The Superiority of Written Corrective Feedback Outcome on EFL Writing at Different Proficiency Levels

Suhartawan Budianto[1]
Nur Mukminatien[2]
M Adnan Latief[3]

[1,2,3]Graduate Program in English Language Education, State University of Malang, Malang Indonesia

Abstract: *Written corrective feedback has been the subject of considerable debate among researchers in EFL/ESL writing. Each research claims the dominance of type of corrective feedback used is more powerful than others. This study investigated the effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL writing at different proficiency level (N=63) where the previous research claiming direct corrective feedback contributes in grammatical accuracy (Mirzaii & Aliabadi, 2014; van Beuningen et al., 2012) while the others argue oppositely (Eslami, 2014; Jamalinesari, 2014). Results showed that the students taught with Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) produce better writing than those taught with Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) in EFL writing. Moreover, results also revealed the effect of Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) and Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) in EFL writing doesn't depend on the level of proficiency. Further research should consider the efficacy of longitudinal study of direct corrective feedback for students with low and high proficiency in EFL writing.*

Keywords: *written corrective feedback (WCF), direct corrective feedback (DCF), indirect corrective feedback (ICF)*

Introduction

Many studies on corrective feedback have been conducted since it emerged in 1980s and it has been a controversial issue up to now whether it contributes positive or negative effects for EFL and ESL learners. It leads to a positive effect because corrective feedback can improve the language gains for L2 and EFL learners (Bitchener et al.,2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Evan et al, 2011; Fazilatfar et al, 2014; Grami, 2012; Kao, 2013; Santos et al, 2010; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Storch & Wiggleswort, 2010; van Beuningen, 2012; Vyatkina, 2010) and EFL (AbuSeileek & AbuAlsha'r, 2014; Ahmadi et al, 2012; Ajmi, 2015; Ebadi, 2014; Ellis et al, 2008; Eslami, 2014; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2014; Khanlardazeh & Nemati, 2016; Lee, 2007, 2008, 2009; Lundstrom & Baker, 2009; Maleki & Eslami, 2013; Mirzaii & Aliabadi, 2013; Montgomery & Baker, 2007; Rahimpoor et al, 2012; Sanavi & Nemati, 2014; Soori et al, 2011; Tootkaboni & Khatib, 2013; Vasquez & Harvey, 2010; Evans et al., 2010a, 2010b). In contrary, corrective feedback is harmful and it does not improve L2 learners' competence (Bruton, 2007; Truscott, 2001; Truscott & Hsu, 2008). To test their arguments, those studies have examined the effect of certain type of written corrective feedback on EFL/ESL writing.

Types of written direct corrective feedback, ESL/EFL context, and proficiency level used have been discussed largely by the recent studies. The studies of direct corrective feedback have been performed by previous studies (Ahmadi et al, 2012; Bitchener et al.,2005; Bitchener, 2008;

Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Eslami, 2014; Farid &Samad, 2012; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2014; Khanlarzadeh & Nemati, 2016; Maleki & Eslami, 2013; Mirzaii & Aliabadi, 2013; Santos et al, 2010; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Storch & Wiggleswort, 2010; van Beuningen, 2012; Vyatkina, 2010). Some others recent studies have also frequently used indirect corrective feedback in examining the value of written corrective feedback on ESL and EFL writing (Ahmadi et al, 2012; Alhumidi, 2016; Bitchener et al.,2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009, 2010; Eslami, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2014; Maleki & Eslami, 2013; Mirzaii & Aliabadi, 2013; Soori et al, 2011; Storch & Wiggleswort, 2010; Tootkaboni & Khatib, 2013; van Beuningen, 2012)

Involving learners in the context of ESL and EFL, the recent studies assume that written corrective feedback is worthwhile for both ESL (Bitchener et al.,2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008, 2009, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Evan et al, 2011; Fazilatfar et al, 2014; Grami, 2012; Kao, 2013; Santos et al, 2010; Storch & Wiggleswort, 2010; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; van Beuningen, 2012; Vyatkina, 2010) and EFL (AbuSeileek & AbuAlsha'r, 2014; Ahmadi et al, 2012; Ebadi, 2014; Ellis et al, 2008; Eslami, 2013, 2014; Mirzaii & Aliabadi, 2013; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2014; Maleki & Khanlardazeh & Nemati, 2016; Rahimpoor et al, 2012; Sanavi & Nemati, 2014; Soori et al, 2011;Tootkaboni & Khatib, 2013) writing. In the context of ESL / EFL, the participants from the same L1 background generally make the same error categories e.g. the use tense, article, countable and uncountable nouns, etc. So, a researcher could determine what errors categories should be given. On the other hand, having learners from the different L1 background needs some consideration because of the varied linguistic system of each language. Let's compare in ESL/EFL writing between learners from French and Dutch as L1 background and learners from Chinese, Japanese, and Indonesian.

The current studies also indicate that the group with corrective feedback generally outperformed the group without corrective feedback (Bitchener and Knoch, 2008, 2009; Bitchener, 2008; Ebadi, 2014; Ellis et al, 2008; Eslami, 2013; Evan et al, 2011; Frear & Chiu, 2015; Hooseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2015; Khanlazardeh & Nemati, 2016). On the other hand, some studies report certain type of corrective feedback is more effective than other under certain condition. For example, Li (2010) finds the implicit feedback better than explicit. In addition, Mirzaii and Aliabadi (2013) report direct corrective feedback was more effective than indirect corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction on letters of job application. Similar finding was discovered by Tootkaboni et al (2014) showing a significance of superior of direct feedback than other for short term effect, but indirect feedback is significant for long term effect. By using comprehensive error correction, van Beuningen et al (2012) report only direct CF resulted in grammatical accuracy gains in new writing and the pupil's nongrammatical accuracy benefited most in indirect CF. In contrary, in their study Jamalinesari et al (2015) indicate that the class with indirect feedback improved better compared to the class with direct feedback. Similar results argue the indirect feedback group outperformed the direct feedback group on both immediate post-test and delayed post-test (Eslami, 2014).

Most previous studies show that giving different types of corrective feedback for certain level of learner's proficiency is worthy to note. The studies using learners with low proficiency have reported different findings. By involving the low level (Dutch Secondary school students with limited language proficiency), van Beuningen et al., (2013) obtain that direct corrective feedback is more effective than indirect corrective feedback for grammatical accuracy while indirect corrective feedback is more powerful than direct corrective feedback for nongrammatical

accuracy. In addition, Eslami (2014) finds that indirect corrective feedback group outperformed direct corrective feedback group in using simple past tense. Both direct and indirect corrective feedback belonged to the low intermediate EFL students in Iran. Similarly, Shintani and Ellis (2013) claim that metalinguistic explanation feedback is better than direct corrective feedback for low-intermediate ESL students. The students gain accuracy and develop L2 explicit knowledge but the effect is not durable. However, direct corrective feedback combined with other types of feedback contribute positive effect in using English articles for low-intermediate international students in New Zealand (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener, 2009, 2010). It is interesting to note that low proficiency students were encouraged in learning independently after class and they got much improvement (Li & Li, 2012). Those claims above might be the gap for other research to examine the most appropriate type of feedback that can be applied for the low proficiency learners.

As stated above, previous research argue that certain feedback is more effective than others for low proficiency learners. Involving intermediate proficiency learners, Alhumidi and Uba (2013) find out that students provided by indirect corrective feedback is better than those with direct corrective feedback in spelling errors. The findings are in line with study performed by Jamalinesari (2015) that indirect corrective feedback leads significant effect on writing a composition for intermediate level. The similar argument claimed by Li and Hegelheimer (2013) indicate that learners may conduct self-editing when mobile-assisted grammar functions as corrective feedback for learners with intermediate level. By using focused meta-linguistic corrective feedback, Ebadi (2014) finds students who got treatment with focused meta-linguistic corrective feedback outperform those without treatment of feedback. In addition, Abuseilleek and Abualsha'r (2014) point out that recast feedback group results better writing than metalinguistic feedback one, but both treatment outperform the control group. The similar finding reveals that intermediate level students gain more language accuracy when peer computer-mediated corrective feedback is served.

Both learners from low and medium proficiency level believe that written corrective feedbacks provided by teacher are very valuable in improving students' quality in EFL/ ESL writing. However, previous studies also examine the effect of written corrective feedback for high proficiency level (advanced level). Providing corrective feedback for learners with high proficiency level, Farid and Samad (2012) declare that direct corrective feedback is appropriate to show the learner the use of verbs. This finding is supported by Mirzaii and Aliabadi (2013) which say that direct corrective feedback is better than indirect corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction. Chandler (2003) also finds that undergraduate with different L1 produce better using direct corrective feedback than indirect corrective feedback relating to grammatical accuracy, but indirect corrective feedback is better than direct corrective feedback relating to nongrammatical accuracy. The other study also finds that direct corrective feedback combined with written and conference contributes significantly in using simple past tense and English articles on ESL writing (Bitchener et al, 2005). Evan et al (2010) argue written corrective feedback is very helpful for experienced and well-educated L2 practitioners. Later, Li et al (2015) also claim automated writing evaluation as corrective feedback is helpful to improve the accuracy in EFL writing.

Moreover, Johnson (2012) addresses that high level leaners believe that strategies and lack of understanding of academic discourse influence students' use of teacher feedback. Additionally, Li (2010) finds that using meta-analysis shows the following results; (1) implicit feedback outperforms explicit feedback, (2) there is sustained effect, (3) treatment conducted in laboratory

is better than conducted in class, (4) the short effect is gained than longer one, (5) It is better for EFL writing than ESL writing. In sum, direct corrective feedback is also preferred by high proficiency learners since it guides them in improving grammatical accuracy.

The previous studies indicate corrective feedback is worthwhile not only for the high proficiency L2 learners but also low one in their writing (Bruton, 2007; Bitchener et al, 2005; Chandler, 2003; Bitchener and Knoch, 2008; Bitchener and Knoch, 2010; Ferris et al, 2003; van Beuningen, 2012). Different level of proficiency causes the various errors produced by the EFL learners. It needs to remember that EFL writers acquire the mastery of not only grammatical and rhetorical devices but also conceptual and judgmental elements (Heaton, 1990).

Eventually, the debate between two contradictory ideas "To correct or not to correct" arrives to the more appropriate statement what to correct and how to correct" (Guenette, 2007). First, the errors are to be corrected. Second, the errors must be treated proportionally, the written corrective feedback not only concerns with local aspects but also with global aspects as well.

To score the students' essays, the researcher decides to use the analytic scoring rubric of writing. The use of analytic scales functions to determine several aspects of writing and assess each aspect since some writers are good at content and organization, but bad in grammar and vocabulary or vise-versa. To measure the effect of DCF and ICF in EFL writing and the interaction to the students' level of proficiency, the research questions are formulated as follows;

    1. Do the students taught with Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) produce better writing than those taught with Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) in EFL writing?

    2. Do the effects of Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) and Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) in EFL writing depend on the level of proficiency?

Method
Research Design
In the analysis of this study, the effect of DCF and ICF was analyzed by using t-test and Mann Whitney test, and the interaction between type of corrective feedback and level of proficiency was analyzed by performing A two-way (ANOVA). Moreover, the independent variables were divided into two different groups. The first group was named DCF and the second one was named as ICF.

This study was conducted in 14 weeks which were divided into two rounds. Week 1 to week 7 belonged to the first round, and week 8 to week 14 belonged to the second round. There were 120-minute weekly in each round (The first section was 60 minutes and section 2 was 60 minutes). Each group wrote by using eight selected topics for #n type of corrective feedback (See Appendix A). The immediate writing task selected by the researcher was given after the students wrote the last topic for #n type of corrective feedback. For the immediate writing task, the students' writing was not returned and was not revised by students.

Before writing immediate task 1 for essay #4 in the first round, students had written Essay # 1, #2, and #3 with # corrective feedback. Group DCF received direct corrective feedback in the first section, while group ICF received direct corrective feedback in the second section. Additionally, before writing immediate task 1 for essay #8 in the second round, students had written Essay # 5, #6, and #7 with # corrective feedback. Group DCF (DCF_H and DCF_L) received direct corrective feedback (DCF) in the first section, while group ICF (ICF_H and ICF_L) received direct corrective feedback (ICF) in the second section.

Participants

This study was conducted in English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of PGRI Adi Buana (UNIPA) Surabaya in Indonesia. The participants were from fourth semester which consisted of five classes (class A to E). There were 27 students from A class, 22 students from B class, 18 students from C class, 17 students from D class, and 41 students from E class. Therefore, there were 125 students totally.

To identify the entry behavior as the basis grouping, this study conducted test for the participants. Based on the results of the test from 125 students, 45 participants were categorized as the high proficiency students, 42 students as the medium proficiency students, and 38 students as the low proficiency students. From those three levels of proficiency above, this study involved two of them (high and low).

To determine the sample, the names of students with high and low proficiency levels were written in the flash card and put in the box (box H for high proficiency students, and box L for low proficiency students). From box H, 35 students were taken out of 45 students while from box L, 28 students were taken out of 38 students. So, 63 students were selected as sample of the study. Then, 14 students from low and 18 students from high were taken to put in DCF group. 14 students from low and 17 students from high were taken to put in ICF group.

Instruments

To investigate the effect of the types of corrective feedback, the researcher applied writing test. The writing test was given two times where the first test was given in immediate task one and the second one was given in immediate task two. DCF was asked to write "My first day at college in immediate task 1 and ICF was asked to write the same topic. Later, DCF was asked to write "Life in the big city" in immediate task 1 and ICF was asked to write the same topic.

Writing from immediate task 1 and 2, then were assessed by using analytical scoring rubric from two raters. The researcher used differentially weighted to every aspect of writing; 30 points for content; 20 points for organization; 20 points for vocabulary; 25 points for language use; 5 points for mechanic. Every aspect of writing such (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanic) was shown by the number; 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (See Appendix B). Number 1 indicated the lowest score (poor) whereas number 5 showed the highest score (excellent). Number 1 indicated the lowest score (poor) whereas number 5 showed the highest score (excellent).

This study also involved two raters, one rater is a writing lecturer who has been teaching writing more than ten years, and the other is a writing lecturer who has been teaching writing for about 20 years. Both raters are from Dr. Soetomo University, East Java Surabaya. Those raters were given rater training in four weeks 90 minutes each week.

Data Collection

The names of the student selected as sample were informed. Later, they were shown the schedule of data collection, and how to response researcher's feedback (direct and indirect corrective feedback), and how the writing class with researcher was done such as follows; Step 1:The researcher assigned the students to write #n, Step 2: The students submitted essay to the researcher #n, Step 3: The researcher gave corrective feedback to students essay #n, Step 4: The students rewrote #n directly and submit to the researcher, Step 5: The researcher documented their essay #n, Step 6: The researcher documented essay from the immediate task

Steps 1 to 5 above were repeated three times to ensure the comprehensibility of correcting errors using #n of corrective feedback, but step 6 was done after students wrote and submitted the

immediate task. The students were asked to write essay which they were not told before in the immediate task to measure the effect after #n of corrective feedback had been provided for three occasions.

The students were asked to write an essay using provided topics in 60 minutes without using a dictionary. The students were not allowed to use dictionary. This was conducted to measure the aspects of vocabulary and mechanics. Then, the participants submitted their writings to the researcher. One week later, the students received a certain corrective feedback on their writing in the previous meeting. They rewrote the revised words, phrases and sentences corrected. They rewrote based on corrective feedback given in 45 minutes, and submitted their writings again after finishing correcting in the same meeting.

After the students wrote three different topics in 6 weeks and revised their writing based on # WCF, the students were asked to do the immediate writing task. The students then submitted their immediate writing task to the researcher. WCF was not given in the immediate writing task, but the researcher had raters to assess the task.

In the last step, the researcher documented the student essay from the immediate task of students' writing based on the score or rate made by the raters. Each student from the two groups was assessed in local aspects (vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics) and global aspects (content and organization). The researcher computed the score of the local and global aspects. The writing scores are put on the table of DCF and ICF. The table 1 below show students' writing score assessed. The means from the two raters (rater 1 and rater 2) then are put in the following table.

Table 1 Scores Given by Raters

P	Content		A	Organization		A	Vocabulary		A	LG Use		A	Mechanic		A	TM
	R1	R2		R1	R2		R1	R2		R1	R2		R1	R2		
1																
To																
18																

P = Participant
A = Average
LG use = Language Use
R1 = Rater 1
R2 = Rater 2
TM = Total Mean

Data Analysis
The result of computation of the t-test or Mann Whitney test was performed to compare DCF and ICF in EFL writing. To examine the interaction effect between corrective feedback and levels of proficiency in EFL writing, two-way ANOVA was run.

Results
To compare the effect of DCF and ICF, the Mann Whitney Test was performed on immediate task 1 since the data were not normally distributed. The results of the computation showed p-value is 0.0044 which is less than 0.05, so it indicates that there is a significant difference between DCF and ICF where the median score of DCF (80.50) is higher than ICF (72.00). This also shows that the students provided by direct written corrective feedback (DCF) produce a better descriptive essay than provided by indirect written corrective feedback (ICF).

Table 3.1 Mann Whitney Test on Immediate Task 1

Method	N	Median
DCF	32	80,50
ICF	31	72,00

W = 1231,5

P-Value = 0,0044

To compare the effect of DCF and ICF, the Mann Whitney test was performed on immediate task 2. The results of the computation showed p-value is 0.0086 which is less than 0.05, so it indicates that there is a significant difference between DCF and ICF where the median score of DCF (80.50) is higher than ICF (72.00). This also shows that the students provided by direct written corrective feedback (DCF) produce a better descriptive essay than provided by indirect written corrective feedback (ICF).

Table 3.2 Mann Whitney Test on Immediate Task 2

Method	N	Median
DCF	32	80,50
ICF	31	72,00

W = 1215,5

P-Value = 0,0086

On immediate task 1, the results of the computation (See Appendix C) showed that the interaction effect of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing depend on the level of proficiency was not significant, $F (1, 59) = .118$, $p= .73$. In sum, it can be concluded that effect of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing does not depend on the level of proficiency.

On immediate task 2, the results of the computation (See Appendix D) indicated that interaction effect of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing depend on the level of proficiency was not significant, $F (1, 59) = .004$, $p= .94$. In sum, it can be concluded that the effect of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing does not depend on the level of proficiency.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the study deriving from two immediate tasks in writing essay conclude that the effect of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing is significant. The effect of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing does not depend on the level of proficiency. The findings are clearly contradictory with the previous studies stating that corrective feedback is not helpful to improve students in EFL and ESL writing (Truscott, 2001; Truscott & Hsu, 2008), but the findings correspond with those of some studies (Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Bruton, 2007, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Eslami, 2014; Ferris et al., 2013; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al., 2015; Kumar & Stracke, 2011; Soori et al., 2011; Sanavi & Nemati, 2014; van Beuningen et al., 2012; van Gelderen et al., 2011) which report that corrective feedback contributes significantly in ESL and EFL writing.

Relating to types of WCF, this study shows definitely that direct corrective feedback is more powerful than indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing. This finding corresponds with the previous studies which report direct corrective feedback outperform indirect corrective feedback (Bitchener et al, 2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Farid & Samad, 2014; Mirzaii & Bozorg, 2013; van Beuningen, 2012). However, those current research pinpoint that direct corrective feedback is more effective than indirect one when it is applied for high proficiency level learners (Bitchener et al, 2005; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; Farid & Samad, 2014; Mirzaii & Bozorg, 2013) while others claim that direct corrective feedback is more effective than indirect one when it is used for low proficiency level learners (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; van Beuningen, 2012)

In contrary, indirect corrective feedback is more powerful than direct corrective feedback in EFL writing (Eslami, 2014; Jamalinesari, 2014). By involving low level (Eslami, 2014) and intermediate level (Jamalinesari, 2014), they claim indirect corrective feedback is more effective than direct corrective feedback in EFL writing.

Many students want to have direct corrective feedback from their teacher than indirect corrective feedback in ESL writing (Chandler, 2003). Chandler also adds that students prefer direct correction because it is the fastest and easiest way for them as well as the fastest way for teachers over several drafts. Moreover, Rummel and Bitchener (2015) claim that then students who received their preferred type of feedback were more successful at eliminating the targeted errors than the ones who did not. In their study, Behzadi & Golshan (2016) claim participant agreed upon a preference for comprehensible, selective, positive –sounding and grammatically-focused feedback. This situation leads students to be more motivated to revise their writing since students' attitudes may influence how their responds toward teacher' feedback (Ferris et al, 2013). It is very common that most students like to be shown the error and the correct form as well. It is interesting to note when Guenette (2012) reports the study run by Ferris (2006) and Lee (2008) that direct correction is by far the preferred correction strategy of ESL and EFL teachers. Furthermore, Chen et al (2016) add the students preferred direct correction to indirect correction.

With the same finding, Kao (2013) states direct correction and metalinguistic explanation have large positive effects on learners' ability to accurately use English articles in their writings in term of long-term learning. Consequently, direct correction may be sufficient for students' acquisition of English articles. It seems that direct corrective feedback is worthwhile only for simple errors. However, this study found that direct corrective feedback is plausible not only for simple error like language use but also content and organization in writing. Perhaps some feel direct corrective feedback is not very challenging because they believe that they can revise without showing the correct form. However, learners will feel lost if the error is very complicated to correct and learners have to find the correct form by themselves.

In addition, the finding of this study is in line with Bitchener et al (2005) and Bitchener & Knoch (2008) who argue that direct corrective feedback improves the accuracy on ESL student writing. In addition, Chandler (2003) claims direct correction is the best for producing accurate revisions in ESL writing. However, this study indicates that direct corrective feedback is beneficial in EFL writing. Therefore, it can be inferred that direct corrective feedback is not only beneficial in ESL writing but also in EFL writing. Direct corrective feedback may give the solution in correcting a simple grammatical problem which is more treatable. There is a possibility for teacher to provide the correct form based on the prior knowledge of learners.

Similar findings (Karbalaei & Karimian, 2014; Lee, 2008) claim that students did not understand all the teacher feedbacks because of illegibility, so it is very logical that direct corrective feedback performs better than indirect corrective feedback. By providing direct corrective feedback, students are not only shown the error but also given the correct form. Ferris et al, (2013) state several students have opinion they did not always remember what they have learned, so direct corrective feedback is more possible to provide than indirect corrective feedback.

Moreover, van Beuningen et al (2013) find direct corrective feedback is good for grammatical error while indirect corrective feedback is good for nongrammatical error. Based on the previous research. Van Beuningen et al (2013) add that the other advantage of direct corrective feedback is that learners have long-term effect for grammatical accuracy gains. Interestingly, the researcher of this study reports that direct corrective feedback is effective not only for grammatical error (language use) but also non grammatical error (content and organization) in writing.

On the other hand, the previous studies report the class with indirect feedback improved better compared to class with direct feedback (Jamalinesari, Ali et al, 2015; Eslami, 2014). In addition, it is truly contradictory with the result of this study stating that direct corrective feedback is more powerful than indirect corrective feedback. Chiu and Frear (2015) report indirect corrective feedback becomes a sign for learners to encourage them in overall accuracy in new pieces of writing. There should be further investigation why indirect corrective feedback works better than direct corrective feedback since the previous research reveal that grammatical errors can be solved effectively using direct corrective feedback (Beuningen et al, 2013; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010).

This study also pinpoints that direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in EFL writing does not depend on the level of proficiency. It can be stated that it does not matter what level of proficiency, learners may gain the better writing when direct corrective feedback is awarded by the teachers. This finding is supported by van Beuningen et al, (2012) which claim there is no a significant interaction between the effectiveness of the corrective feedback treatment and learners' education level. Shoaei and Kafipour (2016) also state proficiency level do not affect the participants' response regarding the corrective feedback. However, the finding of this study is contradictory with the previous research which state that WCF is useful for certain level of proficiency. Guenette (2012) highlights the statement proposed by Bitchener et al (2005) and Chandler (2003) which claim direct correction (providing the correct form) might be equally effective, especially with low-proficiency learners or with specific categories of errors. WCF is prominent in EFL writing for young learners (van Gelderen et al, 2011) whereas WCF is significant only for intermediate level (Eslami, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2015; Soori et al, 2011). Similar finding explains understanding feedback is determined by level of proficiency, especially for young language learners (Guiro et al., 2015). Chandler (2003) finds that error feedback is good for high intermediate to advanced ESL undergraduate. This study uses the university students with low and high proficiency which corresponds with the previous studies (Eslami, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Jamalinesari et al, 2015; Soori, et al, 2011;). Some previous studies state that the implication of corrective feedback is influenced by the students' proficiency levels and developmental readiness (Guenette, 2007) and background characteristic (especially prior education), current attitudes, confidence or motivation levels (Ferris et al, 2013).

Interestingly, the study run by Lundstrom and Baker (2009) point out that the lower proficiency levels who give feedback made more gains than those at higher proficiency levels who receive

the feedback. Lee (2008) finds that low and high students wanted more comments from teachers. In addition, low students are less interested in error feedback than high students. The level of proficiency might be the same or similar, for example, the use of low and high proficiency. In sum, this study claims that WCF is good in EFL writing for any level of proficiency while the others claim that WCF is useful for certain level of proficiency.

This study shows that DCF is not only appropriate for the low proficiency student but also for high proficiency student in EFL writing where most writing teachers face the students with different level of proficiency in a class. Consequently, it is suggested that writing teachers may use DCF for students with low and high level of proficiency. Moreover, the future researchers of EFL writing can investigate the effect of direct corrective feedback in EFL wiring through h longitudinal study. It hopes to claim how well direct corrective feedback influences the long-term effects of students' EFL writing quality.

References

AbuSeileek, A. & Abualsha'r, A. (2014). Using Peer Computer-Mediated Corrective Feedback to Support EFL Learners' Writing, *Language Learning & Technology*, 18, (1), 76-95.

Ahmadi, D., Maftoon, P. & Gholami, M.A. (2012). Investigating the Effects of Two Types of Feedback on EFL Students Writing, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, (46), 2590 – 2595.

Ajmi, A.A.S. (2015). The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on Omani Students' Accuracy in the Use of English Prepositions, *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 6, (1), 61.

Alhumidi, H.A., & Uba, S.Y. (2016). The Effect of Indirect Written Corrective Feedback to Arabic Language Intermediate Students' in Kuwait, *European Scientific Journal* 12, (28), 361.

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, 191-205.

Bitchener, J. 2008. Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102 – 118.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for immigrant and international students, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, (3), 409-431.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2009). The Contribution of written Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Months Investigation, *Applied Linguistic*, 31, (2), 193-214.

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

Bitchener, J. (2012). A reflection on the Language Learning Potential of Written CF, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, (4), 348-63.

Bruton, A. (2007). Vocabulary learning from dictionary referencing and language feedback in EFL translational writing, *Language Teaching Research*, 11 (4), 413-431.

Bruton, A. (2009). Designing research into the effect of grammar correction in L2 writing; Not so straightforward, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18, 136-140.

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

Ebadi, E. (2014). The Effect of Focused Meta-Linguistic Written Corrective Feedback on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners" Essay Writing Ability, *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5, (4), 878-883.

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, *Science Direct*, 36, 353-371.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types, *ELT Journal Volume*, 63.

Eslami, E. (2014). The Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedaback Techniques on EFL Students' Writing, *Sciencedirect Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 445 -452.

Evans, N.W., Hartshorn, K.J., & Allen, T.E. (2010). Written Corrective Feedback: Practitioners' Perspectives, *International Journal of English Studies*, 10, (2), 47-77.

Evans, N.W., Hartshorn, K.J., McCollum, R. M. & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy, *Language Teaching Research*, 14, (4), 445-463.

Farid, S. & Samad, A.A. (2012). Effects of Different Kind of Direct Feedback on Students' writing, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 66, 232 – 239.

Fazilatfar, A.M., Fallah, N., Hamavandi, M. & Rostamian, M. (2014). The Effect of Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Syntactic and Lexical Complexity of L2 Writing, *Sciencedirect Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 482-488.

Frear, D. & Chiu, Y. (2015). The Effect of Focused and Unfocused Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Accuracy in New pieces of Writing, *System*, 53, 24-34.

Grami, M.A. (2012). Online Collaborative Writing for ESL Learners Using Blogs and Feedback Checklists, *English Language Teaching*, 5, (10), 43.

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The Role of Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback in Improving Iranian EFL Students' Writing Skill, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 668-674.

Jamalinesari, A. & Rahimi, F. & Gohhary, H. & Azizifar A,. (2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedabcak on Students' Writing, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 116-123.

Kao, C-W. (2013). Effects of Focused Feedback on the Acquisition of two English Articles, *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language-Electronic Journal*, 17, (1).

Karbalaei, A. & Karimian, A. (2014). On the Effect of Teacher Corrective Feedaback on Iranian EFL Learners' Writing Performance, *Indian J.Sci.Res,* 7, (1), 965-981.

Khanlarzadeh, M. & Nemati, M. (2016). The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of EFL students: An Improvement over Previous Unfocused Design, *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 4, (2), 55-68.

Kumar, V. & Stracke, E. (2011). Examiners' reports on theses: Feedback or assessment? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10, 211-222.

Lee, I. (2007). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms*, Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 69-85.

Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 144-164.

Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' belief and written feedback practice, *ELT Journal*, 63.

Lundstrom, K. & Baker, W. (2009). To give is better than receive. The benefits of peer review to the reviewer's own writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (18), 30-43.

Maleki, A. & Eslami, E. (2013). The Effects of Written Corrective Feedback Techniques on EFL Students' Control over Grammatical Construction of their Written English, *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3, (7), 1250 -1257.

Mirzaii, M. & Bozorg A.R. (2013). Direct and indirect written corrective feedback in the context of genre-based instruction on job application letter writing, *Journal of Writing Research*, 5, (2), 191- 213.

Montgomery, J.L. & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 82-99.

Sanavi, R. V. & Nemati, M. (2014). The Effect of Six Different Corrective Feedback Strategies on Iranian English Language Learners' IELTS Writing Task 2. *SAGE,*1-9.

Santos, M., López-Serrano, S., & M. Manchón. R. (2010). The Differential Effect of Two Types of Direct Written Corrective Feedback on Noticing and Uptake: Reformulation vs. Error Correction, *International Journal of English Studies*, 10, (1), 131-154.

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

Soori, A., Kafipou., R. & Soury, M. (2011). The Effectiveness of Different Types of Direct Corrective Feedback on Correct use of English Articles among the Iranian EFL Students, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 26, (4), 494-501.

Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' Processing, Uptake, and Retention of Corrective Feedback on Writing, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 303-334.

Tootkaboni, A A. & Khatib, M. (2014). The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback on Improving Writing Accuracy of EFL Learners, *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature*, 7, (3), 30-46.

Truscott, J & Hsu, A Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, (17), 292-305.

Truscott, J. (2001). Selecting Errors for Selective Error Correction, *Studies in English Literature and Linguistics.* 27, (2), 93-108.

van Beuningen, C G., De Jong, N H & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the Effectiveness of Comprehensive Error Correction in Second Language Writing, *A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 62, (1), 1-41.

van Gelderen, A., Oostdam., R & van Schooten, E. (2011). Does Foreign Language Writing Benefit from Increased Lexical Fluency? Evidence from a classroom Experiment, *A Journal of research in Language Studies*, 61, 1, 281 -321.

Vasquez, C & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness About corrective feedback through research replication, *SAGE*, 14, (4), 421-443.

Vyatkina, N. (2010). The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback in Teaching Beginning German, *Foreign Language Annals*, 43, (4), 671-689.

Appendix

A. Writing Prompt
1. My first love
2. A childhood memory
3. My dream vacation
4. My first day at college
5. A place I feel save
6. A frightening event
7. The neighbor where you grew up
8. Life in the big city

B. Scoring Rubric

PARTICIPANT

	Level of Mastery				
	Excellent	**Good**	**Average**	**Fair**	**Poor**
Content (C)	5	4	3	2	1
Organization (O)	5	4	3	2	1
Vocabulary (V)	5	4	3	2	1
Language Use (L)	5	4	3	2	1
Mechanics (M)	5	4	3	2	1

Total Score = (Cx6) + (Ox4) + (Vx4) + (Lx5) + (Mx1)

C. Computation Results of Immediate Task 1

Dependent Variable: Score task-1

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	1269.971[a]	3	423.324	12.554	.000	.390
Intercept	362149.767	1	362149.767	10740.030	.000	.995
X	367.768	1	367.768	10.907	.002	.156
Y	866.805	1	866.805	25.706	.000	.303
x * y	3.982	1	3.982	.118	.732	.002
Error	1989.458	59	33.720			
Total	374480.000	63				
Corrected Total	3259.429	62				

D. Computation Results of Immediate Task 2

Dependent Variable: Score task-2

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	2946.954[a]	3	982.318	20.294	.000	.508
Intercept	351914.403	1	351914.403	7270.186	.000	.992
X	519.014	1	519.014	10.722	.002	.154
Y	2391.440	1	2391.440	49.405	.000	.456
x * y	.208	1	.208	.004	.948	.000
Error	2855.903	59	48.405			
Total	369235.000	63				
Corrected Total	5802.857	62				