Abstract

This study aimed to compare the effects of two types of written feedback, direct only correction and direct metalinguistic correction, on the Iranian EFL intermediate students’ ability of tense consistency in L2 written output. To this aim, after checking the homogeneity of the participants by a standardized language proficiency test (Preliminary English Test), two groups were formed: the control (direct only correction) group and the experimental (direct metalinguistic correction) group. Then, all the participants took a writing pretest. For 10 sessions, the control group participants’ errors were corrected by direct only correction, i.e. indicating the location of an error on the students’ text and provision of the correct form. During the same period, the experimental group participants’ errors were corrected by direct metalinguistic correction, i.e. indicating the location of an error, providing the correct form, and providing metalinguistic comments that explain the correct form. After instruction, participants took writing posttest, and delayed posttest. The results indicated that students in the experimental group outperformed the control group learners in the post and the delayed posttest. In other words, direct metalinguistic correction was more effective than direct only correction in improvement of students’ ability of tense consistency and writing proficiency.