

The Impact of Different Types of Teacher Written Feedback on EFL University Students' Writing

ผลกระทบของการให้ผลสะท้อนกลับโดยการเขียนของครูชนิดต่าง ๆ ที่มีต่อการเขียนของนักศึกษาระดับอุดมศึกษา ที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาต่างประเทศ

Chittima Kaweera (จิตติมา กาวีระ)* Dr. Siriluck Usaha (ดร.ศิริลักษณ์ อุสาหะ)**

ABSTRACT

This experimental study aims to investigate teacher written feedback with different degrees of explicitness of error correction namely, direct, coded, and uncoded feedback. These three types of feedback were given to 81 EFL major students enrolled in a 14-week paragraph writing course using a process approach in a Thai university. The students wrote paragraphs of three different genres (narration, description, and comparison and contrast) with three topics and three drafts for each genre. A total of 1,458 second drafts and final drafts were compared to see the improvement of student writing (holistic writing, targeted linguistic errors, and length of writing). Paired Sample T-Test reveals a highly significant improvement in the students' holistic writing and reduction of errors, but there was no significant difference in the length of writing in comparing first and last writing. The result of error analysis shows that the highest error rate was found in wrong word followed by sentence structure, verb, article, and noun ending respectively.

บทคัดย่อ

งานวิจัยครั้งนี้เป็นการวิจัยเชิงทดลองโดยมีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษาการให้ผลสะท้อนกลับโดยการเขียนของครูชนิดต่าง ๆ คือ การให้ผลสะท้อนกลับแบบตรง (direct feedback) แบบรหัส (coded feedback) แบบขีดเส้นใต้ (uncoded feedback) โดยในการทดลองมีการให้ผลสะท้อนกลับทั้งสามชนิดนี้แก่นักศึกษาวิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ จำนวน 81 คนที่เรียนในรายวิชาการเขียนย่อหน้า โดยใช้วิธีการสอนแบบเน้นกระบวนการเขียน ตลอดช่วงระยะเวลา 14 สัปดาห์ การเขียนย่อหน้าของนักศึกษาประกอบด้วย 3 รูปแบบ อันได้แก่ การเล่าเรื่อง (narration) การบรรยายความ (description) และการเปรียบเทียบ (comparison and contrast) โดยนักศึกษาได้รับมอบหมายงานให้เขียนตาม 3 รูปแบบดังกล่าว จำนวนรูปแบบละ 3 หัวข้อ และในแต่ละหัวข้อนักศึกษาต้องเขียนฉบับร่าง (draft) 3 ฉบับ โดยผู้วิจัยได้ทำการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลซึ่งได้มาจากการเปรียบเทียบการเขียนฉบับร่างที่ 2 (second draft) และฉบับร่างสุดท้าย (final draft) จำนวน 1,458 ฉบับ เพื่อตรวจสอบการพัฒนาทางการเขียนของนักศึกษา (คุณภาพ

* PhD candidate in English Language Studies, School of English, Institute of Social Technology Suranaree University of Technology.

** Assistant Professor, School of English, Institute of Social Technology Suranaree University of Technology.

ข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียน และความยาวของเรื่อง) ผลการวิจัยพบว่านักศึกษามีการพัฒนาคุณภาพของการเขียนมากขึ้นและข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนลดลงอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติ แต่จำนวนคำในการเขียนไม่ได้เพิ่มขึ้น ผลของการวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดด้านการเขียนของนักศึกษพบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดที่พบมากที่สุดคือการใช้คำผิด รองลงมาคือโครงสร้างประโยค คำกริยา คำนำหน้านาม และส่วนเติมท้ายคำนาม ตามลำดับ

Key Words : Teacher written feedback, Error correction

คำสำคัญ : การให้ผลสะท้อนกลับโดยการเขียนของครู ข้อผิดพลาดด้านการเขียน

Introduction

A fair amount of studies suggest L2 writing is generally shorter, less cohesive, less fluent, and contain more errors (e.g., Purves, 1988 as cited in Hyland, 2003; Ferris, 2003) According to Reid (1993), errors derived from other variables besides the first language interference generally are influenced by overgeneralization: and level of difficulty. Thus, making errors is a problem occurred as an inevitable part of EFL student writing. According to Lalande (1982), despite the fact that the students have studied certain rules of grammar, “some students exhibit remarkable consistency: they commit the same types of errors from one essay to the next” (p.140). Hyland (2003) also notes, EFL writers often carry the burden of learning to write and learning English at the same time.

Thus, it is common to say that this sort of undesirable consistency can frustrate both students and teachers. Like other EFL students, Thai EFL students have the same problems. In a Thai classroom, errors encountered in English written communication can discourage Thai students from learning English. According to Smyth (2001), one major reason is the significant differences between the two languages. The differences include punctuation (no punctuation marks in Thai) and grammar (i.e., auxiliaries, tenses and aspects,

articles, adjectives and adverbs, nouns and pronouns). Another major problem found in an English written task by Thai students is negative transference of their mother tongue into the target language (Ubol, 1980). As a result, it is common for Thai students who have been studying English for over ten years to have difficulty carrying on a simple conversation or writing a short passage without making several serious grammatical errors (Wongsbhindu, 1997). As mentioned above, errors found in EFL student writing can persist over time. One of the suggested techniques that can solve this problem is to make students learn from their errors in order to avoid future errors and also to improve their writing skills.

Some scholars in writing (e.g., Leki, 1991; Raimes, 1983) believe that to give feedback is one of the important methods in helping the student writers improve their writing pieces. Reid (1993) states, “...it must help students to improve their writing by communicating feedback detailed enough to allow students to act, to commit to change in their writing...” (p.218). In trying to justify how feedback can contribute to better writing, Sommer (1982) states,

“Comments create the motive for doing something different in the next draft : thoughtful comments create the motive for revising. Without

comments from their teachers or from their peers, student writers will revise in a consistently narrow and predictable way. Without comments from readers, students assume that their writing has communicated their meaning and perceive no need for revising the substance of their text” (p. 149).

According to Radeki and Swales (1988) and Leki (1991), it is important for teachers to provide feedback since research on student attitudes towards feedback has found that many students do want the errors in their writing to be corrected and may be frustrated if this does not happen.

It can be concluded that many scholars and researchers agree that feedback is essential and has a positive effect on students’ writing. Thus, feedback on writing can be selected as a means of helping students to make revision and can help students improve their writing skills.

On the other hand, Truscott (1996) contends that feedback is useless for both students and teachers because it is time consuming and might cause many negative effects. He also points out that feedback has a short-term rather than a long-term improvement. He also believes that the improvement is not concerned with improvements in the accuracy of subsequent writing, but in the linguistic accuracy of one written product. However, Truscott acknowledges that EFL student writers cannot make progress in correcting skills if no one points out their errors. Although the results from previous studies on teacher feedback are varied as whether feedback can help EFL writers effectively, it is noted that if no one points out L2 students errors, they cannot make progress in editing skills (Truscott, 1996).

Research evidence on the effect of teacher written feedback

Although a number of many experimental studies on teacher written feedback have been carried since the early 1980s, the results of the efficacy of written teacher feedback have been left in the midst of controversy (Guenett, 2007) The debate about whether and how to give L2 student feedback on their written grammatical errors continues between those who believe in giving the feedback to students to improve their written accuracy and those who did not.

Truscott’s well known article (1996), “The Case against Grammar Correction” stated that feedback is both ineffective and harmful on several grounds and should be therefore abandoned. He also draws the conclusion from prior research (Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992) that there is no convincing research evidence to show that error correction ever helps student writers improve the accuracy of their writing.

On the contrary, in other studies which have examined student progress in written accuracy over time, researcher have typically found that writers who received feedback on their errors showed improvement, which in some cases were statistically significant (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Ferris, *et al.* 2000). However, issues surrounding the method of giving teacher feedback on the L2 student written errors continue to be a central issue for theory and practice of writing instruction (Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1996, 1999).

In order to provide a more conclusive finding of this issue, some studies have tried to focus on the student writers’ response to teacher feedback.

Leki (1991) focused on university students' attitudes toward error correction and error in their own writing. The students reported that error-free work was a major concern and they wished to have their errors corrected by their teachers. However, this might lead to a tension between the students' perceived needs and the teachers' beliefs that development of ideas was more important. Also Zhang (1995) has supported the view that L2 students greatly value teacher written feedback more highly than either peer feedback or oral feedback in writing conferences.

Though it is obvious that L2 students have positive attitudes towards written feedback, it is still inconclusive how such feedback affects a student's long term development (Hyland, 1998). Studies into L2 writing over the past twenty years also have questioned the effectiveness of feedback for improvement of student texts. A recent study by Ferris (1997) has focused on the effects of teacher written feedback on students' drafts and assessed whether revision made in response to that feedback led to improvements in the student writing. The study found that teacher feedback in conjunction with revisions resulted in text improvement. The study also suggested that notes in the margin, requests for clarification, and comments on grammar led to the most substantive revision. Some previous studies have attempted to directly investigate whether L2 students who receive written corrective feedback on their errors are able to improve the accuracy of their writing (Semke, 1984; Polio *et al.* 1998). Also a recent study by Sheen (2007) found that written corrective feedback that targeted a single linguistic feature (article errors) improved learners' accuracy and produced a significant positive effect on

acquisition. Bitchener *et al.* (2005) also investigated whether the type of feedback resulted in improved accuracy levels in the use of the past simple tense and definite article in new pieces of writing. They found a significant effect for the combination of written and conference feedback on these linguistic categories. However, some studies of error correction (Lalande, 1982; Sheppard, 1992; Ferris, 1995; Ferris *et al.*, 2000;) pointed that different linguistic categories of students represent separate domains of knowledge that are acquired through different stages and processes.

Thus, writing teachers need to be aware of issues surrounding the method of giving teacher written feedback to EFL writing students. It is because there are different types of errors found in EFL writing and different types of teacher written feedback (e.g. direct, coded, and uncoded feedback) given to students as well as different levels of students' proficiency. As such, writing teachers need to find out which appropriate types of feedback can treat specific types of error and how they can fit for students at different levels. In order to provide a better understanding of these issues, the present study aims to find out how EFL students who have different levels of English proficiency in a Thai context utilize different kinds of teacher written feedback and the students' perspectives : their attitudes toward, their comprehension of, and their attention on the feedback.

The purpose of the study

The present study focused on the impact of different types of teacher written feedback on EFL students' writing improvement (including holistic writing, reduction of errors, and length of

writing) and the purpose of the study is to investigate the effects of students' utilizing different types of teacher written feedback on the improvement of holistic rating, grammatical accuracy and length of their writing

The operational definition of terms

While research on treatments of errors in writing continues to be explored within L2 writing studies, a number of similar and related terms referring to feedback and error correction are varied. In order to understand terms of the present study clearly, the following definitions of terminology are addressed.

Teacher written feedback refers to written responses provided by the teacher to the students' writing. The responses are limited to comments on grammatical errors and content of the students' writing.

Different types of teacher feedback refer to the different strategies in providing feedback. In this study teacher feedback is divided according to the degrees of explicitness of error correction. There are three different types of teacher feedback used in the study. These are (1) direct feedback; (2) coded feedback; and (3) uncoded feedback.

1. *Direct feedback* – In the literature of error correction, the similar kind of direct feedback can be referred to direct correction (Chandler, 2003), Corrective feedback (Lalande, 1982), form-focused feedback (correction) (Fazio, 2001) and overt correction (Lee, 2004). According to Ferris (2002), direct feedback refers to teacher providing “correct linguistic form” for students

(e.g. word, morpheme, phrase, rewritten sentence, deleted word [s] or morpheme [s]) (p. 19).

Example of direct feedback:

Talkative

I don't like Supha because she is ~~speaking non-stop~~.

2. *Coded feedback* is a type of indirect feedback (Ferris, 2002) and can be referred to error identification (Lee, 2004) in which occurs when the teacher explicitly indicates that errors have been committed and provides a brief explanation without any correction and leaves it to the student to correct by themselves. In this study, a code sheet containing codes of error types, their definitions, and examples of errors were provided while a teacher gave coded feedback to the students.

Example of coded feedback :

V

I drive very fast to the university yesterday.

3. *Uncoded feedback* – As opposed to coded feedback, it can be referred to error location (Ferris, 2002). The teacher simply locates an error by circling it, underlining it (Lee, 2004), highlighting it, or putting a checkmark in the margin. This feedback is more complicated in that students correct their errors by identifying them and use their acquired knowledge to self correct such errors.

Example of uncoded feedback:

There are many dog in this house.

Methods

Setting and subjects

The subjects were 81 second-year English major students at Naresuan University, Phayao Campus, Thailand. These students were enrolled in Paragraph Writing Course using a process approach taught by the researcher. As there were too many students enrolled in the class, they were divided into two sections of 40 and 41 students. However, both sections received the same syllabus, assignment, and all assigned activities, but they were different in the schedule of class meeting and date of submission. Throughout the writing period, a constant routine was maintained.

Differential feedback used and treatment procedure

The method of data collection started in the third week of the semester. The class met twice a week, 90 minutes per a class meeting during a 14-week period. During the treatment, all the students received three different types of teacher written feedback, namely direct feedback, coded feedback, and uncoded feedback. The following summarized the treatment procedure.

Table 1 Data collection and error correction schedule

Class	In-Class Activity	Out of Class Activity
3	Hand in Writing 1 (1 st draft)	
4	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
5	Get DF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
6	Hand in Writing 2 (1 st draft)	
7	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
8	Get CF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
9	Hand in Writing 3 (1 st draft)	
10	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
11	Get UF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
12	Hand in Writing 4 (1 st draft)	
13	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
14	Get DF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
15	Hand in Writing 5 (1 st draft)	
16	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
17	Get CF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
18	Hand in Writing 6 (1 st draft)	
19	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
20	Get UF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
21	Hand in Writing 7 (1 st draft)	
22	Get CF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
23	Get DF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
24	Hand in Writing 8 (1 st draft)	
25	Get CtF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
26	Get CF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft
27	Hand in Writing 9 (1 st draft)	
28	Get CF by teacher	Revise and hand in 2 nd draft
29	Get UF by teacher	Correct errors and hand in 3 rd draft

CtF = content feedback, DF = direct feedback,

CF = coded feedback, UF = uncoded feedback

Writing task

The students were assigned to write paragraphs of three different genres namely, narration, description, and comparison and contrast with three topics and three drafts for each genre. Totally, the students were assigned to write 9 writing assignments (at least 100 words paragraph level) as an outside class activity which was one of the course requirements. These assignments accounted for 40 percent of the overall evaluation.

Analysis

A total of 1,458 second drafts and final drafts were compared to see the improvement of holistic writing, reduction of errors (change in five error categories i.e., verb, noun ending, article, wrong word, and sentence structure), and length of writing (word count). For the students' holistic writing of all 9 final drafts, two teachers of English were asked to rate the students' writing using TWE (Test of Written English) scoring guide as a guideline. Reduction of errors and length of writing were measured by the comparison between the students' second drafts and the final drafts in terms of five error categories (for error reduction) and word count (length of writing). The inter rater reliability was used to see the percentage of agreement between two raters. It was found that, for holistic writing, the percentage of agreement was 83, while the error reduction and length of writing were 81 and 98 respectively.

Correction Guidelines

Regarding five error categories used to analyze students' errors, the researcher adapted the five most frequent error types found in a sample of 5707 errors analyzed in text by 92 L2 writers (Chaney, 1999 as cited by Ferris and Roberts, 2001). These five categories were chosen and operationalized based on information from previous study (Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts, and McKee, 2000), in which 15 error categories were identified. However, it was found that the marking system was too cumbersome for both teachers and students. As a result, the categories were then made simpler and easier to understand.

Table 2 Five error categories used in the study

Code	Types of errors	Description
V	Verb	Error in verb tense or form
NE	Noun ending	Noun ending (plural or possessive) missing or unnecessary
Art	Article	Article or other determiner missing or unnecessary or incorrect used
WW	Wrong word	Wrong word or word form
SS	Sentence structure	Sentence structure: missing or unnecessary words; wrong word order; run-ons and sentence fragments

Source: Ferris and Roberts (2001)

Results

This section presents the result of investigating the extent to which different types of corrective feedback on the content and five targeted linguistic errors helped this group of EFL students improve students' holistic writing, reduce errors, and increase length of writing in their revision and subsequent writing.

Research Question

What are the effects of different types of teacher written feedback on the improvement of students' holistic writing, reduction of errors, and length of writing?

The results of the study show that student writing improved significantly over the semester in terms of holistic writing and error reduction. With regard to the mean performance score of the students' holistic writing, it can be seen that overall the students have an improvement in the holistic writing as compared from the first to the last writing of nine separate assignment. A paired sample T-Test of the difference in the mean score of holistic rating on assignment 1 (3.20) and on assignment 9 (3.46) was statistically significant at .01 level (see Table 3).

Also the error rate reduced significantly between assignment 1 (12.77) and assignment 9 (9.77), statistically significant at .000 level. However, the results of word count showed no significant improvement over the semester; mean word count for the last assignment (188.80) was only slightly higher than those for the first (188.80).

Table 3 Analysis of holistic writing, reduction of errors, and length of Writing

Holistic writing

A1: Mean holistic rating = 3.20; S.D.=.78 (out of 6)
A9: Mean holistic rating = 3.46; S.D.=.94 (out of 6)
(n = 81) P = .01

Error reduction

A1: Mean number of error rate =12.77; S.D.= 5.11
A9: Mean number of error rate = 9.77; S.D.= 3.57
(n = 81) P = .00

Length of writing

A1: Mean number of word =183.66; S.D.= 65.66
A9: Mean number of word =188.80; S.D.= 58.73
(n = 81) P = .462

* A = Assignment

The error rate of five targeted linguistic errors in different genres

The following shows the mean score of the students' five targeted linguistic errors when utilizing three different types of teacher feedback, in each type being employed in a different assignment within the narrative genre.

Table 4 error rate of five targeted linguistic errors in narrative genre assignment

Feedback	Errors	Draft 2		Draft 3		Sig.
Types	Types	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Direct	NE	1	1.15	0	.00	.000
	Art	2.03	1.46	0	.00	.000
	WW	3.06	1.63	.11	.41	.000
	V	4.41	2.72	.28	.67	.000
	SS	2.28	.67	.07	.30	.000
	Total	12.77	5.11	.36	.09	.000
Coded	NE	.54	.93	.07	.34	.000
	Art	2.02	1.94	.33	.65	.000
	WW	6.25	2.96	3.96	2.59	.000
	V	4.16	2.73	2.20	2.13	.000
	SS	4.95	3.09	3.03	2.73	.000
	Total	17.23	8.34	9.46	6.62	.000
Uncoded	NE	1.06	1.08	.29	.84	.000
	Art	1.33	1.27	.34	.88	.000
	WW	3.39	2.27	2.25	2.01	.000
	V	2.95	2.22	1.69	1.91	.000
	SS	2.95	2.81	2.02	2.59	.000
	Total	11.53	5.41	5.96	4.90	.000

Table 4 indicates not surprisingly, that students made significantly fewer errors on their revision when receiving any type of feedback. The students made the fewest errors on the revision after receiving direct feedback (.36) followed by uncoded (.96), and coded feedback (9.46) respectively. The results of error analysis shows that in these narrative genre assignments, the students made the highest errors in verb (4.41) for the first assignment

and wrong word for the second (6.25) and the third assignments (3.39). However, the students made the fewest errors in noun ending (1, .54, and 1.06). According to table 5, the significance of receiving feedback was just as high as with the narrative assignments. The errors were mostly reduced when the students utilized direct feedback (1.17), followed by coded (4.76), and uncoded feedback (8.6). It can be seen on the revision that the students had the highest error rate in wrong word, followed by sentence structure, and verb, while the fewest errors rate were in noun ending.

Table 5 error rate of five targeted linguistic errors in descriptive genre assignments

Feedback	Errors	Draft 2		Draft 3		Sig.
Types	Types	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Direct	NE	.77	.85	.03	.19	.000
	Art	.91	1.10	.03	.19	.000
	WW	3.43	2.01	.49	.80	.000
	V	1.71	1.36	.18	.52	.000
	SS	2.98	2	.41	.70	.000
	Total	9.79	4.32	1.17	1.67	.000
Coded	NE	.79	1.2	.14	.42	.000
	Art	1.16	1.43	.39	.68	.000
	WW	3.07	2.52	1.79	2.01	.000
	V	2.27	1.63	1.22	1.36	.000
	SS	2.28	2.03	1.3	1.55	.000
	Total	9.43	5.97	4.76	4.43	.000
Uncoded	NE	1.25	1.24	.28	.57	.000
	Art	1.32	1.31	.58	.89	.000
	WW	5.38	2.66	3.91	2.37	.000
	V	2.9	2.22	1.62	1.74	.000
	SS	3.6	2.22	2.33	2.16	.000
	Total	14.19	6.3	8.6	5.6	.000

Table 6 error rate of five targeted linguistic errors in comparison and contrast genre assignments

Feedback	Errors	Draft 2		Draft 3		Sig.
Types	Types	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	
Direct	NE	.78	1.01	.00	.00	.000
	Art	.86	1.04	.01	.11	.000
	WW	3.23	2.22	.36	.61	.000
	V	2.6	1.68	.19	.47	.000
	SS	2.3	1.53	.19	.45	.000
	Total	9.77	3.57	.74	1.04	.000
Coded	NE	.60	.83	.05	.21	.000
	Art	.21	.49	.01	.11	.000
	WW	4.25	2.25	3.17	1.98	.000
	V	2.88	2.24	1.83	2.03	.000
	SS	3.14	2.01	2.07	1.75	.000
	Total	10.63	4.45	7.02	3.9	.000
Uncoded	NE	.33	.57	.04	.19	.000
	Art	.20	.45	.01	.11	.000
	WW	3.68	1.75	2.26	1.49	.000
	V	2.19	1.53	1.09	1.16	.000
	SS	2.77	2.16	1.63	1.67	.000
	Total	8.89	3.5	7.25	1.36	.000

As showed in table 6, the greatest level of improvement on revision can be seen when students received direct feedback (.74) followed by coded (7.02), and uncoded feedback (7.25) respectively. It also indicates that the students' highest error rates were found in wrong word followed by sentence structure (for the second and the third topics) and verb errors.

Discussion

Clearly, positive results can be seen in student writing after the teacher provided direct, coded, or uncoded feedback. In the improvement of holistic writing, initial teacher feedback on content followed by error correction seem to have positive effect on quality of the content. This result supports

Fathman and Walley's (1990) conclusion that teacher feedback results in improvement in both content and accuracy. Ferris (1997) also valued teacher's error correction followed by students' revision as stating, "when changes (whether minimal or substantial) were made, they overwhelmingly tended to improve the students' paper" (p.330).

The result of this study also demonstrate that the accuracy performance of five targeted linguistic categories of student writing over 14 weeks improved significantly more if these students were given teacher written feedback and required to correct their own errors. The finding shows that on revision, errors were reduced the most when the students utilized direct feedback. This aligns with Chandler's (2003) conclusion that correction by the teacher was the best of the four methods (correction, underlining and description, description, and underlining) used, as measured by change in accuracy of the student writing, but there was no statistical difference among them. The superiority of direct feedback may be due to the fact that the students can correct significantly more of their errors on revisions with this method than either coded or uncoded feedback. It might because this method is "the fastest and the easiest way for them to revise" (p.291).

With regard to the students' writing fluency, Walfe-Quintero, Inagaki, and Kim, 1998 (as cited in Chandler, 2003) define fluency as "rapid production of language" (p.17). For most previous research studies, the measure of fluency used has been number of word written. Since length (as stipulated by word count) was part of the assignment, the measurement of fluency in this study

was word count. According to the finding of this study, there was no significant increase in fluency over the semester. The results of word count for the last assignment (188.80) were slightly higher than those for the first (183.66), a level that is not significant. This did not support Truscott's (1996) article, stating that one of the putative harmful effects of error correction is its negative effect on fluency. Although there was no statistically significant improvement in fluency, there was neither a reduction, even though the assignments were increasingly difficult. It might because when the students learn more from their errors, teacher correction, revision activity, as well as practices of writing in a long period of time (14-week period), they felt more confident to write even these more challenging genres (descriptive and comparison and contrast). Thus this can indirectly support the finding of positive effect of teacher written feedback on writing fluency which corresponds to those reported in Robb et al's (1986) research on Japanese EFL students and Chandler's (2003) investigation of Hispanic, Asian, and South East Asian students.

Conclusion

Teacher written feedback of any type has a demonstrably positive effect on student error correction and holistic writing. For holistic writing, without changing students' original communicative intent, teacher feedback seem to have positive effect on writing quality. However, the effect of feedback found on fluency (as measured by word count) was not found to be significant, either as a benefit or as a cause of harm (Truscott, 1996). As can be seen in this study, teacher written feedback

play a crucial role in EFL student writing. The method of using teacher written feedback followed by students' revision is a way to draw students' attention to their writing, learn from their errors, and avoid future errors. All of which will be of potential value for L2 learners and teachers. It is expected that the results of this study will add new information to fill the gap in the existing body of knowledge about the treatment of errors in an EFL context.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the cooperation of the participating teachers and students in this study. The authors are also grateful for helpful advice and wise comments of Professor Clifford Sloane.

References

- Bitchener, J., Young, S., and Cameron, D. 2005. The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14, 191–205.
- Chandler, J. 2003. The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267–296.
- Chaney, SJ. 1999. The effect of error types on error correction and revision. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of English, California State University, Sacramento.
- Fathman, AK., and Walley, E. 1990. Teacher response to student writing: Focus on Form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing : Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178–190). Cambridge University Press: New York.
- Fazio, L. 2001. The effects of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority-and - majority-language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(4), 235–249.
- Ferris, DR. 1995. Students' reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 33–53.
- Ferris, DR. 1997. The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL QUARTERLY* 31/2, 315–339.
- Ferris, DR. 1999. The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1–10.
- Ferris, D. 2002. Treatment of error in second language student writing. The University of Michigan Press: Michigan.
- Ferris, D. 2003. Responding to writing. In Kroll, B. *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*. (121) Cambridge University press : Cambridge.
- Ferris, DR., and Roberts, B. 2001. Error feedback in L2 writing classes How explicit does it need to be?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 10, 161–184.
- Ferris, DR., Chaney, SJ., Komura, K., Roberts, BJ., and McKee, S. 2000. Perspectives, problems, and practices in treating written error. Colloquium presented at International TESOL Convention, March 14–18, 2000, Vancouver, B.C.
- Gue'nette, D. 2007. Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 40–53.

- Hyland, F. 1998. The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, K. 2003. *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press : Cambridge.
- Kepner, CG. 1991. An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73 (3), 305-313.
- Lalande, J. 1982 Reducing composition errors : An experiment. *Modern language Journal*. 66, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: the case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 149, 1-29.
- Leki, I. 1991. The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 3, 203-218
- Polio, C., Fleck, C., and Leder, N. 1998. "If only I had more time : " ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 43-68.
- Radeki, P., and Swales, J. 1988. ESL students reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16, 355-65.
- Raimes, JM. 1983. *The Writing Process*. Massachusetts: Little, Brown & Company Limited.
- Reid, J. 1993. *Teaching ESL writing*. New Jersey : Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Robb, T., Ross, S., and Shortreed, I. 1986. Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20, 83-93.
- Semke, H. 1984. The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195-202.
- Sheen, Y. 2007. The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.
- Sheppard, K. 1992. Two feedback types: Do they make the difference? *RELJ Journal*, 23, 103-10.
- Smyth, D. 2001. Thai speakers. In Swan, M & Smith, B (Ed.), *Learner English*. (pp. 343-356). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sommer, N. 1982. Responding to student writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 33, 148-156.
- Truscott, J. 1996. The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-69.
- Truscott, J. 1999. The case for "the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 111-22.
- Ubol, C. 1980. An error analysis of English composition by Thai students (Occasional Paper No. 16). Singapore : SEAMEO Regional Language Center.
- Wonsbhindu, J. 1997. Thai graduate students' errors in written English. The National Institute of Development Administration.
- Zhang, S. 1995. Reexamining the affective advantage of peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 4, 209-222.