An Investigation into the Beliefs of Primary School Teachers in Bhutan on Written Corrective Feedback

Sonam Lhamo[1] iD **, Patchara Boonteerarak[2]*** iD

[1]*Hongtsho Primary School, Thimphu, Bhutan*
[2]*TESOL Department, The International College, Payap University, Thailand*

Abstract

For ESL students in English language classrooms, writing poses a challenge, where students commit numerous errors, however effective corrective feedback from teachers can aid improvement. Consequently, teachers must recognize their viewpoints on the best methods for providing written feedback. In light of this, this study intended to ascertain the opinions of Bhutanese primary school teachers, specifically those who teach students in grades PP to VI, regarding written corrective feedback (WCF). The interaction hypothesis, which serves as the theoretical basis for this study, contends that classroom interaction, essential to language acquisition includes teachers' corrective feedback. A questionnaire was distributed to ten English teachers to get more insight into their perspectives on WCF. The Likert Scale was employed to measure teacher's responses to the closed-ended questionnaire. The results demonstrated that nearly everyone had favorable opinions about written corrective feedback on students' work. The results implied that to give teachers and students more knowledge and awareness of WCF, they should both have the chance to participate in training related to feedback. Hence, language teachers would be able to provide students with a suitable WCF to help students enhance their writing skills.

Keywords: Bhutanese primary teachers, teachers' beliefs, written corrective feedback

Introduction

Over the last several decades, Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) in second language writing has had a long and argumentative history in the fields of L2 writing and second language acquisition (Alkhatib, 2015). Feedback is critical in writing classrooms for teacher-student

---

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: patchara.boonteerarak@gmail.com

discussions about students' writing as well as for students to improve their writing. One of the most difficult tasks facing English writing teachers is delivering feedback (Ferris, 2007). Similarly, it is also considered that providing corrective feedback on student writing is one of the writing teacher's most difficult tasks (Enginarlar, 1993). Because it is the most time-consuming activity, providing WCF on students' work may be a very difficult and unpleasant process for teachers (Ferris, 2007; Jiang & Zeng, 2011). Providing WCF can also be difficult for teachers who believe they are not well-trained or don't have the necessary understanding of WCF approaches (Guenette & Lyster, 2013). Furthermore, teachers of writing face irritation and difficulty due to a lack of general agreement among scholars on the effect, quantity, styles, or tactics for offering feedback.

Despite ample evidence supporting the efficacy of written corrective feedback, some teachers maintain skepticism regarding its positive effects, yet still advocate for the necessity of correcting their students' grammar errors (Guenette & Lyster, 2013). After Truscott published his article "The Case Against Grammar Correction" in 1996, there has been some discussion regarding the usefulness of written corrective feedback in the classroom (Ferris, 1999). Even so, teachers still react negatively to students' writing mistakes (Santa, 2008). The traditional concept that a teacher's role is to transmit knowledge from the curriculum to the learners has been replaced by a recognition that teachers have complex mental activities that determine what and how they teach, according to Nation and Macalister (2010). Teachers' actions in the classroom are influenced by their beliefs. According to Junqueira and Payant (2015), the relationship between L2 writing teachers' beliefs and practices when responding to students' writing is still understudied and requires further investigation. Furthermore, while the ineffectiveness of WCF on student writing has received a lot of attention, there has been little research on teachers' opinions towards WCF, particularly in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). When looking into teachers' professional preparation and teaching techniques, it's important to understand the structure of their beliefs (Ashton, 1990; Fives & Buehl, 2012).

The previous research, according to Lee (2016), was not focused and offered only a limited image of instructors' WCF performance, particularly for EFL teachers. Also, according to Storch (2018), numerous previous studies lacked validity since they ignored the influence of classroom reality, contextual factors influencing teachers' views and practices, and the reasons for probable mismatches between WCF beliefs and practices. The study of teachers' beliefs is important because, as Bazerman (1994) argued, even though students learn by themselves, it is the teacher, who creates better learning situations and guides them further. Hence, some recent requests to investigate WCF have prompted scholars to develop a comprehensive understanding of WCF as a situated activity rather than a singular event (Bitchener & Storch, 2016). To respond to these calls, the main purpose of this research is to look into Bhutanese teachers' WCF beliefs. Further, a great number of studies have focused on students' opinions on WCF, but just a few studies have taken teachers' beliefs into account.

Overall, WCF research is scarce in Bhutan (Jamtsho & Sherpa, 2020). Therefore, this current study aims to delve into this topic by investigating the teacher's beliefs towards the practice of WCF. As a result, a study of teachers' beliefs in written feedback, particularly among Bhutanese

primary school teachers, would be an excellent complement to existing research. Conducting this study would be especially useful for identifying what kind of professional support future teachers in Bhutan should receive to help them become more equipped to respond to student writers. The interaction hypothesis; providing feedback as a part of classroom interaction underpins this study.

The fundamental goal of this outcome is to provide a useful means to reveal Bhutanese primary teachers' views on WCF in students' writing. This type of research, as indicated by (Norouzian & Farahani, 2012), has the potential to expand educator's understanding as well as provide essential information regarding the many types of WCF, as well as a teacher's thoughts and behaviors toward WCF. The revelation of teachers' ideas as a result of this study may cause other teachers to reconsider how they think and see WCF. Teachers may become more aware of the various types of WCF and assess their own WCF practices. Teachers can also keep track of the different types of WCF available and learn how to use them in the classroom. Furthermore, the findings of this study could be used to raise curiosity among school officials or departments, encouraging them to hold lectures and writing workshops for other English language teachers in the school to help them improve their WCF skills. Even though this is a small-scale study, the findings could also be used by instructors who assign WCF to students' work as a guideline. The results of this study, for example, might be shared with the teacher's colleagues to raise awareness of how to include WCF in students' work. Specifically, the students are more likely to profit from their teachers' comments if they are familiar with WCF.

As a result, the researcher's decision to conduct this study is motivated by these factors.
The results of this study will also help L2 language educators better understand written feedback from the perspectives of teachers, contributing to the literature review of current research on L2 written corrective feedback. This descriptive study can provide a crucial foundation for future research on L2 concerning Bhutanese primary teachers' perceptions of written feedback.

Literature Review

This section examines literature related to the types of written corrective feedback and its benefits on students' writing, the beliefs and practices of teachers, and related studies on teacher's beliefs about students' writing.

1. Types of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF)

Errors are an unavoidable element of the language acquisition process and they can show up in the process of learning any language skill, including writing (Indrastana, 2018). This is because writing is a reflection of a student's linguistic ability, faults should be addressed in some way to improve their writing skills. The author also adds that as a result, the existence of error treatment provided by writing teachers is critical. According to Bloom (1970), as cited in (Ellis, 1993), both adults and children who want to know their native language and the target language make errors. The error is a process that is involved in how students learn and perceive new meanings. Unwelcomely, errors were once taken as unwanted forms (Ellis,1993). Errors are dangerous, according to the behavioristic approach, and should be eliminated by the teacher as

soon as possible to avoid the establishment of negative habits (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). Errors, on the other hand, are not considered as a sign of failure in the cognitivist perspective, but as a sign of progress in the learning process (Ellis, 2009). Errors are permitted and recognized as a natural part of the learning process in the communicative method (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011), therefore rapid corrective feedback is avoided. With these types of differences in the notion of errors, there are also some dissimilarities when it comes to corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is sometimes referred to as "error correction" or "grammar correction" in the literature (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Regardless of the terminology, corrective feedback is a complicated issue due to debates over whether to correct, what to correct, how to correct, and when to correct (Ellis, 2009).

There are several sorts of corrective feedback to mark students' writing, and the types of WCF teachers use are determined by the teachers' wishes and needs, according to reports (Lee, 2004). There are four primary sorts of WCF, according to Bitchener and Ferris (2012), which are primarily employed by teachers while editing students' writing. Direct WCF, indirect WCF, unfocused WCF, and focused WCF are the four basic forms of WCF. Apart from Bitchener and Ferris (2012), Ellis (2009) also gives a list of WCF utilized by instructors; Direct CF, Indirect CF, Metalinguistic CF, Unfocused CF, Focused CF, Electronic feedback and Reformulation (Ellis, 2009).

The following section will give a brief concept of most of the types of feedback from both Bitchener and Ferris (2012) and Ellis (2009) as all these types of correct feedback will be referred to in this study.

2. Direct versus Indirect WCF

According to Ferris (2003), Direct WCF, sometimes referred to as overt WCF, requires the teacher to identify and correct an incorrect sentence structure. This could be as simple as adding the correct form, which is typically shown above the error, or removing words or phrases that are not needed. With direct WCF, the teacher responds to the student's written work straightforwardly. In a student's written work, for instance, the teacher might provide the right word in place of a misspelled one. On the other hand, indirect WCF involves the teacher identifying a mistake in structure without offering a clear solution (Ferris, 2003). The student is then required to fix the mistake on his own. The inconsistency of indirect WCF differs can take many forms: highlighting the error, circling it, displaying the number of errors on the margin of the paper, or designating the error's location and type with a code (e.g. SP (Spelling)) (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Furthermore, the teacher does not edit the students' written work when using the indirect WCF; instead, they only offer clarification, an example, or a tip.

The usefulness of both direct and indirect WCF has been the topic of many research investigations, but the findings have been contradictory and unclear (Truscott, 2010).
Direct WCF has been found by some researchers (e.g., Bitchener et al., 2005) to be more effective than indirect WCF, particularly for less proficient students who need more information to identify and prevent more complicated errors, like mistakes related to syntactical structures or idiomatic phrases (Sherpa, 2021). On the other hand, other research has demonstrated that indirect WCF is more successful in improving learners' retention over time

(Lee, 2004). This is because indirect WCF involves students in a problem-solving procedure, which encourages them to identify and consider their mistakes more quickly (Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

3. Unfocused WCF versus Focused WCF

The feedback that covers all faults in students' writing is referred to be unfocused WCF also known as comprehensive WCF. Writing teachers have been observed to frequently employ a complete WCF approach (Ferris, 2007; Lee, 2004). The unfocused WCF approach, on the other hand, has been proven to place an undue load on teachers and demotivate pupils as their papers become clogged with corrections (Ferris, 2007). Focused WCF also known as selective WCF is a type of feedback that concentrates on a small number of mistakes. Several studies have indicated that selective feedback is useful for improving writing correctness (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). However, studies have raised concerns about focusing comments on only one or two errors, arguing that students can produce multiple errors in the same piece of writing, all of which require feedback (Van Beuningan, 2011). As a result, choosing several errors can be more practical and advantageous for students (Storch, 2018).

4. Teachers' Beliefs and Practices

Studying the beliefs of ESL teachers has grown in importance as a field of study; teaching is now perceived as thoughtful behavior rather than just a behavior term because teachers are proactive, analytical decision-makers (Mulati et al., 2020). There have been many definitions of beliefs and belief-related notions in the literature, which has generated some misunderstanding. Pajares (1992) says "The difficulty in investigating teachers' beliefs has been created by definitional challenges, weak conceptualizations, and differing understandings of beliefs and belief structures" (p.307). Borg (2001) also described teachers' beliefs as "a guide that the teacher follows, whether consciously or unconsciously, and that is demonstrated by the teacher's performance in the classroom" (p.187). As a result, the teacher's practice is his or her performance in the classroom. The teacher's beliefs are influenced by several elements, including the student's learning experience, the teacher's teaching experience, and the environment or scenario (Pajares, 1992). Teachers' beliefs, as well as the organizations and cultures in which they work, influence feedback, according to Hyland and Hyland (2006). Policy and Society (unequal authority relations), according to Casanave (2003), teachers' beliefs can play a substantial influence in locating and developing teachers' feedback practices. It can be "heavy in political substance" (Leki,1992, p. 125).

The Purnomo, Basthomi, and Prayogo (2021) study looked to investigate the perspectives of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instructors at universities and their actual uses in delivering WCF to the writing errors made by EFL university students. The study was based on 80 responses to a Google Form survey given to university EFL instructors with a range of teaching backgrounds from all over Indonesia. A correlational design was used for this investigation. Descriptive statistics and Pearson's correlation tests were used to analyze the data. According to the research, the majority of educators think it is important to provide students with a variety of written corrective feedback options. Additionally, the teachers applied many kinds of direct and indirect feedback techniques, and they hardly ever rectified

errors in their every aspect or modified sentences. It was also demonstrated that there was a strong correlation between the opinions of Indonesian EFL university lecturers and their practical applications when it came to the written correction of students' writing errors.

Sakrak-Ekin and Balcikanli (2019) undertook a mixed-method study to explore EFL instructors' beliefs about WCF and whether those beliefs are consistent with their classroom actions. This study asked 25 English instructors to fill up a questionnaire to learn more about their views on WCF. In addition, 175 students' writing assignments were collected, as well as an interview with five teachers. The majority of the instructors believe in the benefits of WCF, according to the study's overall conclusions. However, an examination of writing assignments revealed some inconsistencies in teachers' ideas.

Another study conducted by McMartin-Miller (2014) investigated the percentage of errors identified in students' work by second language instructors, as well as the causes for this. The study also sought to learn more about the students' perspectives on selective and comprehensive error correction. This study included three instructors and 19 students from Grant University, a large university in the United States. The researchers noticed that the three instructors' feedback on the students' writing was inconsistent. A comparative study was conducted by Ko (2010) to examine the similarities and differences between the perceptions of written feedback held by teachers of a second language (ESL) and foreign language teachers in North America. An online survey with questionnaires was distributed to 153 college instructors of Korean as a foreign language (KFL) and ESL to conduct the research study. The findings of this study revealed that KFL instructors favored thorough and direct comments in students' writing over ESL instructors who preferred selective and indirect input. Both the ESL and KFL teachers' practices were found to be vastly different.

The instrument used in Ko's research was a questionnaire that was fairly extensive in that it allowed language instructors to explain their respective beliefs and practices on written corrective feedback in great detail. This questionnaire was later used by Rajagopal (2015), as a result, the researcher decided to use Rajagopal's questionnaire in this study to examine Bhutanese primary teachers' beliefs and practices in WCF.

In this study, the terms teachers' beliefs and practices will be referred to Borg's (2001) definition as a "proposition which is consciously or unconsciously held and accepted as true by the individual" (Borg, 2001, p. 187). It is considered a guide that the teacher follows, whether consciously or unconsciously, and that is demonstrated by the teacher's performance in the classroom. As a result, the teacher's practice is his or her performance in the classroom.

4. Interaction Hypothesis

The Input Hypothesis, the Output Hypothesis, and the Interaction Hypothesis are three theories regarding second language acquisition that have been put forward in the field of applied linguistics (Halabieh, 2019). It responds to the essential components of a successful second language learning process. The Interaction Hypothesis, which Long (1985) put forth, serves as

the framework for conversational communication in language teaching and learning. In this approach, language learners can access comprehensible input, opportunities for improvement, and correction through dialogue. Furthermore, Long (1985) notes that the Conversation Hypothesis proposes that language learners engage in interaction, that is, negotiate meaning, to focus on the form and procedure of the input they receive. The term negotiation is new and significant to Long's perspectives. According to him, one of the interlocutors will simplify and paraphrase to make the necessary adjustments when there is a misunderstanding or difficulty in understanding. The changes enhance the comprehensibility of the input. By focusing on the connection between input, attention, and output, Long (1996) modifies this strategy in his version of the interaction hypothesis. Interactional modifications include things like clarification checks, confirmation checks, and comprehension checks (Long, 1983).

As a result, the Interaction Hypothesis proposes that interaction between a non-native speaker and a native speaker, as well as interaction among non-native speakers, generates an acute second/foreign language learning setting in which learners learn through meaning negotiation (Namaziandost & Nasri, 2019). In addition, research has demonstrated that input alone is ineffective in assisting language teaching and learning (Namaziandost & Esfahani, 2018). As a result, the Interactional Hypothesis is critical in strengthening language learners' writing skills through interaction. According to linguist Allwright (1984), interactions in second-language teaching constitute a fundamental aspect of pedagogy. Furthermore, according to Abbuhl (2021), interactions serve as a primary source of linguistic data, enhancing the learning process by stimulating active processing and development of original content in one's second language. Several other researchers have also indicated that interactions play an important role in language learning (Pearson, 2018).

To sum up, the interaction hypothesis, by Michael Long (1985) states that it is a theory of second-language acquisition that claims that face-to-face interaction and conversation promote the development of language proficiency. This hypothesis provides the theoretical framework for this study and is crucial in language learning.

Research Question

What are the levels of positive beliefs of Bhutanese primary teachers on written corrective feedback?

Methodology

This section includes the approach that was used to investigate the research question of this research. It also covers research design, population, sampling, data collection procedures, data collection instruments, and data analysis.

1. Research Design

According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), a survey research design involves systematically gathering information from a sample of individuals to understand their opinions, behaviors, or characteristics on a particular topic of interest. This method employs structured questionnaires

or interviews to collect data, allowing researchers to quantify responses and analyze trends and patterns within the sample population. Thus, as this study was a small-scale study online survey research is used to look into teachers' beliefs about written corrective feedback in students' writing. It was a quantitative strategy for getting data from teachers that involved posing a series of survey questions. Survey research designs are versatile and can be applied across various disciplines and research contexts, providing valuable insights into social, educational, and organizational phenomena (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

2. Population and Sampling

The population of the study was teachers of Bhutan who teach primary students ranging from classes PP to VI. According to (Creswell & Creswell, 2018), convenience sampling refers to a non-probability sampling process in which the chosen samples are based on the researcher's decision. Researchers also assume that by using good judgment, they can obtain a representative sample and save time and resources. Therefore, through this convenience sampling method, the participants selected for this study were 10 teachers from Hongtsho Primary School, one of the primary schools in the capital city of Bhutan. In this particular school, they were all teaching one of the primary subjects (English, Mathematics, Social Studies, or Science).

3. Data Collection Instrument

A questionnaire with 20 items was administered to investigate the beliefs of Bhutanese primary teachers' WCF about students' writing. This questionnaire was designed to measure the beliefs of Bhutanese primary teachers regarding written corrective feedback. The 20 items consisted of 10 positive and 10 negative items statements about the use of written corrective feedback. These statements were adapted from Rajagopal's (2015) study. For this study, beliefs regarding the use of written corrective feedback were operationally defined as the mean scores of responses to the 20 items, all of which employed the 5-Likert Scale with endpoints ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree.* The questionnaire was developed as a Google survey form. All questionnaire items were written in English.

In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to evaluate the measurement instrument's reliability. It evaluates how closely each item on a scale measures the same underlying construct, giving a measure of the consistency or reliability of the data. The questionnaires were administered to five primary school teachers of Lharing Primary School, one of the schools in the southern part of Bhutan. The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the measurement instrument was 0.72, indicating a high level of internal consistency among the items. This level of internal consistency provides confidence in the reliability of the results and supports the validity of research findings.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

The data collected from 10 respondents from the questionnaire that investigated Bhutanese primary teachers' beliefs about WCF in students' writings were analyzed using a computer program in the form of descriptive statistics data to answer the following research question.

RQ: What are the beliefs of Bhutanese primary teachers about written corrective feedback on students' writing?

In this research teachers' beliefs were operationally defined as 'Negative Beliefs' (Items 3, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 19, 20) and 'Positive Beliefs' (Items 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17,18) about WCF in students' writing. All of these items were imported into a computer program, after which analysis was performed in the form of descriptive statistics looking for frequency, mean, standard deviation, and percentage. For data interpretation, the mean score for 'Positive Beliefs' and 'Negative Beliefs' were compared to see which had a higher score and which had a lower score, and the beliefs were interpreted accordingly.

5. Data Collection Procedures

In this study, the questionnaire was developed as a Google survey form. To administer these questionnaires the participants were contacted via personal chat to explain the study's purpose and how they might participate. The teachers then agreed to take part by filling out the questionnaires online that were emailed to them. After distributing the questionnaire, all the respondents immediately submitted the filled forms within a day. As a token of appreciation, the researcher thanked all the respondents individually again through personal chat. The questionnaires were completed by all ten teachers.

Results

The results of the quantitative analyses of the questionnaires submitted by 10 Bhutanese primary teachers are presented in this section, which investigates their beliefs related to WCF.

Table 1

Positive Beliefs

Positive Beliefs	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	*M*	*SD*
1. One of the most important aspects of teaching second or foreign languages is giving feedback on students' writing.	10	4	5	49.0	4.90	0.31
2. Students' writing is improved by the written feedback provided by teachers.	10	4	5	47.0	4.70	0.48
5. Students enjoy reading written comments from their teachers on the tasks they are given.	10	2	5	40.0	4.00	0.94
7. Students believe that my written remarks are simple to understand.	10	3	4	36.0	3.60	0.51
9. I give my students advance notice of my written feedback policy so they can fully understand it.	10	2	4	36.0	3.60	0.84
10. I can give precise remarks on every problem with my students' writing.	10	2	4	35.0	3.50	0.84
14. The more years of teaching experience I have, the better I can answer students' writing.	10	2	5	45.0	4.50	0.97

Table 1 (Continued)

Positive Beliefs	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	*M*	*SD*
16. I lack the necessary skills to provide written feedback, so I need some training on how to give feedback.	10	4	5	45.0	4.50	0.52
17. Feedback should be given to students' work that addresses both its strong and weak points.	10	4	5	45.0	4.50	0.52
18. It's necessary to give feedback that is both encouraging and significant.	10	4	5	46.0	4.60	0.51

Table 1 shows the degree of agreement provided by Bhutanese primary teachers about their belief in written corrective feedback. From the 10 items classified as 'Positive Beliefs', item no.1 has the highest mean score with (X=4.90). In the case of the lowest, item no.10 has the lowest mean score with (X=3.50). Item no.1 asks the respondent whether they think that providing feedback on students' writing is important, while item no.10 asks the respondent if they can provide accurate feedback on any of their students' writing problems. One intriguing finding from this data is that the mean score for items 14, 16, and 17 is the same (X= 4.50 each). The mean score for the last two items (7 and 9) was also the same scoring (X = 3.50).

Table 2

Negative Beliefs

Negative Beliefs	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	*M*	*SD*
3. Responding to written work from students takes a lot of time.	10	2.0	5.0	37	3.70	0.94
4. Writing comments on student work is time-consuming.	10	3.0	5.0	39	3.90	0.73
6. Students frequently want additional feedback on their writing.	10	2.0	5.0	36	3.60	1.26
8. Depending on the situation at hand, my written feedback style varies significantly.	10	2.0	4.0	35	3.50	0.84
11. When I give negative written feedback to students about their writing, they become discouraged.	10	1.0	4.0	26	2.60	1.17
12. When asked to edit their papers based on my feedback, students lose their original ideas and thoughts in favor of implementing my recommendations.	10	1.0	4.0	25	2.50	1.17
13. Students who follow my feedback on revisions do so primarily to improve their grade rather than their writing.	10	4.0	5.0	45	4.50	0.52

Table 2 (Continued)

Negative Beliefs	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	*M*	*SD*
15. When I respond to student writing, I don't base my decisions on any particular beliefs or guiding principles.	10	1.0	4.0	21	2.10	0.73
19. I normally ignore students who don't respond to my feedback and stop giving them more.	10	1.0	2.0	15	1.50	0.52
20. Giving each student personalized feedback based on their needs is not important.	10	1.0	2.0	13	1.30	0.48

Table 2 shows the degree of agreement provided by Bhutanese primary teachers about their belief in written corrective feedback. From the 10 items classified as 'Negative Beliefs', item no.13 has the highest mean score with (X = 4.50). In the case of the lowest, item no.20 has the lowest mean score (X = 1.30). Item no.13 asks the respondents whether they agree or disagree that students after revising their written work according to the teacher's feedback, their main interest is in scoring a higher grade rather than in improving their writing. While item no. 20 asks the respondents if they agree or disagree with the idea that it is not necessary to provide individualized feedback according to the needs of every student.

Table 3

Teachers' Beliefs

Descriptive Statistics	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	*M*	*SD*
Positive	10	39.00	45.00	424.00	42.40	2.41
Negative	10	20.00	33.00	292.00	29.20	4.02
Valid N (listwise)	10					

Table 3 illustrates descriptive statistics in analyzing the overall data of 10 Bhutanese primary teachers about written corrective feedback. The responses from the questionnaire that consisted of 20 items (10 items each for both positive and negative beliefs) show the highest mean score for positive beliefs with (X = 42.40), while the mean score for negative beliefs is (X = 29.20).

Discussions

This research investigated the positive and negative beliefs of teachers about WCF through an online survey questionnaire that consisted of 20 items which were administered to 10 participants from Hongtsho primary school. The mean score of the degree of agreement with the 20 statements on the use of written feedback, which were categorized as Positive and Negative Beliefs, was used to operationalize beliefs about the use of written feedback for this study. Results revealed that Bhutanese primary teachers held predominantly positive beliefs, mirroring findings from previous studies by Purnomo, Basthomi, and Prayogo (2021) and

Sakrak-Ekin and Balcikanli (2019). Specifically, teachers viewed WCF as a valuable tool for raising students' awareness and reducing future errors, aligning with the overarching goal of WCF, as outlined by Hyland (2003), to foster error recognition and learning. These positive beliefs may also be shaped by organizational and cultural factors, as suggested by Hyland and Hyland (2006).

Moreover, all teachers felt a sense of responsibility to provide feedback and recognized its importance in students' writing skill development, echoing Bitchener's (2012) assertion about the role of language teachers in feedback provision. Additionally, the findings indicated that Bhutanese primary teachers embrace error as an inherent aspect of the learning journey, influenced by the communicative approach's acceptance of errors as part of the learning process (Larsen-Freeman & Anderson, 2011). Teachers expressed a preference for providing both positive and constructive individualized feedback, aligning with the interaction hypothesis proposed by Long (1985), which emphasizes learner engagement and negotiation of meaning through interaction, whether verbal or written. This inclination towards explaining corrective feedback approaches to students reflects a commitment to facilitating meaningful learning experiences and promoting learner autonomy.

To summarize, the levels of positive beliefs of Bhutanese primary teachers on written corrective feedback (WCF) on students' writing are notably high, as indicated by the results of the survey conducted in this research. The teachers demonstrated a strong inclination towards viewing WCF as a valuable tool for enhancing student learning and improving writing skills. Specifically, they expressed positive beliefs regarding the effectiveness of WCF in raising students' awareness of errors, facilitating error recognition, and ultimately contributing to the improvement of writing proficiency. Furthermore, the teachers acknowledged their responsibility to provide feedback to students and recognized the importance of feedback in the learning process. Overall, the findings suggest a prevailing sentiment among Bhutanese primary teachers that WCF plays a crucial role in supporting students' writing development and fostering a conducive learning environment.

Among the study's many findings, the most important were those concerning the training possibilities for writing comments. The study's most significant findings revealed that Bhutanese primary teachers believe they require additional training in teacher feedback because they lack sufficient knowledge of providing writing feedback. Similarly, Lee (2016) highlights the need to address a gap in teacher preparation to improve teachers' competence and writing competency when assessing students' work. Teachers need to receive training as well as guidelines from institutions so they can deliver WCF to learners more effectively (Pearson, 2018). Based on the idea that a more balanced approach to providing feedback is more effective, these findings correspond with the need to offer feedback-related training for individuals who are likely to teach writing programs. For them to understand the significance and effectiveness of feedback, teachers will therefore require training in this area.

From a pedagogical perspective, the findings indicate that while teachers acknowledge the value of WCF, there is a general agreement that students resubmit their work in an attempt to get higher grades rather than to improve their writing skills after receiving teacher feedback.

Therefore, there is a need for training at the institutional level where students can share their personal experiences and raise awareness.

Conclusion

The beliefs of Bhutanese primary teachers concerning WCF are investigated and described in this study. Although the findings suggest that teachers have good attitudes toward WCF, the majority of instructors were not well-trained or allowed to get the requisite skills. Administrators must therefore look into a range of techniques and strategies to better prepare writing instructors to provide feedback more effectively. It is important to investigate and record teachers' beliefs about providing feedback because it is a vital means of communication between educators and students regarding the work they have produced. It also helps all students to advance their writing. With WCF in hand and the relevant knowledge about teachers' beliefs, the teacher training institutes in Bhutan can take steps to improve teachers' ability to provide feedback to students. As mentioned by Borg, (2001), teacher's cognition (i.e., their thoughts, knowledge, and beliefs) must be investigated to fully comprehend teachers and their teaching.

Recommendations

A comprehensive longitudinal study involving classroom observations to evaluate teachers' views and behaviors, as well as their students' choices about WCF, could be conducted in the future. This type of research will yield more detailed results and allow for the tracking of any changes in instructors' attitudes and/or practices. Furthermore, future research should include questionnaires and interviews for both teachers and students to have a better understanding of their perspectives. In addition, in this study as the population included only Bhutanese primary teachers, future research could consider ample representatives from all levels (middle secondary and higher secondary teachers) to examine their beliefs about WCF. In addition, future studies looking into whether or not gender contributes to the process of written corrective feedback must include an equal number of male and female teachers.

Acknowledgment

References

Abbuhl, R. (2021). Interactionist approach to corrective feedback in second Language acquisition. *The Cambridge Handbook of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Learning and Teaching,* 44–64. doi:10.1017/9781108589789.003

Bitchener, J. (2012). Written corrective feedback for L2 development: Current knowledge and future research. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(4), 855-60.

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

Bitchener, J., & Storch, N. (2016). *Written corrective feedback for L2 development.* Multilingual Matters.

Borg, M. (2001). Teachers' beliefs. *ELT Journal, 55*(2), 186-188.

Casanave, C. P. (2003). Looking ahead to more socio-politically-oriented case study research in L2 writing scholarship: But should it be called "post-process"? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(1), 85-102.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches.* SAGE.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Ellis, R. (1993). The Structural Syllabus and Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 91.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*: Routledge.

Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(3), 165-193.

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.

Fives, H., & Buehl, M. M. (2012). Spring cleaning for the "messy" construct of teachers' beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined? What can they tell us? *APA Educational Psychology Handbook, 2,* 471–499.

Guenette, D., & Lyster, R. (2013). Written corrective feedback and its challenges for preservice ESL teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 69*(2), 129-153.

Halabieh, M. (2019). Corrective feedback from cognitive theories perspective (interaction hypothesis, output hypothesis, & noticing hypothesis). *International Conference on Business, Education, Innovation, and Social Sciences*, 64-69.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217-230. doi:10.1016/S0346-251X(03)00021-6

Indrastana, N. S. (2018). Written corrective feedback in teaching writing: A review of theory, research, and practice. *Journal of English in Academic and Professional Communication JEAPCo, 5*(1), 34- 42.

Jamtsho, Y., & Sherpa, S. Z. (2020). Written corrective feedback: Comparing Bhutanese middle secondary ESL students and teacher's perspective. *RABSEL-The CERD Educational Journal, 21*(2), 41-59.

Jiang, X., & Zeng, L. (2011). The efficacy of college English teacher written corrective feedback- An empirical study with a new perspective. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching,* (4), 56-61.

Ko, K. (2010). *Perceptions of KFL/ESL teachers in North America regarding feedback on college student writing* Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of philosophy, The Ohio State University

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2011). *Techniques and principles in language teaching.* Oxford University Press.

Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 285-312.

Lee, I. (2016). Teacher education on feedback in EFL writing: Issues, challenges, and future directions. *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(2), 517–527.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned. Oxford handbooks for language teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in SLA. In W. C. Ritchie and T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of SLA (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

McMartin-Miller, C. (2014). How much feedback is enough? Instructor practices and student attitudes toward error treatment in second language writing. *Assessing Writing*, *19*, 24-35.

Namaziandost, E., & Esfahani, R. F. (2018). The Impact of Writing Practices on Enhancing Productive Skills Among Pre-Intermediate EFL Learners. *ASEAN Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 10*(1), 61-80.

Namaziandost, E., & Nasri, M. (2019). A meticulous look at Long's (1981) interaction hypothesis: Does it have any effect on speaking skills? *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 6*(2), 218-230.

Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language curriculum design.* NY: Routledge.

Norouzian, R., & Farahani, A. A. K. (2012). Written error feedback from perception to practice: A feedback on feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *3*(1), 11-22.

Pearson, W. S. (2018). Written corrective feedback in IELTS writing task 2: Teachers' priorities, practices, and beliefs. *TESL-EJ*, *21*(4), 1-32.

Purnomo, W.W., Basthomi, Y., & Prayogo, J. A. (2021). EFL university teachers' perspectives in written corrective feedback and their actual applications. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 10*(3), 1089- 1099.

Rajagopal, N. (2015). *A teacher's written corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices* Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of master of English as a second language, University of Malaya.

Santa, T. (2008). *Dead letters: Error in composition.* Hampton Press.

Sakrak-Ekin, G., & Balcikanli, C. (2019). Written corrective feedback: EFL teacher's beliefs and practices. *The Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal, 19*(1), 114- 128.

Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, *51*(2), 262 277.

Truscott, J. (2010). Some thoughts on Anthony Bruton's critique of the correction debate. *System, 38,* 329–335.

Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2011). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning, 62*(1), 1–41.