Abstract
This preliminary study aimed to gather data about English teachers’ beliefs regarding the provision of corrective feedback for student writing in university English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classes. Participants included English instructors from Japan and abroad who responded to a survey that employed both qualitative questions about teachers’ beliefs and practices, as well as quantitative questions regarding the methods they used and the time used to explain them. The data was analyzed with the goal of answering these questions: 1) What types of feedback do teachers prefer and why? 2) How long do teachers spend explaining their feedback system? 3) Do teachers require a revised draft and why/why not? 4) How much time do teachers spend making corrections? 5) Is there a difference in the type of feedback teachers prefer depending on the elements of writing that they are focusing on? How well do they feel that students act on those corrections? According to the results, teachers preferred indirect and explicit feedback for all aspects of writing. They spent a short time explaining feedback systems due to assumptions that students already understood, but a long time correcting individual student work.
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1. Introduction
Giving corrective feedback on student writing is one of the most difficult tasks a university EFL teacher has. Figuring out how to do so effectively and efficiently is vital to keeping our heads above water in the seemingly constant stream of writing assignments we assess throughout the semester. However, ideas of how feedback should be administered often differ greatly depending on the teacher. Nation and Macalister (2010) stated that a teacher's practice is often determined by their own individual belief system about best practice, rather than any prescribed set of rules defined by a curriculum or by research data. For this reason, when one is engaging the topic of corrective feedback, whether it be as a general topic of interest or for some insight to help teachers develop their own feedback practice, it is useful to examine and be aware the multitude of beliefs that they hold and approaches they take towards administering written corrective feedback.

The purpose of this study is to analyse the types of correction that teachers are currently using based on the results of a survey which focused on teachers' written corrective practices. The survey also uncovered some attitudes which teachers had towards corrective feedback. We also
wish to draw comparisons between these teacher attitudes and what current SLA research has uncovered about the efficacy of written corrective feedback.

The study aims to answer these main research questions:

1) What types of feedback do teachers prefer and why?
2) How long do teachers spend explaining their feedback system?
3) Do teachers require students to revise their assignments and why/why not?
4) How much time do teachers spend making corrections?
5) Is there a difference in the type of feedback teachers prefer depending on the elements of writing that they are focusing on? How well do they feel that students act on those corrections?

1.1 Literature Review

According to Russell and Spada (2006), in language learning “the term corrective feedback [refers] to any feedback provided to a learner, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of language form” (p. 134). It is important to note that this definition does not include feedback that deals with content, though this type of feedback will also be addressed in this study. Corrective feedback can then be broken down into three main types: direct feedback, in which the error is corrected for the student; indirect feedback, in which the error is indicated, but no further information is given about what type of error it is or how to correct it; and metalinguistic feedback, in which a metalinguistic clue is given in the form of a correction symbol or grammatical symbol. There is also a distinction between unfocused feedback, which addresses all of the errors which a student makes, and focused feedback, which only looks at one type of error (Ellis, 2009).

There has been a considerable amount of argument between SLA researchers about the effectiveness of corrective feedback to improve student writing, and some researchers have even argued that corrective feedback is a waste of time. Truscott (1996) claimed that grammatical corrective feedback, regardless of the type, had no positive effects and actually had negative effects because it led to avoidance strategies. He also pointed out that previous studies had not actually proven that corrective feedback was effective in improving student writing in the long term. Indeed, at that time studies that had concluded that corrective feedback was effective only focused on improvement of student writing in revised drafts (Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Haswell, 1983). Truscott argued, however, that corrective feedback could only be proven to be effective if it led to improvements in subsequent drafts. This point seemed to be substantiated by a number of earlier studies which all concluded that corrective feedback did not have a significant impact on later writing (Semke, 1984; Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992). However, Ferris (2004) and Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) pointed out that these previous studies were flawed because they did not have a control group and therefore the conclusions that they made could not be taken seriously.
A number of later studies have shown that corrective feedback can have positive and lasting effects. The only problem with these studies was that they tended to deal with focused feedback which centered on improving the accuracy of the use of a single language point (Bitchener, 2008; Sheen, 2007; Bitchener and Knoch, 2008; Sheen, Wright, & Moldowa, 2009; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012; Shintani and Ellis, 2013). McGrath (2015) pointed out that such findings were not particularly useful for the classroom setting in which the number of writing assignments a teacher assigns was limited to two or three in a semester; a situation that generally makes it necessary for teachers to take an unfocused approach to administering feedback. There have been a very small number of studies that have shown positive evidence that comprehensive corrective feedback has a lasting effect on learners accuracy (see, for example, Van Beuningen et al, 2012).

Another point that is of considerable importance is the type of feedback that is most beneficial: direct, indirect, or metalinguistic. Truscott and Tsu (2008), the only article published between 1996 and 2008 to conclude that corrective feedback had no effect, addressed only indirect corrective feedback. The researchers simply underlined the error for the participants with no information about the type of error or how to correct it. In the study, Truscott and Tsu tried to argue that differentiating types of feedback was unnecessary, but he didn't provide any evidence to substantiate that claim. One thing that his findings did suggest was that indirect feedback may be ineffective. This observation was substantiated by Bitchener and Knoch (2010) who noted that students who received metalinguistic feedback were able to retain their accuracy gains over a 10 week period, while those who received only implicit feedback were not. It should be noted that this study also included oral feedback, thus going beyond simple written feedback. Chandler (2003) found that simply indicating the error or correcting the error for the student were better than describing the type of error. Shinitani et al. (2013) found that direct corrective feedback followed by revision were more effective and yielded longer lasting results than metalinguistic explanation. Van Beuningen et al (2012) found that direct corrective feedback resulted in gains in subjects' grammatical accuracy, while indirect corrective feedback resulted in gains in non-grammatical items. In each case it can be seen that research has provided very little concrete information about which form of corrective feedback is the most effective. Indeed, it could be argued that all forms of feedback are equally useful depending on student needs and teacher preferences.

Considering the importance of teacher preferences in providing feedback, it is surprising to note that while a large amount of work has been done on corrective feedback focusing on different feedback types and their comparative effectiveness, a much smaller amount of research has looked at teacher and student attitudes towards giving feedback (Evans, Hartsworth, & Tuoti, 2010; Ferris, et al., in press/2011a; Ferris, et al., in press/2011b; Hyland, 2003; Lee, 2004). As Evans, Hartsworth, and Tuoti (2010) noted, in the research to date, informal observations often form the basis of assumptions made about teacher beliefs and practices. Very few studies have gathered data about these beliefs and practices by asking the teachers themselves. Of the studies that have done this, there are even fewer that were written with the specific intent to learn about teacher beliefs and practices regarding written corrective feedback by asking the teachers themselves. These studies
included two case studies with limited sample sizes (Ferris, 2006; Hyland, 2003). Ferris (2006) investigated the strategies three L2 writing teachers used to provide feedback and Hyland (2003) looked at the feedback given by two L2 writing teachers over a complete course. In both cases the authors stressed the value of considering teachers perspectives when giving feedback. They also both noted that teachers have a tendency to focus more on formal aspects of writing than content, though neither explored this idea with much depth. Lee (2004) had a much larger sample size. Her study was based on a survey of 206 writing teachers. This study had some interesting findings in that it found that both teachers and students preferred comprehensive error feedback and that the number of strategies teachers used in correcting student writing were limited.

Of studies investigating student feedback beliefs and practices, Evans et al (2010) offered the most robust sample size and gave the most comprehensive look at teacher attitudes and practices in corrective feedback to date. Their study was based on an international survey completed by 1,053 L2 writing practitioners from 69 different countries. Some key findings from the study were that 92% of respondents felt that providing feedback was important; of the 8% who claimed it wasn't, the main reasons were that they felt content, organization, and rhetoric were more important (26%, n=23); students should take care of grammar errors by themselves (23%, n=20); and error correction is not effective (11%, n=10). The reasons why the majority of respondents felt that feedback was important included opinions that it helps students (45%, n=448), students expect it (22%, n=223), and students need it (17%, n=193). Although this study had a robust sample size and offered an interesting insight into the general reasons for why teachers chose to give corrective feedback in the classroom, it didn't offer insight into teacher's preferences for different types of feedback. The present study will aim to explore teachers reasons for administering different types of feedback, such as direct, indirect, explicit, implicit, focused, unfocused, immediate, and delayed. The study will also look at teacher preferences in the ways that they indicate errors. This topic has rarely been addressed and often not even taken into consideration by researchers. One illustration of this is Ferris (2001) in which teachers were required to use a specific set of symbols in the study, but it was often found that teachers would often not use the symbols that they were provided. The results were affected by this because the study failed to take into account the possibility that the habits in providing feedback that the teachers had formed were stronger than the training provided by the researchers. For this reason, this study also explores the ways that teachers address specific student errors, such as word form, missing words, and punctuation.

2. Methodology
2.1 Participants
Some English language teachers from the researchers’ university—Center for Language Education (CLE) at Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University—agreed to participate. In order to have a larger sample group, each researcher recruited from his network of colleagues with a further request to pass on the survey link to those s/he believed could also assist in the research, some of whom were in Japan while others reside abroad.
In total, there were 57 respondents: 77.1% (n=44) of whom held (or will soon hold) an MA degree while 22.8% (n=13) had a PhD. Overwhelmingly, 84.2% (n=48) teach EFL. Moreover, 3.5% (n=2) have been teaching L2 writing for only 1-2 years, 57.9% (n=33) for 3-10 years, and 38.6% (n=22) for over 10 years.

2.2 Survey

Google Forms was chosen as the survey engine due to its ability to allow for user input fields. In addition to the service being free, the number of questions was unlimited, and results could be collected in a spreadsheet and shared easily. As the survey was online (accessible from an embedded URL in an email request), anonymity could be guaranteed. In addition, online access not only made it easier for participants to complete the survey but also for the researchers to review the data. Despite the initial survey request and the majority of participants being onsite, it was necessary for both researchers to engage with teachers to remind them of the survey and appeal for their assistance. For offsite instructors, no follow-up efforts were made.

As the survey dealt with teacher beliefs and practices, it was divided into two parts that encompassed four screens:

- Part 1 of the survey requested user input to answer ‘general questions on feedback practices’ with 26 ‘main’ questions, not counting optional inquiries that requested further elaboration. Most questions had multiple choice answers and a handful allowed the respondent to select more than one response. Five Likert scale questions were also included.
  ◦ An example: How much time do you spend explaining your feedback system?
    ■ None
    ■ <10 minutes
    ■ 10-30 minutes
    ■ 30-60 minutes
    ■ 60+ minutes

- Part 2, likewise, had 26 questions, each based on how to indicate errors in comparison to a combination of American and British proofreading symbols. Each question was given multiple answer choices with an ‘Other’ field for open-ended comments. The 26 questions were grouped into one of four categories: lexical (word usage, word form), grammatical (verb tense, missing article), mechanical (capitalization, punctuation, typeset/style), and organizational (deletion, insertion).
  ◦ An example: How do you show to insert a space?
    ■ Use ∧ or ∨ along with the symbol that resembles a ‘Y’
    ■ Use ∧ or ∨ along with # symbol
    ■ Use ∧ or ∨ along with “space” written out
    ■ Other:
Originally, a trial questionnaire was created and tested. This version was also divided into two parts, but with only seven qualitative questions and 33 quantitative questions centered on corrective symbols, the focus was misaligned to give greater attention to symbols alone. More specifically, the trial questionnaire only presented two response choices such as a ‘standard’ in the publishing world and an input field for a respondent to comment on. As understanding how corrective feedback was used became the more primary goal, the experience gained from that trial allowed for re-structuring of both qualitative and quantitative inquiries.

2.3 Levels
The data (see Figure 1) here represents all (N=57) teachers in the levels they taught for the Spring 2017 academic semester. The levels are based on the Common European Framework of Languages (CEFR):

2.4 Survey Questions
The data that we received from the questionnaire responses was divided into seven categories: the types of feedback used, the amount of time and resources used to explain the feedback system, the types of errors teachers correct most often, the amount of weight placed on revising student work, the amount of time spent giving corrections, the platform used for administering feedback, and the teacher beliefs and practices in giving feedback for various aspects of writing such as content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar.

The first survey items dealt with the types of feedback used. This was elicited by the prompt, “Which systems do you use to correct student writing?” followed by a multiple-choice list from which participants could make multiple selections. Feedback was divided into two main binary categories: direct versus indirect feedback, and explicit versus implicit feedback. Direct feedback
refers to the practice of correcting the error for the student, while indirect feedback involves giving the student some clues about the correct answer. This was elicited through multiple choice items such as “correct the error for the student” or “indicate an error has occurred and specify the type of error with corrective symbols”. Explicit feedback involves clearly stating that an error has taken place and using words or symbols to indicate the error, while implicit feedback involves letting the learner know that an error has taken place, usually by underlining it, but not giving any information about what the error is. The former was indicated through choices such as “indicate an error has occurred and give a written hint of how to correct it” while the latter was indicated with a prompt such as “indicate an error has occurred but do not specify the type.” Participants were allowed to choose more than one category and were also asked to give a short explanation for why they did so.

Participants were then asked for information about the amount of time used to explain the symbols. As to be expected, this was broken up into various periods of time, from no time at all, to a few minutes, to more than an hour. They were also asked to note aids that were presented to students to help them understand the feedback system, such as symbol lists or guidelines and the amount of time taken in class to teach students how to use these guides, and the extent to which participants felt that their students understood the feedback system.

Another section of the survey also dealt with whether or not students were expected to produce a final draft based on the feedback they received. Participants who did require a final draft were asked how much they felt such a requirement motivated students to pay attention to their teacher's comments. Participants who did not require this were asked about the extent to which students actually read teacher comments and took them into consideration for future pieces of writing.

The next section asked teachers about the amount of time it took them to give feedback on one page of student writing. This was followed by a question about the platform used for administering feedback, broken into four categories: written (on paper), verbal (face-to-face), electronic, and via screencast. Participants were allowed to choose multiple options but asked to explain the circumstances in which they used the different modalities and their rationale for doing so.

In the final and longest section of the survey, participants were asked about their feedback preferences for four of the main elements of writing: content, organization, vocabulary, and grammar. For each of these elements they were asked how they gave feedback with the first question being identical to that in the first section but related to each specific element of writing as opposed to writing in general. They were allowed to make multiple choices, but needed to explain the reasons why they used each method. This section also included a question about the extent to which respondents felt that students were able to act on the feedback given by their teacher and revise their work properly. The section related to grammar contained an extra item related to the number of types of grammatical errors the teachers addressed. The rationale behind asking this question is to see the extent to which teachers engaged in focused feedback. This was followed by a question for participants who chose to focus on only a few errors about which errors they gave feedback on and why.
3. Results
The results indicated that all respondents (N=57) give corrective feedback and 40% (n=23) of teachers elaborated on their process. While 70% (n=40) elected to give more specifics regarding their feedback system, only 54% (n=31) of the respondents clearly stated they used some variety of proofreading symbols or correction codes. However, these tended to be based on their own experience as opposed to an ‘industry’ standard.

Because it is common for teachers to use a number of different feedback methods, participants were asked to indicate all of the types of feedback methods they used from a list of five feedback types (See Appendix). The most commonly used method was indirect and explicit feedback, with 70.2% (n=40) of respondents choosing “Indicate error has occurred and give a written hint of how to correct it” and 64.9% (n=37) choosing “Indicate error has occurred and specify type of error with correction symbols”. A smaller, but still substantial group of respondents aimed for more direct and explicit forms of feedback. The most popular of this type was to “Directly tell the student about the errors in their writing” (50.9%, n=29) and to “Correct the error for the student” (43.9%, n=25). The least popular form of feedback was indirect and implicit feedback, with only 35.1% (n=20) of respondents choosing to “Indicate an error has occurred but not specify the type”.

In the comments about teacher justifications for choosing various error types, it was found that teacher decisions about what types of feedback to choose were often related to their beliefs about the types of feedback students at various levels could understand. For instance, lower level students were largely expected to need more explicit help, but higher level students were more likely to be expected to be able to figure out what was wrong by themselves and thus could cope with more implicit feedback. There were also beliefs expressed about different types of errors and the types of feedback suitable to addressing them. Lexical errors such as collocations or complex grammatical errors such as word order were seen by some teachers as being too difficult, or even impossible, for students to figure out by themselves and thus were best addressed with a direct approach. Nonetheless, there were also some teachers who believed that students benefitted from figuring out how to make corrections by themselves, as this comment from one participant illustrates: “I believe my students will benefit by using some effort to figure out the mistakes for themselves. I only provide guidance if the students really cannot solve issues by themselves”. These observations will become clearer with an analysis of the types of error correction used for different types of writing.

Overall, teachers did not spend a lot of time explaining their feedback system. About 40% (n=23) answered their efforts took less than 10 minutes and nearly 44% (n=25) answered it averaged about 10-30 minutes. Only 7% (n=4) indicated that they allot 30-60 minutes, while 5.2% (n=3) did not indicate a time frame.
Whatever the length of time a teacher devoted to explaining their feedback system, 40% (n=23) of teachers speculated that students were able to understand the correction symbols, but learners who were not became disenchanted to the point of being unable or unwilling to learn from their mistakes. Nevertheless, 57.9% (n=33) replied that a document was provided to students that explained the correction codes that a particular teacher used and students were encouraged to refer to when they were revising their work. Many teachers also emphasized that they spoke one-on-one to students who truly struggled or needed further clarification.

In terms of the medium for giving feedback, respondents were asked the modes for delivering feedback that they used. They were allowed to choose multiple answers. As Figure 2 illustrates, giving feedback on paper was by far the most common method. Electronic written feedback and verbal face to face feedback were also fairly popular. Some reasons that participants gave for preferring feedback on paper to electronic feedback were that administering feedback on the computer was hard on the eyes. In regards to giving feedback verbally, one participant remarked that it was too time consuming. Nonetheless, a few teachers stated that face-to-face conferencing was necessary for struggling students, though they felt that it should be limited to individual cases.

Whatever the medium chosen, the majority of teachers (86%, n=49) across levels required a revised draft. As a few participants mentioned, a common rationale for this was that revision was necessary for students to clearly understand their errors and improve. Of the 14% (n=11) of participants who did not require students to submit a revised draft, a couple of teachers commented that, although a small number of diligent students might read the feedback to improve on their writing, most students did not pay much attention to the feedback because responding to it didn't directly affect their grade.
Regarding the time taken to give feedback on student work, the majority of teachers spent between 6-10 minutes to correct a page of student work (See Figure 3). Only 22% (n=13) of respondents reported spending less time and 36% (n=21) reported that they spent more than 10 minutes. Thus, for most teachers, it can be seen that giving written corrective feedback was a fairly time-consuming process.
When participants were asked about preferred feedback techniques for the four main error types (content, organization, vocabulary and grammar) there were some differences. As shown in Figure 4, the most commonly used form of feedback for feedback on content was indirect and explicit feedback in the form of writing comments that gave students a hint about how to correct the error, though there were also a large number of teachers who opted to directly tell students what was wrong. An almost identical pattern can be seen with the way teachers addressed errors in organization. In addressing vocabulary errors, there was a similar preference for indirect and explicit feedback, but respondents were more likely to give this feedback in the form of corrective symbols. In the case of grammatical errors, there was a very large number of respondents who indicated that they used corrective symbols. Lastly, the least popular form of feedback was to simply indicate that an error occurred and let the students figure it out for themselves.

Figure 4: How errors are indicated
As shown in Figure 5, overall teachers showed a high degree of confidence that students were able to understand their corrections. They were especially confident about their explanations of organization. The area where they showed the most uncertainty was grammar. Nonetheless, the differences between each area were very slight. Indeed, in all of these areas the majority of teachers said that they thought students were likely to understand their explanations.

There was also a question related to whether teachers corrected every error or if they focused on a limited number of errors. To expedite the feedback process, especially when there are many papers to check, teachers may find themselves limiting what they correct. As mentioned in the literature review, there is a growing body of research indicating that there is pedagogical value in this practice. Of the 96.4% (n=55) who responded to this query, 7.3% (n=4) corrected up to 2 types of grammatical errors, 20% (n=11) up to 4 types, 23.6% (n=13) up to 6 types, 18.2% (n=10) up to 9 types, and 30.9% (n=17) would do them all. This indicates that, although a small number of teachers were aware of the trend towards focused feedback found in current research on corrective feedback and were attempting to put it into practice, the majority of teachers still preferred to correct a range of errors.

4. Discussion
L1 students have had a lifetime of learning basic writing structure and receiving feedback on their mistakes, so by the time they become tertiary level learners, they have become familiar with feedback and the symbols used, thereby reducing the need for lengthy explanations of what the
corrective codes mean. L2 students, on the other hand, must deal with a variety of methods used by their teachers, which can vary greatly and be as diverse as the experience each teacher possesses. Therefore, teachers should bear in mind that L2 learners have not had in-depth exposure and experience with writing, especially process writing. When teachers address student errors they need to confirm that students understand what is expected of them and be more willing to incorporate exercises regarding correction into their curriculum. Regarding the present study, participants had varying rationales as to why they made the decisions that they did, the most prevalent of which were usually type of error, time necessary to correct errors and number of assignments to correct. What they seemed much less concerned with was the amount of class time they needed to take explaining their feedback systems. They seemed to be quite confident that students understood their systems, but it was not clear to what extent they actually checked student comprehension of their feedback systems. Indeed, it may be found that such comprehension was in fact lacking and improving it could have led to a shorter amount of time making corrections and a greater sense of confidence on the part of the students.

In terms of types of feedback given, there was a strong tendency for teachers to use indirect and explicit feedback. The reasons for this generally revolved around a desire for students to develop self-efficacy. Nonetheless, there were also clear opinions as to when other types of feedback were acceptable. For example, teachers often opted to use direct feedback when they felt that the item being corrected, whether it be content-based, organizational, lexical, or grammatical, was beyond the student's level. Conversely, they used implicit feedback when they felt that an error was very basic and often-repeated, and assumed that the student could correct it without the need for teacher intervention. Perhaps a reason why teachers chose to limit their use of direct and explicit feedback is that they felt giving L2 students the 'answers' — simply correcting their mistakes for them in full — would circumvent the learning process and cause students to not learn from their mistakes. From this it should also follow that teachers should spend more time in their classes making students aware of their errors and effective means to correct them, in hopes that students would eventually be able to correct the errors themselves. However, it was not found that teachers spent much time at all explaining their feedback systems.

As for the amount of time allotted to explaining feedback systems, it was found that the majority of participants devoted a very short time to the process, but felt that students understood. Most did, however, provide a reference document to explain their feedback system. Nonetheless, given our observation that L2 learners are often unfamiliar with various aspects of writing in English, it seems that more time needs to be spent to explain feedback systems, especially at lower levels. It also appears that follow-up sessions to review and reinforce what was learnt could be implemented to a higher degree. In terms of the amount of time spent giving feedback, the majority spent up to 10 minutes correcting one page of student writing with the rationale that those students who are at risk would have face-to-face consultations. It is recommended that, by increasing the amount of time spent explaining feedback systems in follow up sessions, not only would individual face time with students be reduced, but also the time needed to check assignments. The reasons for
this would be that teachers and students would have a clearer idea of the criteria expected in the assignment and be more efficient in administering and responding to feedback.

Most respondents believed that students were more likely to respond to correction if they were required to produce a revised document to be assessed, and that this was the best way to show their understanding of teacher feedback. Though some teachers felt that a case could be made that diligent students would look at and reflect upon the corrected piece of writing then absorb the corrections without needing to do a revision, the vast majority of participants felt that a graded revision was both necessary and beneficial.

There was a clear pattern that teachers felt that students benefitted from indirect and explicit hints about how to correct errors in content and organization. However, teachers opted to do this through written comments as opposed to corrective symbols. This indicates that a system of symbols for correcting content and organization errors is difficult to develop. On the other hand, for vocabulary and grammatical errors, indirect and explicit feedback was preferred to be given through symbols. In either case, it is clear that the participants believed that students benefited from feedback that encouraged them to correct mistakes on their own. It is also clear that participants believed that students were able to act on their feedback for each element of writing despite the limited amount of time spent explaining their feedback system. It is beyond the scope of the current study to evaluate the extent to which this belief is justified, but doing so would be a very worthwhile endeavor. Something that is indeed in need of more exploration is the question of whether time spent explicitly explaining the feedback system could lead to a reduction in errors overall and a greater sense of self-efficacy on the part of students in correcting their own work.

5. Limitations of the present study
There are a number of limitations to the present study. These include the sample sizes, the focus on only the teacher's perspective, and the limitations of the survey as a data collection method. These points will be considered when conducting future studies.

Firstly, the sample size for this current study could have been more robust and followed up with focus groups and/or interviews. In addition to the smaller sample size there was also the fact that it focused on only the teacher's perspective. Student perceptions of written feedback need to also be taken into consideration, such as their ability to understand their teachers’ feedback, the amount of explanation they need to understand a feedback system, their preferences for direct or indirect, and implicit or explicit feedback, and the extent to which they valued the process of revising their writing. Information about the extent to which students understood teacher explanations and the amount of time they felt that they needed explanation of their feedback systems would be especially valued in evaluating the hypothesis made in this article that clearer explanations of feedback systems would lead to a shorter amount of time being spent checking student work. It would also be interesting to see if students agreed with the notion commonly held by teachers that indirect and explicit feedback helped them to become more independent writers.
Another point of interest would be seeing how much they agreed with the belief commonly held by teachers that the act of revising their work led to improvements in subsequent pieces of writing.

Although it is important to explore teacher and student beliefs about written corrective feedback, it is also important to follow up such an exploration with studies that seek to confirm the extent to which those beliefs are actually valid. For example, there was a clear preference among teachers for indirect and explicit feedback because they felt that it helped students to think about and correct their errors, but there is no concrete evidence that this is actually the case. In order to prove this, an experimental study will need to be conducted that would show the effectiveness and efficiency of that form of feedback in comparison to the other feedback types. These are all issues that will be addressed in subsequent articles.

6. Conclusion
This research revealed that the majority of teachers felt that students needed to correct their writing for themselves. This differed depending on error type. Specifically, teachers felt that content and organizational errors needed to be addressed with written comments while vocabulary and grammatical mistakes should be indicated with corrective symbols. While teachers generally addressed this process of understanding how to correct errors with the use of ancillary aids such as a reference document, they did not spend much time explaining the feedback system. They did, however, spend a lot of time correcting student work. This may suggest that teachers need to spend more time explaining their feedback system.
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Appendix
Corrective Feedback Beliefs and Practices Survey

A. How many years have you taught L2 writing?
   ○ 1-2 years
   ○ 3-10 years
   ○ 10+ years

B. What context do you teach in?
   ○ ESL (Students are living in an English speaking country and need English to communicate)
   ○ EFL (Students are not living in an English speaking country)

C. What level of education have you completed (or in progress)?
   ○ BA
   ○ MA
   ○ PhD

D. What was/is your primary field of study for your degree? (i.e. Applied Linguistics, Literature, etc.)
   ________________________________________________________________________________

E. In what level do you teach? (Multiple choice with standard descriptors and CEFR level scale)
   □ A1 (Beginner/Elementary)
   □ A2 (Pre-Intermediate)
   □ B1 (Intermediate)
   □ B2 (Upper Intermediate)
   □ C1 (Advanced)

F. Which system(s) do you use to correct student writing? (Check all that apply)
   □ Indicate error has occurred and specify type of error with correction symbols
   □ Indicate error has occurred and give a written hint of how to correct it
   □ Indicate an error has occurred but do not specify the type
   □ Correct the error for the student.
   □ Directly tell the student about their writing.
   □ Other:

F2. (Optional) If you chose different systems, briefly explain the situations when you use them and rationale for using them.
   ________________________________________________________________________________

G. How much class time do you spend explaining your feedback system?
   □ None
   □ <10 minutes
G2. (Optional) Briefly elaborate on what you do to explain your feedback system.

_______________________________________________________________________________

H. Do you feel that students understand and remember your feedback?
   ○ Almost none of them understand
   ○ Most students do not understand
   ○ Some do and some do not
   ○ Most students understand
   ○ All students understand clearly

H2. (Optional) If you feel that they do not understand, why do you continue to use this method?

_______________________________________________________________________________

I. Do you have a document (e.g. correction symbols list) which you give to students that explains your corrective feedback system?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

I2. If yes, what information does the document contain?

_______________________________________________________________________________

I3. If no, why isn't a document provided?

_______________________________________________________________________________

J. Do you require students to produce a revised draft after you give them feedback?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

J2. If yes, is it graded and how much is it worth? Do you feel that it motivates students to revise their work?

_______________________________________________________________________________

J3. If no, do you feel that students check and review their comments anyway?

_______________________________________________________________________________

K. How much time does it take for you to correct one page of student work?
   ○ <5 minutes
   ○ 6-10 minutes
   ○ 11-15 minutes
L. When you correct student work, how do you do so? (Check all that apply)
○ On paper
○ Verbally Face to Face
○ Electronica Written Feedback
○ Electronica Oral Feedback (Screencast)

L2. If you use different modalities for different types of tasks, please briefly explain.

M. How do you give feedback about content?
☐ Indicate a problem with content and specify type of problem with correction symbols
☐ Indicate a problem with content and give a written hint of how to rectify it
☐ Indicate a problem with content but do not specify what it is
☐ Directly tell the student what's missing or unclear
☐ Other:

M2. If you chose more than one method, briefly explain when you would use each method.

M3. Do you feel that students are able to take action to your corrections about content?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly agree

N. How do you give feedback about organization?

☐ Indicate a problem with organization and specify type of problem with correction symbols
☐ Indicate a problem with organization and give a written hint of how to rectify it
☐ Indicate a problem with organization but do not specify what it is
☐ Directly explain what the problem is
☐ Other:

N2. If you chose more than one method, briefly explain when you would use each method.

N3. Do you feel that students are able to make corrections based on your feedback about organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly agree
N4. Do you feel that it helps them to avoid similar problems in later pieces of writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stongly disagree

O. How do you give feedback about vocabulary?

- Indicate error has occurred and specify type of error with correction symbols
- Indicate error has occurred and give a written hint of how to rectify it
- Indicate an error has occurred but do not specify the type
- Correct the error for the student.
- Other:

O2. If you chose more than one method, briefly explain when you would use each method.

O3. Do you feel that students are able to make corrections based on your feedback about vocabulary?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strongly disagree

O4. Do you feel that it helps them to avoid similar problems in later pieces of writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not helpful at all

P. How do you give feedback about grammar?

- Indicate error has occurred and specify type of error with correction symbols
- Indicate error has occurred and give a written hint of how to rectify it
- Indicate an error has occurred but do not specify the type
- Correct the error for the student.
- Other:

P2. If you chose more than one method, briefly explain when you would use each method.
P3. How likely do you feel that students are to make corrections based on your feedback about grammar?

1 2 3 4 5
Very unlikely

Q. How many types of grammatical errors do you focus on when you grade a paper?

- 1-2
- 3-4
- 4-6
- 7-9
- All of them

Q1. If you do not give feedback about all grammatical errors, which errors do you give feedback about and why?