback from peers can be faulty as a result students don't benefit from it.	3.7333	1.0597
22	With a limited knowledge of English, there is possibility that students can misguide their fellows.	3.9800	.82316
23	Teachers' feedback is more convenient and effective than the feedback from the peers.	4.2600	.92277

Their response is in line with the findings of Radecki and Swales (1988) argued that teachers' feedback is more accurate and trustworthy. Students believe that peer feedback cannot be effective and practical because they cannot locate the mistakes or errors very well. Students' perspective is that the person who can best do the job is the teacher only. Oladejo (1993) revealed that most of the students consider grammar errors best corrected by the teachers. The second highest mean (3.98) was assigned to the statement that "with a limited knowledge of English language, there is possibility that students can misguide their fellows". It is not surprising to say that most of the students believe that it's mainly the job of the teachers to locate and correct their students' errors. Radecki and Swales (1988) have also confirmed to this perception that students regard marking and locating errors as the sole responsibility of the teachers. As compared to teachers, the

proofreading ability of the students is very poor in Saudi Arabian context. In L1, context, it is possible while in L2 context it is pretty difficult for the students who already have got a weaker background of English Language. The other reason may be that mostly the students don't believe in the correction done by their fellows. However, as their response with a very high mean (3.92) to the statement "correction from the fellow students is an effective method of error correction" shows some value for. They do value peer feedback but not as much as they assign to the teachers' feedback. Thus evidence in support of previous research can be found. That is, peer feedback, under the guidance of the teachers, is a useful tool to help students improve their writing capacity (Boscolo & Ascorti, 2004; Graham & Perin, 2007).

PYP EFL Taif University Students' Perceptions about Indirect Feedback

Sr. No.	Specific methods of feedback	Mean	SD
29	Circling and underlining the errors are helpful methods of error correction.	3.8467	.9605
30	Error codes involve thinking and help students self-editing their writings	3.6733	1.0459
31	Most of the students are not able to understand the codes of errors very well.	3.7067	.9089
32	Some Students through error codes are able to detect their errors but fail to correct them.	3.7667	1.0194
33	The indirect error correction method mainly focus on local errors and the global errors are left uncorrected	3.8567	1.3842
34	Students don't like their teachers locating or circling their errors without correcting them.	3.9067	1.0255
35	Indirect method of feedback is not as effective direct (face to face) method of feedback.	4.3600	.8845

Table 6 includes the students' perceptions about the role of indirect feedback in correction of errors. While giving indirect feedback, the teachers provide the learners with some indication or a clue that there exists an error in their writing. The teacher indicates the errors by underlining or circling them. The highest mean of (4.360) which the students have assigned to is the thirty-fifth statement which states that indirect method of feedback is not as effective as direct (face to face) method of feedback. Indirect method of feedback cannot be effective as students fail to understand the comments or the symbols written by the teachers. This finding seconded the stance of Ellis Loewen & Erlam (2006) who maintained that explicit error correction method was more useful than implicit error correction. Empirical evidence has also indicated that explicitly

corrected group of students showed better improvement in their written work than the ones who were implicitly corrected (Basturkmen, 2009).

The second highest mean (3.90) accorded by the students was to the statement that "Students don't like their teachers locating or circling their errors without correcting them". The respondents think that the teachers, who only circle, underline or put codes next to the errors, are not appreciated by their students. The reason of assigning the second highest mean to this variable can be the poor background of the students in English language. The third highest mean (3.85) highlights the students' belief that indirect method ignores the global errors. As discussed earlier, the indirect feedback process focuses on indication of errors what the learners have made. Lalande, (1982) says indirect error method creates the way for guided learning and focuses on problem solving. This idea has been supported by Ferris & Roberts, (2002) who maintain that indirect error correction method lead to long term learning. While the perceptions of the students in the current study seem to be at variance with the findings of researchers mentioned above.

PYP Taif University EFL Students' Perceptions about Direct Feedback

Sr. No.	Specific methods of feedback	Mean	SD
36	Students appreciate it when their teacher corrects all kinds of errors in their written text.	3.840	1.0303
37	Teachers' written feedback is useless when students don't understand the comments written on their text.	3.4867	.9949
38	Writing comments on students' texts is time consuming and boring for the students.	3.660	1.0544
39	Mostly students are not interested in reading the comments on their texts.	4.3267	.7985
40	Oral conference after written corrections is better because this method focuses on all kinds of students errors.	4.4733	.7018

Table 7 incorporates the students' perceptions about direct feedback. Direct or explicit feedback is further divided into peer and oral feedback. When asked about the perceptions of students about direct feedback, the students attached the highest mean to the item number forty in the survey which stated "Oral conference after written corrections is better because this method focuses on all kinds of students' errors." Anderson (2006) argues that learners learn writing more effectively when they reflect on their errors and try to know the rationale behind correction. This can be done in writing conference, in the form of group discussion or meeting with the respective teacher. Saito, (1998) extends the argument stating that writing conference involves the teacher who discusses with

the students their errors and their corrections right after the writing process. The respondents' perceptions match the findings of Highland & Highland (2006) who propound that such conferences are equally important for the teachers as well. Teachers, in oral conference, get the opportunity to look into the weakness and needs of the particular students. And the students get the opportunity to ask questions to get their confusions and ambiguities cleared. Thus, keeping in mind the students of Taif University, particularly the students enrolled in PYP, this might be the most viable method of feedback which can benefit them.

The second highest mean (4.3267) assigned by the PYP students is to a variable which states, "mostly the students are not interested in reading the comments on their written texts". Keeping in view the perception that students are hardly interested in reading the written comments, it is imperative to look at the purpose of this kind of feedback. Ferris, (2006) says that error correction, either it is in oral form help students reflect on their' grammatical errors with a view to improve his/her ability to write accurately. Despite the fact that providing written feedback is quite frustrating, tedious and time consuming yet teachers give it importance and consider it an effective tool that facilitates teacher-to-student communication (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997). A factor which seems important in Taif University, PYP students, is the lack of motivation among the students. For example, Grami, (2010) has posited that learning English language is not a matter of survival for the Saudi students. Hence, their lack of interest in learning the language hinders their pace of learning. Asking them to ponder on their written texts and self-edit their work in the light of teachers' instruction is a futile or desperate effort.

The third highest mean (3.84) in Table 7, is "students appreciate it when their teacher corrects all kinds of grammar errors in their written text". This variable is quite in line with the one that was assigned the highest mean. The variable, to which the students assigned the highest mean, indicated the students liking towards correction of all kinds of errors. It emphasizes focused approach of feedback. Similarly the present variable also shows that students appreciate when their writing teachers focus on all kinds of errors in their written drafts. The finding is in line with Ellis, (2009 and Van (2010) which showed that the teachers mainly used two main approaches in delivering feedback, i.e., focused and unfocused. Both of them are contrasting in nature. The first approach aims at correction of specific errors only, leaving all other errors uncorrected. On the other hand, the unfocused approach targets correction of all kinds of errors. Another study in line with students' perception is Schmidt's, (1994) 'Noticing Hypothesis'. In the light of this hypothesis, the correction of all kind of errors promotes more 'noticing' on the part of students. This approach seems effective because the correction of wide range of errors not only makes the students pay attention to errors but also to the other features of the target language as well.

Language interference is another factor which demands comprehensive approach of feedback towards correction of errors and the situation approves PYP Taif university students' perception about application of comprehensive approach of error correction. Linguistic interference occurs when a speaker or a writer exploits the knowledge of his/her native language to a second language. Interference of L1 can be positive or negative (Chan, 2004). It happens to be positive when the structures of both languages are alike and consequently result in correct production of the target language. On the other hand, the application of the knowledge of first language becomes negative when different units of both languages interfere in the learning of the second language. English and Arabic are two different languages in structure, syntax, vocabulary, pronunciation, accent and so on. Hence the teacher, having the knowledge of all such difference can note such discrepancies in writings of PYP learners and is expected by the students to give them feedback on their errors comprehensively.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper reported Saudi tertiary students' perceptions and preferences concerning teachers' feedback on their writing tasks. The results showed that most of the participants viewed feedback positively. They reported that teachers' feedback was effective and it helped them become better writers. These results confirmed to the findings of other research studies which already had reported students' positive attitudes towards feedback (see for example, Enginarlar 1993; Hyland 1990; Leki, 1991). Furthermore, the findings supported Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990) and Ferris's (2002) findings on the issue of local and global errors. i.e, the respondents favoured the idea of correcting both the local and global errors. Positive feedback was considered more productive than negative feedback. The students appreciated that positive feedback reinforced their writing skills and increased their confidence to write. Finally, like the findings of Tangkiengsirisin and Kalra (2016) the students considered face to face (direct) interaction more productive than indirect feedback because they failed to understand the comments or the symbols written by teachers.

Recommendations are presented that while providing feedback, teachers should focus both global and local errors. In addition, teachers should make sure that their feedback is positive. However, if there has to any negative element, teachers should employ sandwiching techniques, i.e., beginning with positive remarks about students' work, then highlighting weaknesses if any and summing up the communication with helpful and encouraging observations. Furthermore, it is of utmost significance to have face to face meeting with students rather than confusing them with long and detailed written comments as Saudi students are not at reading. Lastly, based on the variant arguments and findings of previous feedback studies, it can be safely suggested that teachers should not expect immediate improvement in students' incorporation of the feedback. The process can be slow or delayed for various and still-to-be-investigated reasons.

At the end, it is important to clarify that the current research had a few noteworthy limitations. First, it employed a single data collection method; second, the participants were recruited from a single college of the university; and lastly, the researcher could not manage to triangulate the data. Therefore, the findings may only be cautiously generalized to other similar settings within the university or elsewhere. Thus, it is recommended that future research draws upon quasi-experimental designs to determine what students think and report about feedback and how they actually use feedback related situations. Last but not the least, seeking teachers' input in this regard will further validate the findings of future research.

References

- **Al-Sawalha, A.M. (2016).** EFL Jordanian students' reaction to written comments on their written work: A case study. *Arab World English Journal*, 7(1), 63-77.
- **Ashwell, T. (2000).** Patterns of teacher response to student writing in multiple draft composition classrooms: Is content feedback followed by form feedback? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9, 227-257.
- **Bitchener, P. (2007).** Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102-118.
- **Bitchener, J. Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005).** The effects of different types of feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 191-205.
- **Brown, H.D. (2007).** *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc. 396.
- **Casanave, C. P. (2004).** *Controversies in second language writing: Dilemmas and decisions in research and instructions*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- **Chandler, J. (2003)** The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- **Ellis, R. (1994).** *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- **Ellis, R. (2009).** A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63 (2), 97-107.
- **Ellis, R. (2010).** A framework for investigating oral and written corrective feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 335-349.
- **Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Erlam, R. (2006).** Implicit and explicit feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339-368.
- **Ferris, D. (1995).** *The influence of teacher commentary on student revision*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- **Ferris, D. (1997).** Students reaction to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- **Ferris, D. (1999).** The case of grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott(1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11.
- **Ferris, D. (2002).** *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- **Ferris, D. (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...?) *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181-201.

- **Ferris, D. (2010).** Second language writing research and corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisitions*, 32(02) 181-201.
- **Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001).** Error feedback in l2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 10, 161-184.
- **Goldstein, L. (2008).** *Teacher written commentary in second language writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- **Hyland, K. (1990).** Providing productive feedback. *ELT Journal*. 44(4), 279-285.
- **Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006).** Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*. 39(2), 83-101.
- **Krashen, S. (1982), S. (1982).** *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Institute.
- **Krashen, S. (1984).** *Writing: Research, theory, and applications*. New York: Pergamon Institute.
- **Lalande, J. (1982).** Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*. 66(2), 140-149.
- **Lee, I. (1997).** ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*. 25(4), 465-477. Retrieved on 23/01/2017 from https://www.researchgate.net/journal/0346-251X_System
- **Lee, I. (2004).** Error correction in l2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 13, 285-312.
- **Lee, I. (2009).** Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*. 63(1), 13-22.
- **Leki, I. (1991).** The preferences of esl students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*. 24, 203-218.
- **Leki, I. (1992).** *Understanding ESL writers: A guide for teachers*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.
- **Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2008).** *A synthesis of research on second language writing in English*. NY: Routledge.
- **Montgomery, J. & Baker, W. (2007)** *Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self assessment, and actual teacher performance*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 16(2), 82-89.
- **Schmidt, R. (1994).** Deconstructing Consciousness in Search of Useful Definitions for Applied Linguistics. *AILA Review*. 11, 11-26.
- **Stern, H. H. (1983).** *Fundamental Concepts of language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- **Truscott, J. (1996).** The case against grammar correction in l2 writing classes. *Language Learning*. 46(2), 327-369.
- **Tangkiengsirisin, S. & Kalra, R. (2016).** Thai Students' Perceptions on Direct Vs. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback: A Thai University Context. *Arab World English Journal*, 7 (3), 161-176.
- **Truscott, J. & Yi-ping Hsu, A. (2008).** Error correction, revision and learning. *Journal of Second language Writing*. 17, 292-305.
- **Zamil, V. (1985).** *Responding to student writing*. TESOL Quarterly. 19(1). 79-101.