

**The Correspondence between  
Iraqi EFL Parapetory Schools Teachers And Students  
Perceptions Twored Corrective Feedback**

**Iftekhar Hamza Edan**

**Iftekhar Hamza [1207o@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq](mailto:1207o@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq)**

**English language Department\College of Education-Ibn Rushed for Human  
Sciences\ University of Baghdad\Baghdad, Iraq**

**Asst. Prof. Elaf Readh Khalil, Ph.D.**

**Professor, English Language Department, College of Education-Ibn Rushed –for  
Human Sciences, University of Baghdad/Baghdad, Iraq**

**Abstract:**

The existence of inconsistencies between teachers' practices and learners' preferences for corrective feedback in language learning arise in a not greatly effective learning environment. Teacher-student negotiation in terms of corrective feedback in language production has been studied in some ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts. However, there needs to be more studies in some other contexts. Therefore, this study aims to find out the similarities and differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about corrective feedback in an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context and provide educational implications in error treatment. For this purpose, 169 EFL teachers and 375 EFL students were administered a questionnaire for each, and the gathered data were analyzed with statistical procedures and descriptive qualitative analyses. Although it was found out that there are no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the importance of corrective feedback, there exist some differences in the findings of the data.

The research questions are:

1. What are the Iraqi EFL preparatory school teachers' perceive corrective feedback ?
2. What are the Iraqi EFL preparatory school students' perceive corrective feedback ?
3. What is the extent of Correspondence between the perception of teacher and student?

Accordingly the present study aims at :

- 1- Finding out Iraqi EFL Preparatory School Teachers' Perception of teachers' of corrective feedback .
- 2- Finding out Iraqi EFL Preparatory School Students' Perception of corrective feedback
- . 3- Finding out the correspondence between the teachers' and students' perceptions

The current study attempts to address this gap by examining the students' perceptions of corrective feedback (CF) and the teachers' perceptions toward CF and find out the correspondence between students' preferences and teachers' practices and their perceptions on CF in an EFL context, namely Iraqi fifth parapetory schools students and teachers.

The findings of the research are:

- 1-1. The agreement and positive perception of the teachers on the role of corrective feedback in improving the students' performance ,
- 2-The students got positive perceptions on the role of corrective feedback and find it of great help for their linguistic performance.
- 3-The highest correspondence level between the teachers and students perceptions is on the domain of the role of oral corrective feedback in the linguistic performance of the student , but the other type of corrective feedback, the written corrective feedback is of less level of correspondence.

Finally, some conclusions , recommendations and suggestions have been proposed .

## **Introduction**

### **1.1 The Problem and its Significant**

In an EFL context, learners may not be exposed to the target language as much as the ones in an ESL context because of the lack of authentic materials and native speakers. As a result of limited exposure to the second language samples, learners may fail to meet language principles and produce incorrect language (Gass, Behney & Plonsky, 2013).

There are some studies on comparison of students' and teachers' perceptions about writing assignments in ESL contexts (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010).

While there have been several studies examining the different aspects of the corrective feedback, one aspect which has not received much attention, which it deserves, is the correspondence between the teachers and students perceptions toward corrective feedback. Understanding what the learners want and what their perceptions are, will provide essential information to the language teachers on how the problem of corrective feedback should be dealt with in the EFL context.

Keeping this aspect of corrective feedback in mind the present study aims to fill this gap in the research literature. The result of this study will have important implications for language learning and teaching.

The word of feedback is usually applied to give some information to the writer that comes from the reader besides that the application of feedback is carried out in face-to-face activities, direct instruction, and is not carried out in written activities . Additionally, feedback is a crucial aspect in formative assessment process. Based on Brown, he stated that formative assessment is the provision of evaluations to students by teachers based on the process of forming their competencies and skills with the aim of helping them in their growth process to be better than before so giving feedback in learning process is very important.

Corrective feedback is one important thing that must be applied; it is very beneficial to improve students' achievement and students' motivation in learning process. Talking about feedback, John and Helen stated that one of the strongest influences on learning and achievement is about how students get feedback from teachers, but feedback is better to do for increasing students' achievement.

So corrective feedback aiming to correct the students mistakes but in different ways. In this study the perspective of both, teachers and student, will investigate and

the corresponding between them will find out. However, students' and teachers' perceptions about the value and meaning of written corrective feedback is still an overlooked area in L2 writing in EFL contexts.

Corrective feedback have always been popular in English as a foreign language (EFL) settings and their effectiveness in language learning have been widely debated. An increasing number of second language acquisition studies (SLA) indicate that there is a dilemma in the effectiveness of corrective feedback in terms of EFL teachers' and learners' perceptions. Although the effectiveness of corrective feedback a point at issue, there is not much research related to investigating the correspondences between the perceptions of teachers and students toward corrective feedback and wither there is correspondence between their perceptions or not.

Corrective feedback provides additional information to learners beyond whether or not their answers were correct, and is critical to the learning process. The complexity of corrective feedback ranges from simply supplying students with correct answers to explaining why an answer was correct or incorrect.

Therefore, this study aims to find out the similarities and differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about corrective feedback in Iraqi EFL context and provide educational implications in presenting the best and most beneficial form of corrective feedback In an EFL context, the negotiation between the student and teacher perceptions about the use of corrective feedback gains importance for better language acquisition.

It is the aim of this study to find out the gap between the perceptions of teachers and learners about corrective feedback in learning. English as a foreign language (EFL) and to find out the Correspondence between them .

Accordingly, this study tries to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the Iraqi EFL preparatory school teachers' perceive corrective feedback ?
2. What are the Iraqi EFL preparatory school students' perceive corrective feedback ?
3. What is the extent of Correspondence between the perception of teacher and student?

#### 4 The Value of the Study

This study hops to be of value to:

1. Educators, Academics, researchers on ( corrective feedback ) who are interested in developing corrective feedback in the light of the findings
2. Provide practical recommendations to stakeholders, who are concerned with education in general and preparatory school in Iraq in particular, about the importance of utilizing the relationships between the variables and the Correspondence between the teachers perceptions and the students in future.

3. Study findings and recommendations would help educational institutions to make policy changes related to teaching and learning in corrective feedback, teacher and student perceptions toward corrective feedback.

### 1.6 Definitions of Basic Terms.

The following terms are going to be defined:

#### 1.6.1. Correspondence

The word correspondence literally means "Connection between two things; the fact of two things being similar There Is a close correspondence between the two extracts". Oxford Dictionary

#### 1.6.2. Perception

The word of perception comes from the Latin words of perception and percipio, the meaning of perception is receiving, collecting, action of taking possession, apprehension with someone's mind and sense

#### 1.6.3. Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback is defined as a kind of negative feedback and includes a reply to a learner's incorrect language productions (Ellis, 2009) .

Corrective feedback is defined as responses to learner utterances with an error (Baleghizadeh & Rezaei, 2010).

## 2..Literature review and Previous Studies

### 2.1. Historical background of corrective feedback

The history of corrective feedback CF development from 1950s to the new millennium and to present a review of CF in English language teaching is important to make a good understanding of it . In the late 1950's and

1960's increased political, educational and occupational opportunities for communication among countries created a demand for oral proficiency in foreign languages.

#### 2.1.2. The Concept of Corrective Feedback

Feedback is a concept as a means of information provided by an agent.

Corrective feedback is a term used to indicate that there is something wrong in the learners' utterance, and some change should happen or correction must be adjusted in order to make it more target-like.

The definition is the teacher of aspects of a person's performance or understanding of something .Feedback can broadly be seen as essential to promote and consolidate learning on students' mastery of the material, and this significance has also been recognized by those working in the field of learning a foreign and second language .

#### 2.1.2. The nature of corrective feedback.

Schmidt (2001) declared "People learn much about the things that they attend to" (p. 30). Schmidt hypothesized that if input is noticed it becomes intake in language acquisition. This hypothesis proposes that negative feedback by noticing the

gap between inter-language forms and target forms helps learners to develop inter-language.

Corrective feedback differs in accordance with the extent to which it is implicit or explicit. In implicit error correction teachers do not tell the students they made mistakes, while in explicit feedback there is an overt indication of committing errors. Implicit feedback regularly takes the shape of recast where “the teacher first repeated a learner utterance with an error, highlighting the error through emphasis, and then, if this did not result in a learner selfcorrection, the teacher recasts the utterance using the correct form” (Ellis 2008, 884).

According to the Ellis, Loewen, and Erlam (2006) recasts and explicit corrective feedback strategies can also be different in providing implicit or explicit learning. However, Long (2006) said that recasts, because of their implicit nature, assist acquisition. For Long recasts connect linguistic form to meaning in discourse contexts that encourage noticing or rehearsing in short-term memory (i.e., micro processing) required for implicit language learning. Doughty (2001, cited in Ellis et al., 2006)p.340 argued that “recasts constitute the ideal means of achieving an immediately contingent focus on form and afford a cognitive window in which learners can rehearse what they have heard and access material from their interlanguage” (p. 340).

Such a prospect is questionable, first because assuming all recasts as implicit as Long (2006) and Doughty (2001) believed is not assured (Ellis et al., 2006). Students can be taught how to make different decisions, (R. K. Elaf, 2022). Second, recasts can simply assist acquisition on the assumption that learners notice the modifications that have been made to their own utterances, and this is not happening on all occasions (Ellis et al., 2006). Lyster (1998) pointed out that the level of repair in uptake following implicit and explicit types of feedback is not the same and it is remarkably low following recast. Lyster’s findings were confirmed by Sheen (2004).

### 2.3.Types of Feedback

Based on Department of Education and Communities of State of New South Wales divides ten types of feedback such as:

- Corrective feedback(oral feedback and written feedback),
- Feedback during learning,
- Feedback after learning,
- Evaluative feedback,
- Descriptive feedback,
- Informal feedback,
- Formal Feedback,
- Peer feedback, • self-feedback .

#### 2.3.1.Types of corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is the activity in teaching Learning process that teacher gives correction to students’ error. The activities of students error like error in piece of grammar, a pronunciation exercise, or vocabulary

Enhancement . There are two types of corrective feedback;

### 2.3.1.1.Oral corrective feedback

For EFL students, making errors in using the target language is very common. Fidan (2015:1311) says that errors by an EFL student in using the target language are 'unavoidable'. In addition, Brown and Rodgers (2002) also state that almost all language learners produce errors in learning/using a new language. This is because English is not the first language that the students use in daily life. In addition, in the EFL context, they get very little exposure to the target language because it is only taught in school as part of the national curriculum, and there is minimal opportunity to use it in daily society. Even worse, they are not even given enough time to practice the target language in the classroom. Therefore, their teacher will be the primary source to correct any errors. Hedge (2000) claims that feedback or error correction from the teacher is needed when there is limited exposure to the target language. Brown (2001) asserts that students rely on the teacher in most EFL classes because they have very little feedback from their society.

Feedback, particularly corrective feedback, is one of the ways to improve a student's ability in using a target language. Gibbs and Simpson (2004) have claimed that feedback can:

Correct errors, develop understanding through explanations, generate more learning by suggesting further specific study tasks, promote the development of generic skills by focusing on evidence of the use of skills rather than on the content, promote meta-cognition by encouraging students' reflection and awareness of learning processes involved in the assignment and encourage students to continue studying (pp. 20-21).

٢,٢,٣Types of Oral Corrective Feedback .

The Support given by a teacher to the learners regarding their spoken errors. Lyster & Ranta (1997) divided OCF types into 6 major categories, ranging from implicit to explicit according to the division of Sheen & Ellis (2011)

Lyster and Ranta (1997) have done an observational study on corrective feedback used by four teachers in four French Immersion classrooms at primary level schools In Canada. According to them, there are six different types of corrective feedback supplied by those teachers :

1. **Explicit correction,**
2. **Recasts,**
3. **Clarification requests,**
4. **Meta-linguistic feedback,**

In addition, there are two more types of feedback: translations (as claimed by Panova and Lyster (2002)) and paralinguistic signs(Ellis, 2007)). Therefore we classify eight types of corrective feedback as discussed

Sheen and Ellis's (2011) taxonomy continues to keep the six OCF types introduced by Lyster and Ranta (1997) and the categorization by Ranta and Lyster (2007) but presents nine types as follows :

### 2.2.3.1. Recasts

Recasts involve reformulating students' erroneous utterance. The reformulated utterance may correct part or students' utterance. S: The cats is fat.

### ٣,٦,١,٢ Repetition

Repetition is mimicked utterance of whole

Or part of the students' erroneous utterance. It is a way of trying to elicit students to provide the correct form

### ٢,٢,٣,٤ Metalinguistic clues

Metalinguistic clues are metalinguistic comments without the correct form given to encourage students to correct their own errors.

### ٢,٢,٣,٣ Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation

(i.e. in addition to signaling an error has been committed and providing the correct form, there is also a metalinguistic comment) .

### 2.2.3.2. Explicit correction only.

Explicit correction provides the correct form with clear signal to students that they have made an error.

### Written corrective feedback WCF

The literature on L2 learning has continuously shown varying positions regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback on errors. As early as the 1970s, research has questioned the value of error correction (in ESL learning in general and in ESL writing), and a rift was created in the field of second- or foreign-language teaching as to whether error correction is useful. With respect to error correction in writing (WCF), some early research found it to be ineffective for the most part (e.g., Hendrickson, 1977, 1980; Hillocks, 1982; Lalande, 1982; Robb et al., 1986; Semke, 1984), while several other studies found that different types of error correction in L2 writing can be useful (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Dulay & Burt, 1977; Kennedy, 1973; Krashen, 1977; Krashen & Selinger, 1975).

### .Usefulness of different types of CF

Teachers considered elicitation, repetition and explicit correction to be the most effective OCF for language learning (Kirgoz & Agcam, 2015). In terms of students' perspective, metalinguistic feedback and explicit feedback are the most useful OCF, while repetition and clarification requests were the least useful OCF (Kagimoto & Rodgers, 2008). Many students considered clarification requests were ambiguous and useless in assisting to comprehend the errors they had made (Ölmez-Öztürk &

Öztürk, 2016). This hinders the development of efficient reading in the FL, for there is a strong transfer of reading habit from one language to another. (Sundus A.J. 2022). There are discrepancies between the teachers and students' perceptions towards the usefulness of different CF types according to the several previous findings.

### 3.1 Research Methodology

This study was conducted using non-experimental ,qualitative methodology with a correlational design.

A correlation methodology has been applied in the present study

A descriptive research The methodology involved in the current study is the descriptive one.

According to Johnson and Christensen (2019), the primary purpose of a descriptive study is to provide an exact description of the characteristics of a phenomenon.

Descriptive methodology falls into different types, among them is the survey research which is employed in the present study.

Mills and Gay (2019) define survey research as an instrument for collecting data that identify one or more features of a given group.

A questionnaire is used to collect data for a survey by asking members of a population a set of questions.

That involves the conformation whether ,and to what degree ,the correspondence between two perceptions could occur.(Gay et al , 2012, p.204)

In the current study the correlational research determines whether the two perceptions are of the same direction or they in opposite directions.

### 3.2 Population and Sample

Population refers to a group of individuals or organization that could be involved in the study (Blankenship ,2010,p.82).

According to Kumar (2011), the population refers to the persons from whom the sample is drawn in order to collect the necessary data and answer the study questions.

For any research study, a sample refers to the items, events, or people that represent the characteristics of the larger group from which the sample was drawn (Mills & Gay, 2019).

The population of the present study involves Iraqi EFL fifth preparatory school students and teachers in Baghdad governoret . The total number of the teachers' population 301 while the total number of the students' population is (15731).

To achieve the aims of the study, two samples have been selected.

The first one is the sample of teachers which include 169 teachers from different preparatory schools in Baghdad governoret.

The second one is the sample of students which involves 375 EFL fifth preparatory school students in Baghdad, chosen from different preparatory schools .

### 3.3.Instruments Of The Study



To achieve the aim of the current study , two questionnaires have been developed from:

- The teachers 'questionnaire developed from Fukuda (2004), Agudo (2013), and Katayama (2007).
- The students' questionnaire developed from ( Samuel & Akther)

### **3.3.1.Validity of the study instruments**

Validity is one of the key qualities that must be taken into account in accordance with (Taherdoost, 2016), Validity refers to the extent to which a research instrument truly performs its intended function .

### **3.4.The Reliability Of The Study Instruments**

Similar to validity, reliability is an important component of any good instrument. It refers to the consistency of score measurements across numerous times (Cook and Beckman, 2006).

### **3.3. Mathematical and Statistical Means of The Study**

To accomplish the aim of this study, the data extracted from the questionnaire were analyzed and processed by relying on the computer, and using the statistical package for social sciences (spss).

## **4.Results, Conclusions, Recommendations, and Suggestions**

### **4.1 Presentation of Results**

The results are shown and presented in four main parts according to the aims of the study. In order to manipulate the collected data, the following statistical procedures have been employed:

The mean scores and standard deviations are used to determine the perceived/unperceived and preferred/unpreferred items.

- 1- As for the teachers' questionnaire, the theoretical mean 3 is considered the mean criteria that distinguish the perceived and the preferred items. The items that gain the theoretical mean score of 3 and above are considered to be perceived or preferred, whereas, the items that receive a theoretical mean score below 3 are regarded as unperceived or unpreferred. While, for the standards' questionnaires, the theoretical mean 2.5 is viewed as the criteria that determine the perceived and the preferred items.
- 2- The items of the questionnaires have been sorted according to their respective component rankings. The items are arranged from highest mean score to lowest mean score.

Nevertheless, the data collected from the administration of each questionnaire is presented and discussed according to the questionnaire components, and then generally.

## **.Conclusions**

In the light of the study findings are the following :

1. Teachers perceptions is positive on the importance of corrective feedback especially written corrective feedback in improving the written performance of the students.
2. Teachers indicate that student error should be corrected, wather written or oral for the impact of the corrective feedback in developing the students linguistic abilities.
3. Students perceptions is positive and of a great agreement on the role of corrective feedback in improving their language acquisition
4. There is no agreement between the perceptions of teachers and students on the role of written feedback in improving written performance, as students are more in agreement than teachers on the role of written feedback in improving written performance,
- 5..The level of correspondence between the perceptions of teachers and students on the role of oral corrective feedback in the student's linguistic performing more highe than the teachers on the role of oral corrective feedback in the linguistic performance of the student,

## **4.5 Recommendations**

In view of the study results and conclusions ,the following recommendations are stated:

- 1-To overcome the mismatching between the perceptions of teachers and students towards corrective feedback, teachers should take in consideration that the students come from different backgrounds with different knowledge about the English language therefore it is essential for teachers to understand the level of their students inorder to make the best way of presenting the most penefici kind of corrective feedback..
- 2-The use of materials and technology is highly effective in focusing the students` attention especially students at the parapetory level since they are still teenagers which requires more colorful and advanced technological tools like drawn pictures ,charts or OHP.
- 3-The implementation of corrective feedback is recommended to be integrated with other topics within and during the activities, in order to make the students more aware of the importance of their errors

4-The students` when studying English their biggest problem is to avoid anxiety to improving language proficiency this make them anxious and nervous during testing and daily tasks therefore teachers are recommended to help the students be more confidant in speaking ,writing and understanding what they hear in the class through a varity of ways like creating a positive atmosphere where punishment and aggressive interaction doesn't occur this makes the students more encouraged to learn.

5-when students make an errors it is important for teachers to tolerate their errors and consider them part of their learning process.

6-Teachers should encourage the students to be exposed to more materials rather than the textbook only that is providing the class with stories magazines or simple books that suits the level of the students to provide more domain for corrective feedback

.7-To increase chances for peer corrective feedback encouraging students to work together as groups or in pairs since its very helpful for the students` to learn with their other classmates and test each other.

#### **4.6.Suggestions for Further Studies**

1.The Correlation Between Iraqi EFL Teachers and Students Perceptions Toward Assessment and Corrective Feedback .

\_The Relationship Between Corrective Feedback and Error .

The Correlation Between Corrective Feedback and Productive Skills.

The Correlation Between Corrective Feedback and Receptive Skills .

#### **References**

- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. System, 31(2),

217-230. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346->

251X(03)00021-6

- .K., Elaf (2022). "The Effect of Cognitive Strategies on Iraqi EFL College Students' Writing Anxiety". Journal of the College of Education for Women, University of Baghdad, vol. 33, no. 4, Dec. 2022, pp. 27-39, doi:10.36231/coedw.v33i4.1633

- Jean, G. & D. Simard (2011). Grammar learning in English and French L2: Students' and teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals* 44.4, 465–492.
- Jeon, M., & Kang, I. (2005). Investigating student preferences in error correction in Korean-language teaching. *American*
- Lindsay, P. H., & Norman, D. A. (2013). *Human information processing: An introduction to psychology*. Academic press .
- 
- Blake, R. and Sekuler, R., 2006. *Perception*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Blake, R. and Sekuler, R., 2006. *Perception*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Krebt, D.M. (2017). The Effectiveness of Role Play Techniques in Teaching Speaking for EFL College Students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 8(5):863. DOI:10.17507/jltr.0805.04. University of Baghdad.
- Lai, H. M., Hsiao, Y. L., & Hsieh, P. J. (2018). The role of motivation, ability, and opportunity in university teachers' continuance use intention for flipped teaching. *Computers & Education*.
- Liew Kok-Pun, Michael (1981). Design of secondary schools: Singapore a case study. *Educational Building reports*. Volume 17: UNESCO. p. 37. Archived from the original on 201704-04. Retrieved 3 April 2017.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.
- DELLA SINTIA, S. D. (2021). *ENGLISH TEACHERS' PERCEPTION TOWARD OF THE MOST APPLIED TEACHING METHOD IN CLASSROOM* (Doctoral dissertation, INSTITUT AGAMA ISLAM NEGERI PALOPO).
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Musallam, R. (2010). The effects of using screencasting as a multimedia pre-training tool to manage the intrinsic cognitive load of chemical equilibrium instruction for advanced high school chemistry students. PhD Dissertation. The University of San Francisco, USA.
- Abbas S., & Shaymaa Abdulbaqi Al-bakri, S. A. (2018). The Effect of Pair Writing Technique on Iraqi EFL University Students' Writing Performance and Anxiety. *Arab World English Journal*, 9 (2). DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no2.2>
- Yamarik, S., 2007. Does cooperative learning improve student learning outcomes? *Journal of Economic Education*. 38(3), 259– 277. Available at:

- <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2326597>      <https://doi.org/10.3200/JECE.38.3.259-277>
- Amrhein H.R. & Nassaji H. (2010) Written Corrective Feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied linguistics*, 13, 95 – 127.
  - Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language* 227-257. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(00\)00027-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8)
  - Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2008). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching Research*, 12, 409-431. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089924>
  - Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 191-205.
  - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>
  - Brown. A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching: A comparison of ideals. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 46-60.
  - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00827.x>
  - Cathcart, R. L., & Olsen, J. E. W. B. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for error correction of classroom conversation errors. In J. F. Fanselow and R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '76: Selections based on teaching done at the 10th annual TESOL convention* (pp. 41-53). Washington: TESOL.
  - Al Saadi, Shatha & H. Shahad, (2016). Investigating Iraqi EFL College Students' Multiple Intelligences, *Journal of the College of Education for Women University of Baghdad*, Volume, 27. Issue, 1.
  - Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of 12 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
  - Chenoweth, N. A., R. Day, A. E. Chun & S. Luppescu (1983). Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 79–87.
  - <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100000310>
  - Clark, H., & Ouellette, M. (2008). Students' noticing and incorporation of written feedback: A snapshot of ESOL writing instructors' commentary on adult ESOL students' essays. Master's Thesis, University of Texas.
  - Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESL Canada Journal*, 23, 28-43.

- Dulay, H. C., & Burt, M. K. (1977). Remarks on the creativity in language acquisition. In M. Burt, H. Dulay and M. Finochchiaro (Eds.), Viewpoints on English as a second language (pp. 95-126). New York: Regents Publishing Company.
- Sundus A.J. Kamil, (2022). Investigating Strategies Developed by University Students in Learning English Vocabulary. AL-USTATH JOURNAL FOR HUMAN& SOCIAL SCIENCES FOR HUMAN& SOCIAL SCIENCES Volume, 61, Issue.4, pages, 101—119.
- Ellis, R. (2007). The differential effects of corrective feedback on two grammatical structures. In A. Mackey (ed.), 339 360.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. System, 36, 353-371. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2008.02.001>
- Farahani, A., & Salajegheh, S. (2015). Iranian teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom oral errors: Opinions and responses. Argentinian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1, 14-25.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. TESOL Quarterly, 31, 315-339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588049>
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second language Writing, 10, 161-184. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(01\)00039-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(01)00039-X)
- Garrett, P., & Shortall, T. (2002). Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student- centered classroom activities. Language Teaching Research, 6, 25-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1362168802lr096oa>
- Gass, S. & K. Lewis (2007). Perceptions of interactional feedback: Differences between heritage language learners and non-heritage language learners. In A. Mackey (ed.), 79–99.
- Green, J. M. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? Modern Language Journal, 77, 1-10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1993.tb01938.x>
- Han, J., & Jung, J. K. (2007) Patterns and preferences of corrective feedback and learner repair. Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics, 23, 243-260.
- Hartshorn, K. (2008). The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. Master's thesis, Brigham Young University.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learning receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 3, 141-163. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743\(94\)90012-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(94)90012-4)
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1977). Error analysis and selective correction in the adult ESL classroom: An experiment. ERIC

- Hillocks, G. Jr. (1982). The interaction of instruction, teacher comment, and revision in teaching the composition process. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 16, 261-278.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(98\)90017-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(98)90017-0)
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(03\)00021-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6)
- Jean, G. & D. Simard (2011). Grammar learning in English and French L2: Students' and teachers' beliefs and perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals* 44.4, 465– 492.
- Jeon, M., & Kang, I. (2005). Investigating student preferences in error correction in Korean-language teaching. *American*

**افتخار حمزة عيدان**Iftexhar Hamza [1207o@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq](mailto:1207o@ircoedu.uobaghdad.edu.iq)**كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية - جامعة بغداد / قسم اللغة الإنكليزية****أ.م.د. إيلاف رياض خليل****جامعة بغداد/ كلية التربية ابن رشد للعلوم الإنسانية/ قسم اللغة الإنكليزية****الملخص:**

إن وجود تناقضات بين ممارسات المعلمين وتفضيلات المتعلمين للتغذية الراجعة التصحيحية في تعلم اللغة هو المشكلة الأساسية التي تواجه تطبيق التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية في البيئة التعليمية تمت دراسة التفاوض بين المعلم والطالب من حيث التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية في إنتاج اللغة في بعض سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة ثانية . ومع ذلك ، يجب أن يكون هناك المزيد من الدراسات في سياق آخر لذلك ، تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة أوجه التشابه والاختلاف ومدى التوافق بين تصورات الطلاب والمعلمين حول التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية في سياق اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية وتقديم الآثار التعليمية في معالجة الأخطاء .

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى معرفة تصور معلمي المدارس الإعدادية العراقية للتغذية الراجعة التصحيحية . أيضا لمعرفة تصور طلاب المدارس الإعدادية العراقية من ردود الفعل التصحيحية . وأخيرا لمعرفة التوافق بين تصورات المعلمين والطلاب كلاهما من ردود الفعل التصحيحية.

لهذا الغرض ، تم إعطاء ١٦٩ مدرسا للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية و ٣٧٥ طالبا للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية استبياناً لكل منهم ، وتم تحليل البيانات التي تم جمعها بإجراءات إحصائية وتحليلات نوعية وصفية. سيتم اختيار عينة عشوائية من معلمي وطلاب المدارس الإعدادية في محافظة بغداد. سيتم التعامل مع البيانات التي تم الحصول عليها بشكل ثابت .سيتم استخدام نوعين من الاستبيانات لقياس تصور الطلاب والمعلمين للتغذية المرتدة التصحيحية ، الأول لمعلمي المدارس الإعدادية والآخر لطلاب المدارس الإعدادية. توضح نتائج استبيان المعلمين الاتفاق والإدراك الإيجابي للمعلمين حول دور التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية في تحسين أداء الطلاب.

توضح نتائج استبيان الطلاب أن الطلاب يريدون تصحيح أخطائهم على الفور . يريد الطلاب تصحيح أخطائهم الشفوية أكثر من رغبتهم بتصحيح أخطائهم الكتابية.