NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING TEACHERS' BELIEFS ABOUT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Parinda Jantori

(plernphdkmutt@gmail.com)

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Saowaluck Tepsuriwong

(saowaluck.tep@kmutt.ac.th)

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Pornapit Darasawang

(iporwang@kmutt.ac.th)

King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi

Abstract

This study attempted to investigate native and non-native English speaking teachers' beliefs about written corrective feedback. Five native and five non-native teachers who were teaching at the university level in Thailand were interviewed through three stages of data collection. First, the participants were asked to assess a piece of writing. Then the assessed essay was used as the stimuli in the stimulated recall interview. There were four types of corrective feedback found from the second stage; (1) making explicit corrections, and (2) making explicit corrections with explanations (3) indicating errors with no correction, (4) indicating errors with error codes. The first two types were considered as indirect feedback while the other two types were considered as direct feedback, and they were used as cues for the third stage which was a stimulated recall interview. The result revealed complex pictures of native and non-native teachers' beliefs, i.e. they seemed to share the same beliefs for direct feedback, but reported different beliefs for indirect feedback. However, both groups of the participants pointed to the concerns about learning and practicality in their provision of written corrective feedback.

1 Introduction

For a period of time now, studies into teacher's beliefs have received much attention from researchers in the field of ELT because of the assumption that tapping into teachers' beliefs and investigating their decision-making process grants us an understanding of their teaching practices. Nonetheless, not all classroom practices have been thoroughly investigated. One of such practice, which has received minimal attention, is the practice of providing feedback (Lee, 2003, 2008, 2009).

A considerable number of studies have paid attention to error corrections in terms of their types or their effects on students' accuracy improvement (Lee, 2008). This grew out from teachers and researchers' interest in the way student's writing was corrected (Ellis, 2009), whereby teachers and researchers may gain useful insights for appropriate corrective feedback

practices. Most of the research in this area was conducted to compare the effectiveness between different types of corrective feedback, e.g. direct and indirect feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009) focused and unfocused feedback (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008), and different types of direct feedback (Shintani & Ellis, 2013).

Another aspect that has received a considerable amount of attention in written feedback research is the reaction towards students' errors. This area of study, which has been conducted in different teaching and learning contexts (see Hyland & Anan, 2006; Kobayashi, 1992; Porte, 1999; Sheorey, 1986; Shi, 2001), highlights culture as a crucial element for consideration. Culture is vital as it may have a direct bearing on how teachers' beliefs are formed and exercised (Wiegle, 2002). In these studies, teachers from different cultural backgrounds were sampled, e.g. Sheorey (1986) compared American and Indian English teachers. Kobayashi (1992) compared the differences between Canadian, British and American and Japanese teachers of English. Porte (1999) studied British and American teachers and Spanish teachers who teach English in Spain, while Hyland and Anan (2006) studied which errors are perceived as more serious by Japanese and English teachers. From these studies, similarities and differences between teachers from different cultural backgrounds were found. This may reflect a complex picture of how cultural backgrounds influence teacher's beliefs and practices regarding their provision for error feedback.

Nonetheless, despite an interest in the appropriacy of types of corrective feedback, and their effects on students' learning, as well as the dissimilarities of perceptions towards student errors across diverse cultures, few studies have considered teachers' beliefs regarding corrective feedback approaches. Hence, understanding teachers' beliefs in corrective feedback provision is considered essential. Thus, this study aims to investigate the beliefs of native English speaking teachers (NESTs) and non-native English speaking teachers (non-NESTs) regarding their beliefs about written corrective feedback for students' writing.

2 Studies into different perceptions of errors

Several studies have revealed that non-NESTs perceived errors more seriously than NESTs. Sheory (1986) asked two groups of teachers (American and Indian) to evaluate twenty sentences, which included eight different types of errors. The teachers were asked to choose between a score of 0 to 5, wherein 5 indicated the most serious error. It was found that non-NESTs perceived errors more seriously than the NEST group, as they deducted more points. Similarly, Hyland and Anan (2006) echo this finding in their study, where non-NESTs (Japanese) were found to be more severe about errors in composition tasks, rating high on a10-point scale, in comparison to their NESTs counterparts (English). On the contrary, Kobayashi (1992) found that NESTs (Canadian, English and American) had stricter error perceptions than non-NESTs (Japanese). In this study, NESTs gave lower scores to the composition in terms of grammatical criteria, based on a 10-point scale evaluation.

Some studies had also suggested that NESTs' and non-NESTs' perceptions of error were only slightly different. An example of this is Porte's (1999) study, which investigated error toleration between NESTs (British & American) and non-NESTs (Spanish). The participants were asked to rate the seriousness of errors in twenty sentences in the questionnaire. It was found that there were slight differences in error toleration between the two groups of teachers. In a similar case, Shi's (2001) study compared the holistic scoring and judgment criteria for a

same writing task between NESTs (expatriates who typically speak English as their first language) and non-NESTs (Chinese). The two groups of teachers were asked to rate 10 randomly chosen essays written by Chinese undergraduate students on a 10-point scale, as well as to state three most important reasons for their ratings. The result showed that there were no significant differences in holistic scores given by both groups. However, when looking at the reasons, both groups were significantly different in terms of the criteria they provided for their holistic scoring. NESTs emphasized the content and language but non-NESTs emphasized organization and length of the composition.

Taking these into account, NESTs and non-NESTs revealed different perceptions and responded differently to students' errors. Subsequently, it may be assumed that the approaches they adopt in their corrective feedback provision would also be different according to their beliefs. Although some studies cautioned that teachers reported beliefs may not result in their actual practices (Lee, 2009; Ferris, 2014), it is still valuable to explore the factors behind their choices of providing corrective feedback.

3 Types of written corrective feedback

Many scholars tend to agree on the distinction between two categories: direct and indirect corrections (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Ferris, 2006). Direct feedback refers to teachers' feedback when teachers provide explicit correction to an error. A teacher can also include the examples of correct usage or grammatical rules as meta-linguistic explanation (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). On the other hand, indirect feedback refers to teacher's feedback where an error is pointed out but no explicit correction is provided (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Teachers can provide indirect feedback by underlining or circling the error, or writing the number of errors on the margin of each line. The use of error code to indicate the errors is also categorized as indirect feedback (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Ferris, 2004).

While many scholars categorized written corrective feedback as direct and indirect, Ellis (2009) divided error corrections into three categories. In his term, indirect feedback is used when the teacher identifies the error for the student but does not correct it. Direct feedback, on the other hand, is used when the teacher makes the correction on the students writing. The correction made can be in various forms such as crossing out the incorrect words, or adding the correct words. The third category, meta-linguistic feedback, is used when the teacher provides students with explicit comment which can be in two different forms: using error codes and giving explanations.

Though a seemingly general consensus on the operationalization of corrective feedback, there still exist some discrepancies. Ferris (2003), for example, labelled the use of error code as indirect feedback, whereas Ellis (2009), and Bitchener and Knoch (2010) categorized the use of error code as a direct feedback type since it notifies students about the types of language errors they have made. In this study, the use of error code is considered indirect as it only provides hints as to what needs to be corrected or revised without disclosing a correct alternative. In addition, the present study will consider meta-linguistic feedback, or the provision of explanation, as a type of direct feedback as this approach directly tells the students what they did wrong, and provides explanation as a means to guide them to have a better grasp of an error type.

4 Studies relating to written corrective feedback

4.1 Effectiveness of written corrective feedback

A number of studies have attempted to investigate the effectiveness of written corrective feedback. Many of them have investigated the improvement of accuracy by experimental means, which includes pre- and post-tests and control groups. Some of included the revision of new drafts. From these studies, some have reported that corrective feedback was, in fact, helpful for the improvements on students writing. Ashwell (2000) examined the accuracy improvement in three different drafts through the provision of different feedback types. It was found that there were no clear differences among the groups who received different feedback types. Nevertheless, the study pointed out the usefulness of corrective feedback, stating that the group who received feedback improved more on writing accuracy than the group which did not receive the feedback. Bitchener (2008) adapted the pre- and post-test analysis to study the effectiveness of corrective feedback over at two-month period. The result from the immediate post-test revealed a noticeable improvement on accuracy from the students who received written corrective feedback, compared to the control group who did not receive any feedback. In terms of encouraging students to self edit, Ferris and Roberts (2001) concluded that there were no distinguishable differences found between the group that received error codes and the group that did not. However, the study suggested that the use of feedback could, in effect, help the students to improve their accuracy in writing.

It has also been reported that corrective feedback may not be quite effective. Polio, Fleck and Leder (1998), for example, conducted a quasi-experimental study investigating whether students would improve language accuracy in subsequent revision drafts. The study found that both the control and experimental groups had some improvement in the revision drafts. Nonetheless, the students in the experimental group did not show any significant improvement in accuracy. Thus, the researchers concluded that provision of corrective feedback might not be as beneficial regardless much attention has been drawn into this area.

4.2 Comparing types of written corrective feedback

The studies comparing the effectiveness of written corrective feedback were mainly conducted in two major categories; comparing direct and indirect types and comparing different types of direct feedback. The study indicated the benefit of direct feedback over the indirect type was seen in Van Beuningen, de Jong and Kuiken's (2008) study. In the study, four treatments were explored in an experimental study, which involved direct feedback, indirect feedback, writing practice, and no feedback. It was found that written corrective feedback was successful in helping the students to improve their writing accuracy. When investigating further, they suggested that both types of feedback, direct and indirect, had an influence on the accuracy improvement in the revision task. For long term effects, however, direct feedback was found to be more helpful. Subsequent work by Van Beuningen, de Jong and Kuiken (2012) also pointed out the dissimilarities in terms of the direct and indirect feedback effectiveness. They examined the effectiveness in terms of grammatical errors and other types of errors. The direct corrective feedback was found to enhance grammatical accuracy, while indirect feedback was beneficial to other types of error.

Besides comparing different types of feedback (i.e. direct and indirect), several studies had attempted to investigate the effectiveness of feedback approach within the same types. Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2005) explored how different approaches could increase accuracy in learners' new writing texts. The four approaches included 1) explicit correction, 2) explicit correction with teacher-student conference, 3) explicit correction, and 4) no feedback. Among the four approaches, explicit correction, together with conferencing was found to be the most helpful for the improvement of three grammatical categories; prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article. Sheen (2007) examined the effectiveness of three different groups of treatment; 1) explicit correction, 2) explanation group, and 3) the control group (i.e. the group that did not receive any feedback) in terms of article acquisition. The result showed that the explanation group outperformed the other two, and also suggested that the provision of explanation could enhance students' ability in analysing language. Bitchener and Knoch (2009) also tried to investigate which approach for direct feedback was more effective. They divided direct feedback into three approaches: explicit correction only, explicit correction together with written explanation, and explicit correction together with both written and oral explanation. The study found no differences among three groups and concluded that giving explicit correction was already adequate for helping the students to improve their accuracy.

Previous studies into error perceptions and effectiveness of written corrective feedback suggest two points worth discussing. First, native and non-native English speaking teachers may have different perceptions regarding the seriousness of errors they have found in students' compositions. Second, results from the preceding studies relating to the effectiveness of written corrective feedback, was found to be inconclusive. Some types of written corrective feedback were found to be more effective than the others. With the different perceptions of feedback and different benefits that each type of corrective feedback can offer, this study attempt to explore the differences in the beliefs of NESTs and non-NESTs regarding written corrective feedback.

5 The study

This article is part of a larger study on teachers' beliefs about feedback given to students' composition. There were ten participants who took part in the study, five NESTs and five non-NESTs. The NESTs were native English speakers who came from South Africa, Canada, and United States of America, while the non-NESTs were all Thai. The focus of this study was to investigate whether there were any differences found in the beliefs of NESTs and non-NESTs who are currently teaching in Thai universities. In the following sections, they will be referred to as non-NEST1 to non-NEST5 and NEST1 to NEST5.

All participants had at least a year's experience teaching English at the university level. Five non-NESTs were teaching at university located the north eastern part of Thailand. They were responsible for general English courses offered to beginners to intermediate language users who were studying for their bachelor degree. The other group, the NESTs, was teaching at universities in Bangkok. They were mostly responsible for the general English courses offered for the international program students.

5.1 Data collection

Data collection for the study was divided into three stages: pilot interview, and two stimulated recall interviews which were conducted at different times. In stage one, a pilot interview was conducted with two Thai teachers who were teaching English at a university level in Thailand. Both of them have been teaching English for more than one year. The preliminary study was conducted to help researchers to see reasons that participants mentioned when they provided written corrective feedback. The finding revealed two main aspects that the teachers took into consideration when providing corrective feedback; whether the students would learn from the feedback (will be referred to as 'learning' in the result section), and whether the approach to feedback is practical to do (will be referred to as 'practicality') in the result section.

In stage 2, stimulated recall was used. Ten participants were initially given the same piece of student writing to mark according to their preferences, without any constraints on time or the corrective scheme. The participants could take as much time as they wanted and when they were finished and ready, they were interviewed about their corrective feedback approaches. The essays that the participants have marked were used as stimuli in the stimulated recall interview. Then, data from the interview were analysed, and four types of corrective feedback were found to be common among ten participants. The four types of corrective feedback were 1) only indicating errors, 2) giving error codes, 3) giving explicit corrections, and 4) giving explicit corrections with explanations. These four corrective feedback types were later used to elicit teachers' beliefs in the third stage of the interview.

In the third stage, participants were given the same essay writing they have seen in the second stage. This time, the essay included the four different feedback types found from the second stage. All four types of feedback were given to the same errors. This is to limit the variables that could influence teachers' beliefs in terms of the seriousness of errors, or whether they are word level or sentence level errors. Some participants might believe sentence errors are more severe and others might believe that errors occurring at a word level are more serious. Hence, it may influence their thought and reasons for specific approach to written corrective feedback.

Each participant was given three essays at a time to compare the three types of feedback used in each essay paper. They were asked to respond to two questions: 1) how are the two of these similar to and, at the same time, different from the other one in terms of learning? and 2) how are the two of these three similar to and at the same time different from the other one in terms of teacher's practice? The reason why the participants were asked to compare between different approaches of feedback is based on George's Kelly Personal Construct Theory. In his theory, individual's belief refers to the construct or meaning that a person gives to specific object (i.e. element). The belief of a person should come from his or her testing hypothesis of the world. In terms of hypothesis testing, it refers to a person giving meaning to something from seeing different elements and being able to identify the contrast between these elements. If we do not see the contrast, we cannot be certain of the meaning or beliefs that a specific person gives to that object (Jankowicz, 2003; Donaghue, 2003)

The stimulated recall interview was conducted in English and Thai according to the preference of the participants. After the interview, data from the third stage was transcribed and analysed and grouped according to the two aspects: 1) the reasons behind the approach of

feedback (learning or practicality) and 2) the different groups of respondent (NESTs and non-NESTs).

6 Results

In this section, the data will be presented according to the types of written corrective feedback: direct and indirect corrective feedback types. The highlight would be placed on the two groups of participants: NEST and non-NEST to compare their beliefs. The extracts from the interviews will also be presented.

6.1 Direct corrective feedback

NESTs' and non-NESTs' beliefs about making explicit correction, and making explicit correction with explanation were compared. Extracts showing reasons for each approach will also be given.

Table 1. Reasons for direct corrective feedback

Direct corrective feedback	Learning		Practicality			
	Beneficial	Not beneficial	Practical	Impractical		
	Provide guidance	Foster passiveness	-	Demand time and effort	Judgment on ambiguous errors	Require teachers' grammatical knowledge
Making explicit correction	-	◊◊◊••	-	◊••	◊◊	-
Making explicit correction with explanation	◊◊◊••	•	-	•	•	◊••

◊-Native English speaking teacher •non-Native English speaking teacher

The similarities between NEST and non-NEST in terms of learning as well as practicality can be observed. As seen in Table 1, both groups agreed that making explicit correction could foster passiveness because students will only wait for teachers to spoon-feed them. At the same time, both groups also believed that making explicit correction with explanation is more beneficial to students' learning as it provides more guidance for the students to improve their writing.

In terms of practicality, neither NESTs nor non-NESTs reported that direct corrective feedback was practical to do. They reasoned that this approach is impractical because it requires much time and effort, high judgment on errors, and deep grammatical knowledge.

6.1.1 Making explicit correction

The interview results revealed similarities between NESTs' and non-NESTs' belief about the use of explicit correction, as seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2. NESTs' and non-NESTs' beliefs about making explicit correction

	Learning		Practicality	
Groups	beneficial	not beneficial	practical	impractical
native	0%	60% (3)	0%	60% (3)
non-native	0%	40% (2)	0%	40% (2)

Learning

With respect to learning, 3 NESTs and 2 non-NESTs believed that making explicit correction in students' writing was not beneficial. They reported that it made the students become passive and they might not pay attention to the teachers' feedback. The participants also asserted that learning involves thinking. If the students become passive, then learning would not occur.

Fostering passiveness

If you give explicit correction, it could mean nothing to student. For some students, if it's completely passive, nothing interactive for them, they don't take it very well. (NEST4)

Learning requires the process that students have to think on their own. If they simply see it and receive it like spoon-feeding, they would learn how to do it on their own (Non-NEST3)

Practicality

With regards to practicality, agreement between NESTs and non-NESTs was also found. Several participants, both NESTs (60%) and non-NESTs (40%), seemed to share the same thoughtabout making explicit correction for the students. Their beliefs were reported as follows.

Demanding time and effort

It just takes more time to make correction. (NEST4)

Sometimes it was so difficult to make the corrections because the writing was full of errors. You might need to rewrite the whole sentence for them which require much of your effort.(Non-NEST1)

If you have to make correction, it will definitely take time to do that. (Non-NEST4)

Ambiguous errors

One thing is, sometimes it's hard to know what the student tries to write. When they're really ambiguous (NEST4)

6.1.2 Making correction with explanation

While NESTs seemed to share the same beliefs about making correction together with explanation in terms of benefits to learning, non-NESTs had different beliefs. From table 3, it can be seen that non-NESTs believed that making correction with explanation could be either beneficial or not beneficial to students' learning. For practicality, both NESTs and non-NESTs reported that this approach was impractical.

Table 3. NEST and non-NEST' beliefs about making explicit correction with explanation

	Learning		Practicality	
Groups	beneficial	not beneficial	practical	impractical
native	60% (3)	0%	0%	20% (1)
non-native	40% (2)	20% (1)	0%	80% (4)

Learning
With regards to learning, the participants reported different beliefs. As seen from table 3, 3 NESTs and 2 non-NESTs considered this approach to be useful in learning. They reasoned that this approach allowed the opportunity to provide guidance for the students to develop their writing. The students could gain better knowledge from understanding the cause and types of the errors.

Providing guidance to improve writing
This one here the students look at the mistakes, and there's explanation for it so it's an element of teaching. (NEST7)
It would be easier to learn from because you can see not only how to fix it, but you're looking at what the mistake is and why it's a mistake.(NEST3)
I believe this one can help the students to learn because the students can see the explanation why they got it wrong. This type of corrective feedback got the answer in itself, and the students can learn from these answers. (Non-NEST4)

On the other hand, one non-NEST had doubt about this type of corrective feedback, stating that it might not be useful in learning. The teacher clarified that the students may become passive learners if they were provided with all the information and correction. From doing this, the feedback would not help with their memories. (Example of this can be seen from the following extract).

Fostering passiveness
The students will not learn by themselves. When they were given all the information by the teacher, those will not be stored in their memory.(Non-NEST5)

Practicality
None of the participants thought that this approach is practical. The participants provided reasons that they need to have a certain amount of language knowledge to be able to provide explanation. They were afraid that they might give incorrect clarification for the errors and end up confusing the students.

Requiring teachers' grammatical knowledge
If you need to give explanation, you would need to know exactly the problem. For me, to learn exactly what it is that's wrong requires having language knowledge, linguistic knowledge that I just don't have. (NEST3)
This is inconvenient. Teachers need a lot of knowledge to be able to explain what was wrong. You need to be aware of all exceptions in the rules. If you don't thoroughly explain, then the students might not understand the whole concept of the language rules. (Non-NEST3)

6.2 Indirect corrective feedback

Indirect feedback included two approaches: indicating error, and indicating error and give error code. Each approach will be presented in the following section to show the similarities and differences between NESTs and non-NESTs, in terms of learning and practicality.

Table 4. Reasons for indirect corrective feedback in terms of learning

Indirect corrective feedback	Learning			
	Beneficial			Not beneficial
	Stimulating curiosity	Helping memories	Enhance cognitive engagement	Overwhelm students
Indicating error with no correction	◊	●	◊	◊●●●●
Indicating error and give error code	-	-	◊◊◊●●	-

◊-Native English speaking teacher ●Non-Native English speaking teacher

Table 5. Reasons for indirect corrective feedback in terms of practicality

Indirect corrective feedback	Practicality				
	Practical			Impractical	
	Easy	Not demanding time and effort	Avoid interpretation of students' mistakes	Demanding time and effort	Require teacher judgment on ambiguous errors
Indicating error with no correction	◊●●●●	●	◊◊	-	-
Indicating error and give error code	●●	◊	-	◊	◊

◊-Native English speaking teacher ●Non-Native English speaking teacher

Table 4 and 5 show the differences between NESTs and non-NESTs in terms of their beliefs in learning and practicality for each type of indirect feedback. Native English Speaking Teachers believed that both approaches of indirect feedback lead to active learning. Furthermore, these two approaches could enhance students' cognitive engagement, and thus result in students' learning. On the other hand, most non-NESTs believed that indirect feedback (indicating error with no correction) was not so beneficial because it may overwhelm the students.

Different beliefs between NESTs and non-NESTs were also observed when considering practicality. Both groups reported various beliefs regarding the practicality. They mainly considered the ease of giving feedback, time spent and interpretation of mistakes. However, non-NEST seemed to focus on the ease of approach more, while the NEST tended to focus on interpretation of the mistakes. None of the non-NESTs, however, thought that indirect feedback was impractical.

6.2.1 Indicating error with no correction

Data from table 6 below revealed that NESTs and non-NESTs seemed to have different beliefs with reference to learning. While the majority of non-NESTs believed that indicating error with no correction provided negative influence on learning, only a few NESTs reported similarly. However, when considering this approach to error correction in terms of practicality, both NESTs and non-NESTs seemed to agree that this approach was practical.

Table 6. NEST and non-NEST' beliefs about indicating error with no correction approach

Groups	Learning		Practicality	
	beneficial	Not beneficial	practical	Impractical
NESTs	40% (2)	20% (1)	60% (3)	0%
Non-NESTs	20% (1)	80% (4)	100% (5)	0%

Learning
The participants' beliefs vary with regard to learning. 2 NESTs and 1 non-NEST thought that indicating error helped stimulate students' curiosity and help the students to enhance their memories.

> Stimulating curiosity
> *Just indicating the error usually generates curiousness, "Ajarn why did you mark this wrong?" Or they may actually recognize what's wrong, once they have their attention drawn to it. (NEST5)*
> Helping students to memorize
> *Indicating error with no correctionis better in the quality in that the students have to table out by themselves what they did wrong. And in doing this, it helps them to memorize better.(Non-NEST5)*

On the other hand, some participants reported different beliefs with reference to learning. Non-NESTs (n=4) and NESTs (n=1) thought that this approach could not lead to students' learning. They reasoned that it may discourage students, especially the less proficient ones. Students might be overwhelmed by the red marks appearing in feedback and would not know what to do next and probably learn nothing from the teacher's error indication, as seen from the extracts below.

> Students' overwhelming with the correction
> *I don't think it can help the students to learn. I'm not sure how they can improve, especially with the weak students. If they see the feedback like this, they might be shocked and don't do anything further to revise the draft.(Non-NEST1)*

If you just underline without specify what the problem is, I think they will be so overwhelmed which trying to understand that they would just not look at it. (NEST3)

Practicality
All of the non-NESTs and most of the NESTs highlighted the issues on practicality in the interview. They explained that this approach was found to be practical because of its easiness, less time requirement, and no interpretation.

Easy
This one is the easiest. You just underline and the students have to table out by themselves. (Non-NEST2)

Not demanding time and effort
This type is very fast to do because you don't waste your time making corrections. You just say that this is wrong, and that's it. It's fast. (Non-NEST5)
Avoiding interpretation of the students' writing
Underlining error is less interpretation of what the student's trying to get at. And in terms of practicality, that is the easiest because you just underline what's wrong and you don't have to make any particular judgments on what it is that wrong and let the student table out for themselves (NEST2)

6.3.1 Indicating error with error code

This approach to feedback seemed to reveal the more complex beliefs of native and non-native English speaking teachers. While there seemed to be an agreement between both groups in terms of learning, both groups have different beliefs with regard to practicality.

Table 7. NEST and non-NEST' beliefs about indicating error with error code approach

	Learning		Practicality	
Groups	beneficial	not beneficial	practical	impractical
native	60% (3)	0%	20% (1)	40% (2)
non-native	40% (2)	0%	40% (2)	0%

Learning
In terms of learning, both group of the participants agreed that this approach was useful. NESTs (n=3) and non-NESTs (n=2) believed that it could enhance students' cognitive engagement. It allowed the students to take part in their own learning, engage in correcting the errors themselves and; thus, could lead to their learning. The reasons they gave to support their beliefs are shown below.

Enhancing cognitive engagement
The students will look at it and go, "Oh what is this, I don't know" and then try investigate for themselves, so it's more of thinking involved here. And by creating more thinking, you're giving the students more control and power over their own corrections. (NEST2)
The teacher did not say directly what was wrong, just give the error code. The students, then, have to take part in their own learning. They have to try to

think what was wrong and try to find the correction by themselves. (Non-NEST3)

Practicality

For the practicality aspect, some non-NESTs (n=2) and one NEST stated that using error code as corrective feedback was practical. The reasons were that, it was easy and did not consume much of their time correcting and providing feedback.

Easy
*This one is convenient because you don't need to give explanation. The teacher just has to know what aspect is wrong. There was no need for explanation. (*Non-NEST3*)*

Not demanding time and effort
This is a little bit faster. You have this short codes for different grammatical errors, different mistakes, you don't have to correct it, you just have to underline or highlight where they have mistaken, so it's faster. (NEST1)

On the contrary, two NESTs disagreed with the conveniences of using this approach. The causes of impracticality were due to demanding nature of correction task, and the complexity of the errors.

Demanding time and effort
This (Indicating error and give error code), for me would be the least practical, just because I would have to learn to code. And then I have to learn how to apply it appropriately. (NEST3)

Complexity of the errors
Indicating error and give error code is more difficult in terms of the judgment that teachers have to do. For example, this one is a 'V' but could it be subject-verb agreement, or could it be something else. I mean how you code this will decide what coding you put there is based on your judgments of what the problem is. (NEST2)

To summarize, the data revealed complex pictures of beliefs about direct and indirect types of written corrective feedback. For direct feedback, the respondents reported that it could be either beneficial or non-beneficial for students' learning. As can be seen from table 1, five respondents reported direct corrective feedback to be beneficial, but six respondents reported that it did not encourage learning. At the same time, the respondents found that indirect feedback offered both positive and negative influences on students' learning. As seen from table 4, eight respondents believed that indirect feedback was helpful in learning while five respondents revealed opposite belief.

With regard to the practicality aspect, the respondents seemed to share the same beliefs about direct type of feedback stating that it was not practical. For indirect feedback, however, it could be seen that the respondents reported different ideas that this type of corrective feedback was both practical and impractical to do.

7 Discussion and implications

From the study, we have found that participants are more concerned about learning aspects in feedback provision. Their concerns could be distinguished into two aspects: cognitive engagement and scaffolding.

The participants believed that providing feedback can enhance students' cognitive engagement. From the feedback, the students will have to take be responsible for their own learning by dealing with some hints which teachers had provided for the purpose of stimulating correct responses. Once they are cognitively engaged, the students are believed to internalize the new knowledge, which can contribute to improvement in writing accuracy. At the same time, the participants were also concerned about the students' cognitive load in their revision of subsequent drafts. They clarified that some students might be overwhelmed with the feedback, which may result in a negative influence to learning.

Providing scaffolding through feedback was also revealed as teachers' concern in learning. Feedback provided by the teachers should be regarded as "scaffolding cognitive development" tool, which could lead to the knowledge of the subject content as well as the knowledge of writing (Hyland, 2013 p. 240). The participants believed that meta-linguistic explanation, which is included with direct feedback, can serve as scaffolding for students. Meta-linguistic explanation for corrective feedback refers to the provision of grammatical rules and the example correct usage (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). They believe that the students should at least be provided with some guidance in order for students to self-correct, and this is another aspect of teaching. If the students have to do the self-correction without any scaffolding, they would not be able to resolve the errors, especially more complex issues such as collocations or shades of meaning between synonyms.

Apart from learning, practicality was clearly seen as teachers' concern for providing feedback. For example, the use of explicit correction with explanation which was reported to have learning benefits was considered a burden as participants need to spend more time and effort. This may serve as an explanation for studies which suggested a mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practice (e.g. Lee, 2003; Lee, 2009; Min, 2013). Previous studies have indicated several constraints that contribute to such discrepancies, which include institution, time, student's personality, student's proficiency level (Lee, 2009; Mori, 2011), and even teacher's meta-linguistic knowledge.

Interestingly, both NESTs and non-NESTs in this study reported the lack of meta-linguistic knowledge as a factor for the impracticality of providing feedback. This offers an implication for teacher training in that, particular attention may be needed in equipping teachers with sufficient meta-linguistic knowledge geared towards written corrective feedback provision. Moreover, teachers need to be able to determine suitable approaches that would cater to various personalities and proficiency levels. In addition, the institutions also need to be aware of the time and institutional constraints which may hinder teachers' practice in providing written corrective feedback.

8 Conclusion

The present study attempted to investigate the beliefs of native and non-native English speaking teachers' beliefs about written corrective feedback. The result from the interview revealed slight differences between native and non-native English speaking teachers. In fact, beliefs of the two groups were found to be complex according to the types of feedback. That is, they tend to share the same beliefs for direct feedback, but reported different beliefs for indirect feedback.

Beliefs that guide teachers' decision in the types of feedback are related to learning. They considered the role of feedback as tools for helping students to learn, e.g. encourage active involvement in their own learning that leads them to become independent learner though the use of feedback as scaffolding. However, the issue of practicality such as time constraint and teachers' meta-linguistic knowledge level also played an important role in teachers' feedback provision. Teachers were concerned that their level of meta-linguistic knowledge may have not reached a point which allows them to confidently provide feedback. Therefore, the need to balance between learning and practicality should be taken into consideration for teachers' written corrective feedback.

References

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

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*, 102-118.

Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D.R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. Routledge.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System*, *37*(2), 322-329.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*(4), 207-217.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of second language writing*, *14*(3), 191-205.

Donaghue, H. (2003). An instrument to elicit teachers' beliefs and assumptions. *ELT Journal, 57*(4), 344-360.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*(2), 97-107.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, *36*(3), 353-371.

Ferris, D.R. (2004). The "Grammar Correction" Debate in L2 Writing": Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). *Journal of second language writing*, *13*(1), 49-62.

Ferris, D.R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 81-104.

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

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of second language writing*, *10*(3), 161-184.

Hyland, K., & Anan, E. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of error: The effects of first language and experience. *System*, *34*(4), 509-519.

Hyland, K. (2013). Faculty feedback: Perceptions and practices in L2 disciplinary writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(3), 240-253.

Jankowicz, D. (2003). *The easy guide to repertory grids*. CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Kobayashi, T. (1992). Native and nonnative reactions to ESL compositions. *TESOL Quarterly*, *26*(1), 81-112.

Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, *8*(3), 216-237.

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(2), 69-85.

Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, *63*(1), 13-22.

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

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System*, *39*(4), 451-467

Polio, F., & Fleck, C.L. (1998). "If I only had more time": ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy of essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *7*, 43-68.

Porte, G. (1999). Where to draw a red line: Error toleration of native and non-native EFL faculty. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*(4), 426-434.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(2), 255-283.

Sheorey, R. (1986). Error perceptions of native-speaking and non-native-speaking teachers of ESL. *ELT Journal*, *40*(4), 306-312.

Shi, L. (2001). Native-and nonnative-speaking EFL teachers' evaluation of Chinese students' English writing. *Language Testing*, *18*(3), 303-325.

Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). *Exploring language pedagogy through second language acquisition research*. Routledge.

Van Beuningen, C.G., De Jong, N.H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL-Review of Applied Linguistics*, *156*, 279-296.

Van Beuningen, C.G., De Jong, N.H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, *62*(1), 1-41.

Weigle, S.C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.