ILTERG

INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION RESEARCH GROUP

3rd INTERNATIONAL ILTERG CONFERENCE

PROCEEDINGS BOOK

Editors
Prof. Dr. Gonca YANGIN EKŞİ
Dr. Ahmet Erdost YASTIBAŞ

June 2-3, 2023

The 3rd International ILTERG Conference is held face-to-face and online.

REGIONAL ENGLISH LANGUAGE OFFICE

U.S. Embassy, Ankara, Turkey

The content and originality of the papers included in this proceedings book are within the responsibility of the authors of the papers.

PRESIDENT

Gonca Yangın Ekşi	Gazi University	Turkey

ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Ahmet Erdost Yastıbaş	Gazi University	Turkey
Asuman Aşık	Gazi University	Turkey
Bengü Aksu Ataç	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Burçak Yılmaz Yakışık	Gazi University	Turkey
Ceylan Yangın Ersanlı	Ondokuz Mayıs University	Turkey
Deepika Kohli	Khalsa College of Education	India
Dorota Werbińska	Pomeranian University	Poland
Gamze Emir	Gazi University	Turkey
Fengfeng Ke	Florida State University	USA
Gonca Yangın Ekşi	Gazi University	Turkey
Luis Guerra	University of Evora	Portugal
M. Pilar Agustín Llach	Universidad de La Rioja	Spain
Markus A. Launer	Ostfalia University	Germany
Mehmet Tunaz	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Meltem Huri Baturay	Atılım University	Turkey
Ricardo Pereira	University of Lisbon	Portugal
Samet Taşçı	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Sedat Akayoğlu	Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University	Turkey
Yasemin Bayyurt	Boğaziçi University	Turkey

CONFERENCE SECRETARIAT

Ahmet Erdost Yastıbaş	Gazi University	Turkey
Mehmet Tunaz	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Samet Taşçı	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Abdullah Ertaş	Atılım University	Turkey
Abdulvahit Çakır	Ufuk University	Turkey
Ali Eraslan	Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University	Turkey
Andreas Otto Brunold	Augsburg University	Germany
Arda Arıkan	Akdeniz University	Turkey
Arif Sarıçoban	Selçuk University	Turkey
Asuman Aşık	Gazi University	Turkey
Aydan Irgatoğlu	Hacı Bayram Veli University	Turkey
Ayşegül Amanda Yeşilbursa	Bursa Uludağ University	Turkey
Belgin Elmas	TED University	Turkey
Bena Gül Peker	Gazi University	Turkey
Bengü Aksu Ataç	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Binnur Genç İlter	Akdeniz University	Turkey
Burçak Yılmaz Yakışık	Gazi University	Turkey
Ceylan Yangın Ersanlı	Ondokuz Mayıs University	Turkey
Ceyhun Karabıyık	Ufuk University	Turkey
Çağla Atmaca	Pamukkale University	Turkey
Deepika Kohli	Khalsa College of Education	India
Demet Yaylı	Pamukkale University	Turkey
Deren Başak Yeşilel	Ondokuz Mayıs University	Turkey

Dinçay Köksal	Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University	Turkey
Dorota Werbińska	Pomeranian University	Poland
Erdoğan Bada	Hakkari University	Turkey
Esim Gürsoy	Bursa Uludağ University	Turkey
Fengfeng Ke	Florida State University	USA
Gonca Yangın Ekşi	Gazi University	Turkey
Gülden Tüm	Çukurova University	Turkey
Fatma Kimsesiz	Kırşehir Ahi Evran University	Turkey
Hasan Bedir	Çukurova University	Turkey
İlknur Savaşkan	Bursa Uludağ University	Turkey
İskender Hakkı Sarıgöz	Gazi University	Turkey
İsmail Hakkı Mirici	Hacettepe University	Turkey
İsmail Serdar Altaç	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Joanna Kic-Drgas	Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań	Poland
Kaveh Jalilzadeh	İstanbul University	Turkey
Leyla Harputlu	Hatay Mustafa Kemal University	Turkey
Lili Cavalheiro	University of Lisbon	Portugal
Luis Guerra	University of Evora	Portugal
Malgorzata Ekiert	Pomeranian University	Poland
Markus A. Launer	Ostfalia University	Germany
M. Pilar Agustín Llach	Universidad de La Rioja	Spain
Meltem Huri Baturay	Atılım University	Turkey
Muhlise Coşgun Ögeyik	Trakya University	Turkey
Müzeyyen Nazlı Güngör	Gazi University	Turkey
Nalan Kızıltan	Ondokuz Mayıs University	Turkey
Olga Mateus Gonçalves	University of Evora	Portugal
Ouafa Ouarniki	Ziane Achour University of Djelfa	Algeria
Özlem Saka	Akdeniz University	Turkey
Ricardo Pereira	University of Lisbon	Portugal
Selami Aydın	Istanbul Medeniyet University	Turkey
Serhan Köse	Gazi University	Turkey
Sumru Akcan	Boğaziçi University	Turkey
Şevki Kömür	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University	Turkey
Tuba Baykara	Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University	Turkey
Turan Paker	Pamukkale University	Turkey
Ümit Deniz Turan	Anadolu University	Turkey
Yasemin Bayyurt	Boğaziçi University	Turkey
Yasemin Kırkgöz	Çukurova University	Turkey

FOREWORD

Greetings to all participants and esteemed colleagues as we come together for the 3rd ILTERG Conference. It brings us great pleasure to welcome you to this gathering, which serves as a platform for collaboration and research in the field of language teacher education. ILTERG, an acronym for the International Language Teacher Education Research Group, was established as part of an Erasmus+ project seven years ago and continues to thrive as a non-profit organization, fostering cooperation and knowledge sharing among language teacher educators worldwide.

The ILTERG Conference holds the key objective of uniting language teacher educators from diverse contexts, creating abundant opportunities for exchange and networking. We are fortunate to be joined by a remarkable array of colleagues and researchers from across the globe, each contributing valuable insights from their studies. This convergence of ideas will not only inspire fruitful dialogue but also facilitate the establishment of future plans and collaborative projects in the realm of language education research.

The central theme of this conference revolves around teacher education and development, particularly within the context of English Language Teaching (ELT). ILTERG recognizes the significance of incorporating research, theoretical frameworks, and best practices from a wide range of language teacher education contexts. As language teaching evolves, it is increasingly vital to contribute to the professional growth and development of language educators. Hence, ILTERG Conference aims to play an instrumental role in advancing both language teacher education and English language teaching itself.

We extend our sincerest gratitude to all participants attending this conference, including academics, foreign language teachers, teacher trainers, and graduate students in the field of English Language Teaching. Your presence and willingness to share current research findings in the domains of foreign language teaching and teacher education greatly enrich this event. Your contributions will undoubtedly contribute to the collective knowledge and professional advancement of language educators worldwide.

It is also an honor to host a number of distinguished speakers to present their research and scholarly papers. We would especially like to thank Dr. Katie Welch, Prof. Dr. Yasemin Bayyurt, Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu, Prof. Dr. Kenan Dikilitaş, Dr. Kyria Rebeca Finardi for their invaluable contributions to the conference. We would also like to express our gratitude to workshop presenters Prof. Dr Turan Paker, Prof. Dr. Meltem Huri Baturay and Rupert Breheny, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sedat Akayoğlu and Tom Godfrey. We look forward to listening to them and all other participants, whose studies will be a feast of mind for us.

The 3rd ILTERG Conference serves as a vibrant forum for collaboration, exploration, and the dissemination of research in language teacher education. We encourage you to actively engage in discussions, forge connections, and immerse yourself in the rich tapestry of ideas presented here. Let us seize this opportunity to collectively shape the future of language teaching and education. We also thank the Regional English Language Office of U.S. Embassy, Ankara, Turkey for giving us a grant for this conference.

Once again, a warm welcome to the 3rd ILTERG Conference!

Prof. Dr. Gonca Yangın Ekşi
ILTERG Conference Chair

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ELT STUDENTS' REFLECTIONS ON EXPLICIT AND IMPLICIT WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Selda ÖZER[14]
Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Türkiye

Abstract

The study aimed at examining reflections of ELT students on explicit and implicit written corrective feedback (WCF) in writing skill. Qualitative research, case study design and convenient sampling technique were used in the study. The study group included 16 ELT students at preparatory class. The data were analyzed through content analysis. The analyses showed that both explicit and implicit WCF had positive and negative aspects. Although WCF helped students see their identified mistakes and correct them, revise the corrections not to make the same mistakes and improve themselves in writing as well as being easier to correct the mistakes and more learner-oriented, it also led students just to correct their mistakes, which caused to make the same mistakes, prevented them from learning the actual problem, dwelling on their mistakes, learning from their mistakes, and improving themselves in writing. Implicit WCF led students to try to correct their mistakes on their own, think about their problems/mistakes and search for possible corrections, helped them improve themselves in writing, learn from their mistakes, learn permanently, learn their actual problem not to make the same mistakes again, which decreased the rate of making mistakes, helped them search from different sources, develop their research skills and get higher scores. However, it also caused a few students to have difficulty in finding what and where the problem is. Finally, implicit WCF was more effective than explicit corrective feedback. Based on the results of the study, using explicit WCF first and implicit WCF later is recommended to help students improve their writing skill.

Keywords: Explicit WCF, Implicit WCF, Writing skill, ELT students, Prospective teachers of English

INTRODUCTION

Language learning and teaching include different variables. One of the most significant variables is the role of teachers because teachers may aid students in the development of positive traits by carefully adjusting their methods to the needs and interests of the students and by involving them in the learning process. Monitoring students' performance and offering corrective feedback is a typical strategy to help students (Ananda, Febriyanti, Yamin & Muin, 2017).

Corrective feedback is a term used to describe language learners' inappropriate products in their performance. In response to a variety of problems, including linguistic, content, organization, even discourse and pragmatic errors, corrective feedback can be given orally or in written (Nassaji

---

& Kartchava, 2017). Corrective feedback can be grouped into two as implicit and explicit in second language studies (Ferris, 2002; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). While explicit feedback involves elicitation, explicit correction and metalinguistic hints to attract students' attention in their mistakes, implicit feedback includes clarifying questions, repeating and recasting to attract students' attention in correcting their mistakes (Nassaji & Kartchava, 2017; Granena & Yilmaz, 2018; Kim, 2019). In other words, in explicit correction, the mistakes are expressed directly, but in implicit correction, the mistakes are implied (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006).

As Corder (1974) noted, writing is a sophisticated and complex process that is the most difficult language skill to learn. Writing is a challenge even in the first language, so writing in a foreign language has additional difficulties. Teachers will be able to identify students' language-learning challenges if they have a better knowledge of student errors and their origins in writing. Additionally, it will help them implement effective teaching strategies to improve student learning (Farahmand & Hatami, 2014). According to Ferris (2002) and Al Ajmi (2015), the teacher's response to a student's writing error in a second language writing class results in improvement in the quality of the student's writing.

In writing, explicit WCF comprises the deletion of redundant sentences, words, phrases, or morphemes as well as the addition of those that are missing. Other forms of explicit WCF might be a brief written meta-linguistic explanation, such as the inclusion of grammar rules and examples at the end of a student's script with a reference to the specific passages in which the error appeared, and/or an oral meta-linguistic explanation, such as a mini-lesson in which the rules and examples are explained, practiced, and discussed between students and the teacher (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). In contrast, implicit WCF refers to the identification of the error's type, often using specific codes, to encourage students to come up with their own ideas, do searches, and find the error themselves (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Implicit WCF may be carried out by highlighting or circling the error, noting in the margin how many errors are on a particular line, or using a code to indicate where and what kind of error it is (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011).

Explicit WCF helps students become more aware of their errors and promotes accuracy in their writing. By explicitly pointing out mistakes and providing corrections, students can learn from their errors and improve their language accuracy over time. In explicit WCF, students receive detailed explanations about grammar rules and conventions, and it helps them better understand the correct usage of language structures, which leads to improvement in writing skills. In explicit WCF, errors are addressed directly and immediately, and students recognize and correct their mistakes promptly, reinforcing proper language usage (Hadiyanto, 2019;

Mujtaba, Parkash, & Nawaz, 2020; Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020; Khadawardi, 2021; Subon, & Ali, 2022; Wulf, 2021; Yu, 2022).

Implicit WCF encourages students to identify and correct errors on their own. By providing subtle cues or indications of errors, students are prompted to reevaluate their writing and make necessary revisions. Implicit WCF fosters learner autonomy by requiring students to actively engage in the process of error detection and correction and encourages students to take responsibility for their own learning and develops self-monitoring skills. In implicit WCF, students are prompted to pay closer attention to language form and accuracy without relying heavily on explicit corrections, which can lead to improvement in accuracy and error recognition in their writing (Hadiyanto, 2019; Mujtaba, Parkash, & Nawaz, 2020; Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020; Khadawardi, 2021; Subon, & Ali, 2022; Wulf, 2021; Yu, 2022).

The literature review showed that a wide range of studies have been carried out to examine implicit and explicit WCF in writing (Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts & McKee, 2000; Ferris & Helt, 2000; Ferris, 2002; Sheen, 2007; Amador, 2008; Li, 2010; Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012; Mojtaba and Ghandi, 2012; Nguyen, Pham & Pham, 2012; Ryan, 2012; Shintani, & Ellis, 2013; Farahmand & Hatami, 2014; Hosseiny, 2014; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014; Abedi, 2015; Hadiyanto, 2019; Mujtaba, Parkash, & Nawaz, 2020; Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020; Khadawardi, 2021; Subon, & Ali, 2022; Wulf, 2021; Yu, 2022) and indicated that corrective feedback is essential for improving language skills of second language learners due to its theoretical and pedagogical significance. Most of these studies adopted experimental pretest-posttest design with a control group. However, in this study, the students were exposed to both explicit and implicit WCF, respectively. Thus, they had the necessary experience to produce comparative reflections on both corrective feedback types. This study is significant because it examined the use of corrective feedback as a useful tactic for delivering input that helps students to identify their mistakes and revise their assignments. It is also important in terms of making recommendations for language teachers about how they can focus on providing specific and clear feedback to make students feel more at ease in teaching writing skill. Therefore, the aim of the study is to examine reflections of ELT students at preparatory class on explicit and implicit WCF in writing skill. Within the framework of this purpose, answers to the following research questions were formed:

1. What do ELT students reflect on explicit WCF in writing skill?
2. What do ELT students reflect on implicit WCF in writing skill?
3. Which WCF do ELT students reflect to be more effective in writing skill?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The aim of the research was to examine reflections of ELT students at preparatory class on explicit and implicit WCF in writing skill. Qualitative research and case study design were used to collect rich data and to explain concepts, facts, relationships (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). A case study is used when a case is examined within itself, the boundaries between the case and its environment are not clear-cut, and there is more than one source of evidence or data (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In case study designs, (a) developing research questions, (b) developing sub-problems, (c) determining the situation to be studied, (d) choosing the study group, (e) collecting data and associating the collected data with sub-problems, (f) analyzing the data and interpretation and (g) reporting steps were followed (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In this context, the purpose of this research design is not to generalize but define facts (Patton, 2014). Case study design was preferred in this research to analyze thoroughly reflections of ELT students at preparatory class on explicit and implicit WCF in writing skill.

The Current Context

The researcher applied explicit WCF in the first half of the first semester while the students were studying writing paragraphs. In the second half of the first semester, the researcher started to apply implicit WCF when they started to study writing essays. The underlying logic for the shift from explicit WCF to implicit WCF was that students had learned how to organize a paragraph, write a topic sentence and support the topic sentence using supporting sentences and write a comprehensive paragraph. In addition, the researcher continued to apply implicit WCF during the second semester.

Study Group

Convenient and criterion sampling was used in the study in order to get relevant data from the participants. The criteria were taking writing course in preparatory class and having experienced both explicit and implicit WCF in the course. Thus, the participants of the study had the experience to produce comparative reflections on these two corrective feedback types. 16 ELT students participated in the study voluntarily. Demographic features of the study group were given in Table 1.

Data Collection Tool

ELT students were informed about the study and the difference between explicit and implicit WCF. Then they were asked to write their reflections on explicit and implicit WCF applied in their writing course and to express their preferences in terms of effectiveness along with

explanations on a sheet of paper. The statements written by ELT students in their own handwriting were used as the main data in this study.

Table 1. *Demographic features of the study group*

Demographic Features		f
Gender	Female	10
	Male	6
Age	18	4
	19	3
	20	6
	21	2
	23	1
Total		16

Data Analysis

In the research, the data were analyzed using content analysis. The aim of content analysis is to reach codes, categories and concepts that can explain the data obtained in the research (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). By using content analysis, data are defined, and hidden facts are revealed by the researchers. For this purpose, similar data are grouped and interpreted within the framework of certain concepts and themes (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In this study, students' reflections on explicit and implicit WCF were grouped into two categories as (a) positive aspects and (b) negative aspects. Finally, students' preferences were assigned into the appropriate category as (a) explicit WCF, (b) implicit WCF or (c) both.

Validity and Reliability

Validity in qualitative research is significantly impacted by reporting and describing the data in detail, including direct quotes from participants, and explaining the findings based on these quotes (Wiersma & Jurs, 2008; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). By thoroughly explaining the data analysis process and using direct quotations from the students' own words, the validity was accomplished. The letter "S" was used for each student when presenting direct quotations, numerical codes such 1, 2, 3, and 4 were used to indicate the submission order, and the letters "F" and "M" were used to indicate the gender. For instance, the male student who submitted the form first was assigned the code "S1M".

For reliability, an expert in curriculum and instruction was consulted. The expert was asked to group the students' opinions into appropriate categories. The expert's categories and those of the researcher were contrasted. The reliability formula proposed by Miles and

Huberman (1994) was used, and interrater reliability was calculated at 98%, exceeding the expected level (80%) recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994) and Patton (2014).

FINDINGS

ELT Students' Reflections on Explicit WCF in Writing Skill

ELT students' reflections on explicit WCF in writing skill were analyzed and grouped into two categories as (a) positive aspects and (b) negative aspects. The findings were given in Table 2.

Table 2. *ELT Students' reflections on explicit WCF in writing skill*

Positive Aspects
• Explicit WCF helps students to see their identified mistakes and correct them
• Explicit WCF helps students to revise the corrections not to make the same mistakes
• Explicit WCF helps students to improve themselves in writing
• Explicit WCF is easier to correct the mistakes
• Explicit WCF is more learner-oriented
Negative Aspects
• Explicit WCF prevents students learning the actual problem
• Explicit WCF prevents students dwelling on their mistakes
• Explicit WCF prevents students learning from their mistakes
• Explicit WCF prevents students improving themselves in writing
• Explicit WCF causes students to make the same mistakes
• Explicit WCF leads students just to correct their mistakes

Table 2 displayed that as positive aspects, explicit WCF helped students see their identified mistakes and correct them, as well as helping them revise the corrections not to make the same mistakes. For some students, explicit WCF was easier to correct the mistakes, was more learner-oriented, and helped them to improve themselves in writing. Some of the students' reflections were as follows:

S1M: In the first term, explicit feedback helped me learn how to write a well-organized paragraph. At the beginning of the first term, I wasn't able to arrange my paragraphs because I had never written a paragraph before. Thus, explicit feedback helped me to learn how I can arrange my sentences.

S7F: When we first started writing paragraphs in English, we benefited from explicit feedback a lot. It was easy for us to correct our mistakes in our assignments.

S10F: Explicit feedback helped me a lot because it was clear what and where my mistakes were. To be honest, I corrected my mistakes easily because they were stated by my

instructor, and I tried to learn the right ones. After learning what my mistakes were, I revised the corrections not to forget, and I was always careful not to make those mistakes again, so it worked for me. Since my instructor wrote the corrections for my mistakes when explicit feedback was applied, I was more careful in my following essays by taking those corrections into account.

Table 2 also showed that explicit WCF, as negative aspects, led students just to correct their mistakes, prevented them from learning the actual problem, dwelling on their mistakes, and learning from their mistakes. Explicit WCF caused them to make the same mistakes again, so it prevented them from improving themselves in writing. Some of the students' reflections were as follows:

S2F: In explicit feedback, you just correct your mistakes. You don't learn your own problem. I believe that in explicit style, you still keep doing your mistakes. However, in implicit style, you learn what the point is.

S5F: In explicit feedback, students don't think about their mistakes, but they just correct the mistakes which their instructor marks.

S16M: In explicit feedback, writing the corrections for my mistakes prevented me from thinking and improving myself. Because the correct form for my mistake was obvious, I did not dwell on it.

ELT Students' Reflections on Implicit WCF in Writing Skill

ELT students' reflections on implicit WCF were analyzed and grouped into two categories as (a) positive aspects and (b) negative aspects. The findings were given in Table 3. As positive aspects, implicit WCF led students to try to correct their mistakes on their own, to think about their problems/mistakes and to search for possible corrections. Implicit WCF also helped them improve themselves in writing, learn from their mistakes, learn permanently, learn their actual problem, not to make the same mistakes again, so it decreased the rate of making mistakes. Moreover, a few students reflected that implicit WCF helped them search from different sources, develop their research skills and get higher scores. Some of the students' reflections were as follows:

S12F: Implicit feedback helped me improve more as I thought more about my mistakes and tried more to correct them. I think implicit feedback was better in terms of improving students' writing skills.

S13F: In implicit feedback, students can think about their mistakes and learn from their mistakes. Moreover, it decreased our rate of making mistakes in the next assignments.

S14M: In the second term, implicit feedback helped me develop my writing. My first drafts were very basic and disorganized. After implicit feedback, I developed myself, and now I

am able to write well-developed and well-organized paragraphs and essays. To me, implicit feedback is better for a student who already know how to write a paragraph or an essay.

S15F: In implicit feedback, when it was not stated what my mistake was, I thought more and researched about it. I learned from my mistakes and wrote my own word/sentence. Therefore, I learned permanently, and I didn't make the same mistake again in my following assignments.

Table 3. *ELT students' reflections on implicit WCF in writing skill*

Positive Aspects
- Implicit WCF leads students to try to correct their mistakes on their own   - Implicit WCF leads students to think about their problems/mistakes   - Implicit WCF leads students to search for possible corrections   - Implicit WCF helps students to improve themselves in writing   - Implicit WCF helps students to learn from their mistakes   - Implicit WCF helps students to learn permanently   - Implicit WCF helps students to learn their actual problem   - Implicit WCF helps students not to make the same mistakes   - Implicit WCF helps students to search different sources   - Implicit WCF helps students to develop research skills   - Implicit WCF helps students to get higher scores   - Implicit WCF decreases the rate of making mistakes
Negative Aspects
- Implicit WCF causes students to have difficulty in finding what the problem is   - Implicit WCF causes students to have difficulty in finding where the problem is

Table 3 also displayed the negative aspects of implicit WCF. A few students reflected that implicit WCF caused them to have difficulty in finding what and where the problem was. These students' reflections were as follows:

S4M: In implicit feedback, since what I wrote were already correct for me, even if our instructor marked it, I could not find exactly what and where my mistake was.

S11M: My mistakes were not clear for me in implicit feedback. That's why it was hard for me to find the correct one and most of the time I couldn't understand my mistakes.

ELT Students' Reflections on More Effective Feedback in Writing Skill

ELT students' reflections on which written corrective feedback was more effective in writing skill were analyzed and grouped into three categories as (a) explicit WCF, (b) implicit WCF and (c) both. The findings were given in Table 4.

Table 4. *ELT students' reflections on more effective feedback in writing skill*

More Effective Feedback	f
Implicit WCF	8
Both Implicit and Explicit WCF	6
Explicit WCF	2

As given in Table 4, eight students reflected that implicit WCF was more effective than explicit WCF. While six students reflected that both feedback types helped them, only two students reflected that explicit WCF was more effective than implicit WCF. Some students' reflections were as follows:

S3F: When I compare explicit feedback and implicit feedback, implicit feedback is more beneficial to us because we, ourselves, find our mistakes, errors or what it is. We are English teachers of future and we should find our mistakes in our essays. Therefore, we can teach our students.

S6F: In the first term, explicit feedback helped us see our mistakes. I saw my mistakes and learned how to correct them. In the second term, I figured out my mistakes and how to correct them on my own. Both of them helped me. Because I didn't know how to correct mistakes, explicit feedback helped me learn how to correct my mistakes. With implicit feedback, I improved myself. I think implicit feedback is also helpful, and it improves students because it allowed me to see my mistakes while writing.

S9F: I could clearly see my errors and mistakes in explicit feedback. In this way, I was able to correct my constant mistakes. While learning how to write an essay, I think clearly pointing out our mistakes made it easier for us to learn. Because it's hard for me to learn two new things at the same time, so my mistakes being detected and informed made it easier for me to understand and comprehend them. I learned to find my mistakes by researching with implicit feedback. I tried to find out exactly what the problem was by searching different sources. It improved my research skills and allowed me to reinforce the topics. I learned how to write an essay in the first semester and improved my essays by researching my mistakes in the second semester, so I started to get higher scores. As a result, both styles of feedback improved me and

allowed me to make progress. First, I learned by the help of my instructor's leadership, and then, I learned to find my own mistakes and correct them following my instructor's path.

S12F: Explicit feedback helped me see my mistakes directly. It made me think about my mistakes, but actually, I did not think much. I mean it was not enough. Implicit feedback helped me improve more as I thought more about my mistakes and tried more to correct them. I think implicit feedback was better in terms of improving students' writing skills.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study showed that explicit WCF in writing skill helped students see their identified mistakes and correct them, as well as helping them revise the corrections not to make the same mistakes. For some students, explicit WCF was easier to correct the mistakes, was more learner-oriented, and helped them to improve themselves in writing. Likewise, Subon and Ali (2022) found out that students who receive explicit WCF are more likely to feel confident, at ease, and eager to study. The literature showed that explicit WCF led to gaining or improving greater accuracy, specifically grammar accuracy (Sheen, 2007; Zohrabi & Ehsani, 2014) and to higher rates of learner uptake, indicating that students were more likely to notice and incorporate the corrections when they were provided explicitly (Yu, 2022).

As negative aspects, explicit WCF led students just to correct their mistakes, prevented them from learning the actual problem, dwelling on their mistakes and learning from their mistakes. If students do not comprehend the reasons why their utterance was inaccurate, they are unable to adjust their hypothesis in a way that is supported by evidence, which might result in non-internalization of the revised form (Ryan, 2012). Another finding of the study is that explicit WCF caused students to make the same mistakes again, so it prevented them from improving themselves in writing. Similarly, in a study, students did not fully comprehend their mistakes and quickly forgot what had been addressed after receiving feedback (Zarei, Ahour & Seifoori, 2020). In addition, learners' writing performance would be more accurate grammatically if more explicit WCF was provided (Farahmand & Hatami, 2014).

The findings of the study reflected that implicit WCF in writing skill led students to try to correct their mistakes on their own, to think about their problems/mistakes and to search for possible corrections. Implicit WCF also helped them improve themselves in writing, learn from their mistakes, learn permanently, learn their actual problem, not to make the same mistakes again, so it decreased the rate of making mistakes. In addition, implicit WCF helped students search from different sources, develop their research skills and get higher scores. Similarly, implicit WCF led to better development of complexity and fluency (Subon, & Ali, 2022).

As negative aspects, implicit WCF caused students to have difficulty in finding what and where the problem was. In line with this finding, a study in UK revealed that implicit WCF allowed international students learning English to reorganize some problems, such as verb tense and punctuation; however, it was ineffective in helping students reorganize the structure of several phrases (Khadawardi, 2021). This may be resulted from students' cognitive bias or a mismatch between the feedback they receive from the instructor and the correction they make. Students may be perplexed by some factors, such as the difficulty they have in identifying inappropriate language use with implicit cues, their confusion over whether grammar errors are more important than meaning errors, and the likelihood that they will recognize the instructor's repetition of sentences as an attempt to explain meaning (Yu, 2022). On the other hand, the finding may stem from the student's lack of a thorough understanding of the language because according to Ferris (2002), there are two types of errors as treatable and untreatable. Treatable errors are those that students can correct with the help of a grammar book, such as verb tense agreement, article usage, pluralization, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling. Untreatable errors include word choice, word order, and missing or unnecessary words, and they require that the learners have a thorough understanding of the language.

The findings of the study indicated that half of the students thought implicit WCF was more effective than explicit WCF. The reason of this finding may be the fact that implicit WCF includes students in the correcting procedure (Lee, 2005). Like this finding of the study, in another study, students preferred implicit WCF to explicit WCF in writing (Ferris, 2002). Moreover, Yoshida (2008) found that in Japanese EFL courses, students strongly preferred to have an opportunity to reflect on their mistakes and come up with the appropriate forms before receiving corrective feedback from their instructors. Similarly, Abedi (2015) examined how Iranian EFL students felt about their teachers' oral error correction techniques and revealed that the students wanted indirect corrective feedback, but their teachers implemented direct corrective feedback techniques. Implicit WCF created better development of learners' implicit knowledge and production of pragmatic features (Nguyen, Pham & Pham, 2012).

Nearly half of the students reflected that both feedback types helped them. Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts and McKee (2000) also resulted that both feedback types helped the students in their study. In addition, a study found that explicit WCF led to greater improvement in grammatical accuracy than implicit WCF; however, both types of feedback showed positive effects (Wulf, 2021). Another study revealed that although explicit WCF was more effective in enhancing learners' explicit knowledge of grammar rules, both explicit WCF and metalinguistic explanation led to improvements in learners' implicit knowledge of grammar (Shintani, & Ellis, 2013).

In this study, only two students reflected that explicit WCF was more effective than implicit WCF. On the contrary, a study revealed that students preferred explicit WCF rather than implicit WCF (Amador, 2008). Moreover, another study found that both types of feedback led to improvements in learners' writing accuracy; nevertheless, explicit WCF group showed slightly higher accuracy gains. The literature showed that explicit WCF helped students promote their explicit knowledge of pragmatics rules (Nguyen, Pham & Pham, 2012), it was more effective in addressing specific error types, and it had a greater impact on learners' accuracy and overall test performance than implicit WCF (Subon & Ali, 2022). The findings of a meta-analysis study examining various studies on explicit WCF and implicit WCF indicated that explicit WCF had a larger effect size than implicit WCF across different learner levels and writing tasks (Li, 2010).

CONCLUSION

There is no consensus on which feedback is more effective than the other when comparing the effectiveness of explicit and implicit WCF although most studies point that explicit WCF is more effective as opposed to the findings of this study. The controversy between the finding of this study and other findings in the literature may be resulted from the different groups (experimental and control) in other studies. However, in this study, as mentioned before, the students experienced both types of feedback and their reflections projected a comparative perspective. According to some studies, explicit WCF is more useful in fostering correctness and explicit knowledge of grammatical rules, while other studies suggest that implicit WCF helps students build implicit knowledge and fluency. Thus, it is significant to take into account the unique qualities, preferences, and instructional circumstances of each learner. Depending on variables including competency level, task complexity, and the type of errors being targeted, individual learners may react differently to explicit and implicit WCF, and the effectiveness may also vary. Another reason of the controversy between the finding of this study and other findings in the literature may be the study group of this research because they were ELT students who would be teachers of English in the future, and their proficiency level was high.

Implicit WCF may be regarded as a learning strategy which requires the students to comprehend their errors or mistakes, find a correction, and carry it out independently. Hence, language teachers should benefit from it. It should be kept in mind that implicit WCF was found to help students in verbs, articles, spelling, punctuation and capitalization errors, but it lacks in word choice and sentence structure errors if teachers relied only on it. Explicit WCF provides enhanced accuracy, increased awareness of grammar rules and immediate error correction. However, implicit WCF increases self-correction, learner autonomy and attention to language

form. Therefore, learner characteristics, competency levels, task types, instructional contexts and the way feedback is implemented should be taken into consideration to choose appropriate feedback in teaching English in terms of writing skills. In short, a combination of both explicit and implicit WCF adapted to the needs of students may be the most effective way. Based on the results of the study, using explicit WCF first and implicit WCF later is recommended to help students improve their writing skill.

The current study has some limitations. First, the study was carried out with 16 voluntary ELT students in writing skill. Further research may be held with more ELT students or in speaking skill, and the findings may be compared. Second, the findings are restricted to written reflections of the students on explicit and implicit WCF in their own handwriting. Further research may collect data using individual or focus group interviews, which may broaden the findings.

REFERENCES

Abedi, D. (2015). Are Iranian EFL learners' opinions about oral corrective feedback strategies in line with their teachers' actual classroom practices? *International Researchers, 4*(2), 21-32.

Al Ajmi, S. (2015). The effect of written corrective feedback on Omani students' accuracy in the use of English prepositions. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6*(1),61-71.

Amador, Y. A. (2008). Learner attitudes toward error correction in a beginner's English class. *Revista Comunicacion, 29*(1), 18-28.

Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Muin, F. (2017). Students' preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English department of Lambung Mangkurat University academic year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 7*(3), 176-186.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Dadashi, M. (2011). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students' spelling errors. *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development, 13*(1), 129-137.

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

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

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education.* New York: Routledge.

Corder, S. P. (1974). Error analysis. In J. L. P. Allen & S. P. Corder, *Techniques in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 28*(2), 339-368.

Farahmand, A., & Hatami, A. (2014) The differential effects of implicit and explicit feedback on the grammatical accuracy of male EFL learners' writing. *The Iranian EFL Journal, 10*(3), 181-192.

Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of errors in second language student writing.* University of Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R., & Helt, M. (2000, March). *Was Truscott right? New evidence on the effects of error correction in L2 writing classes.* Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, Vancouver, B. C.

Ferris, D. R., Chaney, S. J., Komura, K., Roberts, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000, March). *Perspectives, problems, and practices in treating written error*. Colloquium presented at TESOL Convention, Vancouver, BC.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes, how explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161-184.

Granena, G., & Yilmaz, Y. (2018). Corrective feedback and the role of implicit sequence learning ability in L2 online performance. *Language Learning, 69,* 127-156.

Hadiyanto, S. (2019). The effect of computer-mediated corrective feedback on the students' writing. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning, 8*(2), 1-11.

Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skill. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences, 98,* 668-674.

Khadawardi, H. A. (2021). The effect of implicit corrective feedback on English writing of international second language learners. *English Language Teaching, 14*(1), 123-139.

Kim, J. H. (2019). Explicit written corrective feedback, language analytic ability, and L2 accuracy development. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 35*(2), 53-81.

Lee, L. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal, 22*(2), 1-16.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309-365.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mojtaba, M., & Ghandi, M. (2012). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' spelling errors. *English Language Teaching, 7*(8), 53-61.

Mujtaba, S. M., Parkash, R., & Nawaz, M. W. (2020). Do indirect coded corrective feedback and teachers' short affective comments improve the writing performance and learners' uptake? *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 36*(1), 34-47.

Nassaji, H., & Kartchava, E. (2017). *Corrective feedback in second language teaching and learning: Research, theory, applications, implications*. London: Routledge.

Nguyen, T. T. M., Pham, T. H. & Pham, M. T. (2012). The relative effects of explicit and implicit form-focused instruction on the development of L2 pragmatic competence. Journal of Pragmatics, 44(4), 4146-434.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri* (Çev. Ed. M. Bütün & S. B. Demir). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Ryan, L. (2012). *Students' attitudes towards corrective feedback in the second language classroom* (Unpublished Manuscript). Trinity College, University of Dublin, Ireland.

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

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*(3), 286-306.

Subon F., & Ali N. A. (2022). The effects of implicit written corrective feedback on ESL learners' writing skills. *Journal of Language and Education, 8*(4), 153-167.

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2008). *Research methods in education: An introduction* (9th ed.) Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Wulf, D. J. (2021). When written corrective feedback is ineffective in second-language grammar acquisition. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, *11*(4), 577-592.

Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78-93.

Yu, W. (2022). Explicit vs. implicit corrective feedback: Which is more effective? *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 653,* 647-650.

Zarei, M., Ahour, T., & Seifoori, Z. (2020). Impacts of implicit, explicit, and emergent feedback strategies on EFL learners' motivation, attitude and perception, *Cogent Education, 7*(1), 1727130.

Zohrabi, K., & Ehsani, F. (2014). The role of implicit & explicit corrective feedback in Persian-speaking EFL learners' awareness of and accuracy in English grammar. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98,* 2018-2024.