Faculty of Letters Journal of Social Sciences

| cujos.cumhuriyet.edu.tr | Founded: 1982 Available online, ISSN: 1305-5143 Publisher: Sivas Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi

Literature Review Of Written Corrective Feedback: Where Are We?

Ayşenur Kör[1,a,*], Mehmet Fikret Arargüç[2,b]

[1] *Gümüşhane University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Literature and Language, Gümüşhane, Türkiye*
[2] *Atatürk University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Literature and Language, Erzurum, Türkiye*
**Corresponding author*

Research Article

Acknowledgement

 # This article has been produced from the unpublished doctoral thesis titled "Investigating the Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on the Writing Skills of English as a Foreign Language Learners"

History

Received: 14/08/2025
Accepted: 10/10/2025

ABSTRACT

The use of written corrective feedback in English writing classes is quite common, although its effectiveness is a matter of debate. This widespread use can lead to many differences in practice. In other words, there are many ways to provide written corrective feedback. However, written corrective feedback practices can be influenced by many factors, including teacher and student attitudes, the type and amount of feedback, student level, motivation, and engagement. These factors must be considered for effective feedback provision. To understand written corrective feedback and consider these factors that may influence its implementation, teachers need to conduct extensive literature review. In such cases, literature studies are crucial. Therefore, this study aims to identify the historical development and status of written corrective feedback through sample studies from the relevant field. This study will serve as a guide for educators who wish to provide written corrective feedback or researchers seeking to understand the existing status of written corrective feedback. This study will clarify what written corrective feedback is, its historical development, how, when, and how much it can be provided, and what internal/external factors influence it and how it can be improved. The study will also offer suggestions for pedagogical practices and future research.

Keywords: Written Corrective Feedback, EFL, Foreign Language Writing Education.

Yazılı Düzeltici Dönüt Üzerine Bir Literatür Taraması: Neredeyiz?

ÖZ

İngilizce yazma sınıflarında yazılı düzeltici dönütün kullanımı her ne kadar etkisi tartışma konusu olsa da oldukça yaygındır. Bu yaygın kullanımın getirdiği birçok uygulama farklılıkları olabilmektedir. Başka bir ifadeyle yazılı düzeltici dönüt vermenin birçok yolu vardır. Ancak yazılı düzeltici dönüt uygulamaları öğretmen ve öğrenci tutumu, dönüt türü, miktarı, öğrenci seviyesi, öğrenci motivasyonu ve bağlılık gibi birçok faktörden etkilenebilmektedir. Etkili dönüt verilebilmesi için bu faktörler göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır. Yazılı düzeltici dönütü anlamak ve uygulamaları etkileyebilecek bu faktörleri göz önünde bulundurabilmek için öğretmenlerin geniş çaplı literatür okumaları yapmaları gerekmektedir. Böyle durumlarda literatür çalışmaları büyük önem arz etmektedir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın amacı yazılı düzeltici dönütün tarihsel gelişimini ve güncel durumunu ilgili alandan örnek çalışmalarla belirlemektir. Bu çalışma yazılı düzeltici dönüt vermek isteyen eğitimciler veya güncel durumu öğrenmek isteyen araştırmacılar için bir rehber niteliği taşıyacaktır. Bu çalışma sayesinde yazılı düzeltici dönütün ne olduğu, tarihsel gelişimi, nasıl, ne zaman ve ne kadar verilebileceği, hangi iç/dış faktörlerden etkilendiği veya nasıl geliştirilebileceği gibi konular netlik kazanacaktır. Çalışma ayrıca pedagojik uygulamalara ve gelecek çalışmalara dair önerilerde bulunacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yazılı Düzeltici Dönüt, EFL, Yabancı Dilde Yazma Eğitimi.

Copyright

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

[a] *74aysenur@gmail.com* *0000-0002-6308-2977* [b] *fikretararguc@gmail.com* *0000-0002-4546-4509*

How to Cite: Kör A,Arargüç M.F (2025) Literature Review Of Written Corrective Feedback: Where Are We?, *CUJOSS*, 49(3): 267-275

Introduction

Writing, as one of the four basic language skills, is an important process in which foreign language students produce output. In this process, information is obtained about how competent foreign language students use the language, what their deficiencies are, and how to develop this ability. Therefore, writing ability is a subject that foreign language teachers should not neglect. When evaluating students' writing performances in a foreign language such as English, attention is usually paid to issues such as content, the way ideas are presented, organization, the appropriateness of the words used, etc., but among these, they are the linguistic errors that attract the most attention, and therefore, receive the most feedback (Beuningen, 2010). Dealing with student errors is a crucial part of second language (L2) teaching (Chen et al., 2016).

Corrective feedback, which is one of the methods of coping with these errors, can be defined as the reactions of educators to the errors made by the students while using the second language (Aziz & Jayaputri, 2023). In other words, written corrective feedback (WCF), which is one of the most discussed topics in second/foreign language writing research, can be defined as written comments made by teachers in various fields in students' writings (Shen & Chong, 2023). In this article, the history of WCF, its types, current position, and several factors included in WCF studies will be mentioned, based on a general literature review. The study aims to define WCF and guide new researchers in WCF studies.

The History Of Written Corrective Feedback

The first traces of WCF can be seen in the 1950s and 1960s, when the Behaviourist Approach gained popularity. Errors made in the writing process began to be seen as an inevitable part of this process. Focus began to shift to the role of the errors made during the writing process and the direct correction of these errors in learning (Lee, 2024). In the 1990s, when the communicative language teaching approach became widespread, foreign language learners were encouraged to focus on specific linguistic forms, and this form-focused approach led to increased interest in corrective feedback (Yoshida, 2008). Furthermore, Truscott's (1996) study, which discussed the side effects and unnecessary nature of corrective feedback, attracted the attention of many researchers to this field.

Also, Schmidt's Noticing Hypothesis has played an important role in paving the way for written corrective feedback. According to this assumption, people learn things they pay attention to, while the opposite is true for things they do not pay attention to (Schmidt, 2010). According t~~o Schmidt, it~~ unconsciously, is not possible to learn a language completely unconsciously; a certain amount of focus on form is one of the conditions for language learning. In other words, foreign language learners need to make a conscious comparison between their own outputs and target language inputs to recognize and correct their mistakes. Learning rates also increase when students' attention is drawn to their mistakes.

Topics such as educators' thoughts and practices, student perceptions, student engagement, educator and student emotions, the role of technology, and educator/student feedback literacy are at the core of written corrective feedback (WCF) research today (Lee, 2024). It is also argued that cultural factors should be addressed for the implementation of WCF and its correct understanding by students (Fitriyah et al., 2024). Another issue that further fuels the debate regarding written corrective feedback is the way it is implemented, that is, which type of written corrective feedback is more effective (Sheen, Wright & Moldawa, 2009). In other words, today, the debate is no longer about whether to correct the errors made by EFL students; different ways of correcting different types of errors are sought, and factors such as students' age, gender, learning style, and cultural identity are taken into consideration (Banaruee et al., 2018). There is no consensus on which type of WCF is more effective (Guo & Barrot, 2019).

How To Correct Students` Errors

Writing skills in a foreign language are crucial for EFL students, as they significantly impact their academic lives and careers. However, many students are not successful at writing and face numerous challenges while doing so (Zhang et al., 2023). Since it is inevitable for students at the beginning of their language learning journey to make mistakes, WCF from teachers plays a crucial role in identifying and correcting students' errors (Fan & Ma, 2018). Written corrective feedback allows EFL students to focus more on their errors (Sheen et al., 2009). Experts in the field state that WCF positively affects students' writing performance and increases their use of the language accurately (Guo & Barrot, 2019). Corrective feedback has been reported to improve EFL students' writing skills, particularly in terms of grammar and organization (Sabarun, 2020).

WCF is one of the beneficial interventions used in the classroom (Lopez, 2021), and thus, there are many types and definitions asserted in the relevant literature. Ellis (2009) states that WCF types are based on two options in his typology study on written corrective feedback. The first is feedback strategies, while the second is the students' reactions to this feedback. Ellis, one of the leading names in this field, proposes six strategies for educators to correct linguistic errors in students' written texts: direct, indirect, metalinguistic, focused/unfocused, electronic feedback, and reformulation.

- ***Direct Written Corrective Feedback***

In this type of feedback, the teacher gives the correct form in response to students' mistakes. He/she draws the relevant error and writes the correct form next to it, on it, or anywhere else. The advantage of this type of feedback is that it allows students to see the correct form directly, while the disadvantage is that it may not be effective in the long term as it requires a minimum amount of student effort.

Example: I eated X (ate) an apple.

- ***Indirect Written Corrective Feedback***

In this type of feedback, the student's errors are marked, but the correct form is not written. The number of errors can be noted at the end of the sentence or statement. This type of feedback is thought to be more successful in long-term learning because it is more effective in encouraging problem solving and reflection on linguistic elements.

Example: I bought a bottle X water X from the market yesterday.

- ***Metalinguistic Written Corrective Feedback***

Using the metalinguistic type of WCF, a teacher makes explicit comments about the nature of student errors. The most common form of application is the generation of error codes. These error codes mean using abbreviations for different errors and giving students feedback with these codes on their errors. The appropriate error code is written where the student's error is located, and the student is given a hint to understand the error.

Example: I bought a bottle of water from (Art.) market yesterday. (Art. for Article)

- ***Focused/Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback***

When providing WCF, all student errors can be considered (e.g., unfocused) or only a specific type of error, such as time agreement, can be addressed (focused). In focused WCF, the student sees multiple corrected versions of the same error and receives extensive feedback on where they made the mistake. But mistakes are seen as more difficult to understand in the unfocused WCF. Although focusing on specific errors in focused feedback has a positive effect in the short term, it is suggested that unfocused written corrective feedback is more effective in the long term.

- ***Electronic Written Corrective Feedback***

Comprehensive English writing corpora, which can be accessed by search engines such as Google, can be used to help students with their writing. Students can benefit from such software in terms of feedback while writing or afterwards. Students can access the writings of more experienced authors or the mistakes made by other students through this software.

- ***Reformulative Corrective Feedback***

Unlike other types, this type of feedback involves re-presenting the same situation in close words so that students can see and evaluate their mistakes. Here, the burden is on the student rather than the teacher. They try to find their error by comparing the statement presented to them with the sentence they have made.

- ***Teacher Comment***

In addition to Ellis`s WCF types, another type of written corrective feedback can be named as written comments provided by the teacher. Since Ellis did not mention, when defining this type of feedback, Pearson's typology study published in 2022 will be considered. According to Pearson, teacher comments are a common and important feature of responses to second language writing. It creates a sense of audience by allowing the reader to address the author through a written prose explaining the prominent features of the text. Similarly, the textual features a teacher focuses on can vary. A teacher might consider the overall quality of the text (overall), its content and organization (discourse), and/or its vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics (form). As with WCF, teachers can focus intensively on a particular trait (focused) or two to five traits (moderately focused). Alternatively, their interests may cover a broad (or unfocused) range of topics.

Although it has been stated that giving WCF improves the writing performance of EFL students, there are few studies on how WCF should be applied. In their study with 47 students, Hartshorn et al. (2010) divided the participants into two groups: a control and an experimental group. While the control group continued traditional education, the experimental group benefited from the feedback that the authors called dynamic written corrective feedback. This type of feedback differs from others in that it focuses on what students need most, is meaningful, timely, continuous, and manageable by both the educator and student. The reason for this is that giving continuous WCF is very time-consuming, and the student finds too much feedback meaningless. The dynamic written corrective feedback model they designed is based on students' rhetorical competencies, writing fluencies, and complex writing skills. Although there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups, it was observed that the experimental group had more writing accuracy than the other group.

Table 1Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback Steps

Step1	Students write an essay in ten minutes.
Step2	The teacher gathers the essays and codes the errors; scores the essays. The teacher gives the papers back in the next lesson.
Step3	Students record errors, typing in error log, and resubmit the edited papers.
Step4	The teacher controls the edited papers and gives them back.
Step5	Students reedit the paper, if necessary and give it back.
Step6	Steps 4 and 5 are repeated until all errors are cleared.

Source: (Hartshorn et al., 2010)

EFL Students' Engagement To Written Corrective Feedback

Although there are many studies on WCF in the relevant field, there are very few studies on how and why EFL students interact with written corrective feedback (Shen & Chong, 2023). In a case study conducted in China, data were collected from students who took a writing course at the second-grade level of the university, where the foreign language teacher used focused WCF (Zheng, Yu, & Liu, 2023). Students who were relatively unsuccessful in the 34-person class were sent an invitation to study, and six of the students who were sent an invitation agreed to participate in the study. The four-week data collection process included the reporting of participants' thoughts immediately after receiving written corrective feedback, semi-structured interviews, and researcher observations. According to the analysis, personal factors such as goals and beliefs greatly affect students' engagement with feedback. Although teachers treat students equally and give written corrective feedback in the same style and level, individual factors affect the effectiveness of this feedback and students' engagement with this feedback. The same study advises teachers who teach writing in a foreign language and apply corrective feedback that they should consider their students` needs and individual differences when giving feedback.

Written Corrective Feedback And Its Effectiveness

The discussion on the effect of WCF on the development of writing skills of foreign language students is divided into two poles. Although Ferris (1999) is at the forefront of those who argue that it is effective, the beginning of the views arguing that written corrective feedback is not actually very effective dates to John Truscott (1996). Truscott argues that researchers have stated that error correction is effective without providing any evidence or stating a valid discussion, but in fact, it is not very effective, has harmful effects, and should not be included in the education process.

Whether corrective feedback has an impact on L2 writing education is still one of the popular research topics of recent years (Ghoorchaei et al., 2021). There is no consensus in the relevant literature on the extent to which written corrective feedback affects EFL students' writing performances, how it has an effect in the short or long term, and which type of WCF is more effective (Abalkheel & Brandenburg, 2020). In particular, the role of written corrective feedback in writing in the second language and in second language research has been a controversial issue (Chen et al., 2016). While some claim that corrective feedback may be disadvantageous in terms of second language acquisition and should be excluded from classroom teaching, others think that corrective feedback is vital for second language success (Aziz & Jayaputri, 2023).

In one study, 79 EFL students were divided into four groups: direct WCF, indirect WCF with revision, indirect WCF without revision, and a control group, and received feedback for two months (Farjadnasab & Khodashenas, 2017). This study employed a pre-test, post-test, and late post-test design, and provided focused feedback, focusing on specific error types (capitalization, lowercase letters, article usage, and present tense verbs). The results of the study showed that the type-independent feedback provided had a positive effect on EFL students' achievement, and the groups receiving feedback were found to be more successful than the control group. When examined by type, it was found that direct feedback was more effective than other types in the short term, but indirect feedback was more effective in the long term.

One of the most striking topics in the relevant field is which of the WCF types is the most effective. Some scholars argue that direct WCF is more effective, while others argue that indirect or focused written corrective feedback is more effective (Sheen et al., 2009). Berkant et al. (2020) conducted a study to investigate the effects of different written corrective feedback on students' writing performance. According to their research, in which they applied a mixed study model, it was determined that the most effective type of feedback was the one in which students' mistakes were underlined, and their mistakes were stated clearly. In this study, two different types of feedback were studied: the first is the type of written feedback in which the errors are underlined and the second is the type of written feedback in which the errors are coded. In the study, it is recommended to repeat this study at different education levels. In a study conducted with 75 ESL students during a semester, the effect of WCF types, such as direct and metalinguistic, was investigated (Bitchener, 2008). In this study, a control group was also used, and feedback types were found to be effective on students' writing performance.

Gümüş (2023) conducted a study investigating the effects of two types of feedback (direct and indirect) on the writing performance of EFL students by providing feedback to 40 participants. Using a pre-test and post-test design, the study results showed that participants who received direct written corrective feedback performed better in writing. The study also included participants' opinions on WAD. According to the interview results, participants perceived feedback to have various positive effects on their writing performance.

In a quasi-experimental study conducted on 10 high school students who learned English as a foreign language, the effect of three different types of WCF (direct, indirect, and metalinguistic) on students' verb conjugation and article use was investigated (Choi, 2017). According to the results of the study, it was seen that the students who received feedback three times were more successful in using the relevant structures. However, a different result was obtained in this study compared to the general opinion. While the participants in the metalinguistic group were more successful in verb conjugation, the participants in the indirect group were more successful in article use. Participants who received direct feedback did not make progress. Since the number of participants in the study is low, a general evaluation cannot be made.

A study conducted by Rizkiani and his colleagues (2020) examined whether there was a difference between students who received indirect coded feedback and those who received indirect uncoded feedback. In this quasi-experimental study, 35 students in the control group received uncoded feedback, while 35 students in the experimental group received coded feedback. According to the analysis results, indirect corrective feedback statistically improved students' writing scores. Furthermore, a significant mean difference was found between students who received coded written corrective feedback and those who received uncoded feedback. Students who received coded feedback performed better. In a quasi-experimental study in which corrective feedback was limited to time and space prepositions, 52 EFL students were divided into three groups as direct focused, direct unfocused, and control, and written corrective feedback was given to the experimental groups three times in three months (Beşkardeşler & Kocaman, 2019). In this study, which used a pre-test, post-test, and late post-test design, both experimental groups performed better than the control, but no significant difference was observed between the two experimental groups in the long and short term. This shows that giving WCF is effective, but there is no significant difference in type.

In a pre-post-test quasi-experimental study conducted on EFL students in Iran, the effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on the acquisition of subject-predicate fit in the short and long term was investigated (Ghoorchaei et al., 2021). 45 EFL students were divided into three groups as direct WCF, indirect WCF, and control group, and data were collected with the pretest, post-test, and late post-test. According to the results of the study, WCF types do not have a significant positive effect on EFL students' short-term and long-term subject-predicate fit acquisitions, and a significant decrease in the performance of the indirect WCF group was observed in the late post-test. In short, different types of WCF do not have a positive effect on EFL students' writing performance but may adversely affect their performance.

In another study, 80 adults who learned English as a second language were divided into four groups as direct focused, direct unfocused, normal writing education group, and control group, and the post-test was applied to see if there was any difference between the groups (Sheen et al., 2009). According to the results of the study, WCF experimental groups showed better grammar performance in the post-test. The same study suggested that practicing writing alone also improved students' writing performance. Among the types of WCF, it was stated by the same study that while focused WCF was more successful, unfocused written corrective feedback was in the last place. Finally, the study suggests that focused written corrective feedback will also improve students' other errors because providing feedback allows students to focus more on grammar rules. Another study emphasized that indirect WCF did not influence students' writing ability; on the contrary, it could be misleading, and students should be made to clearly identify their errors (direct WCF) (Zayani & Troudi, 2023). There are also studies advocating that the type of WCF should be determined according to students' levels. For example, Solmaz et al. (2023) emphasized in their study that direct, unfocused WCF should be used with low-level students.

For the WCF to be successful, certain conditions must be fulfilled. For example, to fully benefit from written corrective feedback in the way of acquiring/learning a second/foreign language, EFL students should be able to interpret the feedback correctly and understand the linguistic information given through feedback (Simard et al., 2015). The effectiveness of WCF can be affected by many different variables. For example, in a study investigating the effect of direct and indirect written corrective feedback on L2 learning, the mediating role of language anxiety on the effectiveness of these feedback types was also examined (Shao et al., 2024). Forty-five Chinese L2 students were randomly divided into three groups: direct WCF, indirect WCF, and control group. As a result of the application, the experimental groups performed better than the control group, but no significant difference was observed between the two experimental groups. According to the same study, the effect of indirect WCF is impacted by personal factors in terms of language anxiety.

Attitudes Of EFL Students And Educators On Corrective Feedback

Students' attitudes can have a significant impact on their performance in learning any foreign language (Hassan & Dzakiria, 2019). The perspectives of foreign language learners significantly affect the role of WCF for two reasons (Chen et al., 2016). First, students can expect different educational techniques from educators, and second, the most effective educational practices can emerge when students exhibit a positive approach. In the relevant literature, there are many studies investigating the attitudes and perceptions of EFL students towards corrective feedback. These studies were carried out at different educational levels. For example, in a study conducted to learn the attitudes of EFL students towards corrective feedback at the high school level, it was revealed that students thought that corrective feedback improved their learning processes and increased their enthusiasm for learning (Aziz & Jayaputri, 2023). In the same study, it was suggested that students found all corrective feedback useful, whether online or face-to-face, but some students had difficulty understanding which was more useful.

Although there are many studies investigating the effectiveness of WCF in increasing the grammar accuracy of foreign language students, Chen et al. (2016) conducted an exploratory study investigating students' perceptions of WCF in the EFL environment, stating that

the number of studies examining the extent to which different educational environments affect students' perceptions and preferences of WCF is quite low. According to the analysis of quantitative and qualitative data collected from 64 university students learning English at three language levels, medium, advanced-medium and advanced, the participants generally exhibit a positive attitude towards error correction while they tend to have an impartial opinion about the role of direct grammar teaching (explicit). They preferred broad comments on both the content and grammar of their written work. Overall, the findings confirm the value of WCF for EFL students outside of English-speaking countries. The same study also highlights the importance of individual and contextual factors in the ongoing discussions on the effectiveness of WCF.

Westmacott (2017), who stated that studies have shown that teachers provide WCF on written work in English language teaching and that students also want this feedback, noted that the debate over which type of feedback is more effective is still unresolved. In an action research study conducted with intermediate-level students at a Chilean university, Westmacott shifted from direct feedback to indirect, coded feedback and examined six students' responses to both types of feedback. The data collected illustrated how the learning context and individual differences influenced responses. Most students in this English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environment indicated that indirect feedback was more beneficial because it encouraged deeper cognitive processing and learning. This study also provides evidence that written corrective feedback can help consolidate grammar knowledge and encourage autonomous learning behaviour.

After emphasizing the importance of determining student needs in providing WCF, Ramadhani et al. (2021) argue that student preferences should be revealed first to understand these needs. For this purpose, they conducted research with 25 students who took advanced writing courses. This research has shown that students prefer direct feedback to indirect feedback, that the type of error they most want to be corrected is grammatical errors, that they prefer to take written corrective feedback specifically after the course, and that receiving feedback motivates students. Yunus (2020) examined teachers' methods of examining students' English-language texts, students' WCF expectations, and whether these expectations are compatible with teachers' practices. 64 students and three teachers took part in the study. According to the data obtained from two different surveys, both students and teachers think that WCF is useful in improving their writing skills. In addition, the same study showed that students preferred direct feedback rather than indirect feedback. However, the study suggested that there was a mismatch between students' expectations and the practices of the teachers.

In a study investigating student views on direct corrective feedback in a foreign language writing course and benefiting from both questionnaire and observation methods, it was observed that students received feedback on form, content, and organization, and mostly preferred to receive feedback on form (Sabarun, 2020). In the same study, it was suggested that students were satisfied with the feedback they received, that feedback helped them improve themselves in writing, and that feedback increased their self-confidence in exhibiting better writing performance.

In an experimental study conducted on EFL students in Pakistan, students were divided into two: a control group and an experimental group. The experimental group was divided into two as direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback, and written corrective feedback was provided to the experimental group for four weeks (Hassan & Dzakiria, 2019). In the study, pre-test, post-test, and late post-test were applied to the participants, and their attitudes and opinions about the written corrective feedback were measured. According to the results, while the control group had a less positive attitude, no statistically significant difference was found between the two groups. In the same study, it was concluded that EFL students think that receiving written corrective feedback is beneficial for foreign language learning.

Studies that include teachers' views on WCF are also available in the relevant literature, but the number of studies investigating the harmony between their views and practices can be increased. Instructors believe that targeting specific errors and using coding symbols is effective, but differences may occur when applying written corrective feedback due to various factors such as classroom dynamics, student competence levels, cultural norms, and institutional constraints (Adzhar et al., 2025). For example, according to the data collected from 3 EFL teachers working in a private language centre within the framework of Activity Theory in Iran through semi-structured interviews, texts WCF applied, and retrospective interviews, when the scope and type of WCF are considered, while teachers' beliefs and practices do not overlap, the types of errors they target are similar to their practices (Soleimani & Rahimi, 2021).

Some studies investigating the attitudes and views of students and teachers on WCF have resorted to comparing these two groups. For example, in a study conducted with 34 EFL teachers and 34 EFL students, while there was no statistically significant difference between the groups in terms of the amount and type of written corrective feedback, some differences of opinion were noted (Atmaca, 2016). While some students find it useful to mark their mistakes in terms of recognizing their mistakes, others find the teacher's intervention wrong in terms of taking responsibility for their own learning. In the same study, it was also stated that some participants expected a more autonomous and guiding teaching style.

In another study conducted with 469 EFL students and 40 teachers, a questionnaire was applied to investigate the opinions of students and teachers about WCF, and as a result of the study, issues with both consensus and disagreement between students and teachers were revealed (Hopper & Bowen, 2023). According to the relevant study, students see the comprehensive feedback type as the most useful among the written corrective feedback types, believe that all errors should be corrected no matter how many times they repeat, and suggest word errors as the type of error that needs to be corrected the most. Teachers also agree with students about comprehensive written corrective feedback, believing that indirect meta-linguistic written corrective feedback is more useful in correcting grammatical errors. On the contrary, students think that direct WCF is more effective in correcting grammatical errors. When it comes to the types of errors that need to be corrected the most, teachers stated that organization and content are more important. As a result of the study, it was seen that there may be both consensus and disagreement between students and teachers in terms of written corrective feedback.

The Relationship Between EFL Educators' Attitudes And Practices Regarding The WCF

While WCF studies generally focus on the effects on writing accuracy and the development of language abilities, the relationship between educators' beliefs and practices about WCF is ignored (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019). In other words, current WCF research has mostly focused on the scope of feedback (focused - unfocused), WCF strategies (direct - indirect) and students' attitudes towards WCF, and educators who play an important role in the WCF process receive relatively less attention (Lee & Mohebbi, 2020). There may be inconsistencies between the opinions and attitudes of educators who use written corrective feedback in their classrooms. The reason for this is that although they think that written feedback is necessary, they are under the influence of many factors such as time constraint, student level, and the number of students while applying. In addition, in studies discussing the effectiveness of written corrective feedback, the issue should be examined from the perspective of not only the student but also the educator, because the educator is as important an element of the application as the student. The effectiveness of written corrective feedback is simply too complex to associate with the student. Therefore, future studies should listen more to the voice of EFL educators. Although there are studies investigating this in the literature, the number is relatively small.

In a study conducted by Mao and Crosthwaite (2019), it was determined that the WCF attitudes and practices of instructors were compatible to some extent but differed at certain points. It was observed that the instructors, who stated that they gave direct corrective feedback, indeed used indirect feedback more. Although they stated that they stated the number of errors in their student papers, they did not actually give it, and although they thought that global issues were more important, they focused too much on details. Among the reasons for these discrepancies, the authors show time constraints, excessive workload, and perceptions of students' attitudes towards WCF.

In his study, Al-Bakri (2019) used semi-structured interviews and application papers to examine the attitudes and practices of instructors towards WCF. Stating that the beliefs of the instructors affect their practices, the author stated that the participants used focused direct corrective feedback and that there was inconsistency between their attitudes and practices. The main reason for this inconsistency is the lack of communication between teachers and students in the relevant study.

Conclusion

From the Behaviourist Approach to today, written corrective feedback has been an integral part of foreign language writing education, making it an interesting field to study. Today`s individualized education requires teachers and educators to consider various factors such as students' age, gender, learning style, and cultural identity, in providing written corrective feedback. However, this is not a journey of mere teachers or educators. On the contrary, students and teachers should be taken as a whole, and the concept of WCF should be handled holistically, including issues such as educators' thoughts and practices, student perceptions, student engagement, educator and student emotions, the role of technology, and educator/student feedback literacy.

In the WCF field, no consensus has been reached about the type, amount, and time of WCF or its effectiveness yet. That is why more studies are needed to fill this gap. More experimental studies, containing experimental and control groups, are needed to determine the effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students` writing performance, and these studies should be planned in compliance with pre-test, post-test, and late post-test design. In addition, the number of participants in the studies should be increased as much as possible since some statistical analyses require large numbers of participants to reach more precise results. For attitudes and opinions studies, interviews, and observations should be used, ensuring that the participants have experienced or are experiencing written corrective feedback.

Teachers should consider students` preferences and opinions when providing written corrective feedback, as this can make the feedback more useful and meaningful to students (Samuel & Akther, 2021). While students constitute one side of the WCF coin, teachers (WCF practitioners) constitute the other. Therefore, understanding teachers' attitudes and practices

regarding WCF is a crucial step in understanding its place in writing classrooms (Sajjadi et al., 2015). Including teachers or faculty members in future studies will provide a broader perspective in studying the concept of WCF. As in every field, the impact of technology on written corrective feedback practices should not be overlooked in future studies and classroom settings. Although traditional feedback practices have achieved success, it can be argued that corrective feedback will be more appealing to the younger generation when integrated with technology. Instructors should be more open to using technology in classroom settings.

Genişletilmiş Öz

Yabancı dil eğitiminde öğrencilerin akademik hayatını derinden etkilendiğinden yazma oldukça önemli bir yere sahiptir. Öğrencilerin yazıları değerlendirilirken organizasyon, düşünce akışı ve dilbilgisi gibi farklı konular ele alınmaktadır. Bu faktörler arasında dilbilgisi hataları düzeltici dönütün en çok odaklandığı konudur. Başka bir ifade ile, öğrencilerin yazarken yaptıkları hataları düzeltmek ve onların yazma performanslarını iyileştirmek için öğretmenler yazılı düzeltici dönüte başvurmaktadır. İngilizce yazma sınıflarında yazılı düzeltici dönütün (YDD) kullanımı her ne kadar etkisi tartışma konusu olsa da oldukça yaygındır. Bu yaygın kullanımın getirdiği birçok uygulama farklılıkları olabilmektedir. Başka bir ifadeyle yazılı düzeltici dönüt vermenin birçok yolu vardır. Ancak yazılı düzeltici dönüt uygulamaları öğretmen ve öğrenci tutumu, dönüt türü, miktarı, öğrenci seviyesi, öğrenci motivasyonu ve bağlılık gibi birçok faktörden etkilenebilmektedir. Etkili dönüt verilebilmesi için bu faktörler göz önünde bulundurulmalıdır.

Yazılı düzeltici dönütü anlamak ve uygulamaları etkileyebilecek bu faktörleri göz önünde bulundurabilmek için öğretmenlerin geniş çaplı literatür taraması yapmaları gerekmektedir. Fakat literatür taramaları oldukça zaman alan, yorucu süreçlerdir. Böyle durumlarda literatür çalışmaları büyük önem arz etmektedir. Dolayısıyla bu çalışmanın amacı yazılı düzeltici dönütün tarihsel gelişimini ve güncel durumunu ilgili alandan örnek çalışmalarla belirlemektir. Bu çalışma yazılı düzeltici dönüt vermek isteyen eğitimciler veya güncel durumu öğrenmek isteyen araştırmacılar için bir rehber niteliği taşıyacaktır. Bu çalışma sayesinde yazılı düzeltici dönütün ne olduğu, tarihsel gelişimi, nasıl, ne zaman ve ne kadar verilebileceği, hangi iç/dış faktörlerden etkilendiği veya nasıl geliştirilebileceği gibi konular netlik kazanacaktır. Bu çalışmaya göre YDD alanında, YDD'nin türü, miktarı ve süresi veya etkinliği konusunda henüz bir fikir birliğine varılamamıştır. Bu nedenle bu boşluğu doldurmak için daha fazla çalışma yapılmalıdır. Yazılı düzeltici dönütün EFL öğrencilerinin yazma performansı üzerindeki etkisini belirlemek için deney ve kontrol gruplarını içeren daha fazla deneysel çalışmaya ihtiyaç vardır ve bu çalışmalar ön test, son test ve geç son test tasarımına uygun olarak planlanmalıdır. Ayrıca, bazı istatistiksel analizler daha kesin sonuçlara ulaşmak için çok sayıda katılımcı gerektirdiğinden, çalışmalardaki katılımcı sayısı mümkün olduğunca artırılmalıdır. Tutum ve görüş çalışmaları için, katılımcıların yazılı düzeltici dönüt deneyimlediğinden veya deneyimliyor olduğundan emin olduktan sonra görüşmeler ve gözlemler kullanılmalıdır. Son olarak düzeltici dönüt vermenin tek yönlü değil, çok yönlü bir eylem olduğu unutulmamalıdır. Dolayısıyla, çalışmalar sadece öğrenciye odaklanmamalı, aynı zamanda öğretmen ve eğitim politikaları da dikkate alınmalıdır.

References

Abalkheel, A. & Brandenburg, T. (2020). Effects of written corrective feedback: A synthesis of 10 quasi-experimental studies. *English Language Teaching, 13*(7), 97-103. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v13n7p97

Adzhar, N., Puteh, M. & Sazalli, N. A. H. (2025). Exploring teachers' beliefs in written corrective feedback (WCF) in Kuala Lumpur secondary schools. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 15*(1), 380–396. http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v15-i1/24483

Atmaca, Ç. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: Written corrective feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 12*(2), 166-182.

Aziz, M. & Jayaputri, H. (2023). EFL learners` perspective on corrective feedback. *Journal of English Language Teaching, 7*(2), 219-225. http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/scope.v7i2.14806

Banaruee, H., Khatin-Zadeh, O. & Ruegg, R. (2018). Recast vs. direct corrective feedback on writing performance of high school EFL learners. *Cogent Education, 5*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1455333

Berkant, H., Derer, N. & Derer, Ö. (2020). The effects of different types of written, corrective feedback on students texting mistakes. *English Language, Teaching Educational Journal, 3*(3), 174-187. https://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i3.3136

Beşkardeşler, S. & Kocaman, O. (2019). The effects of written corrective feedback types on the prepositions of place and time in EFL context. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies in Education, 3*(1), 1-13. http://doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i3.3136

Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future direction. *International Journal of English Studies, 10*(2), 1-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.6018/ijes.10.2.119171

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 102-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004

Chen, S., Nassaji, H. & Liu, Q. (2016). EFL learners` perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: A case study of university students from mainland China. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language, 1*(5), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y

Choi, Jungeun. (2017). Effects of different types of written corrective feedback on Korean high school students' writing. *Foreign Language Education Research, 21*, 21-40. https://doi.org/10.15738/kjell.21..202106.551

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *English Language and Teaching Journal, 63*(2), 97-107. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023

Fan, N. & Ma, Y. (2018). The role of written corrective feedback in second language writing practice. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 8*(12), 1629-1635. http://dx.doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0812.08

Farjadnasab, A. & Khodashenas, M. (2017). The effect of written corrective feedback on EFL students' writing accuracy. *International Journal of Research in English Education, 2*(2), 30-42. https://doi.org/10.18869/acadpub.ijree.2.2.30

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(99)80110-6

Fitriyah, I., Ningrum, A. S. B. & Gozali, I. (2024). An Investigation of written corrective feedback in EFL writing assessment: How teachers' feedback practices meet students' expectations. *International Journal of Language Testing, 14*(1), 166–184. https://doi.org/10.22034/IJLT.2023.411616.1275

Ghoorchaei, B., Mamashloo, F., Ayatollahi, M. A. & Mohammadzadeh, A. (2021). Effect of direct and indirect corrective feedbackon Iranian EFL writers' short and long term retention of subject-verb agreement. *Cogent Education, 9*(2014022), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2014022

Gümüş, H. (2023). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback types on L2 writing achievement and EFL learners' views on these feedback types. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Education Faculty* (66), 314-338. https://doi.org/10.21764/maeuefd.1099551

Guo, Q. & Barrot, J. (2019). Effects of metalinguistic explanation and direct correction on EFL learners` linguistic accuracy. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 35*(3), 261-276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2018.1540320

Hartshorn, K., Evans, N., Merrill, P., Sudweeks, R., Strong-Krause, D. & Anderson, N. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly, 44*(1), 89-109. https://doi.org/10.5054/tq.2010.213781

Hassan, M. & Dzakiria, H. (2019). The university students` beliefs towards corrective feedback in learning English as foreign language in Pakistan. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, 8*(3), 4094-4100. http://dx.doi.org/10.35940/ijrte.C5465.098319

Hopper, D. & Bowen, N. (2023). Students' and teachers' beliefs about written corrective feedback: Perspectives on amount, type, and focus of feedback in an EFL setting. *Reflections, 30*(3), 735-756. https://doi.org/10.61508/refl.v30i3.268135

Lee, I. & Mohebbi, H. (2020). Editorial: Written Corrective Feedback (WCF): Teachers' Knowledge, Beliefs and Practice. Language Teaching Research Quarterly, 25, 1-4. http://dx.doi.org/10.32038/ltrq.2021.25.01

Lee, I. (2024). The future of written corrective feedback research. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 19*(4), 660-669. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2024.2388068

Lopez, M. B. (2021). An updated typology of written corrective feedback: Resolving terminology issues. *Revista Educacion, 45*(2), 1-14. http://dx.doi.org/10.15517/revedu.v45i1.43289

Mao, S. S. & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback: (Mis)alignment of teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 45*, 46–60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2019.05.004

Pearson, W. S. (2022) A typology of the characteristics of teachers' written feedback comments on second language writing, *Cogent Education, 9*(1), 2024937, https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2024937

Ramadhani, G., Muthim, A. & Febriyanti, E. (2021). Students' preferences towards lecturer's written corrective feedback in writing class. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 587*, 63-71. http://dx.doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211021.010

Rizkiani, S., Bhuana, G. P. & San Rizqiya, R. (2020). Coded vs uncoded corrective feedback in teaching writing descriptive text. *ELTIN Journal, 8*(1), 55–66. https://doi.org/10.22460/eltin.v8i1.p%25p

Sabarun, S. (2020). Direct teacher corrective feedback in EFL writing class at higher education: What students perceive. *Vision: Journal for Language and Foreign Language Learning, 9*(1), 17-32. http://dx.doi.org/10.21580/vjv9i14652

Sajjadi, M., Khabbazi, F., & Sajjadi, S. Y. (2015). The effect of written corrective feedback in second language writing. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature, 3*(12), 22-30. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Effect-of-Written-Corrective-Feedback-in-Second-Sajjadi-Khabbazi/ec5e07d8e8de9a946fbada55fdaec62ef2eb8da4?utm_source=direct_link

Samuel, A., & Akther, M. (2021). Students` perceptions and preferences abut teachers` written corrective feedback at secondary school. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 43*(1), 45-58. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1320823

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In W. M. Chan, S. Chi, K. N. Cin, J. Istanto, M. Nagami, J. W. Sew, T. Suthiwan, & I. Walker, *Proceedings of CLaSIC 2010*, Singapore, December 2-4 (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Shao, J., Wu, Y., Zeng, S. & Huang, R. (2024). The role of feedback type and language anxiety in the effectiveness of written corrective feedback for L2 learning. *The Language Learning Journal, 52*(4), 367-379. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2023.2166976

Sheen, Y., Wright, D. & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System, 37*, 556-569. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.002

Shen, R. & Chong, S. W. (2023). Learner engagement with written corrective feedback in ESL and EFL contexts: A qualitative research synthesis using a perception-based framework. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 48*(3), 276-290. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2072468

Simard, D., Guènette, D. & Bergeron, A. (2015). L2 learners' interpretation and understanding of written corrective feedback: Insights from their metalinguistic reflections. *Language Awareness, 24(*3), 233-254. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2015.1076432

Solmaz, F., Taş, S. & Kalın, İ. M. (2023). A study of teacher practices, perceptions, and attitudes towards written corrective feedback. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 23*(1), 18-31.

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

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

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers` choice and learners` preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78-93. http://dx.doi.org/10.2167/la429.0

Yunus, W. (2020). Written corrective feedback in English compositions: Teachers` practices and students' expectations. *English Language Teaching Educational Journal, 3*(2), 95-107. http://dx.doi.org/10.12928/eltej.v3i2.2255

Zayani, E. M. & Troudi, S. (2023). Beyond the written corrective feedback (WCF) debate: Tunisian EFL university lecturers' views of their WCF practices. *Internation Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 10*(2), 21-53.

Zhang, D., Tan, J. T. & Roy, S. S. (2023), A systematic review of interventions improving university students' EFL writing competence. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 22*(10), 93-112. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.22.10.6

Zheng, Y., Yu, S. & Liu, Z. (2023). Understanding individual differences in lower-proficiency students` engagement with teacher written corrective feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education, 28*(2), 301-321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1806225