

Emirati Journal of Education and Literatures
Vol 1 Issue 1 (2023)
Pages 4 - 15
Available at
www.emiratesscholar.com

Tertiary Students' Perceptions of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback in an ESL Classroom in the UAE

Elsayed Mahmoud
CU, Ajman. United Arab Erimates

ARTICLE INFO

KEYWORDS
Feedback- Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback-Classroom interaction – Writing Tasks – Essays.

HOW TO CITE
Mahmoud, E. (2023). Tertiary Students' Perceptions of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback in an ESL Classroom in the UAE. Emirati Journal of Education and Literatures, 1(1), 4-15.
https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

ABSTRACT

Although academic writing is an essential skill in learning, it has become an obstacle for many students who ultimately apply for the academic test to enroll in a college. Researchers thought a lot about solving this issue, so they have utilized corrective feedback in classroom practices since the 1950s. Researchers were divided into two categories: the first agreed with the feedback, but the others disagreed. Four debatable questions have emerged. Hartshorn et al. (2010) created a valuable framework, which has four criteria that are well-considered in this study. The researcher aims to answer the following question: What are students' perceptions of applying Dynamic written corrective feedback (DWCF)? In order to find a somewhat definite answer, the researcher applied DWCF through six essays on 32 cross-cultural students in the ESL classroom under the Intensive English Program (IEP) at one of Ajman's colleges over six weeks. This paper utilized a 10-online survey; then, the researcher analyzed them. The researcher grouped the survey questions into four themes; then, everyone was discussed. This research presented valuable findings, theoretical and pedagogical implications, and recommendations for better writing pedagogy and research.

Double-blind peer review by independent reviewers.
Received: 20 Jan 2023, Accepted: 25 May 2023, Published: 29 Jun 2023
*Corresponding author: s.sayed@cu.ac.ae
Copyright: © 2023 by the author. Licensee Emirates Scholar Center for Research & Studies, UAE.
Open access under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

1. Introduction and Background

Some students consider writing problematic and daunting, and they need their teachers to assist them in overcoming this obstacle until they become connoisseurs in their writing. Hence,

Some researchers found writing corrective feedback (henceforth WCF) as a convenient tool that could be utilized for scaffolding ESL students. The main principle of this tool is to identify a student's errors and assist them in becoming good writers. This topic is debatable as some researchers see it as an effective tool for assisting students in writing (e.g., Ferris, 1999; Ferris, 2006; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Robert, 2001). However, others see it as ineffective and useless as it does not assist students' accuracy (e.g., Krashen, 1994; Schwartz, 1993; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996, 2001, 2004). As a result of that debate and to avoid any defect of WCF, researchers came out with an effective and practical way of scaffolding students' writing: Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (henceforth DWCF). Therefore, this qualitative study aims to investigate the impact of DWCF on ESL students who failed to pass an academic exam such as IELTS or EmSAT because they could not get the minimum score to enroll in one of the colleges in Ajman, UAE. Those students are weak in academic writing, so the study will apply the DWCF technique to scaffold their writing accuracy and to know their perception of this technique.

Hence, the researcher will try this writing technique with them, hoping to be an effective tool for scaffolding their writing levels.

According to the rationale mentioned above, this qualitative research addresses the following question:

1. What are students' perceptions of applying DWCF?

To answer that question, a structured survey will be conducted on the students to identify their views about the DWCF used by the researcher. The following questions will be asked of them.

Do you like writing? Why?

Do you like oral, written feedback, or both on your written assignment? Why?

How did you view the dynamic written corrective feedback (DWCF) before applying it? After applying it?

What is the easiest part of writing? Why?

What is the most challenging part of writing? Why?

Has DWCF influenced your writing positively or negatively? How?

Do you like to continue applying DWCF in the future? Why?

In the future, would you like to have feedback on your written assignment from the teacher, peers, or both?

Do you have any suggestions for improving the DWCF?

To what extent the teacher's feedback under the Intensive English Program (IEP) is:

A. meaningful

B. timely

C. consistent

D. manageable

Therefore, this paper is divided into six sections. In the following lines, the literature review with different theories related to the WCF and DWCF, DWCF's types, and a critical review of the corrective feedback of WCF and DWCF will be depicted. Then, the methodology section will be presented, commencing with the research design, procedure, samples, utilized instruments, and data collection. Furthermore, the study's findings will be revealed. Also, the findings will be discussed in connection to the mentioned theories and divergent conducted studies. Finally, This research paper will summarize the conclusion, pedagogical implications to the SLA field, and the research limitation that could be avoided in the forthcoming studies.

2. Literature Review and Past Studies

2.1. Literature Review

Due to technological developments, writing has become an essential communication skill in many fields. Also, it has become the main obstacle that confronts students in academic exams that are inevitable for every high school student applying for a college. In addition, professional and academic settings need academic writing skills. This view is expressed by Glazier (1994, p3) as he states, "Being able to write in English is essential in college, and it probably is an asset in your career." However, the standards of ESL students have deviated downwards, which needs immediate action to scaffold the levels of those students (Conley, 2007). Zaghar and Zitouni (2018) reiterate that writing is problematic and challenging for students, and it needs immediate action for our students to improve such talented writing skills. Indeed, this problem needs not only immediate action but also an effective one. Hence researchers have thought about it, but what have they got to?

Some researchers began to find a solution in integrating corrective feedback in the 1950s, but since the 1980s, a

plethora of different kinds of methodologies has tackled this issue of CF (Riz & Ketabi, 2015). Some of these researchers are: (Ferris, 1999; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Robert, 2001). However, others see it as ineffective and useless because it does not assist students' accuracy (e.g., Krashen, 1994; Schwartz, 1993; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 1996, 2001, 2004). The main researcher who blatantly attacked using feedback was Truscott (1996), that said it made no difference. Therefore, we found two different views on corrective feedback (CF): some researchers agreed with it, while others disagreed. To deeply understand them, we need to know what corrective feedback means. Indeed, the literature shows that the term has been used differently to express the same theme, which is to correct errors. Some of the most commonly used terms in literature are corrective feedback used in language teaching, negative evidence used in language acquisition, and negative feedback used in cognitive psychology. In this study, we will use the term " Corrective Feedback" because this paper is related to teaching and learning practices in classrooms. Now, what is the definition of corrective feedback?

In general, Kulhavy (1977, p. 211) defines feedback as "any of the numerous procedures that are used to tell a learner if an instructional response is right or wrong." According to this definition, feedback illustrates whether a student's answer is correct or incorrect. Also, Nassaji and Kartchafa (2017) define corrective feedback as a response to the learner's erroneous output to improve the accuracy of the targeted form. Hence, according to their definitions, the output has an influential role in improving students' writing. Hence, it could be inferred that a student’s output is significant for eliciting constructive feedback.

Different theorists and researchers have tackled the importance of feedback from divergent perspectives. Commencing from the 1950s and 1960s, due to the need for effective oral communication among countries, we saw some contributions to avoiding the so-called sin "the error" and trying to overcome its effect (Lennon, 1991). In addition, The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis eroded to linguistics surface in the 1950s and 1960s. Also, the behaviorism theory came to the surface of psychology in the 1950s. Hence, errors were viewed as a "sin" caused by the native and target language differences, and teaching tried to avoid such an error (Dabaghi, 2010). The popularity of contrastive linguistic analysis burdened teachers in identifying the problematic foreign language areas that hinder the target language learning. In psychology, when the behaviorist view came to the surface, they connected the error correction by teachers and scaffolding of the students' language levels as learners will repeat the correction, which will serve as the stimuli until it becomes a habit. This view has been adopted by (Corpuz, 2011, p. 8):

When applied to second or foreign language learning, the behaviorist view assumed that language learning was advanced when the learners actively responded to the stimuli. These responses were then reinforced when repeated time after time to shape and form habits that consisted of automated responses elicited by a given stimulus. Therefore the implications for language teaching were that language learning would take place through exact imitation and repetition of the same structures over and over. Furthermore, this new theory amassed evidence that teachers needed to focus their teaching on structures that were believed to be complicated. By considering his implication, it can be inferred that error correction or CF provided by language teachers could serve as the stimuli to which language learners would actively respond to promote effective language learning or acquisition.)

Error analysis came to the surface as a replacement for contrastive analysis; however, it needed to satisfy researchers to deal with errors. This debate elicits many controversial questions on the roles of Written Feedback. Many researchers investigated these questions to find a definite answer to each.

2.1.2. New Model

Hartshorn et al. (2010) argue that three main criteria could affect students' final product. The first criterion is related to learners per se, such as their motivations, learner learning style, and their English level. Additionally, the second criterion is related to the situation, such as teachers per se, their gender, and their teaching styles. Moreover, the third criterion is related to the methodology, such as what is taught and how it is taught. Therefore, due to these three issues, those researchers proposed a new model called the dynamic written corrective feedback (Henceforth DWCF). Hartshorn et al. (2010, p. 87) defines DWCF as:

It includes (a) feedback that reflects what the individual learner needs most, as demonstrated by what the learner produces, and (b) a principled approach to pedagogy that ensures that writing tasks and feedback are meaningful, timely, consistent, and manageable for both student and teacher.

Based on Hartshorn’s et al. (2010) framework, it is seen that this model is significant as it entails four significant criteria: meaningful, timely, consistent, and manageable. It could be inferred that “meaningful” means all students

ISSN: 3080-1567 - https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

shall understand the teacher's remarks and codes. Furthermore, "timely" means that the feedback shall be imminent between the student's submission and the teacher's feedback. Lastly, "consistent" means the feedback should be merely and continually repeated. Finally, "manageable" means that both teachers and students shall be able to manage the errors and corrections; otherwise, students will never take care of it.

The new model of Hartshorn et al. (2010) has specific procedures. Initially, a student types an assignment and submits it to his/her teacher. Additionally, after the teacher reviews and revises it and types the correction, he/she sends the feedback to that student. As soon as that student receives the feedback, he corrects it and sends it to the teacher for the final version. That might be repeated until they get an error-free assignment).

Nevertheless, Altamimi (2014) critiqued the model for two reasons. The first reason is that practically teachers and students work with many errors that are daunting to both of them. The second reason is that there are many students in many ESL classes. Therefore, he proposed using technology with the DWCF and "an automated essay system" with DWCF.

2.2. Past Studies on Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback

Many studies tackled the issue of improving students' writing. Based on the literature, four essential questions have been debated among researchers. The first question: is the written feedback effective? Many studies tried answers to such a crucial and debatable question. Some researchers did not find positive results in favor of the WCF's effectiveness (e.g., Kepner 1991; Fazio, 2001); others found divergent positive results in favor of its effectiveness.

Dmitri (2016) conducted a six months case study through one research interview. The study concluded that the dynamic written feedback approach positively influenced the learners' beliefs about the usefulness of corrective feedback, as they found it was helpful in the end. Fithriani (2017) conducted a qualitative study on 11 Indonesian students. The results revealed four important findings. First, participants preferred direct than indirect feedback. Additionally, they preferred to receive feedback from their peers about local issues; however, they preferred to receive feedback from their teacher on global issues. Second, students perceive written feedback has three merits: improving writing accuracy and skills, encouraging critical thinking, and enhancing learner autonomy. Third, students received feedback from peers and teachers, but although they received less feedback from their teacher, they incorporated more feedback from a teacher than peers. Finally, students preferred and appreciated feedback from their teacher more than their peers.

In the regional context, Kamalian & Lashkarian (2014) conducted a study to investigate the effect of dynamic written corrective feedback on the writing of Iranian elementary students. The first group received dynamic corrective feedback, while the second received direct feedback. The study revealed that the participants who received the dynamic feedback outperformed those who received only corrective feedback. Also, in the UAE, Alyousef (2019) researched the effect of dynamic written corrective feedback on the writing accuracy of Arab students. The study revealed that DWCF assists teachers and students together by enhancing the writing accuracy of those early-aged students.

The second question: which type of feedback is more effective: Direct or Indirect? Many studies have been conducted and concluded different results. Jamalinesari et al. (2015) conducted a study investigating the efficacy of direct and indirect corrective feedback on EFL students' writing. The study revealed that indirect feedback improved the student is better in comparison to direct feedback. In contrast, Suzuki et al. (2019) conducted a study on four groups exploring the effect of using direct and indirect feedback on written tasks. The study revealed that both direct and indirect types of feedback assisted learners in enhancing their syntax accuracy; however, a significant effect of direct remarks was found for the Past Perfect revision. The study concluded that all types of feedback wore effective for one type of structure; however, the direct corrective feedback lasted longer than the metalinguistic remarks.

The third question: is focused or unfocused feedback more effective? Ellis et al. (2008) conducted a study on two groups. The study revealed that the focused group outperformed the unfocused group at the end of the study. Similarly, Sheen et al. (2009) conducted a study on four groups examining the focused and unfocused topic by a quasi-experimental design. The study revealed that the focused written corrective feedback group outperformed the unfocused group in grammatical structures. In the same track, Frear and Chiu (2015) conducted a study on 67 tertiary Chinese students: 56 females and 11 males in Taiwan. The study revealed that either focused indirect or unfocused indirect written-corrective-feedback students outperformed the control group. However, there was no difference in accuracy between the two groups.

The fourth debatable question: which approach is more effective, giving students feedback on new writing pieces or on the same text that is merely revised? Truscott and Hsu (2008) studied two groups: a control group and an experimental group that received feedback on two in-class writing tasks. Data collection occurred in in-class writing tasks from week 12 to week 14, as students were given illustrations to write a story on. On week 13, stories were collected, and the teacher underlined errors without giving marks to the experimental group. Students revised the errors and submitted them to the teacher. On week 14, students received another writing assignment to do the same. The study revealed that students who received errors underlining performed better on the merely revised text than on the new ones. Also, Liu (2008) conducted a study on 12 freshmen participants at a Southwestern university in the USA. The study revealed that both direct and indirect feedback helped students self-edit their texts, not on a new text. In contrast, Van Beuningen et al. (2012) conducted a study on four Duch secondary schools, concluding that direct and indirect comprehensible written corrective feedback improved accuracy in both revised and new texts.

3. Methodology

This section will provide some information about the subjects and an overview of the study. It will depict a sufficient description of how the study was conducted and how the data was coded, collected, and analyzed. Also, it will give a brief on the students' writing levels.

Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) has been administered in the ESL classroom under the Intensive English Program (IEP) at a college in Ajman. According to their schedule, the researcher was giving them 9 hours a week to apply this approach in their normal lectures. He gave six assessments to the students over six weeks. Students had to respond to the prompt by writing a well-structured essay and submitting it to the teacher via email. The first essay topic was parents are the best teachers. The second essay topic was "wedding ceremony in your culture." Their essay topic was " a previous impressive teacher." the fourth essay topic was " the ideal teacher." The fifth essay topic was " reflection on people with determination." The sixth essay topic was " advantages and disadvantages of the Internet." The teacher had to overview the same essay every time for feedback. That is merely repeated until the essay becomes a fee-error one. Every essay took a week as the teacher employed three-time feedback. The researcher aims to find an answer to the following question: What are students' perceptions of applying DWCF?

An online survey was administered at the end of the six weeks to answer the question.

3.1. Subjects

This study of DWCF in one of the colleges in Ajman in an ESL classroom under the IEP program. The teacher is an English non-native speaker whose first language is Arabic. He had to speak English in the classroom as the class contained thirty-two cross-cultural students (Six Emiratis, One Iranian, Two Palestinians, One Jordanian, Ten Syrians, Four Yemenis, Two Indians, Two Egyptians, and Four Iraqis). All students are English non-native speakers. Students' ages are from eighteen years – twenty-five years. Most of them could not enter college because of their academic weaknesses, especially in writing. According to the writing diagnostic test at the beginning of the course, they failed to get the lowest score in writing (60 %).

3.2. Data Collection Tools and Procedures

After classroom practices for six weeks, the data was collected from the students who experienced this DWCF technique. This qualitative data was gathered by the survey that will be analyzed and summarized. This survey aimed to answer the research question about students' perceptions of applying DWCF. The survey includes ten open-ended questions that allow them to express their views without any restrictions or reduction. The survey was sent to them online via Google Form at the same time as the lecture. The researcher orally explained the survey and clarified four points related to question 10. Fifteen minutes were given to explain the survey, and 30 minutes were given for students to complete it. They finished before the time. It should be mentioned that it was easy to collect the answers via the survey in the researcher's email. The questions have been arranged following the top-down approach. They have been divided thematically to have the students' views on writing in the past, present, and future. Students' answers will be described in the following section. The first question was whether they liked writing and their rationale. The second question asked them about their views on feedback in general and their preferences, while the third question asked about the technique of DWCF and its application. The fourth and fifth questions asked them about the easiest and the most challenging parts. The sixth and seventh questions asked them whether they felt that the DWCF influenced them positively and whether they preferred to continue with the technique in the future. The eighth question asked them how they prefer to receive feedback in the future: Is it from the teacher or peers? Or both of them? The ninth question asked them about their suggestions to improve the

ISSN: 3080-1567 - https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

DWCF. The last question asked about their views Regarding four criteria of the feedback mentioned by Hartshorn et al. (2010, p. 87).

3.3. Data Coding

Although academic writing is an essential skill in learning, it has become an obstacle for many students who ultimately apply for the academic test to enroll in a college. Researchers thought a lot about solving this issue, so they have utilized corrective feedback in classroom practices since the 1950s. Researchers were divided into two categories: the first agreed with the feedback, but the others disagreed. Four debatable questions have emerged. Hartshorn et al. (2010) created a valuable framework, which has four criteria that are well-considered in this study.

3.4. Data Analysis

After the researcher had collected the data via Google form, he started to analyze it with questions. The researcher read students' answers for every question and classified their answers according to the nature of the question. For example, if the question asks students whether they want to receive feedback from a teacher, peers, or both, the researcher makes three possible answers and counts them. In the end, the frequencies of their answers toward a classification have been recorded and described.

3.5. Evaluation Criteria of Students' Writing

The study employed a rubric that the researcher created. This rubric assesses the students writing via four categories: Topic development, Cohesion and Coherence, Lexical Item, and Syntactic Item. Hence, the feedback is given according to these criteria indirectly. It shall be mentioned that the researcher made a diagnostic test for the students to tailor the assignments and their language levels accordingly. They were all below average. Also, the teacher gave them feedback and marks to encourage them to a better level.

4. Findings

This qualitative study investigates the impact of DWCF on ESL students who did not pass an academic exam such as IELTS or EmSAT due to their low scores. The research will apply the DWCF technique to enable them to write a well-structured essay. The data was collected via a ten-question survey, and the results will be described and summarized.

Question 1: Do you like writing? Why? Twenty-five students expressed their tendency to write, but only seven expressed their tendency against writing. The students who have a tendency to write expressed the reasons that made them like writing: it enables their minds to grow, think, and imagine, and it helps them to express their experiences and communicate with others. Their opinions will be presented under pseudonyms:

Sana: "Yes, because writing helps in the growth of the mind and ideas, and through writing, we can express our thoughts, so I love writing."

Laila: "Yes, because writing is fabulous …….You can express your imagination."

Question 2: Do you like oral feedback, written feedback, or both on your written assignment? Why? Nineteen students preferred written feedback, while three preferred oral feedback; however, ten preferred both. The students who preferred written feedback gave reasons for that. One of the reasons is that it helps them to keep the comments for a long time for correction. Another reason is that it enables them to see the comments when they need them as it is recorded. Their opinions also will be presented under pseudonyms:

Doaa: "I like a written one because I look it back if you forget and review mistakes."

Shadia: "I like written feedback rather than oral because it helps me to recheck the mistake instead of coming to you every time to ask again; oral feedback takes my confidence away from me, so, for me, written feedback is better."

Question 3: How did you view the dynamic written corrective feedback (DWCF) before applying it? After applying it? Thirty-one students expressed positive views about DWCF after applying, but most of them learned

ISSN: 3080-1567 - https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

this way after. Only one did not like this way without giving any reason. For the students who expressed positive views about DWCF, they gave many reasons. One of the reasons is that it is helpful as it makes them understand. Another reason is it makes correction easier. Also, it is easier and faster. Furthermore, it improved their levels. In the following lines, some of their opinions will be presented under a pseudonym:

Hessa: "I didn't experience it before; now I'm very, really happy about applying it because I understand my mistakes exactly, and by constant feedback from the instructor, I follow the rules, so it is beneficial for me."

Rasha: “before applying it, it was difficult for me because teachers never gave the feedback, so it was challenging; after applying it, I found it easy because I understood my mistakes, etc."

Question 4: What is the easiest part of writing? Why? 21 students said that the introduction is the easiest part, but 11 students said that the conclusion with editing is the easiest one. Not one mentioned that the body is the easiest. That could have been caused by the low academic level and the limited range of vocabulary. For the students who mentioned that the introduction is the easiest, their opinions will be presented under pseudonyms:

Sultan: “The easiest part for me is INTRODUCTION because it is very easy. Also, we have to write the main idea of the topic."

For students who mentioned that the conclusion is the easiest part, their ideas will be depicted in the following lines:

Maher: “…. conclusion is easy because I have an idea.”

Awad: "The conclusion, because I would have an idea about what I wrote and explain all of it in the end."

Question 5: What is the most challenging part of writing? Why?

Eighteen students mentioned that the body is the most challenging part, while nine students mentioned that the introduction and the title are the most challenging parts. However, only five students mentioned that the conclusion was the most difficult part. For the students who referred to the body part as the most challenging one, they gave many reasons: writing many ideas, writing different points, writing a detailed explanation, and writing many words. Their opinions will be presented in the following excerpts.

Roodah: “The difficult part for me is BODY because we have to write so many points; we should write in the correct order for every point.”

Question 6: Has DWCF influenced your writing positively or negatively? How? Thirty students mentioned that DWCF influenced their writing positively; however, two of the total number explained that it influenced their writing negatively. The 30 students who referred to the negative influence their writing had by the technique mentioned many reasons: It informs them about their weaknesses, gives them a chance to correct, and enables them to learn from errors.” Their opinions will be depicted:

Adel: “Positive because it identifies a mistake, forcing me to change it.”

Helmy: “It affected my writing positively because I learned from my mistakes and their interest and became better at writing.”

Question 7: Do you like to continue applying DWCF in the future? Why?

All 32 students mentioned that they like to continue applying DWCF in the future. All of them said that it is useful and improves their writing and language.

Namita: "Yes, because it was very useful to understand which part of writing I need to improve

Mohamed: “Yes, it's useful to me that I learn a lot.”

Mosab: "Yes, because it helps in strengthening the Language."

Question 8: In the future, would you like to have feedback on your written assignment from the teacher, peers, or both?

Twenty-five students wanted to get feedback from both of them; however, seven students preferred to get feedback from their teacher, but no one wanted to get feedback only from peers. The students who preferred both teachers and peers mentioned that they wanted to understand the main points from teachers and more explanations from friends. Their ideas will be presented in the following line:

Hoda: "of course, I would like help from my teachers or peers because they give me new ideas and will help me build something."

Question 9: Do you have any suggestions for improving the DWCF?

Twenty-eight students stated that they didn't have any suggestions, but four students gave some suggestions. Their opinions will be presented:

ISSN: 3080-1567 - https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

Fanar: "Yes, please 1-to learn more sentences on how to start our paragraph in paragraph 1 and 2 and how to connect to gather more phrases 2. To learn sentences correctly in the conclusion or in begging of an essay to memorize."

Fahad: “practice every day and discuss with the doctor or peers.”

Question 10: To what extent the teacher’s feedback under the Intensive English Program (IEP) is:

A. meaningful

B. timely

C. consistent

D. manageable

For the first criterion, whether the feedback is meaningful, all students said it was meaningful as they understood what was needed. Their opinions will be presented:

Salim: Yes, the teacher's feedback is meaningful; he tells us the mistakes and also where we have improved so that it is easier for us to cope. So we do understand.

For the second criterion, whether it was timely, 30 students said it was timely, but two did not agree. The students who said it is "timely" their views will be presented:

Sameh: "Yes, at the right time."

Akash: "After one or two days, I received the comments."

For the third criterion, whether the feedback was consistent, 30 students agreed, but two students disagreed. Students who agreed to the criterion said that the teacher gave us remarks three times. Their opinions will be presented as follows:

Samy: "Yes, repeated 3 times.”

Hamda: "Yes, repeated 3 times."

Only two students disagreed because it is not as typical as the normal homework. I think they don’t like repetition.

For the fourth criterion, whether it was manageable, 27 students agreed, but five students disagreed. The students who agreed mentioned that it was manageable because we were able to finish the task. Their opinions will be presented:

Soha: "Yes, it is manageable. I am able to finish the work and also I understand the points."

5. Discussion

5.1. Introduction

In this section, the study results and findings will be depicted. Also, the implications of this study about DWCF will be presented. Further, some recommendations related to the topic will be suggested for the English writing classrooms.

5.2. Discussion

Although academic writing is a key skill in the educational field, it has become a hurdle to many students who want to enroll in college. This issue needed to be deeply discussed and effectively solved, particularly for those students. Hence, researchers have utilized corrective feedback in classroom practices since the 1950s. Also, some of the researchers agreed with FC not to be limited to (Ferris, 1999; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Robert, 2001), but Truscot (1996) disagreed with the corrective feedback claiming that it makes no difference. Some researchers have the same opinion as Truscot (e.g., Schwartz, 1993; Kepner, 1991; Sheppard, 1992; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 2001, 2004). In order to have effective written feedback, Hartshorn et al. (2010) came up with Dynamic Corrective Feedback. They created a valuable framework, which has four criteria that are well-considered in this study.

The researcher aims to find an answer to the following question: What are students’ perceptions of applying DWCF? In order to find a somewhat definite answer, the researcher applied Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback (DWCF) through six essays on 32 students in the ESL classroom under the Intensive English Program (IEP) at one of Ajman’s colleges over six weeks.

5.2.1. Four Themes of the Survey

As mentioned above, the survey contains ten questions. In this section, the survey questions were thematically grouped; then, we got to four themes. The four themes are: Students' Perceptions of writing and Its parts, Students’ Perception of FC Type and DWCF Approach, Students’ Perception of DWCF Influence and Futuristic Use, and Students’ Preference to DWCF Sender. Every theme will be depicted separately in the following lines.

5.2.1.1. Students' Perceptions of writing and Its parts

For the first theme, unlike Alyousef 2019, the study's results revealed that most students liked writing. In addition, the introduction is the easiest part, and the body is the most challenging one. It is seen that those students like writing, but they had not been academically taken care of, particularly in academic writing, before they saw the DWCF. Also, they prefer the introduction as they see it as the easiest part and find the body challenging because they have a limited range of vocabulary and grammar. Hence, there was an apparent improvement in

ISSN: 3080-1567 - https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

their writing as they acquired some new academic vocabulary and simple syntax.

5.2.1.2. Students' Perception of FC Type and DWCF Approach

For the second theme, similar to Fithriani (2017), most of the students had a positive perception of the written feedback, so they preferred it. Additionally, they liked the dynamic approach, as Hartshorn et al. (2010) suggested. That is also supported by Alyousef (2019).

5.2.1.3. Students' Perception of DWCF Influence and Futuristic Use

For the third theme, like Dmitri (2016) and Fithriani (2017), students see that the DWCF has influenced their writing positively as it highlighted their weaknesses for strengthening it. They also want this way to continue with them in the future as it is useful and scaffolds their writing. Also, most of them do not have any suggestions, but two of them mentioned that they need more focus on writing the body paragraphs. It is seen that they learned how to construct a paragraph.

5.2.1.4. Students' Preference to DWCF Sender

For the fourth theme, similar to Fithriani (2017), most participants want written feedback from teachers and peers. The only difference between the two studies is that students in Fithriani's studies prefer to receive feedback from their peers on local issues, and the teacher gives them feedback on global issues. However, in this study, they think the teacher's and students' feedback could complete each other more understanding. More importantly, nearly all see the teacher's feedback as meaningful, timely, consistent, and manageable. Only two of them need to be accustomed to it. That goes well with the framework of Hartshorn et al. (2010), as it is easily applied and useful.

5.3. Implications of the Study

Based on the findings of this research, a theoretical and pedagogical range of implications will be presented. Implications are hoped to be considered in educational settings, whether in schools or universities.

5.3.1. Implications

As the positive students' perception of DWCF and its importance, teachers should apply it in English writing classes either at early ages or older ages, particularly with weak students. It firstly encourages the students' output. Secondly, it draws their attention to their errors and urges them to treat the errors themselves. It also draws their attention to avoid these errors in the future. The way is dynamic; practically, it makes those weak students dynamic. This dynamic approach, especially when it urges them to work collaboratively, also activates their minds and critical thinking.

This approach is useful for teachers. Initially, it assists them in giving opportunities to their students to think, produce, and be active. Second, it helps them to direct their students to treat their mistakes/errors effectively. It also helps teachers advance their students' lexical, syntactic, and semantic items. Teachers should bring topics related to students' knowledge, experiences, and communities in this context. Hence, students will perform better in writing when they can easily express their wants, needs, wishes, and cultures. They also should take care of the quality of the feedback and its traits. The feedback should be constructive, implicit, concise, precise, focused, indirect, meaningful, consistent, timely, and manageable. More importantly, teachers should integrate modern software to identify students' mistakes, especially when they have a large number of students.

5.4. Limitation of the study

This study investigated tertiary Students' Perceptions of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback in an ESL classroom in the UAE. However, it has some limitations. Instead of concentrating only on students, it should have integrated the teachers' perspectives on the topic, too. When the study tackles this topic from students' and teachers' perceptions, we could know how similar and different their ideas were. That will direct our futuristic research to fill the gap.

5.5. Recommendation

As a result of the mentioned studies and the study findings, this paper presents some recommendations:

Researchers should study the DWCF intensively as it is useful for students and teachers. They could investigate to what extent the progress of students is by comparing two groups.

Teachers should apply the DWCF with their students as they like it and see it as beneficial and scaffolding. Students who need to learn how to write an essay see that their academic level is developed when they have an interesting topic related to their experiences, and the feedback is dynamic either with their teacher or peers. Teachers should use the principled approach of hartshorn's et al. (2010) to ensure that writing tasks and feedback are meaningful, timely, consistent, and manageable. Students' perception of these principles is positive.

ISSN: 3080-1567 - https://doi.org/10.54878/6s8rz430

Teachers should take into consideration the quality and quantity of the feedback. It should be focused, constructive, concise, precise, and indirect.

Researchers and teachers should investigate and use this approach with early-aged students to make them accustomed to the approach; however, they could also give it to older students.

5.6. Conclusion

As writing is problematic to many university students, this paper investigated university students' perceptions of DWCF in one of the collegiate ESL classrooms in the United Arab Emirates. This qualitative study deploys a survey with IEP students who failed to get a required score in any academic exam such as EmSAT. The researcher tested their writing in the first session and found out that they were much below average. The Dynamic Written Corrective feedback was applied to them, and they were asked at the end about their perceptions of it. Ten questions were asked of them. Hartshorn's et al.'s (2010) framework has been considered in this study. Most of the students' perceptions of this approach were positive, and they wanted to continue with it. Theoretical and pedagogical implications and recommendations have been presented in this paper. Therefore, teachers are advised to use this practical approach with their students in the future with advanced software.

7. Reference

Abalkheel, A., & Brandenburg, T. ((2020). Effects of Written Corrective Feedback: A Synthesis of 10 Quasi-Experimental Studies. English Language Teaching,13(7).

AlYousef, E.(2019). The impact of dynamic written corrective feedback on Arab EFL intermediate students 'writing accuracy: United Arab Emirates University

Altamimi, O. (2014). Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback Revisited: A Critique and an Improved Model. Arab world English journal, 5(3)

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multi-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? Journal of Second Language Writing, 9, 227–57. https://doi.org /10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. Applied linguistics, 31(2), 193-214.

Brooks, N. (1960). Language and language learning. Theory and practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.

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.

Corpuz, V., (2011). Error Correction in Second Language Writing: Teacher's Beliefs Practices and Students' Performance. (Unpublished Master dissertation). Queensland University of Technology, Australia.

Conley, D.T. (2007). Toward a more comprehensive conception of college readiness. Eugene, OR: Educational

Dabaghi, A. (2010). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition, Theory, Research, and Practice. Lambert Academic Publishing.

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. A system, 36 (3), 353–371.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). Journal of second language writing, 8(1), 1–11.

Fithriani R. (2019). ZPD and the Benefits of Written Feedback in L2 Writing: Focusing on Students' Perceptions. An International Online Journal Volume 19 (1), 63-73.

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. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. New York: Routledge.

Fathman, A. K. & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (ed.) Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom 178–90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi. Org /10.1017/CBO9781139524551.016

Fazio, L. (2001). The effects of corrections and commentaries on journal writing of minority- and majority-language minorities. Journal of Second Language Writing, 10, 235–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00042-X

Frear, D. and 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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.06.006

Glazier, F. (1994). The Least You Should Know about English Writing Skills. USA: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Hartshorn, K. J., & Evans, N. W. (2015). The effects of dynamic written corrective feedback: A 30-week study. Journal of Response to Writing, 1(2),

Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., Merrill, P. F., Sudweeks, R. R., Strong-Krause, N. E., & Anderson, N. J. (2010). Effects of dynamic corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. Tesol Quarterly, 44(1), 84–109.

Jamalinesari, A., Rahimi, F., Gowhary, H., & Azizifar, A.(2015). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192, 116-123. https://doi.org /10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.018

Kamalian, A., & Lashkarian, A. (2014). The Effect of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback on Iranian Elementary Learners' Writing. Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 3(5)

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Second language acquisition and second language learning. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York.

Krashen, S. (1994). The input hypothesis and its rivals. In N. Ellis (Ed.), Implicit and explicit learning of languages. London: Academic Press, 45-77.

Kepner, C. G. (1991). An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills. The Modern Language Journal, 75(3), 305-313.

Dmitri, L. (2016). Exploring and Reshaping Learners' Beliefs About the Usefulness of Corrective Feedback: A Socio-cultural Perspective. ITL : International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 167(1), 46-77. https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.167.1.03leo

Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. Review of Educational Research, 47(2), 211-232.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. W. C. Ritchie, & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of Second Language Acquisition. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lee, S. (2009). The Efficacy of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback on Intermediate-high ESL Learners ' Writing Accuracy: Brigham Young University.

Lennon, P. (1991). Error: some problems of definition and identification. Applied Linguistics 12 (2), 180–195.

Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. Arizona Working Papers in SLA and Teaching, 15, 65–79.

Nassaji, H. (2015). The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Nassaji, H. , & Kartchafa, E.(2017). Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teaching and Learning. New York. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315621432

Rizi, A., & Ketabi,S. (2015). A Close Look at Sixty Years of Corrective Feedback. Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 2(1).

Richards, J.C., Platt, J. & Webber, H. (1985). Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics,

London: Longman.

Schwartz, B. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 15, 147–163.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11, 129–158.

Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the Red Pen. Foreign Language Annals, 17(3), 195–202.

Shehadeh, A. (1999). Non-native speakers' production of modified comprehensible output and second language learning. Language Learning, 49(4), 627–675.

Shehadeh, A. (2001). Self- and other-initiated modified output during task-based interaction. TESOL Quarterly, 35(3), 433–457.

Shehadeh, A. (2004). "Encouraging Output". English Teaching Professional, 31, 4–6.

Shehadeh, A. (2003). Learner output, hypothesis testing, and internalizing linguistic knowledge. System, 31, 155–171

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 235–253

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. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 125–144.

Swain, M. (1984). A review of immersion education in Canada: Research and evaluation studies. ELT Documents, 119, 35–51.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: a step towards second language learning. Applied Linguistics 16 (3), 371–391.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? RELC Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research in Southeast Asia, 23, 103–110

Suzuki, W., Nassaji, H. and Sato, K. (2019). The effects of feedback explicitness and type of target structure on accuracy in revision and new pieces of writing. System, 81, 135–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.017

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. A system, 37 (4), 556–569.

Truscott, J. (2001). Selecting Errors for Selective Error Correction. Concentric: Studies in English Literature and Linguistics, 27(2), 225–240.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and Conjecture on the Effects of Correction: A response to Chandler. Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(4), 337–343.

Truscott (1996). Journal of Second Language Writing, 8(1), 1–11.

Truscott, J. and Hsu, A. Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. Journal of Second Language Writing 17, 292–305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2008.05.003

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H. and Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. International Journal of Applied Linguistics 156, 279–96.https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.156.24beu
https://doi.org/10.2143/ITL.156.0.2034439

Van Beuningen C. G., De Jong, N. H. and Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. Language Learning, 62, 1–41. https://doi.org/10.111/j.1467-9922.2011.00674.x