Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH) (e-ISSN : 2504-8562)
2023, Volume 8, Issue 4, e002252
DOI: https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v8i4.2252

L2 Learners' Preferences and Opinions of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing Multicultural Class

Sabariah Abd Rahim[1*], Anna Lynn Abu Bakar[2], Wan Hurani Osman[3]

[1]Center for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, University Malaysia Sabah, Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.
Email: sab@ums.edu.my
[2]Center for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, University Malaysia Sabah, Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.
Email: annalynn@ums.edu.my
[3]Center for the Promotion of Knowledge and Language Learning, University Malaysia Sabah, Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia.
Email: wanosman@ums.edu.my

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR (*):
Sabariah Abd Rahim (sab@ums.edu.my)

KEYWORDS:
L2 learners' preferences and opinion
Written corrective feedback
L2 writing multicultural class

CITATION:
Sabariah Abd Rahim, Anna Lynn Abu Bakar, & Wan Hurani Osman. (2023). L2 Learners' Preferences and Opinions of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing Multicultural Class. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH), 8*(4), e002252. https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v8i4.2252

ABSTRACT

Effective writing skills are essential for second language (L2) learners to achieve. To assist these learners, writing teachers provide methods to improve their skills in writing, and one of the methods is written corrective feedback. Despite applying written corrective feedback, L2 learners still face challenges in developing their writing skills, especially the skill to produce linguistically accurate writing. Written corrective feedback is a form of written feedback that is commonly employed pedagogically in writing class. Nevertheless, it is unsure whether or not L2 learners are benefited from this method. Therefore, this study seeks to determine the preferences and opinions of L2 learners regarding their teachers' written corrective feedback. The study adopted a mixed-methods research method, combining a questionnaire and a semi-structured interview. This study involved twenty-one L2 students from various ethnic backgrounds. The findings indicate that these L2 learners of diverse ethnic backgrounds require written corrections to improve their writing correctness. As a result of the teachers' lack of effort in expressing the written corrective comments, the L2 students are unable to comprehend the corrections made. This impacts their writing accuracy. For this reason, they choose face-to-face consultation for the written CF, as it will benefit both their revisions and future writings. This study is relevant because it provides teachers with insights for enhancing the efficiency of written corrective feedback in an L2 writing class.

Contribution/Originality: This study contributes to the existing literature on corrective feedback in general, and its findings provide language instructors with suggestions for improving the effectiveness of written corrective feedback in an L2 writing multicultural class.

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Feedback in the writing classroom guides the development of L2 writers (Ferris & Robert, 2001; Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Ene & Kosobucki, 2016). Correcting errors and commenting on the written works of L2 learners are popular forms of corrective feedback (CF) utilized by many L2 teachers in writing classes. Spoken or written comments may be provided as feedback. Oral and written CF have different effects on how L2 learners process the material offered. To elaborate, written CF is said to benefit the L2 learners more than oral CF because the L2 learners will have more processing time to compare their output with the corrections provided by teachers, which may increase the probability that they will notice their errors (e.g., Adams, 2003; Santos et al., 2010; Manchón, 2011). Unlike written CF, oral CF is typically shared with both the individual learner and the rest of the class. Thus, oral CF information is typically ambiguous and more likely to go unnoticed in comparison to written CF, where learners are always clear about the feedback offered by their teachers (Sheen, 2010) since they have sufficient time to comprehend the written CF. Due to time constraints and the interactive character of oral CF, L2 students have limited opportunity to uptake their teachers' oral CF. Thus, the researchers of this study focused on written CF.

Since Truscott's (1996) and Ferris's (1999) debate on the usefulness of written CF, the majority of research on written CF has been on its effectiveness (Shen & Chong, 2022). This has led to the research scope focusing on written products (Shen & Chong, 2022). Unfortunately, the findings of the research on written CF of writing outputs do not explain how, to what extent, and why written CF works. As Bitchener and Storch (2016), Storch (2018), and Shen and Chong (2022) have suggested, it is time to change the focus of written CF research. In respect to this, the purpose of the study is to determine the preferences and opinions of L2 learners regarding their teachers' written CF.

In addition, studies have demonstrated that written CF positively affects the writing accuracy and performance of L2 learners (e.g., Egi, 2007; Kim & Han, 2007; Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Suzuki, 2012; Hartshorn et al., 2010; Ferris et al., 2013; Moradian et al., 2016). Nevertheless, L2 learners still make repetitive errors (see Maros et al., 2007; Jalaluddin et al., 2008; Darus & Subramaniam, 2009; Stapa & Izahar, 2010; Nayan & Jusoff, 2009; Musa, Lie & Azman, 2012; Narinasamy et al., 2013; Singh et al., 2017). Studies also indicate that learners appreciate their teachers' written CF (Irwin, 2017; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; Lee, 2008; Leki, 1991; Saito, 1994; Yang et al., 2006). Nonetheless, some findings suggested that learners may not read their teachers' written CF unless specifically instructed to do so by their teachers (Irwin, 2017). This could be the cause of the learners' repetitive writing errors. Corder (1977) stated that:

> *For a successful* language *"teaching-learning process is going to be dependent upon the willing co-operation of the participants (teachers and students) in the interaction and an agreement between them upon the goals of their interaction. Co-operation cannot be imposed but must be negotiated"* (Corder, 1977)

Corder (1977) suggested that for language learning to be successful, teachers must negotiate roles and expectations with their students. They must comprehend one another's needs and preferences. They must also consult students on the type of written CF they prefer and their opinion of the teachers' written CF in order to encourage students to pay greater attention to the CF. Furthermore, the issue of the feedback preferences and

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

opinions of students must be addressed because they have not been sufficiently investigated (Aridah et al., 2017).

In addition, teaching in ethnically mixed classes has become a challenge for teachers (Omeri, 2014), as teachers must not only understand the individual differences of L2 learners, but also the cultural diversity and recognize the differences among the multicultural and ethnic group in their classroom (Omeri, 2014). Learners who do not comprehend this may perceive the learning environment as foreign and unfavorable. Eventually, the situation will elevate learners' stress and anxiety that results from the lack of support from their teachers and peers (Muhamad, n.d). Thus, it is crucial to recognize that the cultural background of L2 learners influences their preferences and strategies of language learning (Omeri, 2014). Gregory and Jones (2009, p. 776) suggest that teachers can overcome this concern by employing an adapting strategy in which *"they can become flexible and change some of their methods and strategies in order to be more inclusive."* They can also implement a relating strategy in which they can take into account the varying needs of individuals and groups, with an emphasis on the development of teacher-student and student-student relationships (Gregory & Jones, 2009). In accordance with Gregory and Jones's (2009) hypothesis, the present study seeks to determine the opinion and preference of L2 learners regarding teachers' written CF. The followings are the research questions for the study:

i. What are the L2 learners' opinions on their teachers' written CF?
ii. What are the L2 learners' preferences for their teachers' written CF?

This study is significant because it improves the teacher-student/learner relationship, whereby L2 learners/students experience less stress and anxiety in L2 writing class as teachers become more flexible and willing to design and apply more suitable written CF based on their learners' preferences and opinions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Writing Accuracy

Accuracy is the capacity to use error-free language in writing or speech (Wolfe- Quintero et al., 1998). The errors could be grammatical or non-grammatical. In writing, L2 learners should be able to produce error-free sentence structures that adhere to a particular grammar rule. L2 learners who can write with fewer errors write more precisely as their language proficiency increases (Arnold, 2008; Wolfe-Quintero et al., 1998). For L2 learners with low proficiency, however, writing accurately can become a stressful task. Thus, written Corrective Feedback (CF) from teachers is essential because it has a significant impact on the language learning development and motivation of L2 learners (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). With low proficiency L2 learners' poor performance in writing accurately, written CF has become one of the most important pedagogical methods adopted in any writing course (Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012). Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and Second Language Writing (SLW) researchers continue to debate whether or not written CF influences the writing accuracy of L2 learners. Nevertheless, the researchers in both fields (SLA and SLW) concur that written CF improves the grammatical accuracy of L2 learners (e.g., Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Sheen, 2007; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2002 - to name a few). Furthermore, studies have shown that written CF improves L2 learners' writing accuracy, whether in revision texts (see Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Walley, 1990; Ferris, 1999, 2006; Ferris & Robert, 2001) or in new written texts (see Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2010; Bitchener et al., 2005;

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

Chandler, 2003; Ellis et al., 2008; Robb et al., 1986; Sheen, 2007; Sheen et al., 2009). Therefore, the writing accuracy of L2 learners can be enhanced when teachers provide CFs to their students' writings.

2.2. Corrective Feedback

According to Bitchener and Storch (2016), written CF refers to a response(s) to linguistic errors, or most commonly, grammatical errors, in the writing of an L2 learner. Written CF provides learners with the CF for their grammatical errors in order for them to write correctly in the subsequent written texts (Ferris, 2011). It is also a common pedagogical strategy in L2 writing classes, since students learn to apply language in order to create knowledge about the language itself (Wang & Jiang, 2015). To benefit from the written CF offered by their teachers, L2 learners must study and comprehend the written CF. This is because the effectiveness of written CFs depends on the comprehension of L2 learners (Zhang et al., 2021). Their positive attitude towards written CF demonstrates that they require written CF to improve their writing ability (Chen et al., 2016). Moreover, misaligned perceptions of written CF between L2 learners and teachers are likely to have a negative impact on L2 learners' capacity to apply CF (Saeli & Cheng, 2019).

2.3. Theoretical Underpinnings Written CF

To explain the facilitative role of written CF, one can examine cognitive theories that explain how written CF facilitates L2 learning. The interaction hypothesis, output hypothesis, and noticing hypothesis are cognitive theories that show teachers' written CF will assist L2 learners in identifying and comprehending their writing errors. If L2 learners are unable to comprehend these written CF, they can consult their teachers for further explanation (interaction hypothesis: Long, 1996). This input explained by teachers can then be used to prevent future instances of incorrect repetition (output hypothesis: Swain, 1995). Language learning is enhanced when L2 learners understand and become aware of the input identified in written CF and explained further by teachers (noticing hypothesis: Schmidt, 1995, 2001). Written CF encourages L2 learners to focus on the linguistic forms of the target language and promotes the L2 learners' practice of the linguistic forms of the target language, which in this study is English.

In addition, the facilitative role of written CF can be discussed from the perspective of Sociocultural Theory (SCT). According to SCT, learners' L2 development is improved when a novice (an L2 learner) interacts socially with an expert (an L2 teacher). Social interaction serves as a form of support or assistance that an expert provides to a novice; this support might be physical (e.g., dictionary) or symbolic (e.g., language) in nature (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). This type of support is referred to as mediation and tools in SCT, where teachers (the experts) provide written CF as a tangible form of support or a tool in SCT (Bitchener & Storch, 2016) for the errors discovered in the writing of L2 learners (the novices). From the standpoint of SCT, learners actively participate in the learning process. As a result, they will respond and take advantage of the offered assistance, which is the CF, by utilizing the correct forms of the errors found in their writing. This will eventually lead to the development of the learners' L2. However, if L2 learners are hesitant to read or respond to the teachers' written CF and fail to practice the correct linguistic forms of English due to a failure to understand the teachers' written feedback, similar errors in their future writings can still be found. This will impede the written CF's facilitative role.

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

3. Methodology

3.1. Research Approach and Design

The research employed a mixed-methods approach and an explanatory design. The mixed-method approach confirms evidence through data triangulation incorporating several data collection and analysis methods, hence enhancing the study's internal validity (Dornyei, 2007). Using questionnaires, quantitative data were collected and evaluated first in this study. The qualitative data gathered via semi-structured interviews are then used to explain and expand upon the quantitative data (Kim & Seo, 2012). The quantitative outcomes of this study might be augmented with interview data to obtain the perspectives and justifications of the participants regarding their preferences. A questionnaire was utilized to elicit participants' language experience and background, as well as their perspective on teachers' written CF. Semi-structured interviews were then used to elicit participants' opinion on teachers' written CF. The results of these two datasets were used to determine the written CF preference of the participants.

3.2. Participants

Twenty-one L2 students from an East Malaysian university participated in the study. The participants were selected for the study using a method of purposive sampling. The method of purposive sampling discovers and selects people who have expertise and experience about the subjects being examined (Creswell & Clark, 2011). According to Bernard (2011), the selected participants should also be able to share their experiences and ideas articulately and thoughtfully. Hence, participants enrolled in the same course and class (Reading and Writing in English) were chosen for the study because they were directly involved with the experience of receiving written CF for the course's writing tasks.

3.3. Instruments

The researchers customized the questionnaire on written CF used by Ferris, Liu, Sinha, and Senna (2013) for individual L2 writers. This is to ensure that the validity and reliability of the data obtained from this instrument represent the qualities the researchers intend to identify and that the collected data are consistent and stable. Moreover, a questionnaire is the optimal tool for description and forecasting (Dane, 1990). Also, it is a time- and cost-efficient method of information collection (Fraenkel et al., 2012). However, questionnaires have a number of limitations, such as the inability of respondents to explain their answers to specific questions. To address this issue, the researchers included a space on the questionnaire for respondents to justify their responses. The questionnaire consisted of two sections (Parts 1 and 2). Part 1 of the questionnaire elicits the ethnicity of the participants, while Part 2 reveals their language experience and background, as well as their perspective on teachers' written CF. The questionnaire described the writing and language background of the participants and predicted their opinion or perspective on the written CF provided by their teachers (based on their experiences). The method of frequency analysis was employed to analyze the questionnaire data.

Next, the semi-structured interview elicited and investigated the participants' perceptions of their teacher's CF. During semi-structured interviews, participants can freely express themselves and provide in-depth information about the study issue

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

(Johnson & Christensen, 2004; Yin, 2014). The interview questions were created based on the responses to the surveys. Its purpose is to elaborate and explain in depth the responses to the questionnaire. The thematic analysis was used to analyze the interview data. In this study, the researchers utilized Braun and Clarke's (2006) six steps of thematic analysis, i.e., becoming familiar with the data by repeatedly transcribing and reading the data, coding the data, searching for and reviewing potential themes, defining and naming the themes, and generating a report of the data analysis. The researchers also used saturation to determine the number of individuals to interview. Saturation is a criterion employed in qualitative data collection research, such as in the present study, where semi-structured interviews were used to obtain qualitative data. Saturation is essential in terminating data collection and/or analysis (Saunders et al., 2018). It refers to the point at which "*more data does not result in any new emergent themes*" (Given, 2016, p. 135). The semi-structured interview session will conclude when no new topics arise from the responses of the participants. Participants were referred to as P1, P2, P3, etc., for ethical reasons.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Questionnaire

Part 1 of the questionnaire illustrates the participants' ethnic background. Table 1 shows the information.

Table 1: Ethnicity of the Participants (N=21)

Ethnicity	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Suluk	2	9.5
Banjar	1	4.8
Malay	5	23.8
Brunei	2	9.5
Bajau	7	33.3
Kadazan	4	19.0

Table 1 reveals that the majority of participants were Bajau (33.3%), followed by Malays (23.8%) and Kadazan (19%). 4.8% of the total number of participants in the research identified as Banjar. The Suluk and Brunei ethnic groups each comprised 9.5% of the total number of survey participants. The multi-ethnicities found in this study reveals that teachers must maintain the teacher-student/L2 learner interaction (Gregory & Jones, 2009) by eliciting the learners' preferences and opinions on their written CF in order to apply the appropriate written CF to these students/L2 learners. This will minimize the stress and anxiety created by the teachers' lack of assistance for the students.

Part 2 of the questionnaire elicits the participants' language experience and background, as well as their opinion on teachers' written CF. Table 2(a), Table 2(b) and Table 2(c) show the findings.

Table 2(a) demonstrates that Malay (5), Brunei (2), Bajau (5), and Kadazan (3) students have learned numerous (*Yes, a lot*) English grammar rules in their English writing course. Malay and Bajau have the largest percentage of participants (each 23.8%) who claimed to have learned a great deal of English grammar in the writing class. This indicates that 15 participants (71.4%) of diverse ethnic backgrounds had been exposed to English

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

grammar extensively in their English writing class. In contrast, the other participant groups, Suluk (2), Bajau (2), Banjar (1), and Kadazan (1), said that they were occasionally introduced to English grammar in their English writing class. It is important to note that, in contrast to the 71.4% of participants from various ethnic backgrounds, 28.6% of the participants (Suluk, Bajau, Banjar & Kadazan) claimed they only occasionally learnt about English grammar in their writing class. These results indicate that, despite taking the same course in the same class, some students felt they did not receive sufficient knowledge on English grammar. What made them choose this response? Based on the qualitative responses to the questionnaire, it was determined that the students have difficulty understanding the teacher's written CF since the majority of errors were circled or crossed out and the proper forms were written next to the errors without explanation. According to Sociocultural Theory (SCT), written CF has a facilitative role for learners, and the teacher, as the subject matter expert, must support or assist students in their learning. To engage students in active learning, in which they respond to and use the assistance provided by the teacher (written CF), the teacher must understand students' preference for written CF. If students enjoy the written CF provided by the teacher, they will respond favorably by avoiding such errors in future writings.

Table 2(a): Language Experience of the Participants (N=21)

Q2: Have you ever learnt any English grammar rules or terms like noun, verb, preposition etc. in English writing class?	**Ethnicity (no. of people)**	**Total (%)**
Not sure	-	-
Very little or never	-	-
Sometimes	Suluk (2), Bajau (2), Banjar (1) & Kadazan (1)	6 (28.6)
Yes, a lot	Malay (5), Brunei (2), Bajau (5) & Kadazan (3)	15 (71.4)

Table 2(b) illustrates the participants' language background.

Table 2(b): Participants' Opinion about their English Grammar Use in Writing (N=21)

Q3: What is your opinion about your English grammar use in writing?	**Ethnicity (no. of people)**	**Total (%)**
My English grammar problems are very serious and really affect my writing.	Suluk (1), Malay (3), Bajau (5), Banjar (1), Brunei (1) & Kadazan (4)	15 (71.4)
English grammar is not a serious problem to me.	Suluk (1), Malay (1), Bajau (2)	4 (19.0)
Other writing issues like punctuation are more important than my English grammar problems.	Brunei (1)	1 (4.8)
I'm not sure if it's a problem.	Malay (1)	1 (4.8)
Others	-	-

Table 2(b) illustrates the participants' opinions of their written use of English grammar (language background). The table demonstrates that the majority of participants (71.4%) reported having substantial English grammar issues that negatively impact their writings. They were Suluk (1), Malay (3), Bajau (5), Banjar (1), Brunei (1) and Kadazan (4). 19% of the participants (Suluk, Malay and Bajau) felt that they had no serious problems in English

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

grammar. On the other hand, one participant (Malay) was unsure whether or not she had difficulty with English grammar. Only one participant (Brunei) believed that English grammar was not a significant concern and that other writing issues, such as punctuation, were more important than English grammar. This finding indicates that more than 70.0% of the participants viewed English grammar as a serious problem that negatively affected their writing. Inadequate grasp of English syntax, confusion over the exact forms and meanings of words, and a lack of confidence while writing in English were among the reasons why the participants believed that English grammar is a critical problem. Providing these students with effective written CF is vital. To accomplish this, teachers must be aware of the learners' preferred form of written CF and their opinion of the teachers' existing written CF. As suggested by the SCT, they should also provide these students with their preferred written CF. With preferred written CF, these learners can acquire and apply the written CF's knowledge. This is consistent with the cognitive theory perspective that learners must first comprehend the provided CF before becoming aware of the specific language forms of the errors presented in the written CF.

Next, Table 2(c) shows the participants' opinion on teachers' written CF.

Table 2(c): Participants' Opinion on Teachers' Written CF

Q3: What is the best way for teacher to give written corrective feedback for the grammar/language errors found in your writing?	**Ethnicity (no. of people)**	**Total (%)**
Correct only the most serious errors.	-	-
Circle but don't correct errors.	Brunei (1), Bajau (2) & Kadazan (2)	5 (23.8)
Circle errors and label them by type.	Suluk (1), Malay (3), Brunei (1), Bajau (3) & Kadazan (1)	9 (42.8)
Correct all errors	Banjar (1), Malay (1), Bajau (2) & Kadazan (1)	5 (23.8)
Others	Suluk (1) & Malay (1)	2 (9.5)
Q4: Does written corrective feedback help you to write grammatically accurate in your writing tasks?	Ethnicity (no. of people)	Total (%)
Yes	Suluk (1), Malay (3), Brunei (2), Bajau (7) & Kadazan (4)	17 (80.9)
No	Banjar (1) & Malay (1)	2 (9.5)
Others	Suluk (1) & Malay (1)	2 (9.5)

Table 2(c) depicts the opinions of the participants on the type of written feedback they prefer and whether or not written CF assists them to write grammatically accurate essays in the future. More than 40.0% of participants requested that their errors be circled and labelled by type. The remaining 23.8% of participants preferred their writing errors to be circled but not corrected, or for all errors to be rectified. Two participants (9.5%) preferred teachers to circle and correct errors, as well as explain written corrective feedback. This illustrates that the participants preferred the written CF to circle and label the errors by type in order to avoid making the same mistakes in the future and to become aware of the problems in their writing. One of the participants noted that he has never received corrective feedback from a teacher, so detecting and labelling the errors in his writing is crucial for him. The findings also show that the majority of participants (80.9%) agreed that teachers' written CF helps them to write grammatically correct essays. They were Suluk (1), Malay (3), Brunei (2), Bajau (7) and Kadazan (4), whereas 9.5% of

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

participants disagreed (Banjar (1) & Malay (1)). Among the suggested reasons was that the feedback enables them to comprehend their errors and prevent repeating them in future writings. In contrast, the remaining 9.5% elected not to voice their opinion (Suluk (1) & Malay (1)) since, according to them, forgetfulness and carelessness will cause them to make identical errors in future writings, despite having received the written CF. The responses imply that L2 learners with multi-ethnic background desire written CF from their teachers. Nonetheless, the type of written CF should be depending on the individual's preference, in order to optimize the effectiveness of the written CF. According to SCT and cognitive theories, the facilitative role of written CF can be enhanced if teachers provide learners with the appropriate and desired written CF (Corder, 1977; Gregory & Jones, 2009) so that they can interpret feedback and use the correct form and terminology in future writing without feeling anxious.

4.2. Semi-structure Interview

The aim of the interview is to obtain the participants' opinion on the written CF of the teacher. The researchers opted to conclude the interview after the seventh participant because the responses were identical, and, as indicated in the preceding paragraph, they used saturation when assessing the interview data. Hence, only seven respondents' responses (of the twenty-one participants) were thematically analyzed. At the conclusion of data processing, a single theme emerged.

4.2.1. Theme: Teacher should explain the written CF

All seven participants stated that the teachers should explain the written CF of the errors found in their writing. The responses were:

> *"It would be preferable if the teacher showed me the mistakes and corrections face to face so that I could better understand them."* (P1)
>
> *"I prefer that the teacher explain the errors and corrections, and I must understand the explanation."* (P2)
>
> *"I prefer explanation and discussion because I will learn more."* (P3)
>
> *"I agree to discuss the errors and corrections made because I know where the errors are and how and why they were corrected."* (P4)
>
> *"I prefer to have a discussion because if I did it alone, I would not understand where my mistakes were and would feel lazy. When there is a discussion, I will be able to identify and comprehend the errors."* (P5)
>
> *"I want the teacher to explain the correction to me face-to-face so that I can correct myself and avoid making the same mistakes in the future."* (P6)
>
> *"The majority of the corrections are lost on me. I simply copied the correction. I prefer that the teacher explain the correction in person so that I can ask more questions." (P7)*

The responses indicate that these learners desire a face-to-face discussion with their teachers regarding the written CF. Teachers should not only provide learners with written

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

corrections for errors in their writing, but also verbally explain the errors and the corrections. This will allow them to ask additional questions or for clarification on the grammatical errors. According to SCT, teachers are the experts, who will assist learners (the novice) by providing them the written CF that functions as the mediation for L2 learning. To comprehend and then internalize the CF, L2 learners must recognize the errors and written CF. The cognitive theories justify the necessity of learners' awareness of the errors and writing CF. It also claimed that the efficacy of the written CF will be intensified with teachers' face-to-face discussion and L2 learners' understanding of the errors and written CF.

In conclusion, the L2 learners of this study, regardless of their ethnic background, value the written CF of their teachers. They want teachers to identify and label the types of errors identified in their writing so that they can avoid making similar errors in the future. The written CF also teaches them proper grammar usage. The findings illustrate the L2 learners' opinion on their teachers' written CF, and it also supports the theoretical viewpoints of teachers' written CF facilitative role, namely the cognitive theories and sociocultural theory. The theories assert that the language learning of L2 learners can only be enhanced if teachers' written CF perform their facilitation role effectively. Also, L2 learners must comprehend the written CF in order to use it as input for future writings. They should also take an active role by responding to and utilizing the provided assistance (the teacher's written CF) when applying the correct forms of the errors identified in their errors, thereby enhancing their L2 development. Participants in the study responded positively to the teachers' written CF in that they wanted teachers to identify and describe the types of errors in their writing so that similar errors can be avoided in the future. In addition, the findings demonstrated that L2 learners favor face-to-face consultation of the written CF. According to them, this consultation will provide the opportunity to obtain a more thorough explanation of the identified literary errors. These findings respond to the second research question of the study: *what are the L2 learners' preferences for their teachers' written CF?* Teachers' written CF is essential for these L2 students. With teachers' written CF, they can recognize errors and their corrections and comprehend them. This will prevent them from making similar mistakes in the future. The current study supports the cognitive hypotheses underlying the written CF. In order to negotiate the meanings of their teachers' written CF, the L2 learners in this study require face-to-face consultation with their teachers. Only through face-to-face consultation will L2 learners modify the written CF's discussion or development into information they will use in future writings.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The majority of the L2 learners in this study acknowledged the significance of their teachers' written CF in their writings. The written CF will assist them in writing essays with correct grammar. Yet, they thought that teachers did not adequately explain the errors detected in their essays. As the CF is written, they were unable to speak and requested additional explanation. Thus, the L2 learners in this study prefer face-to-face consultation of the written CF over written corrections and explanations only. Hence, teachers must be aware of their students' preferences in regard to written CF. The written CF may be interpreted differently by L2 learners and their teachers, which may negatively impact the L2 learners' learning process. In light of these findings, it is recommended that teachers explain or discuss errors and corrections verbally in order to maximize L2 students' comprehension of errors and corrections. This will improve the relationship between students and teachers, particularly in multicultural L2 writing classes. In

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

addition, as this study only relates to this group of participants, it is advised that a larger sample be examined in future studies to determine the validity of the findings. More items should be added to the questionnaire in order to generate additional semi-structured interview questions that will improve the findings and collect more data from a large sample.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

The participants of this study had consented to provide data for the study.

Funding

The researchers would like to thank the participants of this study for their valuable responses. The study was funded by PPIB (UMS) Seed Money: Grant No. GPB0004.

Conflict of Interest

The authors reported no conflicts of interest for this work and declare that there is no potential conflict of interest with respect to the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

References

Adams, R. (2003). L2 output, reformulation and noticing: Implications for IL development. *Language Teaching Research*, 7, 347-376.

Aridah, A., Atmowardoyo, H. & Salija, K. (2017). Teacher practices and students' preferences for written corrective feedback and their implications on writing instruction. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 7*(1), 112-125.

Arnold, E. (2008). Measurements and perceptions of writing development: Omani academic writers of English. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *4*(1), 42-55.

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, 227-258.

Bernard, H.R. (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches (5th ed.)*. Altamira Press.

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. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(3), 409-431.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*(2), 193-214.

Bitchener, J. & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development*. Multilingual Matters.

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

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

Bitchener, J., Young, S. & Cameron, D. (2005). The effective of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing,* 14, 191-205.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77–101.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.

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 Pacif. J. Sec. Fore. Lang. Educ.* 1, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-016-0010-y

Corder, S.P. (1977). *Language teaching and learning: A social encounter*. TESOL.

Creswell, J.W., & Clark, V.L.P. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.)*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dane, F.C. (1990). *Research Methods*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Darus, S. & Subramaniam, K. (2009). Error analysis of the written English essays of secondary school students in Malaysia: A case study. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *8*(3), 483-495.

Dőrnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Egi, T. (2007). Recasts, interpretations, and L2 development. In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 249-267). Oxford University Press.

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, 353-371.

Ene, E. & Kosobucki, V. (2016). Rubrics and corrective feedback in ESL writing: A longitudinal case study of an L2 writer. *Assessing Writing*, 30, 3-20.

Farrokhi, F. & Sattarpour, S. (2012). The effects of direct written corrective feedback on improvement of grammatical accuracy of high-proficient L2 learners. *World Journal of Education*, *2*(2), 49-57.

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

Ferris, D.R. (1999). The case of grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D.R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language students writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D.R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writer? New evidence on the short and long-term effects of written corrective correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback on second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D.R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 181-201.

Ferris, D.R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing (2nd ed.)*. The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D.R. & Hedgcock, J.S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Routledge.

Ferris, D.R. & 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.

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

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

Fraenkel, J.R., Wallen, N.E., & Hyun, H.H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th Ed.). Mc Graw Hill.

Gregory, J. & Jones, R. (2009) "Maintaining a competence" a grounded theory typology of Approaches to teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, *57*(6).

Hartshorn, K., Evans, N.W., Merril, P.F., Sudweeks, R.R., Strong-Krause, D. & Anderson, N.J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44, 84-109.

Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge University Press.

Irwin, B. (2017). Written corrective feedback: Students preferences and teacher feedback practices. *IAFOR Journal of Language Learning*, *3*(2), 35-58.

Jalaluddin, N.H., Awal, N.M. & Bakar, K.A. (2008). The mastery of English language among lower secondary school students in Malaysia: A linguistic analysis. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, *7*(2), 106-119.

Johnson, R. & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches (2nd ed)*. Allyn &Bacon.

Kim, J.H., & Han, Z.-H. (2007). Recasts in communicative EFL classes: Do teacher intent and learner interpretation overlap? In A. Mackey (Ed.), *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A series of empirical studies* (pp. 269-297). Oxford University Press.

Kim, T.-Y., & Seo, H.-S. (2012). Elementary school students' foreign language learning demotivation: A mixed methods study of Korean EFL context. *The Asia Pacific Education Researcher*, *21*(1), 160–171.

Lee, I. (2008a). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *17*(1), 144-164.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.

Long, M. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bahia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). Academic Press.

Manchón, R.M. (2011). Writing to learn the language: Issue in theory and research. In R.M. Manchón (Ed.), *Learning-to-write and Writing-to-Learn in an Additional Language* (pp. 61-82). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Maros, M., Tan, K.H. & Salehuddin, K. (2007). Interference in learning English: Grammatical errors in English essay writing among rural Malay secondary school students in Malaysia. *Journal e-Bangi*, *2*(2), 1-15.

Muhamad, A.J. (n.d.). *Teaching English in multicultural classroom*. IIUM. http://irep.iium.edu.my/6152/1/Teaching_English_in_Multicultural_Classrooms.pdf

Moradian, M. R., Miri, M., & Nasab, M. H. (2016). Contribution of written languaging to enhancing the efficiency of written corrective feedback. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 1-23

Musa, C.N., Lie, Y.K. & Azaman, H. (2012). Exploring English language learning and teaching in Malaysia, *Journal of Language Studies*, *12*(1), 35-51.

Narinasamy, I. Mukundan, J. & Nimehchisalem, V. (2013). The use of progressives among Malaysian ESL students, *English Language Teaching*, *6*(11), 39-48.

Nayan, S. & Jusoff, K. (2009). A study of subject-verb agreement: From novice writers to expert writers. *International Education Studies*, *2*(3), 190-194.

Omeri, A. (2014). Teaching a foreign language in multicultural context. *Journal of Education and Social Research*, *4*(2), 254-256.

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 83-93.

Saeli H., Cheng A. (2019). Student writers' affective engagement with grammar-centred written corrective feedback: the impact of (mis)aligned practices and perceptions. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistic, 22*(2), 109–132.

Saito, H. (1994). Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 11, 4670. https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v11i2.633

Santos, M., López-Serrano, S. & Manchón, R.M. (2010). The differential effect of twotypes of direct written corrective feedback on noticing and uptake:Reformulation vs. error correction. *International Journal of English Studies*, *10*(1), 131-154.

Saunders, B., Sim, J., Kingstone, T., Baker, S., Waterfield, J., Bartlam, B., Burroughs, H., & Jinks, C. (2018). Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. *Quality & quantity*, *52*(4), 1893–1907. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-017-0574-8

Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: a tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and Awareness in Foreign Language Learning (Technical Report* 9) (pp. 1-63). University of Hawaii, Second Language & Curriculum Center, Honolulu, HI.

Schmidt, R. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 3-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *nflrc.hawaii.edu.* http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/PDFs/SCHMIDT%20attention.pdf

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

Sheen, Y. (2010). Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 203-234.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adults ESL learners. *System*, 37, 556-569.

Shen, R., & Chong, S. W. (2022). Learner engagement with written corrective feedback in ESL and EFL contexts: A qualitative research synthesis using a perception-based framework. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2072468

Singh, C. K. S., Singh, A. K. J., Razak, N. Q. A. & Ravinthar, T. (2017). Grammar errors made by ESL tertiary students in writing. *English Language Teaching*, *10*(5), 16-27.

Stapa, S.H. & Izahar, M.M. (2010). Analysis of errors in subject-verb agreement among Malaysian ESL learners. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 16(1), 56-73.

Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching, 51*(2), 262-277. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000034

Suzuki, W. (2012). Written languaging, direct correction, and second language writing revision. *Language Learning*, *62*(4), 1110-1133.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford University Press.

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

Wang, T. & Jiang, L. (2015). The Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on Chinese EFL Learners' Acquisition of English Collocations. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *38*(3), 319-338. https://doi.org/10.1515/cjal-2015-0020

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).

Wolfe-Quintero, K., Inagaki, S., & Kim, H.Y. (1998). *Second language development in writing: Measures of fluency, accuracy, and complexity* (Tech. Report No. 17). University of Hawaii Press.

Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15, 179–200. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2006.09.004

Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods (5th ed.)*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J. & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL students' preferences for written corrective feedback: Do error types, language proficiency, and foreign language enjoyment matter? *Frontiers in Psychology*. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564

© 2023 by the authors. Published by Secholian Publication. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY).