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Students’ Preference toward Teacher Written Corrective Feedback in Narrative Writing Class

Agung Setia Raharjo

Abstract

There is still an issue about the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (WCF) in L2 writing. On one side, WCF is considered harmful because students might not use more complex constructions in their compositions. On the other side, WCF is considered helpful in some ways such as helping in accuracy improvement. This study was aimed at investigating the students’ preferences toward WCF types appear in students’ paper. To do that, 30 students of Narrative Writing Class of English Department in Satya Wacana Christian University had been interviewed. Based on the 5 types of WCF proposed by Ellis (2008) the writer explained the characteristics of each WCF and then proceed to the interview section. The findings revealed that only three types of used by the teacher out of 5 types. They were Direct CF, Indirect CF, and Metalinguistic CF. The participants also stated their underlying reasons on each three types of WCF found in this study of why they preferred it or not.

Key words: Written Corrective Feedback, L2 Writing, Students’ Preference
INTRODUCTION

The issue whether written corrective feedback (WCF) is effective or not in L2 writing has been arguable among the researchers and experts long time ago until recently. Truscott (1996 in Mohebbi, 2013) wrote his controversial study that written corrective feedback (WCF) are ineffective and does not give any possible advantages to students and it should be ignored. After teacher provides WCF to students, they might not use more complex constructions in their compositions. In other word, WCF is not suitable on L2 learning.

After that, other researchers conducted forward investigations about the issue to prove Truscott’s controversial conclusion is wrong. The studies are varied in how the effectiveness of WCF is investigated. Some investigated the improvement in the situation whether the learners fused the correction in a revision of their first draft (e.g, Bitchener & Young, 2005); others investigated about the improvement in homework essay assignments or journal entries in more than a period of time (e.g, Chandler, 2003).

Feedback is very important in the process of writing. Teachers provide response like critics or suggestion through feedback for students’ improvement. Feedback pedagogical role are responding to students writing, and helping students to understand the writing context and providing a practical understanding as students’ reader of their writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

One of the researches has proved that written corrective feedback is improving students’ writing, for example in the study of Beuningen et al (2008).
Written corrective feedback help students in improving their accuracy: while short-term effect found both in direct and indirect feedback, but only direct feedback showed a significant long-term effect. It shows that written corrective feedback help students to improve their accuracy skill in writing.

The complexity of written corrective feedback (WCF) shows the different aspects of writing content, rhetoric, organization, and mechanics, as well as linguistic accuracy (Sheen, 2007). In process of understanding the feedback, L2 learners might have difficulty. Then, written corrective feedback should consider all these aspects at the same time when correcting different pieces of writing. Feedback should be able to create an interpersonal link and targeted the feedback to students’ personalities and needs (Hyland & Hyland, 2006 in Soori et al, 2012). That’s why the students’ preferences in feedback are very important to teacher considering it.

The success of improving students’ writing skill determine from students’ preferences toward the provision of feedback. According to Schulz (2001 in Amrhein & Nassaji, 2007), if a student already preferred to a certain feedback, then the student will pay more attention to use the feedback rather than when the student does not preferred in its effect for their learning. Students’ preference of feedback is not only affect the success of a certain feedback on students’ writing, but it also influences the development of students’ learning.

There are various types of feedback. Ellis (2008) mentioned five types of written corrective feedback: direct feedback, indirect feedback, metalinguistic CF,
focused and unfocused feedback, and reformulation feedback. Each type of feedback has advantages in correcting students’ error, for example in grammatical error and generating ideas.

Corresponding to the issue of the importance of feedback provision in students’ writing, the writer would like to conduct a study on students’ preference toward written corrective feedback. The objective of this study is to examine what kind of WCF students prefer in their narrative writing class in Satya Wacana Christian University. The writer conducted the study on the typology of written corrective feedback because as stated by Ellis (2008:106) it also can be “assistance for teachers and provides them with a basis for examining the options and for systematically experimenting with them in their own teaching”. The study will be guided by the research question “What are the students’ preferences of written corrective feedback in their narrative and descriptive class?”

LITERATURE REVIEW
**Narrative Writing**

Writing is one of important skills in building language competence. According to Brown (2000) stated that a simple view of writing would assume that written language is simply the graphic representation of spoken language. So, it means that spoken language is easier to do than written language.

Writing has many kind of skill that focuses on the mechanism, syntactical, lexical, drawing conclusion, and the organization discourse (Williams, 2007). Writing is often used to measure students’ capability. Students often have to write papers like narrative text for their assignment.

Narrative is categorized as story. It is focusing on specific participants. (Hyland, 2007 in Wijayanti, 2011) stated the purpose of narrative that is to deal with problematic or unusual events to entertain. Narratives created in a constructive format that describes a sequence of fictional or nonfictional event. Writing narrative is not easy, the problem or struggle is what draws and holds the attention, empathy, and interest of the reader.

**Written Corrective Feedback in Writing**

Feedback is an information which given to learners whether an instructional response is right or wrong (Kepner, 1991 in Grami, 2005). That means that teacher’s feedback shows sign to students’ work in varied way.
Feedback is important to student’s writing in correcting students’ errors, because L2 students often make errors in writing.

Based on Hyland & Hyland (2006), those who joined in the field of second language writing found the feedback is an important factor to give agreement to the students in learning, so that students can evaluate their own mistakes and revise their papers if required. This means teachers must provide students with feedback for student’s improvement of writing and teacher’s feedback must be able to make students aware of their own mistakes.

According to Soori (2012), writing teacher has the role as the facilitator, guide, feedback provider, and evaluator in writing. It means teacher need to help the students to take the process of writing which include planning, drafting, revising, editing, and evaluating. Most writing teachers stated that providing feedback in ESL/EFL writing is the most difficult and time consuming but it is seen as pedagogically useful to motivate the students for their writing improvements (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Writing teachers have responsibility for students to improve their writing skill through feedback.

The efficacy of WCF was still being questioned even though there are many studies that investigate the effectiveness of written corrective feedback in L2 writing. Some researchers conduct how the students and teacher view the usefulness of written corrective feedback (WCF) and impaired with many kind of students’ error categories. But still, written corrective feedback could not work fully. According to Ferris (1997 in Hyland & Hyland 2006), although three
quarters of teachers’ comments on students’ papers are apparently used by the students, only half of them could be considered as an improvement.

Types of Written Corrective Feedback

According to Ellis (2008), there are five types to provide written corrective feedback. The first one is direct CF. In direct CF writing teacher should provide learners with the correct forms. Teacher could cross out unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, insert a missing word or morpheme, and write the correct form above or near the erroneous form. According to Ferris and Roberts (2001 in Ellis, 2008) direct CF much better than indirect CF to help the students during their writing process, especially for those whose proficiency level is low. Direct feedback provides correct form for students’ writing.

The second type WCF is indirect CF. It includes indicating that student has made an error without actually correcting it. Teacher could just underlining or using cursors to show omissions in the students’ writing and/or placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. Indirect feedback is good to guide learning and problem solving that can be used to encourage students to reflect about linguistic forms (Lalande, 1982 in Ellis, 2008). Indirect feedback shows the students to discover their own errors so that it is good to build students’ awareness of errors and do self-error-correction in the future.

The third type of WCF called metalinguistic CF. Here, the learners provided with some form of explicit comment using error codes to show the
errors. These consist of abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors. The sign can be placed over the part of the error in the text, but in case, the exact part of the error may or may not be shown. The student has work to find out the clue provided while in the latter the student needs to first locate the error and then work out the correction.

Unfocused and focused CF is the fourth type. In unfocused CF, teacher can elect to correct all of students’ errors or just select the specific errors types to be corrected. It is beneficial in addressing a range of errors. Even though it might not as effective as focused feedback in assisting learners to acquire specific features in short term, unfocused feedback was superior in the long term. While in focused CF, teacher show the nature of the errors. It promotes not only attention but also comprehension of the basis of the errors.

The fifth type of feedback is reformulation feedback. It consists of a native speakers’ reworking of the students’ whole text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact. It aims to provide learners with a resource that they can use to correct their errors but places the responsibility for the final decision about whether and how to correct on the students themselves.

**Students’ Preference on WCF**

Students’ preference toward the effectiveness of WCF should be considered by the students’ prefer of WCF types. It means that which students’
prefer and believe certain types of WCF affect their learning process. In WCF, teacher sometimes give the students’ feedback with correcting error every single word (underline the errors and give a red circle on error words). For example, teachers usually change students’ language based on what they think learners what to or should write, but sometimes there is a different meaning sense of the idea students want to express and that which a teacher assumes is correct (Amrhein & Nassaji, 2007)

Considering to certain types of efficacy of WCF, if a student prefers or believes a certain type of WCF is useful, then he or she might be more likely to pay more attention and use it for their learning process, rather than when he or she does not believe in its effect (Schulz 1996 in Amrhein & Nassaji, 2007). How the feedback work effectively in students’ writing could be seen on students’ preference types of feedback.
THE STUDY

This study is qualitative descriptive research. In this section the writer will provide the context of the study, participants, instrument of data collection, data collection procedure, procedure of data analysis, and method of data analysis.

Context of the Study

The writer conducted the study in Narrative Writing Class in Faculty of English and Literature especially in English Language Education program. The writer conducted the study in 5 different classes from total 6 classes. Narrative class is taken by second year’s students and the students need to write a narrative and descriptive paper that consist of 3 drafts. In each class, the teachers provided their students with corrective feedback to help students revising their papers.

Participants

The participants were 30 students of Narrative Writing class. The writer use convenient sampling to choose 6 participants from 5 classes with different teachers. So, these students are those who conveniently available to participate in this study.

Instruments of Data Collection

The writer used focus group discussion to collect the data. Before that the writer collected students’ paper work from the teachers to discover type of feedback given. The schedule of focus group discussion is determined on the basis of the participants’ and the researcher’s agreement. In the focus group, the writer
provides the feedbacks explanation sheet adopted from Paubun (2014) include explanation types of feedback according to Ellis (2008) and 4 questions also adopted from Paubun (2014) (see Appendix A)

Data Collection Procedure

First, the writer asked permission from the teachers to copy students’ paper work in order to discover what type of feedback given by the teacher. Then, the writer asked for permission to do the research on the class that She/He is teaching. After that the writer arranged the time to do the discussion with the focus groups consist of 6 participants each class who were willing to participate in this study. In the process of discussion before started the discussion, the writer explain the five types of WCF in the explanation sheet adopted from Paubun (2015) (see Appendix B) as the participants will need time to read and understand the types of WCF before they decide which one they prefer to have. The interview process was recorded for more detail explanation during the discussion. The questions on the discussion were added with some more additional questions to clarify participants’ answers and to find the data as is expected according to the students’ view based on their preference on the type of WCF and their reasons.

Procedure of Data Analysis

The writer did the focus group discussion with each group as the agreement of time both groups has arranged. After that, the writer transcribes the
discussion for each group using clean transcription and the transcription language is English. Then, the writer categorized the data. It includes categorizing the typology of WCF based on the theory of Ellis (2008) and highlighting the opinions and reasons about students’ preference and reason. Then the writer makes a description about the students’ preference and their reasons. Then, the findings and discussion of this study was divided into the several sub topics such as the type of WCF used in each narrative writing class, students’ reasons and opinions toward the feedback they got.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the findings emerged from the analysis and their discussion. There were only three types of feedback used by the teacher out of 5 types. The students demonstrated different preference regarding the WCF used by the teachers. They were Direct CF, Indirect CF, and Metalinguistic CF. The first preferred WCF was Direct CF with 30 students who prefer it. The second was Metalinguistic CF with 21 out of the total 30 students preferred, while, only 9 who did not. Then, the third WCF was Indirect CF with only 13 out of 30 students who prefer it, while, the rest 17 students did not prefer this type of WCF. The following chart presents students’ preference on each feedback provided by their writing teachers.

![Chart 1. The Students' Preference on the Feedback](chart.png)
Direct Corrective Feedback

The first preferred of written corrective feedback type was Direct CF. From the total 30 students that had been interviewed in this study, all of them stated that Direct CF was helpful for them. As stated by Ellis (2008) this type of feedback allowed students to see the correction of the errors since the teacher had provided it in the students’ drafts. Due to the students’ reasons of how the feedback was helpful, there were 4 themes divided according to the extracts displayed in this section. The first one is that Direct CF helps to recognize the errors and facilitate students in revising their writing. The proof can be seen in the extracts below.

Extract 1

“Direct CF makes me know my mistakes in writing and because the teacher gives the correction, so, I can revise my writing directly.”

(Participant 1)

Extract 2

“Writing is difficult to do because there will be a lot of ideas that I should write, thus, receiving a Direct CF is really helping me to identify and correct my mistakes that I have made in my writing.”

(Participant 4)

Extract 3

“Through Direct feedback I know my error in writing and know how to write a good sentences.”

(Participant 23)
The extract reveals that the student preferred Direct CF in the process of writing for it enables him/her to recognize the mistakes and facilitate the revision. It indicated that the student preferred Direct CF to be used in the process of writing because it gave an ease for them to see the error he/she made in writing since the teacher already showed the correction of the errors. Thus, it gives the students opportunity to do the revision easily right after he/she got the feedback.

The second theme of how Direct CF be considered helpful is because the corrections are understandable and therefore are more facilitating in the revision stage. Here, the writer analyzed that the correction provided by the teacher makes this feedback understandable because it allowed students to see the errors specifically. Thus, it might give the chance for students to know clearly what kind of errors they had made and later deal with them in the revision. It was supported by the extracts below.

Extract 4

“Direct CF is easy to understand because it gives specific information of my errors in writing.”

(Participant 3)

Extract 5

“My writing improves a lot because of this feedback easy to understand.”

(Participant 10)
The third theme, Direct CF is helpful for it provides sufficient correction. It mainly because the teacher did not only showing the place where the errors were existed in the students’ paper, but the teacher also corrected the errors into the correct form. Thus, it gave an ease for the students in the process of correcting the errors they had made, especially, grammatical matters. The following extracts are the proof.

Extract 7

“It allows me to get a very clear correction, especially, correction for grammatical matters. Beside it is clear, it also easy to be implemented in correction.”  
(Participant 14)

Extract 8

“It is very clear and easy to be used for revision. It shows me the specific errors type.”  
(Participant 19)

The last theme, Direct CF was not time-consuming. It means that since Direct CF allowed the students to see the correction of their errors, what they need to do was replacing all the errors part with the provided correction. Thus, the student did not need to spend a long time to think about the appropriate correction of the error they had made in their paper. The following are the extracts.
Extract 9

“I don’t need to waste my time because I just need to replace my error with the correction provided by my teacher.”

(Participant 17)

Extract 10

“This feedback is very practical and clear. I can save more time in revision.”

(Participant 18)

The writer can conclude that Direct CF has the benefit to provide learners with explicit guidance of errors correction. Especially, it is helpful to guide learners who are less capable to do a self-correcting error or in other words are those who do not know what the correct form is. This idea is similar with Ferris and Roberts (2001) as cited in Ellis (2008) who suggests that Direct CF might be better than Indirect CF for students with low proficiency level in writing.

Indirect Corrective Feedback

The second preferred of WCF was Indirect CF. From the total 30 students that had been interviewed, 17 students in this study did not prefer to use Indirect CF as the feedback in their writing, while, the rest of 13 students preferred this kind of feedback. According to Ellis (2008), in using the Indirect CF the teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction. It takes the form of underlining and use cursors to show omissions in the students’ texts. Firstly, based on the extracts displayed in this section, there were two underlying reasons
of why students did not prefer this kind of feedback. The first one is because Indirect CF tends to be confusing. Here is the proof of what the students said.

Extract 11

“If teacher only marks the errors, so, students will confuse about what it means.”

(Participant 12)

Extract 12

“The teacher only underlines my errors, so, I don’t know what it means.”

(Participant 18)

According to the student, Indirect CF was confusing because it consists of marks only, such as questions marks, underlines, or circles. In the writer’s analysis, the marks might enable students to know in which part errors existed. Unfortunately, students might not be able to know what the teacher exactly want them to correct, for example, whether the errors were a grammatical-error, content, or any other type of errors. It is important for the teacher to provide specific information about the errors type to reduce the confusion. The writer believed that if the teacher specifies the errors, the feedback will be effectively used by the students for revision.

The second reason is that Indirect CF lack of teacher’s explanation. Since Indirect CF consists of marks, circles, and underlines. The students might need further explanation or clarification about what expects or lies behind the marks so that there was no uncertainty about it. In other words, the explanation at least
would make the marks clearer to be understood. No further explanation or clarification of the marks might lead the students ignore and not use the feedback given. It also such a waste for the teacher when the feedback they gave was neglected by the students. The extracts below are the proof of what the student said.

Extract 14

“I don’t know the point because teacher does not provide comment.”

(Participant 20)

Extract 15

“It actually not good enough because it is just cross out and circle my mistakes without any of clue or clarification to help me revise it.”

(Participant 25)

Extract 16

“I do not like this feedback because it’s confusing. If the teacher only circle my errors, so, I can’t get what she actually want me to write. At least, my teacher should give explanation.”

(Participant 30)

Next to those who do not prefer Indirect CF, 13 students prefer this type of CF for it is helpful to be used as feedback for writing. The writer found that there were two underlying reasons due the usefulness of this feedback. The first one, it is considered helpful to increase and stimulate students’ awareness of their weaknesses in writing. It might because Indirect CF only has the role to show the place where the errors exist without actually correct it. The writer then could
conclude that this kind of feedback was helpful to raise students’ awareness of their errors. Students need to learn how to recognize their errors so that they will be able to avoid doing the same mistakes in their future writing. It was supported by the extracts below.

Extract 17

“I think Indirect Feedback can help me to be conscious of my own errors.”

(Participant 5)

Extract 18

“Yes, it is good to make me aware of my weaknesses in writing.”

(Participant 19)

The second reason of why Indirect CF useful for writing is because it helps to stimulate students to do self-revising errors. Self-revising errors is important for future writing because it was impossible to always depend on the teacher’s correction. Since one of writing processes is revising, it contributes to students for building their ability to correct their own errors in order to produce a good writing product. The following extracts are the student’s statement.

Extract 19

“I think it’s good to help me in learning how to correct my mistakes by myself, that’s why I prefer this feedback, too.”

(Participant 2)
Extract 20

“It let the students recognizing their errors. So, they will learn to correct it by themselves.”

(Participant 19)

Indirect CF might have the disadvantages such as lack of teacher’s explanation and confusing because it only consists of marks. On the other side, Indirect CF is not only good at stimulating students to be aware of their own errors, but also can be used to encourage students correcting errors by their own. This is the same with the results of Lalande’s study (1982, in Ellis, 2008), Indirect CF is indeed more effective in case of enabling students to correct their own errors and encouraging students to reflect about linguistic forms. Here, through Indirect CF, teachers could encourage students to practice self-correction of error and implement their linguistics knowledge in revising process.

**Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback**

The third preferred of WCF was Metalinguistic CF. From the total 30 interviewed students in this study, 21 of them preferred the use of Metalingusitic CF as the feedback for their writing, while, the rest of 9 did not. Ellis (2008) stated that teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clues as to the nature of the errors in Metalinguistic CF. Teacher could use errors codes or brief description of the errors in the margin. The clues were to help the students to identify their errors specifically in order to give them an ease for revising the
mistakes. First, the writer found that there was one underlying reason of the students to prefer Metalinguistic CF due to its usefulness in writing. The reason is Metalinguistic CF gives an ease in guessing the errors type. The following extracts are what the students said.

Extract 21

“I can guess what my errors are and try to correct it by my own because teacher was helping by writing a short comment.”

(Participant 13)

Extract 22

“The brief description gives me opportunity to try identifying what my errors type.”

(Participant 14)

The aforementioned students’ extracts indicated that the clues provided by the teacher in Metalinguistic CF, which can be given through a short or brief comment in the students’ paper, were useful to guide the students to guess whether the errors were categorized as grammatical feature, writing content or any other error type.

To the writer’s analysis, the use of Metalinguistic CF in helping students guessing the error type was somehow similar to Indirect CF. The only difference was unlike the Metalinguistic CF in which teacher write brief comment or clues to help students identify their errors easily, there is no brief description of the nature of errors in Indirect CF. Here, the writer could conclude that the brief description
or clues can reduce the confusion for the students in how to use the feedback for correcting their errors in writing. In this case, the teachers help the students to be more aware of their own errors by supplying some clues and brief description in the margin which in turn provide the student the opportunity correct their errors by themselves in the end. The clues were provided in order to assist students to identify what kind of errors exactly they had made and what actually the teacher expect them to do with their writing.

In contrast, for those who did not prefer Metalinguistic CF to be used as the feedback for their writing progress, there were two themes divided based on the students’ reasons of why they did not prefer this kind of feedback. The first one is Metalinguistic CF is as confusing as Indirect CF. It can be indicated that although Metalinguistic CF provides clues to help students recognizing the type of errors, students still found that somehow it is confusing. It might because they have to find the correction by themselves. Here was what the students said.

Extract 23

“It is also confusing for me because sometimes teachers used codes and I don’t familiar with that codes.”

(Participant 21)

Extract 24

“It is the same with Indirect, confusing.”

(Participant 30)
The second reason is the students had a hard time to work with Metalinguistic CF for the revision process. It might because students need time to think about what and how they should revise their draft properly even though clues were already provided to help. It was shown in the following extracts.

Extract 25

“It is also need hard time to think about the proper correction.”

(Participant 9)

Extract 26

“It’s less practical and effective because I need long time to understand this feedback.”

(Participant 28)

From extract, the writer could conclude that students might want a kind of feedback which is more practical. Or in other words, they wanted a kind of feedback like Direct CF in which there was no need for them to spend a quiet long time to work and think by their own about the proper correction. Thus, the students also considered Metalinguistic CF as confusing and time-consuming like Indirect CF.

Even though the existence of clues and comments in Metalinguistic CF tend to be time-consuming and confusing so that students still had hard time in using the feedback, the writer believes that this kind of feedback is helpful in the long-term. This is because when a student only given clues and the decision of correction is placed on the students’ side, it will reduce the possibility to make the
same or more errors in the future. Since, their awareness of errors is unconsciously increased as they practice to find the correction by themselves. The study of Lalande in Ellis (2008) also proved the similar idea that the use of clues or errors codes in feedback given to a group of learners was improving the accuracy in subsequent writing, whereas those who did not receive such feedback made more errors.
CONCLUSION

The study aims to finding out the students’ preferences of WCF types in their Narrative and Descriptive Writing Class.

The study found out that from the five types of WCF proposed by Ellis (2008), there were only three types of feedback used by the teacher out of 5 types. The students demonstrated different preference regarding the WCF used by the teachers. The first preferred of WCF was Direct CF. All the 30 students preferred this kind of feedback due to four reasons. They are Direct CF helps to recognize the errors and facilitate students in revising their writing, it is understandable and therefore is more facilitating in the revision stage, it provides sufficient correction, and it was not time-consuming.

Then, the second preferred of WCF was Indirect CF with 13 students who preferred it and 17 who did not. For those who preferred Indirect CF said that it is considered helpful to increase and stimulate students’ awareness of their weaknesses in writing and helps stimulate students to do self-revising errors. In contrast, those who did not prefer it said that it tends to be confusing and lack of teacher’s explanation.

Next, the third preferred of WCF was Metalinguistic CF with 21 students who preferred it and 9 who did not. For those who preferred Metalinguistic CF said that it gives an ease in guessing the errors type. On the other hand, for those who did not prefer it said that Metalinguistic CF is as confusing as Indirect CF.
and the students had a hard time to work with Metalinguistic CF for the revision process.

Nevertheless, the result of this study cannot be generalized into all contexts. Other similar research may find different result. It is because the limitation of this study which is set in English Department with a small number of subject.

Thus, the writer strongly recommends for other researchers who want to do a further study in the area of WCF to dig deeper about it. It is recommended to enlarge the number of subjects or take different setting. At last, the writer hope that the result of this study can be useful to enrich our knowledge about WCF and can be a reference for EFL/ESL writing teachers in giving useful feedback based on their students’ needs.
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APPENDIX A: Question for Interview

1. Can you recognize this type of Feedback in your writing?
2. Do you prefer this as your feedback or not?
3. What do you think about this? Is it helpful to recognize the error that you made in your writing?
4. Is this Feedback facilitating to revise your draft?
APPENDIX B

TYPES OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK PROPOSED BY ROD ELLIS (2008) AND EXAMPLES

1. Direct written corrective feedback

It provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. Teachers provide correct form, i.e. crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase or morpheme, inserting a missing word, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form.

Example:

Student’s writing:
A boy stole wallet from girl. He escaped with having wallet. When the girl was going through bridge over the river she found boy in the river.

Teacher’s correction:
A boy stole X wallet from X girl. He escaped with having X wallet. When the girl was going

through bridge over the river she found boy in the river.

2. Indirect written corrective feedback

Involves indicating that the learner has made an error but without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the learners’ text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error.
Example:

Student’s writing:

A boy stole wallet from girl. He escaped with having wallet. When the girl was going through bridge over the river she found boy in the river.

Teacher’s correction:

A boy stole X wallet from X girl. He escaped with XhavingXX wallet. When the girl was going XthroughX X bridge over XtheX river she found X boy in the river.

Notes:

X : missing word
X___X : wrong word

3. Metalinguistic written corrective feedback.

Provides learners with some form of explicit comment about the nature of the errors they have made.

- Use of error codes, i.e. abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors placed over the location of the error in the text or in the margin. E.g. art = article, prep = preposition, sp = spelling, ww = wrong word, t = tense, etc.
- Metalinguistic explanations of their errors, e.g. numbering errors and providing metalinguistic comments at the end of the text.
Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>Art.</th>
<th>WW art.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A boy stole wallet from girl. He escaped with having wallet. When the girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep. art.</td>
<td>art.</td>
<td>art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was going through bridge over the river she found boy in the river.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Art. X 3; WW A boy stole wallet from girl. He escaped with having wallet.
Prep.; art. When the girl was going through bridge over the river she found boy in the river.

4. **Focus of the feedback**

Focused vs. unfocused written corrective feedback

This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students’ errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options.

Example:

(1) (2) (3)

A boy stole wallet from girl. He escaped with having wallet. When the girl was

(4) (5) (6) (7)

going through bridge over the river she found boy in the river.
Correction:

(1), (2), (5), and (6) (7)—you need ‘a’ before the noun when a person or thing is mentioned for the first time.

(3)---you need ‘the’ before the noun when the person or thing has been mentioned previously.

(4)---you need ‘over’ when you go across the surface of something; you use ‘through’ when you go inside something (e.g. ‘go through the forest’).

So, for the focus of the feedback, in the above examples the teacher could have chosen to correct just article errors.

5. **Reformulation written corrective feedback**

This involves native-speakers rewriting learners’ text in such a way as ’to preserve as many of writers’ ideas as possible, while expressing them in their own words so as to make the pieces sound native-like’.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original version</th>
<th>As he was running, his knees were shaked.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reformulation</td>
<td>As he was running, his knees were shaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knees shaking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Error correction | As he was jogging his tammy were shaked. |