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This study aimed to investigate the effect of the two types of written corrective feedback, namely, direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback, on the grammatical accuracy of students’ business correspondences’ and to explore their responses in terms of attitudes and perceptions towards two types of feedback. A pre-test-post-test design was used to determine the effectiveness of the two types of feedback on 21 grammatical points. Sixty-four Thai students majoring in Business English participated in this one-semester study. Paired sample T-tests were used to compare the means of same group’s pre and post tests. Also, the independent-sample T-test was used to analyze the means of the two different groups receiving different types of feedback. A questionnaire survey was conducted and students’ reflection journal on their attitudes and perceptions, moreover, semi-structured interviews were qualitatively analyzed for salient themes. Even though students in both groups improved significantly, there were also significant differences between the groups receiving different types of feedback. Those receiving direct corrective feedback significantly outperformed the indirect corrective feedback group in terms of syntactic errors (incorrect tense, whole sentence or clause aberrant, relative clauses, singular for plural, plural for singular, verb missing, subject formation, subject-verb agreement,
sentence fragment, and run-on sentences) as well as mechanic errors (capitalization and spelling). However, in terms of grammatical errors (pronoun, article, preposition, word form, conjunction, and negation) the indirect corrective feedback was significantly better than their counterpart. The questionnaire, students’ reflection journal entries, and semi-structured interviews revealed that students paid attention and were aware of the corrective feedback that they received however; both groups reported their preference for direct over the indirect corrective feedback. There is a mis-match between students’ attitudes and perceptions and writing instructors’ in terms of providing corrective feedback. With respect to pedagogical implications, the findings supported the role of written corrective feedback in L2 writing. Nevertheless, its impact on participants with a different EFL background needs further investigation.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

In an increasingly globalized world, English is widely used for various purposes, such as business, traveling, finding a job, etc. In the business world, English plays several roles, such as a role in internal and external communication and a role in having a chance to get a good job (Davies, 2000). Consequently, for individuals to be able to participate fully on the global stage, it is essential for them to develop English skills to their fullest potentials.

Among the four basic language skills, in recent years, writing skill has become more necessary than the other skills (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). The ability to write well is not a naturally acquired skill; it is usually learned or culturally transmitted as a set of practices in formal instructional settings or other environments. The need to express opinions and thoughts through writing in literate societies is very crucial. People are involved in many types of writing in their everyday lives, such as personal diaries, business letters, proposals, etc (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996). As Hyland wrote “for over half a century writing has been a central topic in applied linguistics and remains an area of lively intellectual research and debate” (2003, p.1). It is therefore highly acceptable that writing can be studied from a wide range of perspectives. When students who are non-native speakers of English enter the academic arena in English medium institutions of higher learning, the pedagogical tasks associated with improving students’ writing skills become far more complicated than they had been in writing instruction to native speakers of English (Hinkel, 2002, p.1), although writing is not capable of being acquired but learned. Yet, a certain amount of consciousness-raising may be warranted, students are required to write close to error-free texts with the expectations of becoming more proficient writers in the L2.

Moreover, English is also used in a variety of professions such as academic studies of medicine, science, as well as in information technology. As a result, English becomes a lingua franca for both communication and in professions. English is used as a medium of communication these days all over the globe. Jenkins (2007,
p.34) states that, “It is often observed that English has become a global language, and that the majority of its non-native speakers (NNS) use it as a lingua franca to communicate”. According to McArthur (1998, p.38), “English is the lingua franca of airports and major hotels, civil aviation and shipping lanes. It is the leading language of science, medicine, technology, and academic publications.” Another conclusion made by Hyland (2002, p.78) is that even though writing is thought to be more necessary compared to other skills, unfortunately, writing research does not provide “cut-and-dried” answers as to how to best teach writing. Writing is thought to be more necessary than the other skills as the ability to share opinions and express our thoughts through writing indicates literacy.

Teachers dealing with English courses, and writing courses in particular at this international university face many kinds of challenges – dealing with correcting and marking students’ writing assignments. A survey of teachers and students of a writing focused English course at this particular university regarding homework practices found that most students received written feedback on their written assignments from their teachers and all teachers reported giving such feedback (Parreno, 2001). When giving feedback on students’ writings, teachers employ various practices. He noted in his survey that there is no system or standard set by the university on how teachers should give feedback. Hence, different ways of commenting on ideas, organization, and language use are common by writing instructors. While giving feedback, teachers face the day-to-day challenge of trying to find the right balance between the effectiveness of feedback provided and efficiency in their usage of time.

Based on the aforementioned problems, a writing instructor is required to evaluate and provide feedback to students’ writing to help them constantly improve. However, the series of writing, evaluating, rewriting and reevaluating require a great deal of time and energy for both the teacher as well as the students. Therefore, it is important for the writing instructor to have evidence on the value of the feedback they are providing to their students.
Conflicting findings on corrective feedback have been reported since the mid 80’s up to today; hence, the research results have not been helpful in settling the issue of whether to use or avoid corrective feedback in EFL/ESL classrooms (Guentte, 2007; Storch, 2010). Based on the mixed and conflicting findings, writing teachers in the EFL context are left to depend on their personal preferences on whether and how feedback should be provided for their students’ written work.

1.2 Thai Educational Context

As this study will be conducted in Thailand, to be specific in a Thai academic context involving undergraduate students, some general background on the importance of English in the Thai context needs to be provided.

According to many scholars (Foley, 2005; Wiriyachitra, 2004; Wongsothorn, 2003), English has been introduced in Thailand dated back in 1800’s when it was taught in the palace to only members of the royal family. Not until 1921 did English became a compulsory subject in schools for students after grade four. In 1996, the Ministry of Education made English a compulsory subject starting from grade one. Punthumasen (2007) reports that formal education system in Thailand is divided into two levels. The first level is the basic educational system which includes six years of primary and six years of secondary education. The second level is the “lower than degree level and degree level” (p.5). The English curriculum is based on “culture, communication, connection, and community” (p.137). This curriculum “introduces a compulsory 12 credits of English at tertiary level: 6 in general English and 6 in academic English or English for specific purposes” (p.136).

1.2.1 The Roles of English in Thai Educational Context

According to Anurit, Selvarajah and Meyer (2011), unlike its neighboring countries, Thailand has never been colonized. Hence, as Wiriyachitra (2004, p.1) puts it, “Thailand has always been a country with only one official language which is Thai. He further explains that as Thailand needs to progress in terms of business, education, and tourism industries, Thais need to be able to demonstrate high proficiency for communication and negotiation with those who cannot speak Thai in today’s globalized world. As a result, English has become a necessity in Thai schools and
universities. Also, Wongsothorn, Sukamolson, Chinthammit, Ratanothayanonth, and Noparumpa (1996) found that 97% of Thai students started their English education at the elementary level. It is also required in national entrance examinations. However, its status in the country is still a foreign language. The reason is because; English does not serve as an official language and people are not required to know the language for everyday functions.

The effects of globalization, world trade, and technology have encouraged the Thai government to reform its education policy. Under the National Education Act of B.E. 2542 (1999), which aims to promote a knowledge-based society and a competitive economy for sustainable development of the country (Ministry of Education, 2004a), English language instruction has been to improve language proficiency of Thai students (Wongsotorn, 2003; Wongsotorn, Khiranburana, & Chinnawongs, 2003) and equip students with useful learning processes and strategies to enhance the use of English for academic and social purposes (Ministry of Education, 2004b). The policy reformation has put pressure on English instruction particularly at a higher education level, as it is highly expected to prepare students before entering job markets. The changes are aimed to equip them with English knowledge as well as language and study skills before entering to the real-world industry (Wiriyachitra, 2004; Wongsotorn, Khiranburana, & Chinnawongs, 2003).

However, as mentioned by Wongsothorn et al. (1996, p.89) even though Thailand does not officially claim to be having second language, the most vital foreign language used as a means of international communication is English. This is also confirmed by Foley (2005) who stated that English has been added to the curriculum as a required subject in the majority of schools and all universities. Unlike other languages such as Japanese, Chinese or French which are offered in Thailand, English is the only language, according to Wongsothorn, that is taught in most language classes at all levels. In the business sector, English is often used alongside Thai. Many business documents are in both Thai and English (Wongsothorn et al., 1996).
1.3 Description and Objective of the Course

Business Communication in English II is the course that concentrates on the study and interpretation of the forms of writing for business at the executive level and it includes the development of skills in business writing where strategies and skills and in-depth analysis are an important aspect of the communication. One of the objectives of the course is aimed at developing the students’ accuracy in writing skill for building informative, request, negative, and persuasive messages for business correspondence purposes.

1.4 Rationale of the Study

Much of what a student is required to do in the Business Communication II course is writing business correspondences and at the same time instructors are required to teach as well as provide feedback in order to help them improve their writing. Since the on-going process of writing, evaluating, giving feedback and rewriting take up a great amount of both instructors and students’ time, it is therefore necessary for instructors to have evidence as to what kind of feedback is of most value to the improvement of their students’ writing.

According to Nunan (1999), providing feedback side by side to giving instruction is considered as one of the most significant roles that a writing instructor can assume. Ellis (1997, p. 70) also added that it is teachers’ “traditional right” to provide feedback on students’ written works. Hence, teachers are supposed to provide feedback on their students’ productions. Teachers spend a good amount of their time and effort to provide their students with various kinds of feedback. Ferris (2007, p.166) also mentioned that providing feedback to learners is considered to be teachers’ “most time consuming and challenging part” of the writing instructions. Nevertheless, Leki (1991) advocates that it is very vital that teachers provide feedback as students prefer their errors to be corrected. He adds that students will feel very frustrated if teachers do not provide any feedback on their productions. Hence, teacher feedback plays a significant role in developing student writing.

The effectiveness of providing feedback is considered an important aspect of a teacher (Hyland and Hyland, 2006) but whether correcting students’ error will positively result in better students’ writing is still something that researchers and
scholars need to examine. This study uses the framework based on Ellis’ (2009) typology of corrective feedback—direct correction and indirect correction.

Furthermore, it has been concluded by researchers such as Campbell (2002) and Nickerson (2005) that language accuracy in business English writing, including different types of letters and business correspondences is taken for granted even though the mastery of such skill is one of the significant criteria in the companies’ recruitment process. According to Schott Karr (2001), graduates with business letter savvy will be highly valued by professional recruiters. Arvani (2006, p. 13) adds that in the globalized world, business correspondence serves as the main channel of communication and therefore its accuracy should not be overlooked.

In addition, a study carried out by Turk (1989 in Napoli et al., 1999) confirmed that business writing or written communication skills were crucial for graduates wanting to be successful in their future careers. Also, business sectors consider their prospect employees to have effective business writing skills as one of the criteria in the recruiting procedure. Not only that, in a study conducted by Roberts (1992) which involved around 1000 executives, it was found that more than 70% of them indicated that job applicants failed in the process of recruitment because of their poor writing abilities, especially in the areas of grammar.

Yet another interesting confirmation by Tangkiengsirisin (2003) is that careful and skillful business writer will ultimately lead a life of a successful businessperson as business writing plays a vital role in business communication. He added that business communicators are usually judged by the way they write. Therefore, the ability to write effective messages is one of the essential characteristics that all business communicators need to possess.

Learners can only use just so much feedback information as giving too much at once will simply distract, or discourage and may actually detract from the value of learning (Ur, 1996). This view is also supported by Katayama (2007) and Ellis (2016). Ellis(2016) states that correcting all aspects of errors both content and grammar at once would harm students’ feeling which would discourage them from learning. Hence, this present study also sheds light on this field’s literature by investigating the effectiveness of the two types of feedback on students’ writing.
The main focus is on writing accuracy, using 21 error classifications based on Polio (1997).

The present study is similar to other studies in certain aspects but with the aims of filling the gap in the literature, there are also many differences, for example, the study of Kepner (1991), Chandler (2003) and Bitchener el al. (2005). Firstly, it is similar to Kepner’s study in a way that both studies investigate the effect of two types of feedback on students’ writing. However, this present study can be contrasted from the previous one as this one was carried out on EFL students and secondly, the researcher is the teacher for both experimental groups. Moreover, unlike the previous study, post test has been implemented in this present study.

The similarities of this study as compared to that of Bitchener et al. (2005) is that both aim at investigating the effect of different types of feedback. Yet the differences remain in the points being investigated. Unlike Bitchener et al.’s study which investigated only accuracy in the use of preposition, articles and the past tense, this study looked at the effect of two types of corrective feedback on 21 error points adapted from Polio (1997) (see APPENDIX B).

Moreover, the current study is similar to Chandler’s (2003) study as both investigate the effect of written corrective feedback. However, this study focused only on two types of corrective feedback, i.e. direct and indirect types focusing on 21 key aspects adapted from Polio (1997). The classification of errors in this study was based on Wu and Garza (2013), where errors are categorized under four main categories namely: syntactic errors, grammatical errors, semantic errors, and mechanical errors.

Furthermore, unlike the study carried out by Ellis et al. (2008) and Bitchener and Knoch (2009) which implemented the treatment only once, this study implemented the treatment four times throughout the course. According to Parreno (2014), the value and relevance of any instructional method will only be appreciated if it is carried out as a part of the curriculum cycle rather than just once.
1.5 Significance of the Study

As discussed earlier, extensive studies on the possible impact of teacher feedback on students’ writing have been conducted, yet its value is still undetermined (Gass & Magnan, 1999). Gass and Magan note that some researchers “advocate the need to view the same question from different perspective in order to identify and study more variables” (p.186).

The present study contributes to the field of ELT in several ways. Firstly, the findings from this study may provide the writing teachers with awareness of the right balance between the effectiveness of feedback they provide to the students and the efficiency in their usage of time. Secondly, the findings would also serve as valuable guidelines for both researchers and instructors to use in order to help their students achieve accuracy in business writing. Lastly, this current study can also provide the institution in question with a different method to enhance students’ writing ability in terms of business correspondences which is necessary for their academic and professional successes.

Furthermore, the answers to the research questions in this study can add to the existing body of knowledge and fill up the gap as recommended by scholars such as Ellis et al. (2008), Ferris (2010), and Storch (2010) in terms of pedagogical implications. The insights on the qualitative aspects can also address Storch’s (2010) recommendation regarding students’ affective aspect when students receive feedback on their writing.

1.6 Research Objectives

This research aims:

1. To investigate the two types of written corrective feedback (direct and indirect corrective feedback) on the students’ writing accuracy

2. To explore the students’ perceptions and attitudes towards the two types of written corrective feedback
1.7 Research Questions

1. Are there significant differences in the effects of the two types of written corrective feedback, namely, direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback, on students’ writing accuracy?

2. What are students’ perceptions and attitudes towards the two types of written corrective feedback?

The following hypothesis is made based on the research question:

Ho: There is not any significant difference between the effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback on learners' achievement.

1.8 Operational Definition of Terms

The definitions of key terms for this study are provided below:

**Accuracy**: the ability to be free from errors and the correct use of specific language items. In this research it refers to 21 grammatical errors (see APPENDIX B)

**Students**: in this study, students refer to Thai Business English major students at this particular international university enrolling in Business Communication in English II course for semester 2/2015.

**Written corrective feedback**: in this study, this refers to the feedback on students’ errors in their writing focusing on language accuracy. In this study the two types of written corrective feedback are direct and indirect written corrective feedback.

**Direct corrective feedback**: this refers to the kind of written comments explicitly given by the writing instructors in order to supply the corrections by 1. drawing a line through error and writing the correct words/phrase/ above it, 2. cutting out unnecessary word/phrases/chunks to make the structure accurate, 3. adding in a letter, word, or word chunks to make the structure accurate

**Indirect corrective feedback**: this refers to the written corrective feedback in which the writing instructor will only point out or locates the errors by underlining or circling without providing the corrections or explanations
1.9 Chapter Summary

In a nutshell, this chapter presented the background and rationale for the present study. It described the need for this study, the related research gaps to be investigated, the purpose of the study, the significance of the study, and the operational definitions of the major terms used in this study. The next chapter will present a review of related literature addressing the issues of writing approaches, types of feedback and their importance, mainly in the L2 context.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

There is a very large body of literature on second language writing covering wide range of topics. However, the literature review section of this thesis will place the most emphasis on written corrective feedback in second language writing.

Firstly, the researcher will shed some light on what scholars say about feedback and how it is provided in the case of second language writing. Also, the researcher will discuss the different approaches to writing – the product approach, process approach and the genre approach - in terms of the advantages and limitations. Thirdly, theories of language relevant to second language learning that have implication for error correction will also be discussed. Lastly, the main focus will be placed on the written corrective feedback on L2 writing. Various types of feedback such as error correction, coding, reformulation, conferencing, as well as peer feedback, will be outlined. The emphasis will be on two main methods of corrective feedback which are direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback. Empirical research and previous studies’ findings on feedback will also be summarized and compared.

2.2 Different Approaches of Writing in Second Language

Writing was once thought to be the written form of oral language. Nowadays, written language is recognized as more than just “talk written down” (Nunan 1999). Nunan states that writing was invented due to societies’ changing needs. These needs cannot be met by merely spoken language. Thus, when the need for records that could be used for multiple references arose, writing then emerged. According to Grabe and Kaplan (1996), writing is considered to be a set of skills that require constant practice. These skills are learnt through both experiences and practices (p.6). Taking this into consideration, writing pedagogy is all the more relevant.

The term writing itself refers to a sequence of words linked together in a certain way (Harmer, 2004). Writing is the process of combining thoughts and
knowledge that writers want to convey into a piece of writing. Writing ability is to produce a good piece of writing to match its audiences as well as to reflect the accuracy of grammar and sentence structures (Tribble, 1996). In order to assist students to be good writers, raising their awareness of the learning process and understanding the system of the target language is necessary (Vickers & Ene, 2006). For many years, researchers have been trying to find the most effective way to teach writing in order to develop students’ writing ability. Different approaches have been proposed such as the product approach, the process approach, and the genre approach. In the section below, these writing approaches are explored.

2.2.1 Product Approach

This approach regards writing as textual products in which meanings are considered to be encoded by the writer and are expected to be decoded by the reader. There should not be any confusion or ambiguity as according to Hyland (2002), readers have to strictly conform to homogeneous practices.

Pincas (1982a) states that the product approach to teaching writing focuses on linguistics knowledge. In other words, the emphasis is on the correct usage of vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devices. To elaborate, she came up with four stages to this approach of writing, namely familiarization, controlled writing, guided writing, and free writing. The first stage is to bring about awareness of certain features of the text. However, the controlled and guided writing stages provide more freedom to the learners in order to practice their skills until they feel ready for the last stage which is ‘free writing’. This is when they use their skills to write a letter, story or even an essay (p.22). She sees this approach of writing as primarily about linguistic knowledge with the main focus on vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devises.

According to Nunan (1999) the product approach focuses on student copying from the teachers’ supplied models. It is considered to be a linear pattern of writing (Adams, 2006). This model of writing, as Burton (2005) describes, is a single “draft-think-plan” linear process with only one-off correction.

This approach is more useful when applied in a situation where the main focus is placed on form or the structure (Tribble, 1996). Even though this approach has
dominated the L2 writing practices for a good amount of time, it has some limitations. First of all, this approach does not pay attention to students’ strategies of learning but only focuses on the writing structure and the use of vocabulary (Ferris and Hedgecock, 2005). Another weakness deals with the problem of writing restriction.

As stated by many scholars such as Pincas (1962), Hinkel and Fotos (2002), Richards (2002), and Ferris and Hedgecock (2005), the disadvantages far surpass the advantages, as it only focuses on the end product rather than the means.

According to Wallace and Hyes (1991), it is very crucial to have revision as it helps students make changes to their writing. One of the main revision methods is peer feedback. However, in certain instructional contexts, students do not trust their peers’ feedback. This is often the case in Thailand where the level of English is quite low and the students prefer their teacher’s feedback.

In brief, this approach is concerned with appropriate knowledge on the structure of language from which writing develops as a result of input in the form of texts provided by the teachers.

**2.2.2 Process Approach**

It was during the 1990’s that the process approach to writing came to be known in writing pedagogy. According to Silva and Matsuda (2002), the process approach to writing is a complex, recursive and creative process which is quite similar in its general outlines for both L1 and L2 writers when they are learning to write.

In contrast to the product approach, the process writing or the process approach places less emphasis on linguistic skills as students’ writing is not seen as a product to be evaluated. This notion of writing regards writing as a process of discovering meaning and developing organization (Matsuda, 2003). Teachers in the process writing act as a facilitator not as an evaluator (Joe, 1992).

Tribble (1996, p.160) explains the process approach as an approach to the teaching of writing in which more stress is given to the creativity of the writer and places more emphasis on the improvement or the development of good writing practices. As for Hedge (2005), the process of text will have to go through various stages of revision, editing, and generating.
Being motivated to write → getting ideas together → planning and outlining → making notes →
writing up first draft → revision → get ready to publish

The stages of writing process from Hedge (2005, p.51)

Moreover, the writing process cannot be considered as a linear process but rather recursive, meaning the students may go through the revision stage at any time (Raimes, 1985; Smith 1982). This process approach of writing according to Badger and White (2000) is considered as unconscious process through enough practice of the language skills. Moreover, Jordan (1997, p.168) believes that the process approach helps students “decide on the direction” of their writing. The students are directed through the recursive practice of discussion, drafting, feedback and informed choices.

Also, the process approach involves the reviewing stage in which writers are supposed to evaluate and revise their written work which entails multiple drafts. In elaborating the Flower Hayes process model, Flower et al. (1986) described what revision in writing is. They claimed that in revising, writers evaluate their work based on intentions and criteria they have set for their writing. Writers’ intentions are their goals and plans for their written work, while criteria are standards for a good text, in terms of grammar, organization, and other genre requirements, which have been set in writers’ long term memory. “Detecting problems in the text involves reading the text and comparing it to the set intentions, and both processes are influenced by the writers’ willingness to entertain dissonance” (p.28). However, they also noted that as the writing process is non-linear, revision does not occur at the end only, instead writers constantly monitor their writing from planning to translating, to reviewing in a back and forth fashion.

2.2.3 Genre Approach

A quite recent approach is the genre approach of writing. Despite being a recent approach, the genre approach is considered to be an extended version to the
product approach. There are various definitions provided by well known scholars about what is meant by genre. Swales (1990, p.58) defines genre as a “class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes which are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community.”

Badger and White (2000) consider this to be a variation of the product approach in which multifaceted social context is also a focus in the writing. They explain that the main element in this approach is to point out the relationship between the writer and the reader. According to Flowerdew (1993), it is categorized into different kinds of text, for instance, articles, legal reports, and business letters.

Genres are used to teach students the types of written text they need in their target setting. (Bhatia, 1993; Swales 1990). To illustrate, when learners write a letter, they should understand the difference between an informal and a complaint letter. Dudley-Evans (1997) presented three phases of genre approach. According to him, the students are presented with a sample model of the target model in the first phase. Then in the second phase, students, with the help of the teachers and relevant exercise, practice the language forms. In the final phase, students then can produce text on their own.

According to Badger and White (2000), there are six steps for the teaching procedure of process genre approach. These six steps include: preparation, modeling, planning, joint constructing, independent constructing, and revising. The first step is preparation in which the teacher will begin with preparing their students to write by providing a situation that will require them to produce a written text. The second step is modeling and reinforcing in which the teachers introduce a model of genre to students and allow the students to think about the social context of the written text. The third step is planning in which many activities are set up to trigger the students’ schemata about the topic by either brainstorming or classroom discussion. The fourth step is joint constructing which the teacher and the students work together in order to start writing a task. The fifth step is the independent constructing in which the students have examined the model texts and are ready to compose their own written
text. The final step is revising in which the students eventually have their work checked, discussed or evaluated with either fellow students or the teachers.

While these experts paid less attention to the specific roles of content and their social environments, most ESP researchers, such as Bhatia (1993), Flowerdew (1993), and Swales (1990) primarily outlined the genre approach with spotlights on the formal distinctiveness of genres in order to help students gain understanding of the communicative purposes and linguistic features of texts that they are required to write in their professional discourses. They regarded genres as devices for examining and teaching the written texts that students needed to master in specific settings like English for academic purposes and English for professional communication classrooms.

There are several strengths offered by the use of genre approach to writing. First of all as Swales (1990, p. 83) explains how the rhetorical instruction plays crucial role in improving of students’ writing by providing foundation knowledge. Bhatia (1993) recommends, if the rhetorical structure of content is analyzed using the genre approach, the students will be able to identify common patterns in each genre. These common features will therefore serve as foundation knowledge for students that can be used by them in the next learning setting.

Moreover, the genre approach also promotes participation from the students to understand writing as a tool that they can use and to realize how writers manage content to create logical organization. According to Kay & Dudley-Evan (1998, p.310), low proficiency learners need something that they can rely on as they have little exposure to the English writing. This allows the students to become more flexible in their thinking and they will eventually realize how authors of each genre organize their writing.

Even though the genre approach has considerable beneficial roles, there are two drawbacks. As Byram (2004, p.236) claims, it underestimates the required skill of content production from the students. Another limitation is that it fails to take into account students’ self-sufficiency. Hence, this approach is often blamed for limiting the learners’ creative thoughts about the content (Badger & White, 2000 p.157). According to Johns et al. (2006) the genre approach may be a double-edged sword,
on the one end it can help learners to identify and interpret literary texts while on the other the genre approach interferes with the learners’ creativity.

To overcome the limitation of the genre approach as discussed above, Badger and White (2000) did an experiment by combining genre and process approaches together as an alternative known as the “process-genre approach” or the process genre model of writing.

![Figure 2.1 A Process-Genre Model](image)

A Process-Genre Model of Writing (Badger and White, 2000, p.159)

Gee (1997) states that the creation of process approach is to overcome the disadvantages of the product approach and by the same token, the genre approach’s creation is to overcome the disadvantages of the process approach as well.

In sum, it can be said that the product approach mainly places the emphasis on a good written product without paying much attention to the process of writing. However, in the process approach, students follow the phases of prewriting, revising and editing before the final product is submitted. As for the genre approach, more emphasis is placed on the context and social situation.

### 2.2.3.1 Business Letter Genre

Nowadays letters and written correspondences play a significant role in the realm of communication in general and in official or business occasions in particular. With the advent of emails, the function of letters is diminishing but in official
contexts, letters have kept their value. Various researchers have come to the conclusion that business letter genre can be further distinguished to other universal sub-genre or repertoires (offering prices, promoting sales, requesting information, etc.) (Dos Santos 2002, Flowerdew and Wan 2006, Henry and Roseberry 2001). These repertoires, according to Miller (1984), can be easily classified as they are intended to perform a determined action within the business organization. As far as Nus Van (1999) is concerned, the structural elements that constitute a business letter include the following elements:

| Letterhead: Consisting of company name, logo, address |
| Inside address: consisting receiver’s name and address |
| Date: date of when the letter was sent |
| Salutation: Shows the beginning of the letter |
| Subject Line(optional): Prepares the reader for the body of the letter |
| Close: Signal the ending of the letter |
| Signature: include sender’s personal information such as position and name |

Figure 2.2 Business Letter Elements

Also, Nelson (2000; 2006) distinguished business lexis from words in everyday communication. To elaborate, nouns used in business represent business related institutions, concepts and places while adjectives were found to be more of a positive stand and impersonal. As far as verbs are concerned, they are rather dynamic. Nickerson (2000) came up with linguistic devises that people tend to use in the context of business communication. These include, hedges, passives, attitude markers, emphatics, relational markers as well as inter-textual markers. Even though there are varieties of business letter, the basic structures of business letters constitute fixed elements referred to as “stable units” or “standard structural units for business letter” (Van Nus, 1999). These fixed units are letterhead, inside address, reference, date, salutation, subject line, pre-close, close, signature, and postscript. This distinguished
them from general English composition. However, non native speakers often find difficulties in writing the main part of the business letter (Flowerdew & Wan, 2006).

As Park et al. (1998) puts it, the main objective of a business letter is to obtain a “favorable response” from the reader, so its overall accuracy and clarity should be highly considered by the writer. To elaborate, they further explained that students are expected to write business letter in English that would be read and judged by readers who have their own values, range of acceptable standard and convention. Hence, the language accuracy and clarity of the written message are the first and foremost considerations.

2.3 Feedback and its Importance

2.3.1 Defining Feedback

Feedback is an important skill and a valuable part of any language course. It is a crucial aspect of the writing instruction. Primarily, research shows that it enables students to assess their performances, modify their behavior and transfer their understanding. Hyland (2002) added that a good feedback’s purpose is not to assign grades to students’ writing, rather, it is to explain what needs to be done in order to help the students write better.

2.3.2 Types of Feedback

Feedback comes in different forms, and one of the most common is correction. Sadler (1989) linked feedback to gap-filling in student understanding, and one way to fill the gap is to indicate to learners that they are either correct or incorrect.

Based on empirical studies, Kauchak and Eggen (1998, p. 44) suggested that, in order to be useful in student learning, feedback should provide “corrective information” and should be “specific”. It is, thus, not surprising to observe that one of the most common forms of feedback is error correction or corrective feedback, especially in second language learning, which is called by other names such as error treatment or error repair (Ellis, 2000).

According to Chaudron (1984, p.13), there are several terms used to identify the act of providing feedback. The three most common terms are corrective feedback,
negative evidence and negative feedback. He explains that correct feedback consists of different layers of meaning. According to his view, the term “treatment of error” is simply referring to “any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the factor of error”. Yet there exists “the true” correction which succeeds in altering, changing or improving the learners’ interlanguage as to eliminate the wrong production.

Besides, Lightbown and Spada (1999, p.171) offer a more comprehensive view by stating that corrective feedback is an indication provided to learners of their use of target language being incorrect. According to Leki(1991) and Zhang (1995) ESL students tend to prefer for teachers’ written feedback over other types of feedbacks.

2.3.3 Types of Written Corrective Feedback

Language teachers who believe the value of error correction have different practices in giving corrective feedback. Written feedback in broad sense usually takes two forms; direct correction and indirect correction. Direct correction is done when the teacher corrects students’ errors on their work by providing the correct structural or lexical forms (Lalande, 1982; Semke, 1984; Robb et al., 1986). Whereas in the indirect correction, the teacher points out the error by circling or underlining without providing corrections (Bitchener and Knoch, 2009). There are also other forms of feedback such as marginal comments, content comments, and meta-linguistics feedback. “Corrective feedback takes the form of responses to learners’ production or that contain or are perceived as containing an error” (Ellis, 2016).

Ellis (2009) talked about the different kinds of written corrective feedback provided by teachers. He divided the types according to ways of giving feedback into the following: direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, focused corrective feedback, unfocused corrective feedback, electronic feedback and reformulation.

Direct corrective feedback is an approach in which students receive the correct words or correct ways of writing something. Indirect feedback on the other hand simply tells students that there are mistakes in their work, which can be done in two ways: by indicating (marginal notes) and locating (underlining) the errors or just
by indicting that there are errors without telling where they are. Metalinguistics strategies use clues to indicate the kind of mistakes committed, either by using codes or by numbering mistakes in the text and giving short grammatical descriptions below the text. Teachers may cover all or almost all mistakes or just focus on selected kinds of mistakes. Thus, with regard to the focus of feedback, it can be unfocused, which is extensive or deals with all kinds of language errors, or focused, which is intensive or corrects only selected types of errors. With the advent of the internet, electronic feedback has been devised. Mistakes are highlighted and an electronic links are given so that students can see how they are supposed to use the language appropriately.

Reformulation, on the other hand, involves a native speaker showing how he or she would write the students’ ideas “as native-like as possible” while keeping the content of the original idea. This current study will use the framework based on Ellis’ typology of corrective feedback (2009)—direct correction and indirect correction.

Other scholars (Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Panova & Lyster, 2002) explained six different types of feedback in following terms: recast, explicit correction, clarification requests, metatlinguistic information, elicitation, repetition, and translation.

Recast was used in the literature of L1 acquisition as to talk about responses made by adult to children’s language production (Farrar, 1992). Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 46) explain recast as “teacher’s reformulation of all or part of a student’s utterance, minus the error”. According to Ellis et al. (2008) recasts are of various types including corrective recasts, corrective/non-corrective recasts, full/partial recasts, single/multiple recasts, single utterance/extended utterance recasts, and simple/complex recasts.

The characteristic of explicit feedback is being an overt and clear indication of the existence of an error and the provision of the target-like reformulation. This can take two forms including explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback (Ellis, Loewen & Erlam, 2006). Unlike the explicit feedback where the teacher provides both positive as well as negative evidence by clearly pointing out the error to the students, the metalinguistic feedback provides the students with “comments,
information, or questions related to the well-formedness” of their utterances. (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)

Clarification Requests is a kind of feedback that brings up questions to indicate that the production or the utterance were not well formed and that it needed to have formulation or a repetition. This kind of feedback tries to minimize problem in either “comprehension, accuracy, or both” (Lyster & Ranta 1997, p. 47). This type might not provide the learners with the location or the type of the error.

Metalinguistic feedback places emphasis on rules or features of the target language. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) metalinguistic feedback are “comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the students’ utterance, without providing the correct form” . It is yet subdivided into three categories which are metalinguistic comments, metalinguistic information and metalinguistic questions.

Elicitation is a technique of correction that provides learner with prompts in order for them to make self-correction. It may be done in one of the three ways as follows: request for reformulations of ill-formed utterances, use of open question, and the use of strategic pauses to allow a learner to complete an utterance. This kind of feedback does not need to be accompanied by other feedback types (Panova & Lyster, 2002).

Lyster and Mori (2006) suggested prompts as another range of feedback types. It consists of four prompting moves: elicitation, metalinguistic clue, clarification request, and repetition. These four moves facilitate learners to perform self-correction whereby the teachers withhold the correct form.

Yet another approach to provide corrective feedback is through the use of repetition. This is less communicatively intrusive when compared to the explicit error correction or in other words metalinguistic feedback and hence falls at the implicit extreme of feedback. This feedback is simply the teachers’ repetition of their ill-formed part of the students’ utterance, usually with a change in intonation (Panova & Lyster, 2002, p.584). The last one is translation. It was initially considered as a subcategory of recast (Lyster & Ranta 1997). However, the distinction between this and recast is that it is generated in response to a learner’s
well formed utterance in a language rather than the target language. Both recast and translation lack overt indicators that an error has been produced.

2.4 Distinguishing between Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback

This study will use the framework based on Ellis’ (2009) typology of corrective feedback—direct correction and indirect correction. The main distinction between the two is having the learner involve in the process of error correction.

2.4.1 Direct Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback constitutes various forms. The first one is Cross-out. This is done when the instructor omits or cut any error from the students’ written work. The second one is referred to as rewrite. For this, the instructors rewrite the word, phrase or even a new sentence to provide the correct spelling or sentence structure on the students’ written work. Thirdly, addition is used when the instructor adds any kind of missing phrase, words, article, preposition, suffix, prefix, etc. on the students’ writing (Ellis, 2009).

According to Bitchener and Ferris (2012), direct corrective feedback helps students in their improvement on their future written work. Ferris (2002) states that this form is very beneficial when used to treat students’ errors in their final stages of the writing process. She added that students’ language proficiency is one of the most crucial factors in deciding the amount of direct corrective feedback they should be receiving. According to her, this type of feedback usually benefits advanced learners.

2.4.2 Indirect Corrective Feedback

Indirect corrective feedback constitutes instructors’ underlining, circling, or highlighting students’ written productions to indicate errors without giving the correct forms (Ellis, 2009). Students are required to study their errors and correct them on their own (Ferris, 2002). Unlike its counterpart, the indirect corrective feedback demands more work on students’ part to understand the error and work to fix them.
2.4.3 Dichotomy between Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback

One of a much debated issue is whether to use direct or indirect error correction or feedback. A range of findings still have mixed outcomes. The direct corrective feedback indicates the error as well as correct linguistic form for the learners whereas the indirect corrective feedback only points out the errors without correcting them. Indirect method of correction can come in various forms such as underlining, coding, etc. depending on the explicitness (Ferris, 1995; Bitchener & Knoch, 2009).

There are various studies which compared the effect of both types of feedback and resulted in diverse findings. For instance, from the study of Lalande (1982) there were no significant differences between the two even though the researcher noted advantages of indirect feedback of coding over the indirect. In the same line, Robb et al.(1986) also showed no difference between direct and indirect feedback in their study. Moreover, Semke (1984) did not find any differences between the four groups of direct and indirect error correction.

However, Van Beuningen et al. (2008) found that the direct corrective feedback were more effective on students’ long term writing whereas for short term students’ writing, both direct and indirect feedback were found to be effective similar to the findings of Bitchner and Knoch (2010b). Besides, the recent study of Van Beuningen et al. (2012) also shed the light on direct feedback to be more effective for students’ grammar while indirect feedback was proved to be better for non-grammatical error corrections. Hence, there is still diversity in the research on corrective feedback which needs more investigation.
The importance attached to correcting error varies in different methods according to Ellis (2016). Ur (1996, p.243) explains that in audiolingualism negative assessment is to be avoided as far as possible since it functions as “punishment and may inhibit or discourage learning”. He added that in humanistic methods “assessment should be positive or non–judgmental” in order to promote a positive self image of the learner as a person and language learner. However, in skill-learning approaches, the learner needs feedback on how well he or she is doing in order to improve that particular skill.

2.5 Other Types of Feedback

2.5.1 Peer Feedback

Peer feedback is also known as “peer review” (Mangelsdorf, 1992), “peer evaluation” (Keh, 1990, Chaudron, 1984) and “ peer commentary” (Conner & Asenavage, 1994). Some scholars, such as Pol et al. (2008), Rollinson, (2005) and Topping (2000) defined peer feedback as an educational arrangement within which other students’ suggestion or comment made on their fellow peers’ formative or summative work are taken into consideration.

There has been a controversy about the benefit of peer feedback. Many studies recommended the use of peer feedback while others doubt its beneficial impact. Some scholars such as Lundstorm and Baker (2009), Pol et al. (2008), Storch (2004), and Ferris (2002) recommend using peer feedback in ESL writing classes for its valuable cognitive, metalinguistic, social and affective benefits. Hyland (2000) also mentioned that peer feedback set an atmospheric state to increase student participation in the classroom and make them less dependent on the teacher.

Contrastingly, some scholars such as Min (2008), Hinkel (2004), and Saito and Fujita (2004) question the benefits of peer feedback. They believe that students will still question the purposes and advantages of this method. This is obviously true especially with students who are accustomed to teacher power or teacher-fronted
classroom. These scholars also found out that, in fact, some students may think receiving comments from their classmates whose English is at the same level or lower than theirs is not a valid alternative for getting feedback.

So the main criticism here is that students feel that only their teachers are qualified to provide them with useful comments. Besides, a research conducted by Carson and Nelson (1994) claimed that some students have certain traits that make them find it difficult to provide honest feedback as they value positive group relationship. This was confirmed by Saito and Fujita (2004) who reported that a large number of studies noted that biases is associated with peer feedback (for example friendship, intimacy etc.).

2.5.2 Computer-mediated Feedback

This kind of feedback is referred to as electronic or automated feedback. It is a new approach of feedback for both L1 and L2 writing. Automated feedback is conducted using a special software which can read and produce feedback on grammar usage. (Ware and Warschauer, 2006). Few scholars such as Chen (1997), Yao and Warden (1996) opt for this kind of feedback as this can save teachers’ time by allowing them to focus on other aspects of students’ writing rather than on corrections. Yet, there is not an answer to whether faster feedback is better than typical hand written feedback provided by their instructors.

Also, the software creators recommended that the electronic feedback should not be used solely but rather side by side as supplementary tool in any writing class (Burstein et al., 2003). As for Pennington (1993), the success of the technological usage is determined by the context of use as well as the type of software chosen. Moreover, this can also create a negative influence for students who do not have access to computer facilities (Belcher, 1999). Using computer mediated feedback can also affect the sentence structure usage. For example, Kern (1995) found that those students who were given feedback through automated method tend to use only simple sentences. Even though some researchers of automated feedback are quite optimistic about its beneficial effect on the students’ writing, more investigation is needed to be
done as to premature its claim that this feedback type far surpasses the traditional paper based feedback provided by the teachers.

2.6 Corrective Feedback and SLA Theories’ View on Error

Several theories have been put forward into helping us understand language learning or language acquisition. However, the researcher would hereby discuss the theories of language relevant to second language learning and their implications on error correction or feedback.

2.6.1 Behaviorism

An outstanding theory of learning in the 1950s, behaviorism views language learning as similar to other kinds of learning, to put in other words, it is the learning as habit formation (Ellis, 1997). Skinner and many other behaviorists believed that children learn or acquire language through the process that he calls imitation. They would imitate anyone significant to their lives, be it their parents or any adults. After having been exposed to language stimuli in their context or environment, they will imitate. The habit formation will occur once these responses are reinforced through a series of repetition.

However, according to Ellis (1995 p.22), errors in this behavioral view is something “undesirable” and are considered to be products of “non-learning”. These errors are to be avoided. Errors in the second language are considered as results of the interference of the first language. To elaborate, second language learners’ knowledge or habit can influence and can be transferred to their usage or habit formation of their first language. Hence, they may commit errors when they speak or even write in second language. Moreover, contrastive analysis was initiated by behaviorists to determine the differences between the learners’ first language and their target or second language.

It cannot be denied that behaviorism has a good amount of implications for language learning even though this view of language learning has been criticized mainly because it could not account for the fact that children produce some words or utterances that they might have never heard anyone speak before. So there are certain
critics who argue that language learning is a far more complex process than a stimulus-response concept can explain.

Nevertheless, behaviorists try to avoid errors as much as possible by providing a good amount of practice in producing a good or correct language. According to this concept, once error occurs, it needs to be corrected by the teachers without giving opportunities for students to perform self-correction. This approach in error correction is clearly reflected in unfocused or comprehensive direct corrective feedback. To elaborate, in this method all kinds of errors are to be corrected explicitly by the teachers.

2.6.2 Input Processing Hypothesis

As indicated by Corder (1967), input refers to anything that is accessible for the learners. It is indispensable because it is considered as the essential instrument for language learning. VanPatten’s (1996) Input Processing depends on the fundamental notion of forms and structures to be learnt. He further enhances the role of input and utilizes the term ‘input processing’ (IP) for the cognitive procedure which happens after the learners understand the input and integrate it into their interlanguages.

Krashen (1987) proposed five related hypotheses in this model to explain language learning. The first model is the acquisition/learning hypothesis which distinguished learning from acquisition. It states that unlike learning, acquisition is unconscious absorption of language features through actual usage of language for communication purpose. According to Krashen, learning a target language is not equivalent to acquiring that particular language. The second hypothesis according to him is the monitor hypothesis stating that language is only a way to check the language output before or after the production. The third one is called the natural hypothesis which suggests that there exists a natural order in which linguistic rules are learnt or acquired. The fourth one is the affective filter hypothesis which consists of factors such as attitudes which may filter the learning or acquisition process. The last hypothesis is the input hypothesis. This one states that there is only one way of learning a language and that is through “comprehensible input”. He states that language needs to be meaningful to the learners in order to be learnt. Thus, it
therefore implies that L2 teaching approaches such as error correction enhances the learners to comprehend and would eventually assist them in comprehending certain features that they have not grasp. Krashen also states that fathomable input is vital for learners learning a new language. Input is one level in advance of what the learners know with the point of helping learners gaining expertise in that language ability.

Gass et al. (2003) explained positive input and negative input. Positive input or positive evidence is a situated of very much developed sentences that learners are presented to while negative evidence alludes to information or in this case feedback that is given to the learners for their mistaken usage of language. Various scholars such as (Bley-Vroman, 1989; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Gass, 1988; Long, 2007) came to a conclusion that negative evidence help adult learners achieve their goal of learning a target language.

Also, White and Arndt’s (1991) study proved that negative evidence in the form of correction promoted participants learning. He experimented with French learners of English using a pretest, immediate posttest and a delayed posttest design to investigate how learners learn not to do something in their target language although that particular feature is used in their mother tongue language which is French. Another study by Trahey and White (1993) supported the previous claim that negative evidence is an essential and effective input for learners to learn a target language. There have been various studies to thicken the evidence of White’s claim. These studies examined the effect of corrective feedback and supported White’s findings. (Gass & Mackey, 2006; Ayoun, 2001; Iwashita, 2003). Gass & Selinker, (1994) concluded that even though positive evidence has the ability to reveal to the learners’ the information of target language which is different from their first language, negative evidence, however, shows what is not possible in the second language.

2.6.3 Output Hypothesis

Swain (1985) also argued that besides comprehensible input, comprehensible output can also provide the necessary resource for Second Language Learners. The comprehensible output hypothesis according to Swain (1985) is that language learning occurs when the language learner faces a gap in his/her linguistic knowledge of the second language. By noticing this gap, the language learner will then try to modify
language output. This modification of output may end in learning a new aspect of the language which the learners have not acquired yet. Although Swain did not claim that comprehensible output is solely responsible for all or even most parts of the language acquisition, she highlighted the point that under some conditions, comprehensible output facilitates SLA in ways that it can provide the necessary input. As a matter of fact, although Swain (1985) acknowledged that without comprehensible input language learners are not able to make connections between forms and meanings for SLA development, she provided evidence of the immersion programs in which comprehensible input alone did not lead to SLA. This view sharply contrasts with Krashen’s input hypothesis where the role of comprehensible output is neglected or minimized.

To this point, according to what was put forth in relation to Krashen’s input hypothesis and his critiques’ concerns, it can be concluded that the importance of language input for SLA is not questioned and some type of language input is necessary for SLA. Hence, without debating on the right or wrong of Krashen’s hypothesis which is beyond the scope of this study, the premise taken is that some forms of language input is necessary for the study without delving into the psychological aspects of the language input.

According to Gass and Mackey (2006), output is the production of language by the learners. It is one of the ways to use or practice what they have learnt successfully. By producing output, learners can receive more input in the form of feedback. The notion of output came to spotlight after Swain’s (1985) proposal of output hypothesis. According to Swain (2000; 2005), the cardinal concept of Output Hypothesis is comprehensible output or pushed output. It is further explained as the concept where the learners are “forced” to produce more accurate language by being given sufficient opportunities to practice and receive feedback for further improvement. Besides, receiving feedback will provide opportunity for learners to notice the gap between their target language and their interlanguage. Therefore, the concept of corrective feedback is positive as it can promote learners to develop their language skills by triggering pushed output.
2.6.4 Noticing Principle

Skehan (1998, p. 51) states “noticing is the result of existing knowledge systems and processing capacities constraining what the learner can attend to effectively.” Schmidt’s (1990) Noticing Hypothesis which suggests that it consists of attention and awareness, made a significant contribution to the explanation of what is vital in the effective processing of vital input. He further explained that not all input is processed and further enhanced while only noticed input is available for learner to intake and process effectively.

According to Schmidt (1990), if a particular linguistic feature is emphasized, the chance of noticing is higher than those unfocused. Besides, the feature should also be salient as well as frequent to be noticed. Being frequent and prominent, these linguistic forms can be brought to consciousness and eventually processed effectively.

Yet, there are certain factors which affect noticing. The first factor is the individual differences. Some learners may have a greater capacity for processing while others may find it difficult to do so. Another factor is readiness. Some learners are more ready as their internal structures or mechanism in their interlanguage assist them to attend to certain input and easily allow them to notice better. The final factor affecting their ability to notice is the task demands. Simply putting, task demands are the expectations on what and when they are required to do an activity. This can affect processing as the capacity system for processing is limited, and overloading of such system as the result of high task demand may suppress the noticing (Schmidt, 1990; 1993; 2001). A considerable amount of research revolving around the issue of noticing has been conducted by many researchers (e.g., Kim, 1995; Leow, 1997, 2000; Robinson, 1996, 1997; Rosa & O'Neill, 1999; Schmidt & Frota, 1986) and all of them lend a tremendous support to this hypothesis.

According to Schmidt and Frota (1986, p. 310) “corrective feedback juxtaposes the interlanguage form with the target language form, putting the learner in an ideal position to notice the difference. Such feedback raises the learners’ consciousness about the lack of correlation between the target language and their own interlanguage.” This view has direct implication for corrective feedback.
2.6.5 Socio-cultural Theory

This theory by Vygotsky is abundantly used to explain the process of learning in general. It also has its important implications for second language learning as it states that “human mental activity is essentially a mediated process in which symbolic and socio-culturally constructed artifacts, the most pervasive of which is language, plays an essential role in the mental life of the individual.” (Weissberg, 2006 p. 248). Weissberg also noted several elements that constitute to scaffolding which include, recruitment, reduction of degree of freedom, direction maintenance, making critical features, controlling frustration, demonstration, and extension.

Scaffolding is done for the purpose of teaching someone to do something by enabling the learners to be able to carry on the tasks on his or her own without much help or facilitation. Scaffolding thus need to be done with the learners’ zone of proximal development or ZPD. According to Aljaafreh and Lantolf (1994, p. 480) “Effective error correction and language learning depend crucially on mediation provided by other individuals, who in consort with the learner dialogically, co-construct a ZPD in which feedback as regulation becomes relevant and can therefore be appropriated by learners to modify their interlanguage system.” ZPD and scaffolding may have implications on written corrective feedback as well. Providing feedback can be considered to be a process of scaffolding as it is done to guide learners’ attention in order to help them learn certain linguistic features or aspect of language that they have not fully mastered yet. Teachers should always consider learners’ zone of proximal development when giving feedback.

2.7 Second Language Learning VS Second Language Acquisition

Some language researchers use the term learning and acquisition interchangeably; however, Krashen (1987) describes acquisition as unconscious absorption of the language in a natural setting within which the language is normally used for various purposes. On the contrary, learning is the conscious behavioral aspect which involves mastering the rules of the target language. According to him, learning a language does not lead to acquisition but helps learners to monitor themselves. According to Krashen’s view, learners are able to acquire only certain aspects of the
target language. Besides, aspect of language such as formal of professional writing requires the learners’ conscious process and a considerable amount of practice (Omaggio Hadley, 1993). Hence, learners should be provided with enough awareness-raising activities to become more proficient in learning or mastering that target language. McLaughlin et al. (1983) distinguished learning acquisition and language by explaining about implicit knowledge and explicit knowledge of language in cognitivists’ view of second language acquisition. Ellis (1997) clarified that implicit knowledge is intuitive as learners are not conscious that they have such knowledge and might not be aware that they have learnt it. However, explicit knowledge is the “knowledge that is “analyzed”, “abstract”, and explanatory” (p.110). Krashen and cognitivists differ in the conversion of explicit knowledge to implicit knowledge and vice versa. According to Krashen, explicit or learned knowledge cannot be converted to implicit or acquired knowledge. On the contrary, cognitivists believed in the opposite (Ellis, 1997).

According to Schwatz (1993) UG can only operate on positive evidence so corrective feedback which equals to negative evidence plays no role in language learning. However, negative evidence can trigger UG principles and may be needed to help leaners overcome persistent errors.

Cognitive-interactionist theories emphasize that written corrective feedback is most likely to assist acquisition when learners commit errors and then receive feedback that they recognize as corrective (Ellis, 2016). He further explains that written corrective feedback facilitates the processes for language acquisition in two ways. Firstly, by providing learners with positive evidence of target language forms and secondly, by providing learners with negative evidence that pushes them to self-correct their errors (i.e. through output).

Li ‘s (2010) meta-analysis of 33 studies which involved 1,773 learners found that corrective feedback had a medium effect on learners’ language acquisition. This effect was evident in tests after learners receive the treatment for more than two times. The effect was also greater with foreign language settings rather than in second language settings.

Ellis disagrees and believes that what learners know about a language, especially linguistic forms and structures which at first become their explicit
knowledge, will undergo a controlled processing and then later on becomes implicit or automatic knowledge. In establishing a theory of instructed second language acquisition, Ellis (1997), argues Krashen’s “non-interface” view and with cognitivists’ “strong interface” position. He proposed what he termed a “weak interface” view which is explained below:

- “Explicit knowledge can be converted into implicit knowledge in the case of developmental grammatical rules.

- Explicit knowledge can be converted into implicit knowledge in the case of developmental rules, providing the learner has reached the stage of acquisition that allows for integration of the new rule into the interlanguage system.

- Explicit knowledge cannot be converted into implicit knowledge in the case of developmental rules if the learner has not reached the requisite stage of acquisition.

- Not all knowledge originates in an explicit form- more often than not L2 knowledge begins as implicit knowledge.

- Formal instruction can help to automatized both explicit and implicit grammatical knowledge.”

(Ellis, 1997, p.115)

According to Ellis, it takes time for explicit or learned knowledge to develop into implicit or acquired knowledge. In addition, acquisition entails attention to input and in some instances monitoring output. According to him, both can affect fluency as acquiring new linguistic knowledge involves a different process from that of using L2 knowledge. Moreover, lack of accuracy while being fluent in communicating ideas can be related to learners’ priorities: focusing on making existing knowledge automatic or paying attention to new knowledge. Prioritizing one can have a negative result on the other, thus, learners who focus on only being fluent may produce inaccuracies.
It cannot be denied that L2 writing contains errors and so it is the teachers’ legitimate duty to regulate their learning by giving effective feedback. Providing feedback is vital in the writing process without which improvement will not take place. Therefore, it can be said that error correction on learners’ writing will consciously raise their awareness and as a result plays a vital role in developing learners’ knowledge even though written language may not be acquired.

2.8 Scholars For and Against Error Corrections


Many studies showed that feedback practices are still debatable as increasing number of studies have also been investigating whether certain types of corrective feedback are more likely to help than others. Truscott (1996; 1999; 2004) argued against the benefit of providing feedback. According to him, correction can only lead to a superficial and transient type of L2 knowledge. Hence, in his view, error correction is considered to be entirely unnecessary and ineffective, or even harmful. Also, another reason to be careful about error correction is that it triggers avoidance behavior in students which result in shorter and simpler writings (Hyland, 2002; Truscott, 2004). Moreover, as stated by Cumming and Riazi (2000) that teachers do not care much about what the student is trying to convey so the major fear was that student may hold back progress due to error corrections.

However, there are many scholars (Ferris,1999; Geunette, 2007; Saliva, 2002) who tried to refute Truscott’s view on this matter and still recommend that instructors should continue to provide feedback until there is more and comparable research to prove otherwise. To elaborate, Ferris (1999, p.2) criticized that Truscott’s ideas are “premature and overtly strong.” She and other researchers
such as Lee (1997), Ashwell (2000), and Chandler (2003) explained that if students are left without any feedback or guidance, their error will go unnoticed and eventually move to the phase of fossilization.

According to Ferris (1999, p.8) if feedback is not provided then the student will not try to improve their writing skill seriously as they will not perceive its importance. Also, a research by Russell and Spada (2006) echoed this view that having corrective feedback is more effective than not providing any corrective feedback at all. Hence, until we can have more evidence that feedback hinder the process of learning, it is still a valuable tool to be used by writing instructors.

The conflicting findings by researchers and scholars are mainly due to the differences in their research designs (Guenette, 2007). Some studies lack having the pre-tests, e.g. Kepner (1991) while some had different instructors and tasks, such as that of Semke (1984).

### 2.8.1 Truscott & Ferris Debate on Corrective Feedback

The discussion around the effectiveness of grammar correction became generally known in the late 1990s mainly because of a debate between Truscott (1996) and Ferris (1999). Initially, Truscott wrote an article where he claimed that all kinds of grammar corrections should be eliminated, and that grammar correction is ineffective, not natural and even downright harmful. He also stated that teachers are not to presuppose that correcting students’ grammar is helpful for, and will work in favor for, the students. He also claimed that perhaps tradition is what keeps teachers correcting grammatical errors (Truscott, 1996). Truscott concludes that anything else but grammar correction is better that grammar correction, a statement that provoked Ferris enough to publish a response to Truscott’s article. Ferris (1999) begins her article by stating that Truscott’s thesis is premature and she proceeds to review the arguments stated by Truscott. Ferris also emphasizes the importance of knowing that there are different types of error correction, and in what way they are helpful for students. Further she questions Truscott’s statement that because some students do not make progress through grammar correction it should be all together abandoned, Ferris states the opposite and argues that teachers ought to put even more effort into
corrective feedback and grammar correction in order to be even more effective (Ferris, 1999).

Additionally, Truscott (1996) stated that most students want corrective feedback and that they consider it to be helpful, but he argued that the students may not know what is most beneficial for their learning. Ferris (1999), however, states that through her own and many teachers' experience she can conclude that if grammar correction were to be absent it would interfere with the students' motivation, which could be even more harmful than the actual grammar correction (Ferris, 1999). Ferris also touches on this subject in her 2004 article, agreeing with Truscott in that what the students want does not necessarily imply that it is the preferable alternative. However she emphasizes her previous statement concerning the students' interest in error correction, she concludes this statement by saying “thus, the existing research on student views predicts that the presence of error feedback may be beneficial and its absence may be harmful” (Ferris 2004, p. 55). Ferris also questions the ethical element of studies which include a control group receiving no, or very little, feedback. She states that in order to include a control group not receiving any form of feedback, the researcher has to be certain that either corrective feedback is harmful for the students or that receiving no feedback also has a positive outcome, or the researcher is simply denying the students feedback with only the research in mind (Ferris 2004).

2.9 Grammar Accuracy and Its Importance on Language Learning

Grammar can be considered as backbone of any language which must be understood in order for one to communicate effectively. It provides the language users with the structure they need in order to organize and put their messages and ideas across.

Each different SLA theories discussed earlier focus on certain aspect of writing and sometimes neglect the other aspects. For instance, social constructionists place emphasis on the social context while the cognitivists look forward to cognitive processes without considering the differences of their students' diverse backgrounds. While some advocates for academic writing over-emphasize the form, the social constructionists do not see any importance in that. Hence, according to Ferris and
Roberts (2001) whether a writing instructor should provide feedback on errors and how to give feedback will still be a debatable issue for researchers and teachers alike.

Whether or not to give grammatical feedback is still an important aspect of ESL research. Researchers so far have found contradictory results on the effectiveness of grammatical feedback. Grammatical feedback is found to be helpful by many researchers while others claim that it does not help the learners.

One of the main issues is whether or not grammatical feedback works for ESL. Some researchers take an extreme approach to answer this question. For example, Truscott (1996, p.329) argued that grammar corrections on students’ writing does not work, yet researcher such as Ferris (2002) believed otherwise. Various researchers have conducted studies to justify their different stands. Scholars such as Stern (1993), Schmidt and Frota (1986), Shin (2008), Chaudron (1995), Bley-Vroman (1997) and Gass et al. (2003) believe that grammatical feedback is essential for ESL learners’ progress.

Stern (1993, p. 128) suggested that in order to learn a language students need to study grammatical forms through deliberate practices by using in real-life contexts. Hence, according to him, correction of grammatical error is an essential part in the learning process as it completes the “cycle of language teaching” (p.154). Besides, Schmidt and Frota (1986) also agreed that raising the learners’ consciousness of language forms through corrective feedback is crucial. According to them, if learners do not notice any disagreement between their production and target language structure on a particular form, they will not be able to set themselves in the process of learning that particular form or structure.

Also, Gass et al. (2003) explained that correcting errors will draw attention to the problematic area and it is a known fact that “attention” has an important role in language acquisition of L2. Moreover, in the study of Shin (2008, p.364), it was found that grammatical correction was needed to verify the hypotheses that the students have made in structuring their ideas when they write. Chaudron (1995) also pointed out that second language learners’ development of interlanguage is aided through corrective feedback.
Bley Vreiman (1997, p. 48) also explains that negative input or negative evidence aids language learning. He states that negative evidence in the form of error correction can help second language learners learn the language quicker. He further elaborates that “some of the errors made by foreign language learners suggest that they hold hypotheses requiring evidence for disconfirmation.” Moreover, Cook (2001) confirms that even though using positive evidence is much appreciated than negative evidences, providing corrective feedback can also help learners figure out the correct way of saying or writing.

Furthermore, Ferris (2000) states that students will benefit from it as long as the correction is clear to them. Moreover, Ferris and Hedgcock (1998) explains that even though a considerable amount of research shift its focus from grammar to content and organization, it has been found in all studies that students place a great importance on getting grammatical feedback on their writings. Thus, not providing enough feedback may frustrate or worry the students. This may demotivate them to improve their writing. So, researchers such as Ferris and Hedgcock (1998), Ferris (2000), as well as Goldstein (2005) agree that teachers should provide feedback on this aspect of writing to ESL students as well. However, it is impossible to provide feedback on all aspects; they can prioritize and select errors that occur in higher frequencies or those that impede comprehension.

On the other hand, those who do not believe in beneficial effect of providing grammatical feedback to ESL writers argue that this type of feedback might be in conflict with the stage of acquisition of the ESL students. According to Truscott (1996, pp. 343-344) students might not be ready for the corrections and hence grammatical feedback might have little or no value. In his view, this kind of correction leads to what he calls “pseudolearning”. Accompanying his view, Krashen (1987) stands against correcting learners’ language errors. He believed that corrections might result in learners being defensive. As a result, they might avoid the usage of complex language structures. He claimed that language learners will be more engrossed with errors in writing.

To round up this view, most researchers hold the belief that language acquisition is a gradual process. Hence, it implies that grammatical feedback given
also gradually helps in the process of ESL language learning acquisition. It helps the students to notice as well as become aware of those errors.

2.10 English as a Lingua Franca in Business Communication

Base on the communication strategies at a Fortune 500 company by Simmons (2009), organizations are eager to accomplish strategic goals establish well-defined communications strategies. A well-defined strategy is one that engages employees and aligns with the organization’s business goals. The effective communications could help to assure employees received useful, timely, and consistent communications.

The way people response the daily transaction can interpret their communication strategy so depending on where a worker come from the strategy differs. Although English is commonly used in multinational organizations as lingua franca, misunderstandings can still occur, simply because knowing English alone may not be the only aspect to understand people one is dealing with.

Globalization accelerates the need for business English communication skill. English has increasingly become the lingua franca of today’s world language with business practitioners coming from a variety of cultural backgrounds and speaking different national languages. With the increasing importance of English in international business, this global trend has made English a worldwide business language and business lingua franca. The emergence of internationalized business operation means that a shared language is essential for communication purposes and that business professional have to be able to communicate in English professionally and effectively.

Charles (2007) coins the term of ELF by adding ‘B’ to illustrate the utilization of ELF in international business context. He also backed that BELF differs from ELF in that the domain of BELF is solely business. As Nickerson (2005, p.195) puts lingua franca interaction refers to the situation where “there are no native speakers of English present in the interaction” in that English is used as a shared language among individuals who speak English as a second or foreign language. According to Louhiala-Salmonen, Charles and Kankaanranta (2005) BELF is a merger- acquisition
environment where the interaction between Swedes and Finns took place in English within the organization. In their study, they investigated business communication conducted in EFL in globalizing business context. The study examined the two most frequent communicative events in which English was used as a common language or lingua franca among the non-native speakers. The finding showed that when English was used as a shared language in the business domain, communication was facilitated, since all its speakers were on an equal footing because nobody’s native language was used.

The previous research in Hong Kong, City University also illustrated the similarities and differences of the communication behavior of Hong Kong Chinese and Swedish/Finnish business professionals by using business English as a Lingua Franca. The researchers aimed to find out communication behavior in terms of intercultural business setting and examine the effects of the English language proficiency on the communication behaviors of these two research groups.

2.11 Teacher’s Roles in Giving Feedback

It is worth noting here that the role of feedback on ESL writing needs to be considered within the context where feedback is to be given. Traditional student and teacher relationships are unequal in terms of power distribution. Hence, students tend to accept their teachers as authority figure, with the power to assess them. Meanwhile, a writing instructor also has conflicting roles, since they have to be facilitator, evaluator as well as being an audience for their students’ writing (Leki, 1990; Reid, 1994). According to Tribble (1996, p. 119) the role of a teacher in providing feedback can be divided into four basic categories: audience, assistant, evaluator, and examiner.

In this present study, the researcher would like to play the role of audience (reader), and assistant, not that of evaluator or examiner.

As an audience, the researcher would like to respond to students’ ideas, feelings, and perceptions on their written tasks. White and Arndt (1991, p.125) suggest as a guideline for responding to students’ writings in this role: “Respond as a genuine and interested reader rather than as judge and evaluator”. Hence, assuming this role, students will not feel overwhelmed, they will not fear the teacher as an
authoritarian, feedback will be more or less like a motivation and suggestion from a friendly reader, rather than from a judge.

As assistant, the researcher would like to improve the students’ performance and help or assist them in order to write more effectively in the future by looking at their progress in writing.

2.12 Students’ Attitudes and Perceptions towards Feedback

A number of studies that investigate learners’ attitudes to teachers’ feedback showed that learners consider teachers’ feedback valuable and helpful in order to improve their writing (Cohen, 1987; Leki, 1991; Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Padgate, 1999). If students do not get what they believe they need, they may lose motivation (Ferris, 2003).

Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1994) conducted a survey research of 110 ESL and 137 EFL students and found that both groups had a positive attitude toward written corrective feedback. However, they reported that EFL students preferred grammatical corrections while ESL learners preferred feedback on content and organization. Sheen (2011) pointed out that EFL students are interested to learn linguistic features which match the students’ priorities and goals in language learning. She explains that EFL learners are more interested in developing their L2 knowledge.

Schulz’s (1996) findings indicated that all surveyed ESL students had positive attitudes towards error corrections. Schulz (2001) conducted a follow-up study with EFL students and reported that EFL learners also considered grammar instruction and corrective feedback essential in language learning. Sheen (2011) holds that learners’ attitudes towards error correction tend to influence the scope of engagement in learning a language.

According to Chaudron (1995), most of the time students do not pay attention to their teachers’ written comment or feedback. Moreover, in the case study of Cohen and Calvanti (1990), it was found that students had no systematic way to deal with teachers’ feedback and just made a temporary mental note of such feedback. On the contrary, another case study in a Thai university context with 14 freshmen reported the action of students after receiving feedback from their teachers. Most of them
either read, read and correct their mistakes, read and check their mistake from their teachers, or read and remember what their mistakes are (Wen, 2009).

Even though students’ cognitive and behavioral response to written corrective feedback may not be positive, many case studies and surveys have found that, in general, student perception of written corrective feedback has been favorable in recent years (Hyland, 2003; Shin, 2008; Wen, 2009; Parreno, 2014). The experimental studies, asking the subject perception of the grammar feedback they received by Lallande (1992) and Kubota (2001) received positive attitudinal responses. From another survey by Schulz (2001), most students reported to have positive attitudes towards feedback they received. Belief about long-term benefit of written corrective feedback was first revealed by Hyland (2003). In his study, his subject reported that they are aware that their grammatical corrections might not immediately improve their grammar but they were confident that this correction would be useful to them in the long run. They also reported that without receiving written corrective feedback, their writing would always be at the same level with less or even no progress.

Taking into account the expectations of students regarding written corrective feedback can be vital. As mentioned by Schulz (2001), Learning of a new language could be hindered if the students have specific beliefs regarding the role of grammar and corrective feedback and if their expectations are not met. Nevertheless, Cohen and Calvanti (1990) suggested that teachers do not always have to give in to the students’ expectation every time especially if those expectations are deemed useless.

### 2.13 Limitations of Written Corrective Feedback

Both direct and indirect written corrective feedbacks have their limitations. The first disadvantage is that both are time-consuming and requires a good amount of time dedication on the writing instructors’ part. Moreover, students receiving corrections may feel embarrassed and therefore lose their confidence in their future attempts in producing a piece of writing. (Hendrickson, 1984). Also, their linguistics proficiency may be a barrier to their understanding of the feedback and benefit from it (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012; Corpuz, 2011).

The meta analysis of the effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA by Li (2010) confirmed that empirical data from classroom and laboratory settings generate
essentially different results. It has been suggested that —lab-based studies yielded a substantially larger effect than classroom or group-based studies (p.345). Hence in this study the researcher base only on the classroom setting.

From a pedagogical perspective, Ellis et al. (2006) argued that it is important to examine corrective feedback within the classroom context and that ecological validity can only be achieved through classroom-based research (p.365).

### 2.14 Previous Studies on Written Corrective Feedback

Presented below is a summary of studies on corrective feedback, providing details of research focus, findings and limitations. Some studies compared the effect of feedback while other studies compared different types of feedback treatments.

**Table 2.1 Previous studies on Written Corrective Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>The design used in the study</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Lalande</td>
<td>• Experimental studies using two groups of L2 German learners consisting of direct correction VS. the use of codes CCF • This study had 4 treatment session on plot summaries essays (250 words) • Three months duration • Major findings: Learners reported advantage for</td>
<td>• They used four different teachers. • The difference between group was not statistically significant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1984   | Semke              | - Experimental design consisting of 4 groups: comments and questions only, corrections direct only, correction (directs) + comments, use of codes + direct corrections on second draft  
|        |                    | - There were eight sections. Two sections per group  
|        |                    | - This study used 9 journal writings (free writing)  
|        |                    | - Major findings: No difference was found between the four types of treatment.  
|        |                    | - They used different instructors  
|        |                    | - There were unequal number of words required for each group of experiment. (group one – 100 words, group two, three and four – used 50 words)  
|        |                    | - Pre-test Vs. Post-test were not analyzed |
| 1986   | Robb, Ross, & Shortreed | - Experimental design consisting of four  
<p>|        |                    | - Treatment was provided |
| 1990 | Fathman &amp; Whalley | • Experimental design consisting of four groups: control, | • There were no pre test |
|      |                | only once |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1991</th>
<th>Kepner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Experimental design consisting of 2 groups: direct correction, message related comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Comprehensive corrective feedback on journal entries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Journal entry number 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- They used immediate post-test only: 1 treatment and then rewrite
- Using coded corrective feedback
- Major findings: only feedback only and content only groups showed improvement

- Post test only
- No pre test
- No control group
was used as post test

- Journal includes 200 hundred words for every two weeks
- Time duration: 12 weeks
- Major findings: students who received feedback on accuracy did not make any significant improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1995 Frantzen</th>
<th>Quasi-experimental design consisting of pre and post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were two groups:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Grammar review (10-15 minutes per day) + error correction (indirect then direct + explanation in some cases) on writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Non-grammar (with indirect corrective feedback)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>They used two different teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no real control group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
feedback for ethical reason)

- There were four essays
- First one is the pre test
- Last one is the post test
- Time duration: one semester
- Major findings: group with Grammar review improved significantly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1999 | Padgate | Experimental design with two groups (direct feedback and indirect feedback)  
This study had 2 treatment session on essays (250 words)  
Three months duration  
Major findings: both group improved but no significant differences |
<p>|      |        | Focused only on four aspects; tense, subject-verb agreement, copula be, and verb form |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Design &amp; Methods</th>
<th>Findings &amp; Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Kubota</td>
<td>- Experimental design with only one group&lt;br&gt;- Use of codes and test on revision&lt;br&gt;- Using comprehensive corrective feedback&lt;br&gt;- Major findings: both types were found to be useful</td>
<td>- Shows only short term effect&lt;br&gt;- This study did not address the issue as to whether error correction has any impact on student writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>- Experimental design consisting of two groups: 1. Control group consisting of 15 students, 2. Experiment group consisting of 16 students&lt;br&gt;- the experimental group corrected the underlined errors of each assignment before handing in the</td>
<td>- No real control group as the control group also received similar kinds of feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
next assignment, while the control group was asked to do the corrections after the first drafts of each of the five compositions were handed in.

Time duration: 14 weeks, 50 minutes per class, twice per week

- Major findings: report that direct feedback resulted in the largest accuracy gains, not only in immediate revisions but also in subsequent writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Bitchener, Young, &amp; Cameron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental design consisting of three groups: 1. Direct corrective feedback +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Ferris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five minutes of student-teacher conference, 2. Direct corrective feedback only, 3. No written corrective feedback, only comment on content and organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major findings: direct error correction and meta-linguistic explanation is more effective than direct error correction and no feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental design Using direct, indirect with standard codes, indirect with no codes, indirect with nonstandard codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group one had 20 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group two had 10 hours per week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group 3 had 4 hours per week (part time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>different instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• some of the teachers did not follow coding procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
corrective feedback on 16 error categories
- time duration: 15 weeks, three hours per week
- major findings: strong relationship between teachers’ error markings and successful student revision on the subsequent drafts of their essays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Ellis et al.</th>
<th>Quasi-experimental design consisting of 3 groups: 1. Focused direct CF, 2. Unfocused direct CF, 3. Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There were three tests: pre, immediate post, delayed post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate post test was given on the same day after receiving last writing with CF, while delayed post test was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Focused only on the article usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No significant differences between the two types of feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2009 | Bitchener & Knoch | Experimental design consisting of 2 groups: one control group, one experimental group with three subgroups. | • Focused only on article usage  
• Treatment was given only once  
• Experimental design consisting of 2 groups: one control group, one experimental group with three subgroups.  
• The subgroups included  
1. Direct Corrective feedback + oral metalinguistic explanation  
2. Direct corrective feedback + |
|      |                 |                                                                       | • major findings: both focused and unfocused corrective feedback improved students’ accuracy but no difference between the two types of feedback. |
written metalinguistic explanation, 3. Only direct corrective feedback

- They used pre-test, immediate as well as delayed post test
- One treatment was given one week after the pre-test
- Time duration: ten months
- Major findings: no difference between the treatments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Feedback Type</th>
<th>Major Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Bitchener, East &amp; Cartner</td>
<td>Experimental design consisting of two groups: 1. direct corrective feedback, 2. Coded corrective feedback</td>
<td>They used pre test, immediate post test as well as delayed post test</td>
<td>Major findings: if corrective feedback is focused on selected, i.e. not all, kinds of errors, both work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sheen</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental study consisting of five groups: 1. oral recast, 2. oral metalinguistic, 3. written direct correction, 4. written metalinguistic + direct correction, 5. Control group</td>
<td>Pre-test was given on the first week</td>
<td>used different instructors, focused only on article usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Storch &amp; Wigglesworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• immediate post test was given on second and last sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• delayed post test was given four weeks later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• major findings: direct correction promotes noticing but written metalinguistic corrective feedback promotes understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• experimental design consisting of two groups: reformulation, editing symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comprehensive CF on grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Major findings: more language-related episodes and higher levels of engagement were observed among</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• used different instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Van Beuningen et al.</td>
<td>An investigation into the effect of direct and indirect feedback on writing accuracy. Consisting of four groups: Group 1: Direct corrective feedback, Group 2: Indirect feedback, Control 1: Self-editing but no feedback, Control 2: No self-editing and no feedback. Major findings: direct and indirect feedback improved writing accuracy. Direct corrective feedback is effective for better grammatical accuracy and indirect feedback is better for non-grammatical accuracy.</td>
<td>Used different instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Parreno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An investigation into the effect of direct and indirect feedback on writing accuracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consisting of two groups: Direct Corrective feedback, Indirect corrective Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major findings: no significant differences between direct and indirect corrective feedback group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Looked at only four areas of errors (s-v agreement, preposition, adverbs, adjectives)

### 2.14.1 Summary and Discussion on the Previous Studies

Notably, the studies mentioned above have not systematically investigated the relationship between attitudes to corrective feedback and their effectiveness. As can be seen from the list above, most of the studies employ experimental method to study the efficacy of written corrective feedback. Nevertheless, these studies revealed serious concern that could influence the findings. The first and foremost concern is the use of post-test only design or having post test without comparing to pre tests. To illustrate, these included the studies of Fathman and Whaley (1990), Kepner (1991), and Semke (1984). Without having had a post test to compare with that of pre test, results on the findings of the treatment are not valid.

The next issue concerns limited time frame. The study of such included Fathman and Whaley (1990), which did not take into account the long term learning of accuracy. Lastly, in some studies there is the factor of using different instructors or instructional methods. The study of Laland (1982), Semke (1984), Frantzen(1995), Ferris (1995) and Sheen (2010) used different instructors. While Birchener, Young & Cameron (2005), used different instructional time. Moreover, the study of Ellis et
al. (2008) were conducted on different courses. Semke (1984) and Bitchener, East & Cartner (2010) required different tasks from the students.

Even though the tendency seems to be that corrective feedback is useful for improved accuracy in writing, as shown in the table above, there still exist conflicting findings. Hence, this current research will fill in the gap and try to overcome the limitation of the previous research.

2.15 Common Errors in Written English of Thai Students

Like other EFL students, Thai EFL students have the same problems. In a Thai classroom, errors found in English written communication classroom are apparent among university students. According to Smyth (2001), one major difference is the significant differences between the two languages. Another major problem found in an English written tasks by Thai students is negative transference of their mother tongue into the target language (Ubol, 1999).

There are six main grammatical problems for Thais according to Thep-Acharapong (2005). These include subject-verb agreement, topic-comment structure, passive voice, relative clause, participial phrase, and subordination. According to Honsa and Sattayatham (2007), common errors were found in the grammatical area of word choice, articles, plural forms of nouns, verb to be, conditional sentences, fragments, spellings and omission of subjects. This was also confirmed by Bennui (2008) who found that Thai students usually make similar errors such as word-order, prepositions, subject verb-agreement, personal-pronoun and run-on sentences. Another research by Jenwitheesuk (2009) found that Thai students’ errors are particularly on the use of wrong tense, determiners and prepositions.

According to the above mentioned problems, those researchers concluded that all the errors were due to first language, in this case is Thai, interference on their second or foreign language production. This was supported by Brown (2002) who stated that L1 interferences is a significant source of error for learners. Another explanation given by Thep-Acharapong (2005) is that the errors are due to the differences between the two language and that English has far many rules that Thai learners perceived as complicated structures. Besides, Marcaro (2006) explains, when
second language or foreign language learners of English engage in any task involving target language, it is a natural behavior that these learners may use their L1 knowledge to assist them.

In order to better understand the influence of the mother tongue or L1 language on the production of the target language, one needs to be aware of the grammatical features in L1, which in this case is Thai language. According to various researchers such as Thep-Ackarapong (2005), McKenzie-Brown (2006), Bennui (2008) and Anyan (2007), the features of Thai language are as follows:

- There are no verb inflections for tense, person as well as number. In order to indicate the timing of action, time markers are used either before or after the verb. There is no addition of -s or -es to indicate a singular/plural subject. Hence there is no such thing as subject-verb agreement in Thai language.

- The copula verb “be” as a linking verb is not used in Thai language. Moreover, intransitive verbs are not used for describing subjects. Therefore, a complete sentence in Thai language can consist of just a subject followed by a complement without linking verbs.

- There is no distinction between singular and plural nouns in Thai language. Classifiers are used in order to specify the quantity or amount of nouns.

- If the meanings are obvious, Thai may omit the subject and object personal pronouns or even personal possessive pronouns. Also, no distinction is made between gender pronouns and third person pronouns.

- Thai adjectives, unlike English language, appear after the nouns. In Thai, adjectives can be used as verbs too in certain context.

- Thai language do not have articles. Besides, quantifiers such as many/much/a lot, a few/ little/less have the same forms in Thai.

- Oftentimes prepositions in Thai language are dropped.
- Non-borrowed Thai words are monosyllabic. Hence, the production of English morphemes by using suffixes and prefixes can be challenging for Thai learners.

- Thai sentences also follow topic-comment structure. The topic starts a sentence and the rest of the sentence describes the topic.

- Existential subject, “there+ be” does not exist in Thai language, however, “have” is normally used to describe a similar meaning in Thai language.

- Finally, there are no clear boundaries of sentences in Thai language with the absence of punctuation marks.

Previously, any English structure, output, or utterances that do not adhere to standard American or British English were considered an error or mistake. Nowadays, a recent school of thought has come up with a new perspective of non-standard creations of non-native English users. This new thought talks about new varieties of English. Kachru (1985 cited in Schneider 2009) states that these varieties can be categorized into three circles including inner circle, outer circle, and expanding circle. Schneider (2009) termed these new varieties of Englishes as “post-colonial Englishes” as they came through the colonial expansion of the British. Foley (2012, p.195), refers to this world English as “global language”, “world language” or “international language” and is an “entirely a natural phenomenon”. According to Jenkins (2006), even though new Englishes include many varieties such as Indian, Philippines and Singaporean English where each have different characteristics, they also share similar features. This according to Foley (2012), should not be classified as mistakes or errors from L1 transfer because ELF users use this structure to express themselves more freely without having to worry about adhering to the standards of native English.

Moreover, Schneider (2009, p.102) explains the process of this new feature of international language as “innovation” or “the result of internal change and linguistic creativity” which according to him is a natural characteristic of all languages. He discusses the three innovation types, namely simplification, restructuring, and exaptation. He explains there are four mechanisms that are involved in the
simplification process. Firstly, loss; when units fall into disuse, this reduces the number of items in opposition with each other and hence makes the resulting set of options simpler. Secondly, regularization; this is for the expression of a consistent grammatical category the same formative is appended to all possible units. Thirdly, analogy; this is the transfer of a pattern or relationship from one domain to another one which shows some similarities but is not identically structured before the application of an analogical change. Lastly, reduction of markedness; this is done by deleting a marked form and replacing it by an unmarked form (pp.103-104).

Restructuring, is closely linked to simplification which according to him is the “systematic re-arrangement and reinterpretation of constituents and constituent sequences in language evolution” (p.104). Finally, exaptation, refers to the process in which “at any given time, useful items and structures which arose without any particular reason and just happened to be available, as it were, started to adopt a function” (p.106).

According to Jenkins (2006), new Englishes have many levels of variation. The levels include pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, idiom, and discourse style. Foley (2012) added that oral features of new Englishes can also be evident when it comes to writing.

Kachru and Nelson (2006, pp.39-46) note the following features of Asian Englishes

- Confusion in the use of definite and indefinite articles
- No distinction between countable and non-countable nouns
- Confusion in the use of tenses
- Run-on sentences
- Spellings and capitalizations

This was also supported by Schnedier (2009, p.85) who reported that the new varieties of English being spread in Asian and African learners include the following features:

- Omission/misuse of articles
- Unclear distinction of count/non count-nouns
Confusion of word-order in sentence structure
- Misuse/misplacing of preposition
- Using singular for plural and vice-versa

According to the above view, some of the common English errors of Thai learners may be the results of L1 interferences as presented. The question arises on how to distinguish whether a feature is an error or simply a new variety of English. To answer the question, Platt et al. (1984, cited in Jenkis 2006, pp. 22-24) clarify what features account for a New English variety as follows:

To be classified as a new variety of English,
- It should be developed and taught through formal education system.
- It has developed in an area where a native variety of English was not the language spoken by most of the population.
- It has become localized by adopting some language features of its own, such as sounds, intonation patterns, sentence structures, words, and expressions.

Bambose (1998) gave a checklist of the above criteria to answer the question
- Demographic: how many and which speakers use this innovation?
- Geographical: how widespread is it?
- Codification: does it appear in the written form?
- Authoritative: it needs to be sanctioned by examination bodies, teachers, book developers and publishers.

Foley (2012, p.194) suggested that codification and acceptability are the two most important factors to be taken into account as any non-standard English that are not coded or accepted will be seen as “errors” or “mistakes”.

To consider the Thai setting of this present study, investigations about the most common language problems among Thai students as revealed by researchers such as (Bennui, 2008; Sattayatham and Honsa, 2007; Thep-Akarapong, 2005) were
taken into account. Also, from the researcher’s preliminary observation, it was
deemed acceptable that 21 error points categorized according to Wu and Garza’s
(2013) category of errors were focused in this study see (APPENDIX B). According
to them, the errors should be grouped into major categories based on their effect.
According to them syntactic errors include incorrect tense, whole sentence or clause
aberrant, relative clause error, using of singular for plural, using plural for singular,
verb missing, subject formation, subject- verb agreement, sentence fragment, and run-
on sentence. The reason for this is that these errors “affect the whole sentence
structure” (p.76). Grammatical errors according to the researchers include misuse of
pronoun, article, preposition, word form, conjunction, and negation as they are
considered as “instance of faulty or unconventional usage of linguistic features.”
Semantic errors include word choice, quantifier, and wrong comparative. These,
according to them are the errors at the word level, “which can be fixed by replacing
with the right word” Lastly, mechanical errors include capitalization and spelling
mistakes.

The researcher used Wu and Garza’s (2013) categorization as its reliability has
been confirmed by various EFL studies on grammatical errors and feedback
categorization (Parreno, 2014; Mc Nulty, 2014, Ruegg, 2015 and
Alhaysony,2013).Focusing on such errors would make this study pedagogically
relevant to this particular research setting.

2.16 Chapter Summary

This chapter firstly investigates the concept of writing and the development
of writing approach. Having examined various approaches to L2 writing, it can be
seen that they have advantages and limitations. It would appear that no one approach
alone provides 'the answer' as to how to teach L2 writing. A combination of different
approaches depending on the type of student and the context is likely to yield more
favorable results in L2 teaching. The researcher has also discussed major issues in
feedback and different types of written corrective feedback. Studies on the effect of
written corrective feedback on second language acquisition are also tackled upon.
Lastly, the tendency in research findings seems to have established evidence in
support of corrective feedback, stating that it can influence and improve students’ language accuracy in writing. In the next chapter, the research methodology for this study will be presented.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter, the research methodology is discussed regarding the research design, sample, research instruments, data collection procedures, and data analysis method. The chapter begins with descriptions of each of the stated issues along with the justification for selecting them in conducting this present study and lastly the pilot study is discussed.

3.2 Research Design

This study is of a quasi-experimental design. The reason is due to the non-possibility of "random selection from the population to the sample" and of "random assignment from the randomly selected sample to the two different class periods" as stated by Nunan and Bailey (2009, p.46). It is considered as an acceptable way for researchers who are school teachers or university lecturers as they might not have resources or authority to select their subjects randomly from the population or assign them randomly into groups. The groups that they can conduct an experiment on are usually assigned by the school's or the university's administration.

This study is a mixed method which employed both quantitative and qualitative data as according to Creswell (2009) a research study would be better understood using the two methods. Also, Richardt and Cook (1979, p.21) state that combining both qualitative as well as quantitative methods would provide insights better than using either one alone. Also, Eisner and Peshkin (1990) shared a similar point of view stating that using both methods is considered as being “a true mark of scholarly sophistication”.

In social science research, experimental method has been one of the most used methods to demonstrate with a high degree of confidence the cause and effect relation (Dörnyei, 2007; Neuman, 2003; Connor, 1987). Neuman (2003) defined experiment as modifying to make it different than normal situation in order to test or compare the
outcome. The thing that is modified can be called treatment or the independent variable, while the outcome is the dependant variable.

Two experimental groups with pre-test and post test design were employed to test the effect of the treatment, which in this study is the types of feedback, on the students’ writing accuracy to answer two questions as outlined in chapter one as follows:

1. Are there significant differences in the effects of the two types of written corrective feedback, namely direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback, on students’ writing accuracy?
2. What are students’ perceptions and attitudes towards written corrective feedback?

At the beginning of the course, both groups of students were given a pretest followed by a series of treatment which were then followed by a posttest. The results of the pretest and the posttest were compared using statistical analysis. Another quantitative method was employed using questionnaires to elicit the participants’ attitudes towards feedback they received. Qualitatively, a semi-structured interview has been conducted after the treatment in order to triangulate information in terms of students’ perception on the types of feedback they received. Moreover, students’ reflection journals were analyzed. The last method employed was the in class observation. To understand from the instructors’ point of view, a semi-structured interview was also used with three writing instructors.

3.3 Research Setting

This current research was conducted at an international University in Thailand in the academic year 2/2015 with 64 students enrolling Business Communication in English II course. The pilot study was conducted twice, once in 3/2015 and another one in 1/2015 with 63 and 64 students respectively. The pilot study was conducted with the students studying the same course as the actual study.
3.3.1 Description of the Participants

According to Dörnyei (2007, p. 99), where an important criterion of sample selection is the convenience of the researcher then the members of the target population are selected for the purpose of the study if they meet certain practical criteria. The participants of this research were Business English students who enrolled in Business Communication in English II Course offered by the Department of Business English, Faculty of Arts, at an international university as their major required course in the academic year 2/2015. The sample was assigned to the researcher by the registration office with 36 students per sections. However, in one section, 4 non Thai students were excluded from this study while in another section 2 non-Thai and 2 Thai with international schooling background were excluded. Hence there were 32 students per section. One group (A) received direct corrective feedback while the other group (B) received indirect corrective feedback.

The two sections were handled by the same lecturer and were assigned to two different groups by tossing a coin. (Direct Corrective Feedback Group n = 32, Indirect Corrective Feedback Group n = 32). The ratio of male to female participants was almost equal, i.e. 47% males and 53% females. The participants were homogeneous in terms of age and first language background which is Thai. The treatment ran for 12 weeks with three hours meeting per week. In order to be able to enroll this course, students are required to pass Business Communication in English I offered by the Department of Business English and English IV course which is compulsory for all students at this particular university offered by the Institution of English Language and Education. So, this can be said that the English language proficiency of the students were more or less the same with some variation due to the differences in their educational background.

3.3.2 Profile of the Participants

Below is the description of the participants
Table 3.1 Average Age of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Direct (group A)</th>
<th>Indirect (group B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Average years of studying English starting from kindergarten to high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Direct (group A)</th>
<th>Indirect (group B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.3 Comparability of the Participants

The participants were homogeneous in terms of age and first language background which is Thai. The independent sample T-test was used to compare the result of pre-test and post tests of both groups. This statistical test revealed the number of errors by the students in group A and group B. The pre-test result which is .45 revealed that both groups are not significantly different from the start in their grammatical accuracy in the areas of this study. See (APPENDIX M).

### 3.3.4 Experimental Variables

In this study there is one dependent variable which is students’ written accuracy and there are two levels of independent variable which includes—direct and indirect. The first is direct written corrective feedback done by correcting students’ errors by providing the correct form on their writing tasks. The second group received indirect written corrective feedback by the researcher indicating the location of errors by circling or underlining without providing the correct form.
3.4 Teaching and Feedback Procedures

In order to reveal students’ levels of English business writing at the beginning of the experiment, writing samples were obtained. This was done by conducting a pre-test and a post test which is in line with that of Bitchener et al. (2005). The fact that the researcher had to teach a prescribed syllabus that could not be changed or adapted based on the University's and Business English Department’s regulations, the researcher had to strictly follow the guideline.

The classroom activities and tentative lesson plans based on the textbook required by the department follows the course outline (see APPENDIX H). The researcher combined a number of pedagogical approaches to teach L2 writing following the guidelines of various researchers that have been reviewed (e.g. Ferris and Hedgecock, 2005; Grabe and Kaplan 1996; Hyland and Hyland 2006; Kroll 2003; Raimes, 1983; Silva and Matsuda, 2001). These include process approach, the genre approach and the product approach.

During the 12 weeks experiment period, the students were asked to do their writing in the class period because the researcher wanted to make sure that they perform the writing without the help of others. They were reminded at the beginning of the writing process of the importance of grammar, vocabulary, organization and writing mechanics. At the end of the class, they were asked to hand in their writing tasks. They were always told that they would receive feedback on their writing in the following class. The next step was the post-drafting process. This was done through correcting students' writing, giving written feedback on their scripts and then returning them for re-drafting. Each experimental group received one type of feedback. After returning the scripts, the students were given time for and were asked to re-draft their writing and pay attention to the corrections that the researcher made on their scripts.

The scripts would be collected again at the end of the task and would be returned to the students with feedback on them the following lesson. This would bring each writing task to its end.

By following the three phases described above (pre-drafting, drafting and post-drafting) the researcher aimed to give more attention to the writing process. First,
the researcher prepared the students for the writing task through brainstorming, discussion, and reading. Second, they were given time to perform the writing task in class while the researcher monitored the activities. Third, the researcher gave written feedback on students’ writing, explained their errors according to their treatment groups and asked them to re-draft their compositions and pay attention to their errors.

As explained above, the students in two different groups received 2 different types of feedback. The first experiment group received direct corrective feedback, which means that their errors will be corrected on their scripts. The procedure followed in giving this type of feedback every time the scripts were collected, the researcher went through all papers and read them carefully. The errors found (see APPENDIX B) were corrected (i.e. errors were be crossed out, underlined or circled and the corrections were written for the students next to the errors). Students’ scripts were returned to them once they were corrected. They were then asked to re-draft their writing and hand it in for correction.

The second experimental group received indirect corrective feedback. It means that the students’ error were only underlined or circled without providing the correction. After the scripts are returned, students were asked to re-draft their writing and hand it in for correction. Because the error were not corrected, the students were given instructions to look up their errors in a grammar book or use the internet to find out why this word or that phrase was underlined.

Table 3.3 .Steps to Analyze Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Collect letter writing data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>Collect letter writing data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Identify Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Classify errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Check with the inter-coders/calculate intercoder agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Quantify errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5 Data Collection

Data that were used in this study were obtained from six primary sources: 1. Writing samples, 2. Questionnaires, 3. Students’ Interviews, 4. Observations, 5. Students’ reflection journal, and 6. Semi-structured teacher Interviews.

3.5.1 Instrument to Measure Writing Accuracy and Analysis Method

As Ellis (2000, p.150) explained in accuracy studies, the effects of treatment or instruction are measured by doing investigations of whether there are any gains in the accuracy with which specific structures improved or are well performed after the treatment.

According to Shekhan (1996, p.32), the term accuracy is the wellness of the target language produced in relation to its rule. Another definition provided by Foster and Skehan(1998) is “freedom from error”. Meanwhile, Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1997) explain that language accuracy of the target language is how the language is used in communication both spoken and written, which are free from errors (p.33).

In order to analyze students’ writing accuracy, a number of students’ writing errors needed to be pointed out. According to Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1998, p. 33) looking for writing accuracy is to count the errors in students’ production in “some fashion”. This researcher also used the word counting according to Wolfe-Quintero et al.(1988) in (APPENDIX A). Their method of counting words has been used by various scholars, (Henry,1996; Homburg, 1984; Larsen-Freeman, 1983; Sharma, 1980).

One of the suggested approach in analyzing the accuracy of students’ production is called T-unit. T-unit according to Hunt (1965) is defined as an independent clause and all the subordinate clauses attached to it. In order to use these measures, clause or T-unit must be clearly defined alongside with the definition of what is “error-free”. T-unit analysis has also been used by Larsen-Freeman & Strom (1977) as an objective measuring unit to measure second language learners’ writing ability.

According to wolfe-quintero et al. (1997), there are two types of complexity measures. The first are measures that analyze language units which include clauses,
sentences or T-units based on clauses per T-unit, clauses per sentences or per t-unit. The second type of measure analyzes the presence of certain structures in a language unit.

In order to decide which measure to follow in analyzing the language complexity, the researcher reviewed previous research and the grammatical structures it targeted in students’ writing. Homburg (1984) counted the dependent clauses per T-unit while Karmeen (1979) counted passives, dependent and all independent clauses per T-unit. Evola et al. (1980) counted all types of pronouns, articles and connectors per T-unit.

Critics question the validity of the T-unit as an index of writing proficiency and overall development of written language. T-unit analysis has been subjected to certain criticism. First, T-unit measures do not quantify such important factors as organization, cohesion, coherence, relevance in the analysis of syntactic complexity. Second, objective measures such as T-unit length and error-free T-unit do not consider effectiveness of writing (Ney, 1996; Gaies, 1980, Perkins, 1983). Gaies (1980, p.56) gave the following example to demonstrate his point of view

1. My hobby is collecting hardened parts or print of animals or plants preserved in rocks (mean T unit=15)

2. My hobby is collecting fossils (mean T-unit=5)

He explained that the first example is superficially syntactically more complex which according to T-unit should reflect higher proficient level, however, in this case it is just a mere indicator of restricted lexical ability. Moreover, Ney (1996) and Gaies (1980) argue that T-unit length does not treat excessive coordination within a sentence.

There are several ways to think about error in writing in light of what we know about second language acquisition and what we know about how texts, context and the writing process interact with one another. Students writing in a second language generally produce texts that contain grammatical errors. In fact, depending on proficiency level, the more content-rich and creative the text, the greater the possibility there is for errors. These kinds of errors are especially common among L2 writers who have a lot of ideas, but not enough language to express what they want to
say in a comprehensible way. What is classified as an error, which is associated with learner competence, may actually be a mistake, or more specifically in an EAP context, a "derailment" related to learner performance (Shaughnessy, 1977). These "derailments" occur when students attempt to use the academic voice and make their sentences more intricate, especially when the task requires more complex ideas.

T-unit is also considered by many scholars as not having reliability. Some researchers (O'Donnell 1976, Witte and Davis 1980, Witte 1983) have pointed out that T-unit length was a stable individual trait neither within one discourse mode nor across two different discourse modes. This means, the level of syntactic complexity for a particular individual fluctuates within the descriptive mode and narrative mode of writing. The question of T-unit’s validity and reliability has not been answered hence, the researcher refrain from using this measurement.

Ellis (2000) explained that the study of error treatment must have an operational definition and researchers should be able to identify incidences in a lesson however, this is still challenging for researchers. One of the limitations is that teachers cannot correct every error that occurs. Hence, it is worth mentioning what counts as error and what does not. Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1997) also explained that various scholars such as Henry (1996), Hirano (1991), and Sharma (1980) have used different concepts to what is considered as error. The study of Henry (1996), Larsen-Freeman (1983) considered vocabulary, spelling and punctuation mistakes as errors. However, the study of Homburg (1984) does not include mistake in the use of punctuation as errors.

Another, more objective and reliable method is using error-count. It is one of the most common objective measurements in order to analyze students’ writing accuracy (Fischer,1984; Ellis,2000) . Hence, this study opted to use error count to analyze the students’ writing accuracy. (see APPENDIX B). This method is considered to be reliable as many studies have used it in varieties of ways. For instance, Fischer (1984) counted students’ grammatical and vocabulary errors per clause while Kepner (1991) counted students’ grammatical errors in all aspects at sentence level. In Zhang’s (1987) study, the number of error per 100 words was counted. Hence, it is clear that researcher can use any method in order to count the
errors as he or she see fits the study. Polio (1997, p.128) also confirmed the reliability of error count. In this study, error count will be used as main instrument to collect data by adapting from Zhang (1987), the writing accuracy will be calculated by counting number of errors per 150 words. (See APPENDIX B).

### 3.5.2 Questionnaires

In order to yield more useful results through examining the data from a different angle, this study will therefore include a triangulated methodology. According to Merriam (1998) “…triangulation strengthens reliability as well as internal validity” (p. 207). Hence, questionnaire (see APPENDIX E) and interview (see APPENDIX F) were also used to triangulate this study.

Questionnaires, as Mackey and Gass (2005, p.6) defined, is a set of “written instruments” presenting the respondents with “a series of questions or statement” from which respondents are to either select or provide answers.

After the experiment, the questionnaires were administered to students in both groups. The purpose of pre-experimental questionnaire is to elicit their attitudes on written corrective feedback they were given to investigate their attitudes and experiences after the treatment has been given. This questionnaire is to collect students’ data emphasizing on their perceptions and attitude towards their own writing skills’ feedback and improvement.

According to Mackey and Gass (2005, p.92), survey in the form of questionnaire is one of the most used methods in order to collect data consisting of a variety of questions in a second language research. The questionnaire in this study will elicit students’ belief and attitude towards feedback.

However, cons of using questionnaire have also been reported (Dörnyei, 2003, Leavitt, 2001). One limitation is that students may not be motivated to answer all the questions. Moreover, misinterpretation of the questions might lead to error in responses. Hence, to maximize the reliability of the use of questionnaires, the researcher has utilized and examined the kinds of questions that can be replicated from the previous studies. The design of questionnaire that the researcher used in
this study was adapted from the previous research of various scholars such as (Chandler, 2003; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007; Hedgecok and Lefkowitz, 1996, Ferris, 1995, and Parreno, 2014)

The researcher attached a cover letter providing the purpose of the research with the questionnaire. To assure the respondents that their responses would be considered confidential and only the researcher will have access for the research purpose. When conducting the interview, the researcher also ensured that the recordings will only be use for the purposes of this research and will not allow anyone to have access to them. They were assured that their responses for both questionnaire as well as interview will not affect their midterm or their final scores. Moreover, all students will be asked to sign the informed consent form (see APPENDIX D) to give permission for their participation in this research.

Besides, interviews with some students were also conducted in order to gain qualitative information about students’ perception on both types of feedback. The researcher used semi-structured interviews as this method, according to Dörnyei (2007), leaves room for respondents to answer without fix restrictions. Interviews are among the most frequently used research methods in applied linguistics (Block, 2000), partly because they can help researchers investigate phenomena that are difficult to investigate through observation. In this case, interviews was used to investigate students' beliefs and attitude about issues relating to feedback, and supplement or clarify questionnaire responses.

According to Dörnyei (2007, pp.134-135), there are different types of interviews that can be used in qualitative data collection. The first type is "single or multiple sessions," in which the researcher conducts either a "one-off" interview lasting for 30 to 60 minutes or a sequence of interviews with the same participant to ensure a rich description of findings. The second type is the "structured interview," in which the researcher prepares a set of focused questions to be answered by the participant. There is no room in this type of interview for questions from outside the prepared list and the participant will have to be focused in his/her answers. The third type is "unstructured" or "ethnographic" interviews in which the researcher gives maximum flexibility to the participant to speak freely in a friendly atmosphere. The researcher prepares a short list of one to six questions only to start the interview,
while any other necessary questions can be addressed to the participant during the interview. The fourth type is a "semi-structured interview," which is mainly used in applied linguistics research. The researcher prepares a list of all the questions to be addressed to the participant. Yet the format of the interview is open-ended, as the participant is encouraged to express ideas freely, elaborate and even ask questions.

In this research, a semi-structured interview in which the participants were given time to answer were used and they were allowed to interrupt, ask questions and comment. The purpose of the interviews was to fill in the gaps left and to elicit answers to questions that might not be answered through the questionnaire. All interviews were conducted in the researcher’s office at the University. The interviews were also recorded. Duranti (1997) suggests that after a researcher has conducted interviews, copies of the original tapes should be made as a precaution, and so I used two recording devices, one cassette recorder and one digital recorder, to ensure that all the interviews that the researcher conducted were backed up and available on tape as well before analyzing it in terms of salient themes and patterns.

1) Questionnaire Reliability

According to Gliem and R. Glime (2003, p.8) “When using Likert-type scales it is imperative to calculate and report Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for internal consistency reliability for any scales or subscales one may be using”. So, as to assure the researcher and the participants of the appropriateness and correctness of the instruments, the Index of Item Objective Congruence (IOC) and Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient were applied. Besides, prior to a large-scale investigation, a pilot study was also conducted to assess the likelihood of success of the main study.

It is claimed that “The content validity of a measurement instrument for a theoretical construct reflects the degree to which the measurement instrument spans the domain of the construct’s theoretical definition” (Rungtusanatham, 1998, p. 11). As measuring the content validity of research instruments are of paramount importance and necessity, the Index of Item Objective Congruence (IOC) was then applied to assess the content validity of the questionnaire survey as well as the interview questions. According to Rovinelli and Hambleton (1997), the value of index of item objective congruence (IOC) can be calculated by using the following equation:
IOC = \sum \frac{R}{N}

IOC means the congruence between the items and the objectives or content, whereas \( \sum R \) represents sum of scores checked by at least three specialists in the field and \( N \) is equal to number of specialists. The range of the scores for each item is -1 to +1. A score of -1 indicates that the test is not congruent with the objectives or content. A score of 0 signifies that the degree of measurement is unclear. Lastly, the score of +1 indicates that the test is congruent with the objectives or content. If the obtained IOC value is higher than 0.7, the test or the particular item is considered acceptable.

Specifically, the interview questions and the questionnaire items were revised and adjusted in accordance with the suggestions of three experts in the field. The chosen questionnaire item was based on the result of IOC from five experts which was no less than 0.8. The ones that were lesser than .8 were excluded from this study. Based on the experts’ comment and suggestions some new questions were form. After setting up new questions according to the experts’ comments and suggestions, the questionnaire was sent again to the five experts for confirmation. (APPENDIX P)

“When using Likert-type scales it is imperative to calculate and report Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for internal consistency reliability for any scales or subscales one may be using” (p. 88). For this reason, the researcher used Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient to assess the reliability of a questionnaire survey. In this study, the coefficient alpha was 0.87.

### 3.5.3 Inter-coder Reliability

According to Weir (2005), using at least two raters to mark a test will result in a more reliable results than having only a single rater or marker. Therefore, in this study to examine the inter-coder reliability of the written corrective feedback based on Ellis’(2009) typology of corrective feedback (APPENDIX B) —direct correction and indirect correction, two instructors from the same department as the researcher were asked to analyze the students’ writings. One of the instructors holds a Ph.D in Teaching English as a Foreign Language from a university in the United Kingdom while another instructor earned a Ph.D. in English Language Education from Thailand. Both instructors mastered a very good command of English language and
have been working as English teachers for over 15 years. All together in this study there were three coders including the researcher.

The researcher and both instructors agreed upon the coding scheme based on Ellis’ typology of corrective feedback (2009). The researcher and the two instructors examined and compared each other’s coding results and discussed the agreements as well as disagreements. Three native speakers at the university were consulted when certain language points were not able to be settled. The coders conducted the coding in students’ pre test and post test. After doing that, the coders’ results were compared to that of the researcher and the average percentage of inter-coder agreement on each piece of writing was calculated. The result revealed that the inter-coder agreements were quite high.

Table 3.4 Inter coder Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Tasks</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Inter-coder agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre test</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre test</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.4 Semi-structured Interview

To answer the second question as proposed in this research “What are students’ perception and attitude towards written corrective feedback?” semi-structured interviews were conducted to triangulate the responses from questionnaire
Interviews are among the most frequently used research methods in applied linguistics (Block, 2000), one of the main reasons is because they can help researchers investigate phenomena that are difficult to retrieve from questionnaire alone. In this case, interviews were used to investigate students’ beliefs and attitudes about issues relating to feedback to supplement and clarify questionnaire responses.

The objective of having this interview was to collect qualitative data on students’ perceptions towards feedback they received. The semi-structured interviews (APPENDIX F) were used as they allowed the respondents to clarify on issues according to the guiding questions (Dörnyei, 2007). The writing instructors’ were also interviewed to find out their perceptions and attitudes on written corrective feedback. Moreover, as Lincoln and Guba (1985) state, “it permits the respondent to move back and forth in time-to reconstruct the past, interpret the present and predict the future” (p.274).

This semi-structured interview was conducted with twelve participants – six from each group, at the end of the experiment. A set of questions were formulated as open-ended in order to elicit the respondents’ free responses. In order to set a relaxed atmosphere, the interview session began with broad questions such as “did you find this course interesting?” or “what did you like or dislike about the course?” As according to Dörnyei (2007), these kinds of questions will warm up the interviewee before the actual interview.

The interviews were conducted in the researchers’ office at the university itself. Prior appointments were made beforehand with each interviewee. The interviews were conducted in both languages- English and Thai- as they preferred in order to clarify their responses. The interviews were carried out in a rather informal manner. The interviews were later transcribed in a light of salient themes and patterns. Based on the inductive analysis (Brice, 2005), the data was grouped into categories that reflected the major themes.

The questions answered from the interviews revolve around students’ perceptions of the feedback they had received throughout the semester. Most of the students who were interviewed showed positive perception towards written corrective feedback. Especially those students in direct corrective feedback group said that they were able to write better due to feedback provided by the teacher. There were mixed
result in the indirect corrective feedback groups. Some think it was too challenging while others think differently.

Content validity of the letter writing tasks was approved by experienced teachers at the university. The topic of letter writing was chosen from past issues of examination which had already been approved by the external and internal academic committee when they proof-read the exams.

3.5.5 Classroom Observation
Observation is one of the most useful research instruments that can help researchers in investigating the environment in a real setting as well as obtain clear and direct answers to questions related to teaching and learning practices. According to many scholars, (Dörnyei, 2007; Good and Brophy, 2003; Mackey and Gass, 2005) a classroom observation can provide researchers with more specific evidence than other ways of collecting data. In this study, the researcher’s observation was used to triangulate the questionnaire and interview data about the attitudes and perceptions of students in receiving the corrective feedback. According to Wragg (1999), classroom observation requires a lot of efforts from the researcher as the researcher is playing many roles at the same time.

According to Dörnyei (2007), there are many ways to conduct classroom observation. In this particular study, the type of observation used is in the category of non-ethnographic as stated by Polio (1996). This observation is non ethnographic in the sense that the focus will just be on teaching and learning as well as feedback rather than on all aspects of what is going on in the classroom.

3.5.6 Students’ Journal Reflection
In this study, the students in both sections were asked to write a reflection in their journals after they have received the feedback on their writing. Dewey (1938) believed that education should serve not only as a means of acquiring information but also as a way to bring learning to our everyday actions and behaviors. Most successful learners know how to identify questions and problems as they reflect on what they already know, what they want and need to know, and how they will proceed to increase their understanding. Less successful learners need to develop the habits of mind that are the underlying strategies of the learning process.
Reflective practice can be supported in classrooms by creating opportunities that allow students to think about their learning, their own lives, and the world around them. The process often illuminates problems, misunderstandings, and confusions and helps determine new growth, independence, and responsibility for learning (Strong, Silver, and Perini 2001).

Reflective journals allow students to practice their writing skills in an open-ended format that encourages the same thought process that is used in analytical writing. Zemelman, Daniels, and Hyde (1993) believe that the most powerful learning happens when students self-monitor, or reflect. As learners continue to distinguish what they know from what they need to reevaluate or relearn, they begin to translate discoveries they have made about their own learning into plans for improvement. Just as reflective journals open the windows of a student's mind, they also allow teachers to look in. In this way, the journals become a useful assessment tool that gives teachers additional insight into how students value their own learning and progress.

3.6 Data Analysis

After all letter writing tasks, and questionnaire were gathered, they were processed and analyzed using the SPSS program. The qualitative data from observation, students’ reflection journal, semi-structured interview and questionnaire were also analyzed to triangulate the data. Also, the writing instructors’ interview were analyzed to find the similarities and differences in students and teachers’ perceptions and attitudes on written corrective feedback.

For descriptive purposes, the pre- post test scores, means, standard deviations and percentages were obtained. Paired sample t-test was used to compare the means of same group’s pre and post test to see the difference after feedback has been provided. Also, the independent-sample t-test was used to analyze the means of two different groups receiving different types of feedback.

3.7 Pilot Study

The present study was developed from the pilot study which had been conducted twice; once in the summer semester and the other one in the semester before the actual study was carried out. The main objective of conducting the pilot
study was to investigate the pedagogical approaches to providing two types of corrective feedback on students’ writing using the framework based on Ellis’ typology of corrective feedback (2009)—direct correction and indirect correction. The reliability and face validity as well as the comprehensibility was piloted during this phase of research. According to Norland (1990), pilot research can seek answer to question, does the measurement tools consistently measure what it was designed to measure. Also, Cronbach’s alpha was performed and the results of this pilot study revealed very high reliability i.e. Cronbrach’s alpha =.8

Students enrolling in the same course in the previous academic year served as a pilot study as they shared some common characteristics with the sample participating in the main study. In the pilot study, the subjects included 63 Thai undergraduate students majoring in Business English, Faculty of Arts, at an international university in Thailand. All of these students were native speakers of Thai and their age ranged from 19-22. These students enrolled in Business Communication in English II course during the second semester of the academic year 2/2015. The subjects were divided into two groups: direct corrective feedback (Group A) and indirect corrective feedback (Group B). Each student was assigned to write four types of letters which included informative, request, negative, and persuasive correspondences. There was a pre-test and a post-test for both the groups.

3.8 Triangulations

After quantitative and qualitative analyses had been carried out, the data was triangulated. Students’ interview, questionnaire, students’ reflection journal and classroom observation were triangulated to explain their attitudes and perception towards the type of feedback they received. The quantitative and qualitative data were also compared to further comprehend the performances of the students in two different groups.

3.9 Time Frame

The pilot study was carried out in semester 3/2014 and once again in 1/2015 while the actual study was completed in 2/2015. The actual study started on 11
January 2016 to 13 May 2016. The reason for re-carrying out the second pilot study was to ensure the improved methodology which was not employed when it was first piloted.

The schedule for both groups was as follows:

Group A (Direct Corrective Feedback): Tuesday & Thursday 10.30 – 12.00

Group B (Indirect Corrective Feedback): Tuesday & Thursday 12.00 – 13.30

3.10 Chapter Summary

In brief, this chapter presents the methodology for the main study. This study employed two types of research method; quantitative, which includes a quasi-experimental study to investigate the effectiveness of feedback on students’ writing, and qualitative, where results collected from semi-structured interviews, students reflection journal and classroom observation conducted with students to investigate the attitudes and beliefs about feedback. The error-counts was used to measure students’ writing accuracy which was analyzed using statistical measurement. Questionnaires and interview were also conducted to examine the participants’ attitude towards feedback.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter details the findings of this study. The quantitative result according to types of error is presented followed by the qualitative data from the interview, observation and students’ reflection journal. Statistical results are summarized in the form of tables and figures with a discussion of their meaning. Lastly, the analyses of the study results explain possible causes and effects. Relevance of results to findings are discussed according to the research questions.

4.2 Pre-test Error Count

Table 4.1. Pre-test error count for both groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Error</th>
<th>Group A (Direct)</th>
<th>Group B (Indirect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactic Error</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect tense</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sentence or clause aberrant</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular for plural</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural for singular</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb missing (not including auxiliary)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject formation</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-V agreement</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence Fragment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run-on sentence</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical Error</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article (missing, misused)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word form</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation (never, ever, any some, either, neither misplaced negator)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantic errors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantifier (much, many, this, these, a few, many kinds of) | 21 | 22 |
Wrong comparative | 10 | 22 |
**Mechanic errors**
Capitalization | 11 | 6 |
Spelling | 7 | 11 |
**Total** | 540 | 488 |

Table 4.1 presents pre test of error counts for each group according to different grammatical errors. The lower the score the higher the grammatical accuracy is.

### 4.3 Descriptive Statistical Result for Pre-test

**Table 4.2. Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups (pre test)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Pre –test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>25.714</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>23.238</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 presents the descriptive statistics both groups’ pre test result based on 21 grammatical errors. The mean of direct corrective feedback group was 25.71 with 2.77 standard deviation while the mean of the indirect corrective feedback group was 23.23 with 1.76 standard deviation. Independent sample T-test of both groups’ pre test was performed to check the similarity and compatibility of both groups. Independent sample T-test was not significant (p=.45) (see APPENDIX M).

### 4.4 Post-test Error-count

**Table 4.3. Post test error count for both groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Error</th>
<th>Group A (Direct)</th>
<th>Group B (Indirect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Syntactic Error</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect tense</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole sentence or clause aberrant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative clause</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular for plural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural for singular</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb missing (not including auxiliary)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4. Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups (post test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Type</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject formation</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S-V agreement</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sentence Fragment</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Run-on sentence</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammatical Error</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article (missing, misused)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word form</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation (never, ever, any some,</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either, neither misplaced negator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semantic errors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word choice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier (much, many, this,</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these, a few, many kinds of)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong comparative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical errors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Descriptive Statistical Result for Post-test

Table 4.4. Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups (post test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Post –test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct</td>
<td>10.666</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect</td>
<td>10.714</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 presents the descriptive statistics both groups’ post test result based on 21 grammatical errors. The mean of direct corrective feedback group was 10.66 with 2.14 standard deviation while the mean of the indirect corrective feedback group was 10.71 with 1.07 standard deviation.

Paired samples t-test for both direct and indirect corrective feedback groups were performed to see within group improvement. There was a significant difference in the overall accuracy for direct corrective feedback post test as compared to the pre test. (pre test M= 25.71, SD= 12.72; post test M= 10.66, SD=9.82 , t(20)=6.53, p=.000).
Moreover, the indirect corrective feedback group also showed significant improvement (pre test, M= 23.23, SD= 8.09; post test, M= 10.71, SD= 4.93, t(20) =6.50, p=.000) (see APPENDIX M).

In the next section the errors are classified into four categories consisting of grammatical errors, syntactic errors, semantic errors and mechanic errors (see APPENDIX B). Their pre tests and post tests are compared to show the improvement.

### 4.6 Syntactic Errors Result

Table 4.5 *Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Syntactic Errors (pre test)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Pre-test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>10.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>7.421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 shows independent sample T-test pre test was performed to check the similarity and compatibility of both groups in terms of Syntactic Errors. Independent sample T-test was not significant (p=.30) (see APPENDIX M).

Table 4.6 *Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Syntactic Errors (post test)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Post-test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>5.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. The independent sample t-test post test of both groups in terms of Syntactic Error is significant (p=.005). The result showed that the group receiving Direct Corrective Feedback performed significantly better than those receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback in terms of syntactic errors.(see APPENDIX M).
4.7 Grammatical Errors Result

Table 4.7 Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Grammatical Errors (pre test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Pre-test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>13.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>6.473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent sample T-test of both groups’ pre test was performed to check the similarity and compatibility of both groups in terms of Grammatical Errors. Independent sample T-test was not significant (p=.54) (see APPENDIX M).

Table 4.8 Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Grammatical Errors (post test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Post-test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>22.166</td>
<td>10.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>8.666</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The independent sample t-test post test of both groups in terms of grammatical errors is significant (p=.003). The result showed that the group receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback performed significantly better than those receiving Direct Corrective Feedback in terms of Grammatical errors (see APPENDIX M).

![Figure 4. 2. Comparing Means of Grammatical errors (pre test and post test)](image)

4.8 Semantic Errors Result

Table 4.9 Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Semantic Errors (pre test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Pre-test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent sample T-test of both groups’ pre test was performed to check the similarity and compatibility of both groups in terms of Semantic Errors. Independent sample T-test was not significant (p=.23) (see APPENDIX M).
Table 4.10 Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Semantic Errors (post test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent sample t-test post test of both groups in terms of semantic errors was not significant (p=.83). Even though both groups performed better in their post test but the result was not significantly different between direct and indirect feedback groups.

Figure 4.3. Comparing Means of Semantic Errors (pre test and post test)

4.9 Mechanical Errors Result

Table 4.11 Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Mechanical errors (pre test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent sample T-test of both groups’ pre test was performed to check the similarity and compatibility of both groups in terms of Semantic Errors. Independent sample T-test was not significant (p=.89) (see APPENDIX M).

Table 4.12 Descriptive statistics for error count of both groups’ Mechanical errors (post test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Post-test)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A (Direct Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B (Indirect Corrective Feedback)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The independent sample t-test post test of both groups in terms of Mechanical errors was significant (p=.006). The result showed that the group receiving Direct Corrective Feedback performed significantly better than those receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback in terms of Syntactic errors. (see APPENDIX M).

Figure 4.4 Comparing Means of Mechanical Errors (pre test and post test)

4.10 Data from Questionnaire

Results indicate that the two experimental groups have different views and perception about the written corrective feedback they received. Seventy-five percent
of students in the Direct Corrective Feedback group found that their teacher’s feedback is very useful while only 25% in the Indirect Corrective Feedback think similarly. In contrast with the students receiving Direct Corrective Feedback, most of the students in the Indirect Corrective Feedback group felt discouraged and unwilling to do the task again. They were quite confused and wanted the teacher to change the feedback style. They wanted to have their mistakes and errors explicitly spelled out. Less than 30% in the Indirect Corrective Feedback group found the teacher’s feedback beneficial while almost 70% in the Direct Corrective Feedback group agreed the feedback was beneficial to them. Students in both group attend to and appreciate their teacher’s pointing out of their grammatical problems. This is in line with various scholars’ findings (Brice, 1995; Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988).

Result from open-ended question also confirmed the above, most students reported that they prefer teacher to provide them explicit correction. Majority of them also think that their business letter writing skills were improved because of the feedback they received. Unlike, the direct corrective feedback group, the indirect corrective feedback did not feel very positive towards the type of feedback they received. They reported that they want teacher to write correct words for them because it was too difficult for them to correct by themselves.

To sum up, the students in the Direct Corrective Feedback group appreciate the teacher’s feedback and would like to receive more feedback. Students in both groups prefer direct correction over indirect corrections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Students’ responses (Direct Feedback)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I find my teacher’s feedback on my writing beneficial</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand my teacher’s feedback on my writing</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would like to receive feedback from my teacher in the future</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I prefer that my teacher corrects my errors on writing</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I prefer that my teacher shows my errors to let me correct myself</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not prefer to get feedback on my writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I prefer to get feedback than no feedback</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teacher’s feedback on my writing doesn’t help me to improve my skill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My teacher’s feedback discourages me to write in the future</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teacher’s feedback helps me improve my writing</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My teacher’s feedback makes me confident of producing a better writing</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My teacher’s feedback discourages me from producing a better draft</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My teacher’s feedback improves my grammar</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. My teacher should change the feedback style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. I wish to receive more written feedback from my teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I think I do not benefit from teacher’s feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students’ responses (Indirect Feedback)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.I find my teacher’s feedback on my writing beneficial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.I understand my teacher’s feedback on my writing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.I would like to receive feedback from my teacher in the future</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I prefer that my teacher corrects my errors on writing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.I prefer that my teacher shows my errors to let me correct myself</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.I do not prefer to get feedback on my writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.I prefer to get feedback than no feedback</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Teacher’s feedback on my writing doesn’t help me to improve my skill</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.My teacher’s feedback discourages me to write in the future</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.63%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.My teacher’s feedback helps me improve my writing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this study, 12 students, 6 from each group were selected for a semi-structured interview according to their progress on the grammatical accuracy in business letter writing. The interviews were later transcribed in a light of salient themes and patterns. Based on the inductive analysis, (Brice, 2005) the data was grouped into categories that reflected the major themes. The questions answered from the interviews revolve around students’ perceptions of the feedback they had received throughout the semester. Most of the students who received direct corrective feedback showed positive perception and perceived that they improved significantly due to the feedback provided. However, students receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback, even though they showed improvement, felt that the instructor did not care to mark their papers and they were confused on what they need to do in order to improve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My teacher’s feedback makes me confident of producing a better writing</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher’s feedback discourages me from producing a better draft</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher’s feedback improves my grammar</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>34.38%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teacher should change the feedback style</td>
<td>46.88%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to receive more written feedback from my teacher</td>
<td>65.63%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I do not benefit from teacher’s feedback</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 Data from Semi-structured Interview

In this study, 12 students, 6 from each group were selected for a semi-structured interview according to their progress on the grammatical accuracy in business letter writing. The interviews were later transcribed in a light of salient themes and patterns. Based on the inductive analysis, (Brice, 2005) the data was grouped into categories that reflected the major themes. The questions answered from the interviews revolve around students’ perceptions of the feedback they had received throughout the semester. Most of the students who received direct corrective feedback showed positive perception and perceived that they improved significantly due to the feedback provided. However, students receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback, even though they showed improvement, felt that the instructor did not care to mark their papers and they were confused on what they need to do in order to improve.
For example, when the students were asked to explain how they benefited from the teacher’s feedback. Some said that they benefited in improving grammar and others claimed that they benefited from the teacher’s feedback. Below are the six responses from the direct corrective feedback group (DF) and the Indirect corrective feedback group (IF).

1. How do you benefit from your teacher’s feedback? Please explain.

**DF S1:** I think my grammar got better because sometimes in other subjects when teachers only underline, I don’t know what to correct but in this class when you correct my grammar and you write the proper one for me I can learn and next time I think I try to use better words.

**DF S2:** I think my weakness is grammar but when the teacher correct at first I was confused why I make so much mistake but later in the next assignments I think I try to be more careful and I go back to see the corrected words and I think I don’t make those mistake again. Yes I like it and I think my writing is much better than before.

**DF S3:** Yes, I think I improved a lot. I try to write to make it better than my previous ones. I think my last work is much much better than my first work. I want to get every point correct.

**DF S4:** I benefit especially in grammar points. I understand preposition better and I think I will not write wrong preposition in my letter anymore.

**DF S5:** At first, I didn’t like because its all red colour, my paper was full of correction. It make me feel sad. But I try to improve and I think I have already improved.
**DF S6:** actually because I hate grammar so much. I never thought I can get better. I think now I write better with fewer mistakes.

**IF S1:** first day I was very confused. I don’t know what to do but when I try to check what was wrong I correct and next time I become more careful but I want the teacher to be specific and give me correct answer. I think I can learn better if I know the answer from the teacher. It’s difficult to find myself.

**IF S2:** the feedback was good as I need to find out why you underline my work. Sometimes I can sometimes I can’t but I try.

**IF S3:** I think I benefit but I want more help from teacher, I want to know how to correct. I am afraid what I think will not be correct again.

**IF S4:** I benefit a lot because teacher didn’t correct for me so I correct myself and I learnt more and before I submit I can review and correct myself better and better each time.

**IF S5:** I did not benefit a lot because I still don’t know where I can check the correct answers.

**IF S6:** I think today I can write and teacher will not give me a lot of circle like before. Because I know what is wrong, I don’t write it again. My weakness was I always forget what article to use, so I double check myself carefully.

On the question that asked their preferences on feedback, majority of them preferred explicit or direct corrective feedback. Below are the six responses from each group.
2. Do you prefer that the teacher corrects your errors on the script or that she underlines your errors?

**DF S1:** I prefer teacher correct for me because I am not sure what is correct.

**DF S2:** I want teacher to give me the correct word because I am very weak.

**DF S3:** I am ok if teacher correct or underline because if I don’t understand I will go and ask teacher again.

**DF S4:** I want teacher to correct. Because teacher corrects my work now I know what to use and what I cannot use. If teacher underline my grammar, I think it will not help me find correct way to solve my mistakes. So, I think it is teacher’s duty to correct for me. Teacher should provide right words for students when they write something wrong.

**DF S5:** I don’t like too many corrections, I feel sad to see and I have to show my parents and they will think I don’t work hard.

**DF S6:** yes teacher should give me the answer if I do it wrong because its teacher’s duty to check and correct for students. Sometimes if teachers are busy they do not correct for the students and tell the student to go correct. I think, it’s not good.

**IF S1:** Teacher always underlines and let me find but I want teacher to correct as it would be easy for me. Sometimes I am busy and I don’t have time to find the right answer.

**IF S2:** I like teacher to tell me what is wrong and correct for me, it help me remember because I have to think and find the correct way to write but sometimes I can’t find but I think if teacher correct for me I can write better too.
IF S3: No, I don’t want to have only circle or wrong but I want teacher to correct because I have poor grammar and I don’t trust myself. I know I am weak in grammar, I think every teacher tell me but nobody tells me what is right word. When teacher only underline I know it’s wrong but I don’t know how to correct sometimes.

IF S4: I want teacher to give me hint like this just show me where I should improve more. I can find out my own mistake and do better next time. If you give all answer then I think I might forget soon.

IF S5: I like this way, I want to improve when you underline my wrong spelling and grammar. I think I can do it and you can see I have done better writing assignment.

IF S6: I think I prefer that teacher correct difficult point for me but most of the time small mistake I can do myself.

When students’ were asked about their actions after they received feedback, most of them reported that they try to look at their mistakes and remember them in order not to make the same mistakes again.

2 Do you make changes on your writing based on teacher's feedback? Please explain.

DF S1: yes I changed based on feedback that I get and I remember and do not make same mistake again.

DF S2: I see what I did wrong and I changed according to what teacher give feedback
**DF S3:** I changed my revision draft based on teacher’s feedback because I want to write better with fewer mistakes.

**DF S4:** I always change after I get feedback from teacher and I remember my mistakes or the points that I do wrong and in my next writing I correct like teacher say and it make my writing better.

**DF S5:** yes I change according to feedback and eventually I get less feedback but I still change every time I get feedback to improve my writing.

**DF S6:** yes I do what teacher correct because my grammar is very bad so when I change it sounds better and next time I remember and try to use the form that teacher correct for me.

**IF S1:** yes I change my writing by thinking what should I correct when teacher underline and then I try to make it right sometimes I am not sure but I always try to do better.

**IF S2:** yes I try to change if I know what is wrong but if I don’t know I still try but I am not sure if its correct.

**IF S3:** yes I always change the part that I made mistake, I think first why teacher underlined, and then I try to think of new way to say it or change it to be grammatically correct.

**IF S4:** yes I improve my writing based on teacher’s feedback by looking at the mistake but I want teacher to be clear what is my mistake so I can really do better next time.
IF S5: yes I try to make changes according to teacher’s feedback and make my writing better. I look to see which part I got underline and I try to find out my mistake and do not do again.

IF S6: yes I always change and correct by myself based on what teacher suggest. I look at points that I often do wrong and redo and it improve a lot now I think.

On the question asking about their feeling towards teacher’s feedback, students in the direct corrective feedback groups were happy and satisfied with the feedback they received while those in the indirect group said they felt bad or even stupid. Some of them thought that getting indirect feedback was because of the instructor’s busy schedule. Below are the responses from students.

4. How do you feel when you get your teacher’s feedback on your writing?

DF S1: I think teacher work very hard to improve my writing skill.

DF S2: I feel good to know my mistake so I do not do it again.

DF S3: I feel like crying because so many mistake but I like to know so I don’t make more mistake when I go and work in future.

DF S4: I feel I should work hard to not get so many red marks and mistake

DF S5: I don’t know how I feel but I look at every word that you correct and improve better

DF S6: I feel good because other teacher in other subject didn’t have time like you to correct everything for me.
IF S1: I feel very confuse because you checked and circle and tell me it is wrong but I don’t know what is wrong.

IF S2: I feel sad and stupid because I get so many circles lines but I try to see what I should do but later I try to do better and correct myself.

IF S3: at first I didn’t like the circle and teacher’s feedback at all because I think I come and learn but teacher do not tell me how to correct but after few times I learn myself and I feel ok and I can do it.

IF S4: I thought teacher was busy and do not have time to correct for me. I know teacher has many work to do so its ok.

IF S5: I feel shocking at first because I do not want to look stupid but later I feel ok because I try to change my mistakes.

IF S6: I feel so sad at the beginning of the semester because I don’t know how to write correct words that teacher underlined for me but now I learn already.

When the students were asked if feedback was accounted for their improvement, all of them were very positive. They felt that it was because of the feedback they received that made their writing better.

5. Do you think that your teacher’s feedback make you improve your business letter writing?

DF S1: yes I think I improve a lot from teacher’s feedback you can see my work now.

DF S2: of course I improved a lot from the first work that I write. That one was full of mistake but this last work do not have any mistakes at all
DF S3: I think yes the teacher helped me a lot and I my business letter writing improved very much

DF S4: I don’t know but I think yes I write with less mistakes now

DF S5: yes I improved my writing but I am not sure.

DF S6: yes I am very happy because I improve so much I didn’t even think I can write this good. I think I can get a good job because this is very important skill to use in real life.

IF S1: I think teacher’s feedback made me think and learn by myself and I improved by myself.

IF S2: I improved a lot but sometimes I am not sure if what I write is good enough.

IF S3: yes I think teacher’s circled and underlined my mistake made me improve my business letter writing skills.

IF S4: I think I improve but I am not sure if what I write will be correct or not

IF S5: Maybe, but sometimes I am still not sure

IF S6: I don’t know but maybe I improve a little bit

4.12 Data from Reflection Journals
Analysis of students’ reflection journals were generated into the following themes:

1. Attitudes and perceptions: this part consist of students’ feeling, like and dislike and opinion about the type of written corrective feedback that they received.
2. Progress on their writing: this part consist of students self evaluation regarding the progress on their writings, whether or not they see their own improvement.

3. Actions they carried out after receiving feedback: this part consist of students’ action, how they deal with feedback.

4.12.1 Attitudes and Perceptions

The majority of students in both groups wrote about their attitudes and how they perceived the written corrective feedback that they received. They discussed their feelings and their opinion about the feedback.

Students’ in the Direct Corrective Feedback group at first felt that they were very poor in writing after seeing a lot of red marks on their writing assignment. They did not view it very positively at first. However, their reflection entry towards the end of the semester showed that they really liked the red marks which they think made them improved grammatically. The group that received the indirect corrective feedback reflected that they were confused at first but in the later reflections they think this kind of feedback made them really think and improve themselves. This is illustrated in student’s entry below

*DC (week 3)* : “I think I write well at first but after seeing a lot of red marks I think I am not very good. I feel very bad and stupid. I do not think I can write a good letter.

*DC* (week 3) “I am very sad I feel so bad about my letter writing. There are a lot of mistake I forgot to double check my mistake and teachers correct everything, teacher must think I am very dumb.

*DC (week 3)* “I think I like the teacher to correct but when I see my paper I was quite shock, I didn’t know I had to improve so much to do well.”
IC (week 3): “I don’t really understand why my teacher circle everything. She didn’t explain anything what I do wrong what can I do now”

IC (week 3): “I think the teacher did not have time to correct my work. She just circle some point and I don’t know what should I write”

IC (week 3): “I am so sad that my letter writing is full of mistakes but I will try to do better next time but I don’t know how to correct it’s so confusing.”

DC (week 9): “today my teacher didn’t give me a lot of correction, I think my grammar is better, I try to look at my mistake and improve.”

DC (week 9): “My grammar is much better than last semester, I think if all teacher correct my mistake I will be better writer for sure.”

DC (week 9): ”when I got my work back...OMG.. I was shock and happy and wow I can write good letter I think I can get good job in the future too.”

ID (week 9): ”I look at my assignment and I think I improved from before...actually I now try to read first before I submit my teacher to see if I can do everything correct.”

ID (week 9): ”I get less mistake because I have learn to not write wrong preposition and grammar and yes I think the teacher make me think when I write.”

ID (week 9) “This time my teacher is very kind I get very few red circles because I do not make the mistake. I am very happy so happy”

4.12.2 Self Evaluation on the Progress of their Writing

Most of the students in both direct and indirect Written Corrective Feedback groups believed that they have improved a lot from feedback they received. However, some few students from indirect corrective feedback group still wanted the teacher to give the answer instead of just underlining or circling. In other words, they stated their preference for the direct corrections. They think that they can improve better if they
know what exactly are their mistakes and the teacher should work harder and provide them with the exact corrections.

DC (week 9) : “I feel that I have developed more than before, I never have a teacher to correct me so much, but I think this way I learn and I don’t make same grammar mistake again.”

DC (week 9) : “even my parents can see that I write better letter, I have business at home and now my parents always allow me to write letter to my company customer. I am very happy I write like a professional worker.”

DC (week 9) : “I think my mistake got fewer and fewer and I think I write good grammar now than before. I want to say thank you my lovely teacher I will keep writing.”

ID (week 9) : “even my grammar is not perfect like native speaker, I think I improve better than I write letter before. But I want teacher to really check my work and tell me how to correct so I can do the right thing.”

ID (week 9) : “my letter writing skill is improving because now I have so less mistake you can see my this work. I think sometimes I still confuse why teacher underline for me I think its correct already or teacher make mistake. I don’t know.”

ID (week 9) : “My skill improved from when I start the course, I didn’t even know I was bad in grammar. I think my writing is now very good. I want teacher to have more time to read and give me correct word if I write wrong words.”

4.12.3 Actions

Common actions of students when they received written corrective feedback were reading and correcting their mistakes, asking their friends to help, checking from
internet, and remembering them so that they do not make the same mistakes again. This was also in line with Wen (2009) reporting that students will notice and try to do something about their teachers’ written correction on their errors. However, some students’ in the indirect corrective feedback group also reported that they ignored certain errors that the teacher underlines which they do not know how to correct. According to Cohen and Calvanti (1990), if the student had no systematic way of dealing with the feedback that the writing instructors provide, they may just make a mental note and might even ignore totally.

**DC** : when I get my work back I see what the teacher correct and read to remember it

**DC** : I check what the teacher write on my paper and I correct in my second writing. I try to remember it but sometimes it’s difficult to remember all.

**DC** : It’s easy to correct my errors because my teacher show me how to correct and I just follow, I think I remember and I don’t make the same mistake again.

**IC** : I try to ask someone who understands why teacher circle my words. Sometimes I think it’s already correct, maybe the teacher did not understand me.

**IC** : sometimes when I really don’t know what is wrong, even my friends don’t know, they get lower score than me, so I type my writing work on google and it tell me what I should correct. But sometimes, I am lazy so I didn’t do anything.

**IC** : when I see teacher underline so many things I go to my friends, my friend is very smart he always help me correct but I always forget again and make mistake again.

### 4.13 Data from Classroom Observation

As observation is also one of the many useful research instruments, in this study it helps the researcher to triangulate the interview and journal reflection data. Ellis (1988) and Lambert (1991) suggest that researchers may be required to take into
account classroom constraints to find out what actually happens in the classroom as much as possible.

The researcher observed the students after handing back their assignments. The observation was conducted four times after each writing assignment were corrected and returned to the students for redrafting. The result of observation was in line with the interview as well as students’ journal reflections. Those in the direct corrective feedback group were more satisfied with the feedback they received and perceived it to be teacher’s hard work to make them improve. On the other hand, students receiving the indirect corrective feedback were very confused after receiving back their first two assignments. Some of them just looked at their papers and make a mental note of their mistakes while others simply put it in their files. Few students from indirect corrective feedback group walked towards their peers to inquire about their mistakes. Some of them look up on the internet for the answers.

Data from questionnaire, interview, observation and students’ reflection journal indicate that students in both groups were aware and try to correct their writing after receiving their teacher’s feedback. These findings were supported by that of Ferris’ (1995) but refutes Cohen and Calvanti’s (1990), Chaudron’s (1995) which claimed that students do not notice and pay attention in order to improve their writing. Upon receiving their corrected assignment, students were asked to revise their work by using the feedback given by the teacher. In rewriting, they need to read, pay attention to and eventually become aware of their errors. As explained by Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) and Ferris (1995). Also, if L2 learners are motivated to integrate into the L2, they will develop a higher level of proficiency and positive attitudes, which can have a positive effect on their writing. (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) In short, learners may continue to exhibit errors in their writing for the following social reasons:

1. negative attitudes toward the target language
2. continued lack of progress in the L2
3. a wide social and psychological distance between them and the target culture, and,
4. a lack of integrative and instrumental motivation for learning.
The attention, the awareness, feeling of making progress of students due to the corrective feedback they received can lead to students’ positive or negative attitudes and perceptions of feedback.

4.14 Examining Individual Cases

For further investigation into the effects of feedback on students’ writing, individual cases from both experimental groups; 6 students from Direct Corrective feedback group and 6 from Indirect Corrective feedback group were examined. Accuracy in the used of 21 error point categorized under Syntactic, Grammatical, Semantic and Mechanic Errors were used in order to analyze the individual cases. Independent sample t-test were analyzed on two high, medium, and low achievers from both groups in order to see the significant differences between two feedback types.

4.14.1 Syntactic Errors

Table 4.13 Independent Sample t-test for Syntactic Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Sample T-test</th>
<th>Pre test (p value)</th>
<th>Post test (p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Achievers</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achievers</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 shows that there were no significant differences between high achievers of both groups however, medium and low achievers receiving direct corrective feedback outperformed their counterparts receiving indirect corrective feedback.

4.14.2 Grammatical Error

Table 4.14 Independent Sample t-test for Grammatical Errors
Table 4.14 shows that there were no significant differences between high achievers and medium achievers of both groups however, low achievers receiving direct corrective feedback outperformed their counterpart receiving indirect corrective feedback.

### 4.14.3 Semantic Errors

Table 4.15 Independent Sample t-test for Semantic Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Sample T-test</th>
<th>Pre test (p value)</th>
<th>Post test (p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Achievers</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achievers</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15 shows that there were no significant differences between high achievers of both groups however, medium and low achievers receiving direct corrective feedback outperformed their counterparts receiving indirect corrective feedback.
4.14.4 Mechanical Errors

Table 4.16 Independent Sample t-test for Mechanical Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre test (p value)</th>
<th>Post test (p value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Achievers</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achievers</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16 shows that there were no significant differences between high achievers of both groups however, medium and low achievers receiving direct corrective feedback outperformed their counterparts receiving indirect corrective feedback.

Overall, the analysis show that medium and low achievers students in direct corrective feedback group outperformed those receiving indirect corrective feedback. However, there were no significant differences for high achievers regardless of type of feedback they received.

4.15 Data from Teachers’ Interview

The purpose of interviewing the teachers was to investigate their feedback practices and their attitudes to feedback. The teachers were initially asked about the main problems of EFL/ESL students faced when writing business correspondences. They believed that the main problem when writing were in grammatical areas. They claimed that the students had particular problems in correct structure, word order, verb tense and prepositions. In general, the teachers said that the students lacked the fundamental grammatical aspect of writing elements that would help them write professionally. Most of them claimed that students already know the content of what to write but it was the grammatical issue that make their business letter writing lack professional touch. Here is an example:
Teacher A: (Thai Teacher)
“Most of the students are very poor at all aspects of the language (pause) the grammar, mainly the tenses. For example, they just start using the present simple tenses and then go the past and then back again to the future in the same sentence. The use of prepositions also sometimes they translate directly from Thai to English and that’s why they make a lot of errors. I can understand what they are trying to write because I am Thai but imagine one day they will have to go work in an internal firm (pause) I really don’t know what they will do.

Teacher B: (Native Speaker)
“Many of them are not really sure of the structure and the word order despite the fact that they in university levels. They seem to get messed up with every single grammatical mistake (pause) you name it. They can’t get their tenses right. I always get headache when I have to read a run-on sentence that runs for eight lines. I am not kidding. Their mistakes totally make me forget what they are trying to communicate. I just find it extremely hard to get their point.

Teacher C: (Non-native, Non-Thai)
“I think they are very weak when it comes to grammar. They do not sound like professional writers to me. We are training them to look professional but they still make these small mistakes and errors in their writing. It gives me goose bumps. So far, I have never had a student writing correct articles in my class. They just throw in any a or the anytime they please. And yes their basic spellings are beyond words. Today, I just had one student spelling ‘customer’ as ‘costomer’, it was repeated five or six times in the letter writing task imagine.

On the question of how teachers delivered feedback, it appeared that most used the indirect technique.

Teacher A:
“When I get back their writings, I go though it once to understand if their contents are right if they are trying to answer what is supposed to be answered by ignoring all their grammatical errors first. Then I read it again the second time, this time I just underline some grammatical mistakes they make. I can circle all words otherwise they
will be in shock. When in fact, they write every other words wrong, literally, every other words. In the end I write a comment on their paper to check their grammar.

Teacher B:
“At first when I join the University, I try to give individual feedback on each student’s paper. But now I don’t have that much time you know I have so many students and everyone make so many mistakes. If I do like that I will take weeks and it’s not possible. I just put question marks on part that I don’t really understand what they mean. I read every papers and just look for common errors and explain on the board next class. Some three or four common mistakes.

Teacher C:
“I think the most effective and efficient way is to underline and let them know their mistakes. They are already in a university we do not have to spoon-feed them with correct answers. It’s their duty to sort it out themselves. If they have questions or problems, they can come to my office any time I can explain them if they like.

When asked how they expected students to respond to feedback they gave, the majority of the teachers said they expected students to read through the corrected work and make attempts to correct their errors by themselves. They added that most students did not do this. A reason perhaps is that teachers did not follow up students after giving feedback, nor did they ask for a second draft.

Teacher A:
“I just expect them to realize where their mistakes are. That’s part of my comment on their papers as well. Some good students they do, well (pause) some are far too busy. It’s their choice.”

Teacher B:
“I want them to look up their errors and when they write the next assignment I don’t want to see the same errors again. I want them to take responsibility for their own work.”

Teacher C:
“I would like them to come and ask if they didn’t understand what I wrote, if they think that my comments are not clear. I also expect them not to repeat the same mistakes. They don’t actually always meet my expectations.”

On the question whether students valued the feedback they received, the teachers felt that they did.

**Teacher A:**

“I think yes, they value the feedback. If I underline something, I observed that they looked at it.”

**Teacher B**

“I have some good students who appreciate feedback I can’t deny that but also I have many students who just would not care.”

**Teacher C**

“I think they should, well if they do not see the value of feedback they are not learning anything. But like I told you before, they are not school children they must value feedback and act accordingly.”

Finally, the teachers were asked to give recommendation for EFL teachers for more effective feedback. The teachers were also asked if they think it is necessary for students to redraft their writing. The teachers’ answers were quite limited, showing a certain lack of awareness of L2 writing methodology and feedback methodology. None, for example recommended re-drafting, or providing direct feedback. Below are the examples

**Teacher A:**

“I would suggest writing instructors to never return students’ writing without giving feedback. Teachers just need to find one or two mistakes and underline them. I don’t think the students should rewrite again because it will waste their time to write the same topic again. I think they should practice with another writing and don’t do same mistake again.”

**Teacher B:**

“I think two things I would like to suggest. First you should not make any corrections. If you make corrections you will be defeating the purpose of your feedback. You should make the students think. Students, individually, should list their
mistakes and create a journal for their own mistakes and learn to correct them by themselves. They have to try and show how they can correct their own errors on writing. I find that useful for my own class. I think rewriting their work would not make sense as they have already written it once, it is enough to learn from their mistakes.”

Teacher C:

“\textit{I think at the end of the day whatever you write on students’ paper will just go in the bin. They will lose the paper. I would recommend the writing instructors to discuss their errors, their common errors in class on the board. For me, redrafting is not compulsory as long as they know what is wrong. They do not need to write again. I know some teachers do that but it just waste their time and the students’ time as well.}”

To sum up the teachers’ interview responses, the teachers use different ways of giving feedback to students. Most of them give indirect corrective feedback. The teachers do not ask the student to re-write their second draft and they confirmed that students do not do what they are expected to do after receiving feedback. In the final analysis, it is clear that the process of giving feedback is incomplete as it is limited to giving only vague comments and few indirect corrections. There is no further action taken by the teachers which raises the need of teaching L2 writing. As Oladejo (1993, p.84) puts it “Teachers’ opinion and students’ needs do not always match and such mismatch could contribute to lack of success in language learning.” Some teachers prefer correcting all errors as they appear, while others believe that constant correction can boost students level and anxiety and thus hinder learning (Krashen, 1982). Similarly to teachers, some students prefer being corrected more than others but there is a tendency for all students wishing to be corrected. Leki (1991) found that most of his students who participated in the study preferred all their written errors to be explicitly corrected.

Due to these different attitudes, Zhu (2010, p.128) maintains that “both teachers and students should adopt a reasonable approach to handle the error-correction mismatching effectively and appropriately in order to adapt to their preferences in learning and teaching.” Therefore, by knowing students’ attitudes towards error correction teacher can adopt to the learner’s needs and preferences.
Such beliefs may influence the effectiveness of teachers’ feedback (Schulz, 1996). These belief may be gathered for analysis by means of questionnaires and interview (Fantozzi, 1998).

Responses also show that students in general value the teachers’ feedback and that teachers believe in the importance of giving feedback to students. However, teachers use limited range of feedback methods such as indirect method only. They also seem to have a limited understanding of L2 writing methodology.

4.16 Data from Professional Recruiters

According to Schott Karr (2001), graduates with business letter savvy will be highly valued by professional recruiters. Arvani (2006, p. 13) added that in the globalized world, business correspondence serves as a main channel of communication and therefore its accuracy should not be overlooked. So, for this study, five professional recruiters in five various sectors (Conrad Hotel, PTT Thailand, Johnsons & Johnsons Thailand, TNS research group, and KBank) were asked to rate the students’ letter writing for both pre-test and post test to see whether the writing is acceptable or not (see APPENDIX N). For the direct corrective feedback group only eight students’ pre-test result were acceptable by the professional recruiters while only seven were deemed acceptable for the indirect corrective feedback group. However, the post test writing of direct corrective feedback group gain higher acceptable level which was 25 students while only 20 students’ writing from indirect corrective feedback were considered as effective business writing by the professionals.

4.17 Discussions

4.17.1 Answering Research Question 1

The first question that this study intends to answer is: Are there significant differences in the effects of the two types of written corrective feedback, namely direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback, on students’ writing
accuracy? The table below summarizes the answers to the research question number one.

Table 4.17 *Types and significance of feedback*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Sig (Independent Sample T-Test)</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Errors</td>
<td>Yes (p = .006)</td>
<td>The result showed that the group receiving Direct Corrective Feedback performed significantly better than their counterparts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical Errors</td>
<td>Yes (p=.003)</td>
<td>The result showed that the group receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback significantly outperformed the Direct Corrective Feedback group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Errors</td>
<td>No (p=.83)</td>
<td>Even though both groups performed better than their pre test, the result was not significantly different between Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Errors</td>
<td>Yes (p=.006)</td>
<td>Direct Corrective Feedback Group performed significantly better than those receiving Indirect Corrective Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results have shown that both types of feedback made significant positive effect on overall writing. This result is in line with the previous research of various scholars such as Fathman and Whaley(1990), Ferris (2006) and Kubota (2001) in terms of getting positive result after giving corrective feedback to students. However, the improvement of both groups can be due to different factors. The improvement shown in the group receiving direct corrective feedback may be due to short term
memorizing from the previous corrections that have been made which can be supported from Ferris (2006). Thus, the improvement for this group may or may not be a real improvement of their linguistic knowledge but rather by imitating the teacher’s corrections. Meanwhile, the improvement of those in the indirect corrective feedback occur when students notice their mistake and make corrections. This is in line with Schmidt’s (1990) noticing of target structure. To elaborate, the students in this group would have gone through the process of testing; revising and confirming their hypothesis of the target language which made them learn the linguistic structures. Even though Trucott (1996, 2004, 2007) claimed that written corrective feedback on grammatical errors is not effective and should be abandoned in L2 classrooms, the findings of this study suggest the possibility that the corrective feedback is effective to enhance students’ accuracy. In fact, this findings confirms the findings of several earlier studies. For instance, Ashwell (2000), Ferris (1997), Ferris & Roberts (2001), Bitchener (2008), Bitchener & Knoch (2008, 2009, 2010a 2010b) all show that corrective feedback is effective to enhance students’ performance in terms of overall accuracy. Even though it is difficult to compare the result directly with the results of this study due to different experimental setting, the findings of this study might add more empirical evidence supporting the preposition that written corrective feedback on grammatical error is effective to enhance L2 accuracy.

Some highly influential second language acquisition theorist such as Krahen and Turscott have proposed that abundant and comprehensible naturalistic input under meaningful and realistic circumstances alone is sufficient for the eventual production of fluency and grammatical accuracy, one major factor they did not take into consideration is that there are distinction between ESL classroom and the EFL classroom. In the latter, where students have no opportunity for immersion in the language, but only attend English class in their home country for two to five hours a week or so, and particularly when such students are at a lower L2 proficiency level, then grammar and corrective feedback do have a fundamental role to play in basic L2 learning. At universities in predominantly English-speaking countries, in contrast L2 students are immersed in the language that they study, using English language every day for a wide variety of daily needs as well. Thus, such theorist did not take into the account the needs and necessity of professors in home country where the students are
in an immersive ESL environment, downplays the necessity for grammar instruction for lower EFL students studying in their home country, as well as downplays the necessity for written corrective feedback for EFL students at higher proficiency levels studying in their home country. Besides, Polio et al. (1998) claimed that written corrective feedback, in the form of direct as well as indirect correction, is not effective for learners. Such results are in contrast with the present study.

Moreover, this can also imply that Universal Grammar and Interlanguage model are accounted for students’ learning. According to the Universal Grammar and Interlanguages, the participants in this research may already have the explicit knowledge about 21 error points but their inaccuracies or mistakes could mean that they have not fully acquired those language rules as they needed some form of trigger. Also, according to cognitive processing models, this result may imply that the participants had declarative knowledge without being automatized as yet. To clarify, the students needed more input, which in this case is the written corrective feedback, to emphasize and bring awareness for their future processing. Besides, Ellis (1994) can also be accounted for the improvement of Indirect Corrective feedback group as according to him, students receiving indirect corrective feedback are given an opportunity to act on their own initiative in further production unlike those getting direct corrective feedback which might only allow them to imitate and memorize the correct forms without gaining aspects of the formal language of the words. However, some features that the indirect corrective feedback group did not show as much improvement as their Direct feedback counterpart could be due to insufficient exposure of grammar properties that are far beyond the input(White, 2003; Ellis, 2016).

The findings are in contrast with that of Lalande (1982), Robb et al. (1986), Semke (1984), Leki (1990a), Ashwell (2000), and Ferris and Roberts (2001) which stated that there is no significant differences between direct and indirect corrective feedback except in terms of Semantic errors (word choice, quantifier, wrong comparative).

Jokar and Soyoof (2014) conclude direct corrective feedback to be the most effective in grammar learning, coinciding with Van Beuningen et al. (2012) study. However, since the individual learner’s understanding plays an important role, a
teacher only giving learners direct corrective feedback cannot expect the learners’ proficiency level to increase without the learners having understood the feedback given. Indirect corrective feedback, although showing inferior results in comparison to its direct counterpart, may be beneficial for some students, but not all. Relating the understanding of the feedback a learner receives to the proficiency level, it may be thought that learners need a certain level of metalinguistic awareness or maturity in order to benefit from indirect corrective feedback (Kim, 2013).

The group that received Direct Corrective Feedback outperformed those receiving indirect corrective feedback in terms of Syntactic Errors (incorrect tense, whole sentence or clause aberrant, relative clause, singular for plural, plural for singular, verb missing excluding auxiliary verbs, subject formation, subject verb agreement, and run-on sentence) and Mechanic Errors (Capitalizations and spellings). This is supported by various researchers such as Bitchener and Knoch (2008), Bitchener et al. (2005), Van Beuningen et al. (2008, 2012), Suzuki (2012), Lee (2004), Lan Anh (2008), Parreno (2014) who found that Direct corrective feedback has the advantage as this type of feedback provides learners with explicit guidelines about how to correct their errors. Also, this study lend support to that of Chandler (2003), whose university level of ESL learners were East Asian. She found that direct correction were the best form of feedback that teachers should provide in order to improve Asian students’ grammar.

However, due to differences in L1 background and research contextual setting, most learners in this study prefer to receive direct corrective feedback. These findings could also be related to the socio-cultural context of learning. Depending on how authoritative the structure of the classroom context is, there could be varying degrees of resistance to what is delivered to students by the teacher. In more authoritarian contexts, students may be used to accept whatever the teacher tells them. Direct corrective feedback in such context, as this one, will be more useful for such learners than those who learn in more socio-culturally open contexts in which they might have a greater role in everything including learning. Another possible reason could be the differences in the proficiency level of the participants. The participants of the present study were intermediate learners of English. There is intuitive support for the claim that learners’ level of proficiency may influence the degree of their dependence on the
teacher. So, the lower the proficiency levels of the learners, the greater their need to be supported by the teacher even if they feel they like to be independent. This might explain why learners performed best when they received direct feedback despite the fact that they preferred to be only partially supported or in another term, when receiving indirect corrective feedback. In much the same vein, the degree of learner autonomy encouraged and supported by the teacher and educational system can influence the effectiveness of various feedback modes on students' learning.

The more autonomous learners may tend to prefer or benefit more from indirect types of feedback whereas the less autonomous learners may have to rely on direct feedback. In addition, one reason why the learners had the lowest scores in the indirect feedback groups could have been their misunderstanding of their teacher’s corrections. Studies conducted by Hyland and Hyland (2001), and Hyland (2003) revealed that indirectness of the corrective feedback modes could lead to misinterpretation and incomprehension.

Moreover, Bitchener and Ferris (2012, p.70) holds that the L2 learning background of each learner may influence their benefit from written corrective feedback they received and gave a description of this particular issue as being “under-explored”. To elaborate, there is a possibility that students’ poor English made it difficult for them to understand and benefit from indirect corrective feedback. Bitchener, East and Cartner (2010) also added that certain grammatical errors can only be self-corrected and understood by learners if they have good command of the language otherwise they will not benefit from such feedback.

In terms of Grammatical errors (pronoun, article, preposition, word form, conjunction, negation), the result showed that the group receiving indirect corrective feedback significantly outperformed those receiving direct corrective feedback. This is in line with previous research of Allwright et al. (1988), Hendrickson (1978), Lalande (1982), Rahimi (2009), and Ellis (2009) as it pushes learners to benefit from interlanguage development. In keeping with the findings of the present study, Chandler (2003) also concluded that underlining or circling in the form of indirect correction was best for grammatical errors that students could correct themselves.

In terms of Semantic Errors, there were no significant differences between the groups even though the progress within group was significant. This can be supported
by Guenette (2007) as he believes that there is no corrective feedback “recipe” (p.51). In his view, no matter what the role or nature of feedback may be, some learners will gain benefit from explicit corrective feedback while others needed their instructors to just point out their inaccuracy to them. Besides, Lee (2008) concluded that the nature of learners’ proficiency, motivation and quality of feedback also play important parts which may differ from one learner to another.

Motivation is believed to be one of the important factors affecting the speed and success of foreign language learning. Gilakjani, Leong, and Sabouri (2012) stated that motivation refers to encouragement, desire, and effort to do a particular thing in order to achieve the set of goals. Understandably, individuals have different reasons for learning a particular language which can be typically divided into two basic types of motivation: integrative and instrumental (Gardner, 1985). “Integrative motivation” typically refers to the desire to communicate with or integrate into a target language community, whereas “instrumental motivation” is the desire to learn the target language because it opens up educational and economic opportunities for learners (Ellis, 2003). In addition, some researchers in second language acquisition (SLA) have incorporated the psychological dimension into the motivation factor. In particular, they propose another two basic types of motivation, namely intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Carreira, 2005). Intrinsic (internal) motivation is driven by an interest or enjoyment in doing the activity itself; while, extrinsic (external) motivation is the desire to achieve external goals or receive rewards such as money, a grade, a better job (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Alongside the cultural and curricular aspects of standardization, there is variability in the process of L2 learning. Learners vary in the ultimate level of proficiency they achieve, with many failing to reach target-language competence. This variation is often the result of individual learner differences in motivation and aptitude, in addition to the use of an assortment of strategies, such as inferencing and self-monitoring for obtaining input and for learning from it (Ellis, 1994; Krashen, 1982). Specifically, the effectiveness of feedback may depend on the level of students’ motivation, their current language level, their cognitive style, the clarity of the feedback given, the way the feedback is used, and the attitudes of students toward
their teacher and the class (Ferris, 1997; Goldstein, 2001; Omaggio Hadley, 1993). Classroom settings, course goals, and grading procedures and standards are also important (Leki, 1990).

Moreover, Attitude to the target language and that language community are also considered important factors in learning a foreign language. It is clear that if we have a positive attitude towards the target language, its speakers, social and cultural customs and community, we can learn that particular language faster and more effectively than other languages (Baker & Hengeveld, 2012). In addition, attitude towards the classroom and teacher is also related to language learning; for instance, the student who feels at ease in the classroom and likes the teacher tends to learn the language more effectively than those with negative attitudes (Krashen, 1981).

Examining individual cases and interview became very clear that if the teacher provides corrective feedback to the students written work it needs to be adapted to each individual with his or her personality, strength and weaknesses in mind. This was also confirmed by Storch and Wigglesworth (2010), who found a number of factors, like student beliefs, goals and attitude, to impact the effect of the feedback. Guenette (2007), who compared a number of studies that teachers should provide corrective feedback to their students, but that they need to be aware of that there is no “recipe” on how to do it (p.51). the success or failure will also depend on classroom context, type of errors made by the students, the students’ proficiency level, writing task type, etc.

Although the qualitative data show that students in all groups were satisfied with the kind of feedback they received, the quantitative findings revealed that the direct corrective feedback group had more positive attitudes towards the feedback they received than the indirect corrective feedback group. This findings appear to correspond to those of many previous studies that reflect overwhelming positive attitudes toward direct error correction on writing of second and foreign language learners (Radecki & Swales, 1988; Schulz, 1996; Saito, 1994). Schulze, however, hypothesizes that these attitudes may result from previous instructional experiences,
such as curriculum, testing methods, and the myth about the usefulness of grammatical feedback.

According to all participants, part of adjusting the corrective feedback to the recipient means providing different amounts of error correction to high and low achieving students. To elaborate, this means that low achieving students should get more explicit feedback while the high-achievers students can be provided with either type of feedback.

From behaviorist and mentalist perspectives of error, which have emphasized the product (the error itself) to more constructivist views, which focus on underlying process (why the error is made), researchers have attempted to understand the errors in writers' texts by hypothesizing their possible sources (Bartholomae, 1980; Hull, 1985). Although reading an error-filled text can be tiring and disconcerting, errors can help us identify the cognitive strategies that the learner is using to process information. According to Ellis (1985), it is through analyzing learner errors that we elevate "the status of errors from undesirability to that of a guide to the inner working of the language learning process" (p. 53).

Whether an error, mistake, or "derailment," awkward discourse can occur for a variety of reasons, some of which have already been mentioned. First of all, learners may translate from L1, or they may try out what they assume is a legitimate structure of the target language, although hindered by insufficient knowledge of correct usage. In the learning process, they often experience native language interference from developmental stages of interlanguage or from nonstandard elements in spoken dialects. They also tend to over-generalize the rules for stylistic features when acquiring new discourse structures. In addition, learners are often unsure of what they want to express, which would cause them to make mistakes in any language (Carson, 2001; Connor & Kaplan, 1987; Kutz, Groden, & Zamel, 1993; Raimes, 1987).

Repeating a previous mistake, or backsliding, is a common occurrence in L2 writing. More important, though, is the issue of fossilization—when "learner interlanguage competence diverges in more or less permanent ways from the target
language grammar” (Odlin, 1994, p. 13). Fossilized errors can be problematic in writing because the errors become ingrained, like bad habits, in a learner's repertoire, and they reappear despite remediation and correction.

Based on this result it can be concluded that the first null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between the effects of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback on learners' achievement is rejected

4.17.2 Answering Research Question 2

The second research question asks: What are students’ perceptions and attitudes towards written corrective feedback? In order to answer this question the findings from questionnaire, semi-structured interview, classroom observation and students’ reflection journal are compared.

Findings of the above are parallel in some parts and contrasting in others, as summarized below:

- Semi-structured interview, questionnaire and students’ reflection confirmed that students in the direct corrective feedback group are in favor of their teacher’s correction mode while the students in the indirect corrective feedback group do not prefer this type of feedback.

- Semi-structured interview and students’ reflection journal showed that students in the indirect corrective feedback group wanted more clarification of the feedback. They felt confused and some of them did not understand why the teacher underlined or circled some words in their writings. However, towards the end of the semester, they reported that they understood their teacher’s feedback better but still wanted more explicit type of feedback. Classroom observation also confirmed that when both groups get their assignment back, the Direct Corrective Feedback group received it more positively than their indirect corrective feedback counterpart.

- Even though within group progress were significant for both groups, the group receiving direct corrective feedback perceived that they improved better due to
teacher’s feedback. Contrastingly, the questionnaire and semi-structured interview reported that majority of students in the indirect corrective feedback group did not perceived that teacher’s feedback help them improve their writing. They reported that they would improve better if direct feedback was provided.

- The data from questionnaire, semi-structured interview and students’ reflection journal showed that the students in the indirect corrective feedback group interpret the teacher’s feedback (underlining and circling their mistakes) as teacher’s busy schedule and no time to do detail corrections for them. Some of them said if teacher had more time to write correction for them, they would improve better than just pointing out their errors to them.

- Majority of the students in the direct corrective feedback group reported that teachers’ feedback encourages them to write more while those in the indirect corrective feedback group were discouraged by the feedback they received.

- In the initial phase, most of the students in both group did not like the written corrective feedback as it insulted and made them feel intimidated or even felt stupid. However, later on they realized that the teacher’s written correction made them improve their writing. This was shown in the journal reflection and the semi-structured interview.

Hence, it may not be surprising that language learners expect to receive written corrective feedback on their language output as they view their teacher as a knowledgeable person who has the responsibility of explaining and giving feedback (Schulz, 2001). Moreover, in line with Shin’s (2008) case study, students preferred direct corrective feedback over indirect corrective feedback as they did not have enough knowledge and skills. Also, they admitted that most of the time they did not understand or did not know how to correct their own mistakes that were circled or underlined.

These findings corroborate Ferris’s (1995) findings but contradicted those of Cohen and Calvanti’s (1990) and Chaudron’s (1995) which reported that many students did not pay attention to the written corrective feedback that they received. It
is clear from the questionnaire, semi-structured interview and students’ reflection journal that they paid attention to and were aware of the feedback in either direct corrective or indirect corrective mode that they received. Most of the students took note of their errors and kept track of their further progress. After handling back their writing assignments, students were asked to revise their letter writing, they needed to read and this made them even more aware of their mistakes and errors. This was also in line with that of Hyland’s (1998) case study that most of the students tried to understand and use their teacher’s written corrective feedback in the revision of their work.

The positive attitudes from Direct Corrective Feedback group are most probably due to the belief that it is useful for them. In the semi-structured interview they remarked that it helped them improve their grammar and writing skills. In Hyalnd’s (2003) case study, students also believed that the written corrective feedback helped them notice their errors and that continuous corrective feedback would eventually result in better production of their outputs.

Schulz (2001) listed few possible reasons which can be used to explain why students in the Direct Corrective Feedback group perceived feedback positively. Firstly, according to him it is the way foreign languages are taught and tested. As supported by Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1996), students’ attitudinal responses oftentimes reflect the principles and practices that they observe in formal classroom lesson or norms. The Business Communication in English II course in which this research was conducted also involved some grammatical points to certain extent. The course aims for the improvement of students’ written language proficiency and grammatical accuracy is an integral part of the said proficiency. This course includes assessments such as quizzes and exams, therefore grammatical accuracy is also a vital criterion. The students’ concern for this accuracy can be related to the students’ personal aims and objective which increase their motivation to improve their skills. The reflection journal also showed that getting good grades was one of the objectives that the students had. They hoped that they could improve their writing and grammatical skills which would as a result improve their course grade. While some of them reported in the semi-structured interview that this letter writing skill can get them a good job in the future after graduation. These goals may be possible reasons to
enforce them to write better. Students in this group probably believed that the written corrective feedback was helping them deal with their concern for grammatical accuracy. Thus, they have a very positive view towards the feedback they received.

Another reason according to Schulz (2001), the students’ positive view towards written corrective feedback is due to their personal experiences. To elaborate, the students in this group felt that their language skills, especially their grammatical skill, had improved. As students kept track of their performances in each practice writing, they could probably notice the reduction of correction, which they perceived as their own improvement.

Based on the questionnaire, semi-structured interview, observation, and students’ reflection data, students who received Direct Corrective Feedback were more positive than those receiving indirect corrective feedback. Even though both groups believed that written corrective feedback helped them notice their errors, they viewed the feedback they received differently.

For the direct corrective feedback group, they may think that the written corrective feedback that they received made them realize their mistakes and errors and eventually helped them focus on those mistakes. This did not leave them on their own to guess how their grammatical mistakes should be corrected.

On the contrary, the indirect corrective feedback group may think that the feedback they received tell them their mistakes however, most of them did not prefer this way of feedback because it requires them to engage in the problem solving and thinking and they might have to do random guessing especially with difficult errors. This finding is in line with that of Shin’s (2008) which stated that students preferred the direct written corrective feedback over the indirect correction because it was easier for them to implement. Besides, there are various researchers such as Sommers (1982), Zamel (1985), Conrad and Oldstein (1999), and Conners and Lunsford (1993) who also found that feedback could be confusing and ineffective as students might not understand their teachers’ feedback. Ellis (2010, p.342) stated that the reasons for students’ disengagement with teacher’s feedback may have several effects on students’ cognitive impact, behavioral aspect and effectiveness. Also, according to Leki (1990) and Cohen and Calvanti (1990), students may not pay attention the
feedback other than just making a mental note of it if they feel that they do not know how to correct they will just ignore.

However, the semi-structured interview and their reflection journal towards the end of the semester showed that the indirect corrective feedback group had a better attitude compared to when they initially received this kind of feedback. They could have perceived the indirect corrective feedback as a challenge due to its problem solving nature. Their positive attitudes which developed later on could also be related to their sense of accomplishment in their later writing performance. As they all had to keep track of their writing performance, they could have noticed that they were improving. This improvement was shown in their reflection journal entry. When they saw fewer corrections or underlining, they might have felt that they were improving, and thus giving them a sense of accomplishment. This finding is also supported by that of Dörnyei (2001) who believed that L2 learners’ perception of their competence in the target language can heavily influence their self-confidence and their motivation to learn more.

From the students’ reflection journal entry, it was clear that both experimental groups viewed that the amount of written corrective feedback made them feel differently about their writing skills. This was also in line with Williams and Burden (1997)’s suggestions on the nature and amount of feedback. They believed that feedback is one of the factors that may motivate or demotivate second language learners. Students receiving a lot of corrections for improvement in the form of direct or indirect revealed negative feelings. They equated many comments and corrections to their perception of their incompetence and having poor English. On the other hand, students in both groups reported positive feelings in their reflection journal when they received few comments and little written corrective feedback on their writings. Few comments made them feel that they were progressing and thus give them a sense of accomplishment.

It can be seen in many students’ reflection journal that both groups of students appreciate the practice writing and the rewriting activities. They said that both were useful in developing their language skills. They believed that this gave them the chance to learn from their mistakes. This findings hence, supports the claims of
Lalande (1982), Fathman and Whaley (1990), and Cohen and Calvati (1990) that rewriting is a useful activity for teaching writing.

Another source of motivation, according to students’ reflections, comes from students’ main objective in studying the course. For many students, getting a good grade was their main reason. They hoped that they could improve their writing and make fewer grammatical mistakes as to get good scores in quizzes and exams. The finding support Dörnyei (2001)’s claim that L2 learning goals is involved with instrumental orientation.

According to Hyland and Hyland (2006, p.3) “EFL students, particularly those from cultures where teachers are highly directive, generally welcome and expect teachers to notice and explicitly corret their errors and may feel resentful if their teachers does not do so.” Attitudes and preferences may be affected by students’ context, which they define as a frame which encloses feedback.

The institute itself, the classroom’ principles, students’ goals in learning to write, their abilities, and the genres studied are frequently important but ignored variables in feedback studies (Ellis, 2003). However, students have individual identities and may disregard cultural models (Hyland and Hyland, 2006). This is why although one can review literature to compare result, one cannot generalize attitudes and preferences equally to all students.

4.18 Comparing Students’ and Teachers’ Responses towards Feedback

The responses of the teachers and the students seem to agree and differ in several aspects. For example, both the teachers and the students value feedback and believe that it is important. The students tend to prefer the writing of the correct form next to their errors in preference to other methods. They prefer the direct corrective feedback. The teachers, however, tend to use indirect corrective feedback because they think that the student benefit more when they look up their errors on their own, assuming that they will do so. In addition, the teachers and students believe that feedback in general improves writing. In the final analysis, the interviews add more value to the research findings as they show the teachers and students’ attitudes to feedback and provide their ideas for recommendations. Sheen (2011) pointed out that the research
environment or context may determine how learners respond to corrective feedback they receive. According to Sheen (2011) and Ellis (2011), teachers should take learners’ goals and attitudes towards correction into account and give them the importance of their preferred correction. Additionally teachers should bear in mind and adjust the feedback strategy to fit the needs of individual learners. They suggest that for low achievers or weaker students, especially in EFL context, errors should be corrected explicitly so that learners have the opportunity to learn language features. Sheen (2011, p.175) concluded that “the success of feedback depends on a myriad of cognitive, sociocultural, discoursal, and internal and external learner factors.” Accordingly, if teachers takes learners’ factors into account – including their attitudes and preferences- correcting may be more favorable

4.19 Chapter Summary

The findings of this quasi-experimental study opposed the findings of some previous research (e.g. Ashwell, 2000; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Truscott and Hsu, 2008) in that written corrective feedback showed significant effect on students’ writing. In contrast with various studies which found no difference between the two types of feedback (Lalande, 1982, Semke,1984; Parreno, 2015), the result of this study showed significant differences in various aspect between the use of direct corrective feedback and indirect corrective feedback in certain grammatical areas. This research is also in line with Bichener et al. (2005), Chandler (2003), Ellis (2008) that written corrective feedback has a positive effect on the accuracy on students’ written work.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This present study was conducted to answer the questions regarding the effectiveness of two types of written corrective feedback on students’ letter writing, the differences between the two types of feedback and the students’ attitudes and perceptions on the types of corrective feedback they received. To answer these questions, this quasi-experimental study collected both quantitative and qualitative data. In this chapter, the implications of the findings reported in the previous chapters are discussed. Also, the limitations and recommendations for future research are discussed in the area of written corrective feedback.

Taking into account the background of the students in this research study, there are errors that could have arisen from their L1, but at the same time, there could also be some manifestations of what termed English as Lingua Franca. Lack of verb and noun inflections, the correct use of articles, prepositions, wrong usage of tense, and problems with sentence structure (including run-on sentences, sentence fragments, dropping subjects/objects) can be related to the influence of their L1 language, which in this case is Thai.

As reviewed earlier in the literature review section, the Thai language which is highly context based, has no inflections for verbs and nouns, no articles and has the same word for quantifiers, no clear sentence boundaries. These Thai linguistic features seem to have been transferred to or influenced the written English of the participants in this study. Due to their limited grammatical and vocabulary competence in the L2 language, the students could have relied on their native language systems and transferred their L1 to their L2 writings.

This findings go in line with those of Sattayatham & Honsa (2007) and Bennui (2008) in terms of common English errors of Thai students. Moreover, some of the nonstandard forms that were found in this study can be categorized as intralingual and developmental errors. These include problems with verb forms, misuse of articles, count/non count nouns, and misuse of prepositions. As according
to Brown (2000), when the students learn English as a foreign or a second language, they could have committed such errors due to overgeneralization, ignorance of rule, incomplete application of rules, and false concepts hypothesization.

5.2 Exercising Restraint in Written Corrective Feedback

Written corrective feedback has been indicated to have a positive effect on long-term grammatical accuracy without necessarily harming structural complexity. However, it may be discouraging for students to have their papers covered in corrective red ink with little feedback on the message they have been trying to convey. Hence, there should be a balance between grammatical accuracy and the message they have been trying to convey. Nonetheless, written corrective feedback should perform its function, however, in a way that encourages students to maintain and take pride in their own unique linguistic and cultural identities of their L2 writings.

Therefore, written corrective feedback should focus on concerns of grammatical accuracy without undue regard to idiomatic usage based on the students’ own unique World Englishes or cultural norms, as long as such idiomatic usage does not impede the understanding of the reader. Written corrective feedback should not appropriate students’ unique cultural and personal voices by demanding the so called British or American ‘standard’ English norms. English teachers, especially writing instructors must respect and encourage their students in expressing their own unique cultural style of communicating. Written corrective feedback has an important role to play in the development of grammatical accuracy. Yet, it must be undertaken with all proper caution and restraint. Therefore, as teachers must respect the validity of their students’ own linguistically and culturally distinct world Englishes and must allow their student ample leeway for personal self-expression and creativity in L2 writing.

Some of these linguistic features termed as “error”, in British or American Standard English, can be considered as common features of English as Lingua Franca. To elaborate, lack of inflections for past simple tense and singular subjects for present simple tense, lack of plural noun inflections and non-use or misuse of articles are common features of English as a Lingua Franca according to Jenkins (2006) and Schnedier (2009). Moreover, Lingua Franca’s English features have emerged as a
result of language contact between L1 and the target language, hence, the learners simplify and regularize in their L2 just like what they can do in L1. Omitting verb inflections for past simple tense and for singular subjects in present simple tense, the absence of plural s or es, the non usage of articles could have been a result of implication from Schneider’s model (Schneider, 2009). The usage of articles where not needed could be related to regularization or overgeneralization in which the learners could have applied the same rule in using articles. The simplification involved in these features could have been influenced by the transfer of replication of the Thai language features. The learners’ L1 grammatical competence could also encourage or increase the use of such innovations.

The debate on whether to call such nonstandard features as ‘errors’ or ‘innovations’ will likely to continue because of different perspectives on the issues, i.e. English as a second or foreign language or English as lingua franca. However, it appears that in both perspectives the seeming root of such features can be traced to the influence of Thai as the first language of the learners. On one hand, the L1 of Thai students interferes in their production of English causing them to commit errors, such as lack of verb inflections when needed. On the other hand, the native language of these students increases the use of such linguistic innovations through the process of simplification or regularization to freely express themselves in English.

These opposing views may undeniably influence the practices in English language teaching and can put teachers in a difficult position, especially those who hold views that are in contrast with that of their institutions. To deal with such situation, it will be ideal to follow Foley’s (2012, p.218) suggestion for teachers to “live with and negotiate realities”. It will be crucial for English instructors to take into consideration their department or schools, their colleagues and their institution’s beliefs and balance with their own principles. Teachers should also be mindful that institutional beliefs influence student assessment practices, which is of utmost importance to the students. Thus, as teachers are duty-bound to their institutions as well as to their students, they may need to adapt their practices. As such, if teachers work in a system which follows the principles of teaching English as a foreign or second language and whose assessment may include grammatical accuracy, they have
to regard inaccuracies as ‘errors’ and engage learners in activities that may deal with theses inaccuracies, by providing corrective feedback.

On the other hand, even in such situation, teachers may tolerate such inaccuracies and not call them as ‘errors’ in learning situation that call for free expression of ideas or communicative activities. As long as these innovative linguistic features do not affect the intelligibility of students’ utterances or communication. Tolerating such nonstandard forms can help develop fluency and promote learners’ self-confidence while using English as a means of communication especially in an international setting.

5.3 Summary of the Findings

5.3.1 The Findings of Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback

- Giving written corrective feedback is better than not giving it.

- There is a significant difference between direct and indirect written corrective feedback. Direct corrective feedback is better with certain grammatical areas such as in incorrect tense, whole sentence or clause aberrant, relative clause, singular for plural, plural for singular, verb missing, subject formation, subject-verb agreement, sentence fragment, run-on sentence, capitalization and spelling. Indirect correction is deemed more useful with errors in pronoun, article, preposition, word form, conjunction, and negation.

- For low to intermediate levels, where their English proficiency is still questionable, direct corrective feedback should be used.

- Feedback is essential for encouraging learning (Anderson, 1982; Brophy, 1981) and the development of L2 writing (Hyland and Hyland, 2006)

This study is also in line with some key studies of Ellis, Lowewen and Erlam (2006), Lyster (2004), Lyster and Mori (2006), and Mifka-Profozic (2012) that the explicit feedback in the form of direct correction is more effective than implicit corrective feedback in many grammatical areas although the context of the instruction may at times influence the effectiveness. Ellis (2016) also notes that learners benefit
from corrective feedback even if they do not repair their errors but when they do “deeper processing” it will assist them to learn better in the future.

One consideration that teachers may have to bear in mind when responding to their students’ writing is that if they choose to deal with grammatical issues, grammatical feedback needs to be contextualized and individualized. For example, the students’ level of language proficiency must be taken into account so that the teacher will know how much assistance each student actually needs (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994).

They can therefore decide what kind of feedback is suitable for a particular student. Due to learners’ individual differences including language proficiency, learning styles, motivation and attitudes, teachers ought to be aware of what individual learners lack and need in order to choose feedback which is appropriate for them. This task, however, is not simple and even impractical in some contexts, but some forms of social interaction between the teachers and the students can help to inform the teachers about the learners’ proficiency and needs. Different feedback types may serve different purposes and may only be suitable for different stages of proficiency (Campbell, 1998, Sommer, 1982). In practice teachers may apply more than one kind of feedback when responding to the students’ writing.

5.3.2 The Findings of Student Attitudes and Perceptions on Feedback

- Most students had more positive attitudes towards direct corrective feedback compared to the indirect corrective feedback.

- Written corrective feedback not only make students notice their errors but also make them understand and be aware of the errors.

The study indicates that learners have positive attitudes towards written corrective feedback. This positive perception can be due to the fact that learners think that feedback is useful. Moreover, they may perceive some improvement in their accuracy performance and attribute such improvement to the corrective feedback. However, the findings also reveal that learners who received direct corrective feedback have significantly more positive attitudes than those who receive indirect corrective feedback. It is possible that learners view it as more
useful for them in their learning situation. Furthermore, learners who receive direct corrective feedback may perceive more improvement in their writing performance in every practice and rewriting, which can positively influence their attitude towards the corrective feedback.

5.4 Implications of the Study’s Findings

The findings theoretically imply that written corrective feedback in both forms of direct and indirect corrections can help in learning certain linguistic structures of a second language by helping learners notice the gap between their production and the target language’s structure. Moreover, in the view of cognitive processing models of second language learning, awareness and understanding develop explicit or declarative knowledge and make that knowledge become more automatic or procedural. However, the proceduralization of such declarative knowledge or the automatization of controlled processes is most possibly gradual and may be apparent only after a considerable period of time.

5.5 Pedagogical Implications of the Findings

Pedagogically, the findings of this study imply that

- Written Corrective feedback is effective

- Rewriting is a useful activity in the teaching and learning of writing especially when written corrective feedback in provided to students as it helped students to focus on their attention to and become aware of their errors.

- Errors can be effectively treated by properly using both types of written corrective feedback.

The findings of this study also suggest that although there might be a degree of mismatch between learners' perceived effect and the actual effect of the written corrective feedback on writing accuracy, the kind of feedback teachers give to learners' writing does influence the writing accuracy. For this reason, the findings of this study can have implications for language teaching and learning.
Based on the information that teachers get from the learners, they can take important and influential steps toward improving the learning-teaching conditions in their classrooms. Moreover, by taking the learners’ points of view into consideration, teachers can also give an appropriate mode of feedback to each individual learner if they know how each learner prefers to be treated. This, of course, requires the individualization of the writing classes, which may not be an easy task. The awareness of the effectiveness of written corrective feedback on learners’ writing accuracy can also have implications for language assessment. The knowledge of how various feedback modes influence learners’ writing accuracy can help teachers make more informed decisions as to how to provide feedback and how to assess learners’ writing.

An important factor to consider when discussing corrective feedback, and the effects it may have on students’ grammar proficiency, is that all learners are different and may require different methods of feedback. Despite the result from studies showing one type of feedback to be more effective than another, this may be true for some learners but not all. Hyland and Hyland (2006) conclude that what is effective for one learner in a particular setting is less so in another. Further, the level of metalinguistic awareness in one student may be different than the one in another, resulting indifferent levels of understanding their own errors and being able to correct them accurately. Moreover, it seems as if students prefer to receive written feedback rather than not receiving it, at least when it comes to grammatical accuracy (Ferris, 1999, Hyland & Hyland, 2006, Liao & Wang, 2009). However, it can be questioned whether or not students are the best to decide what is most beneficial for the actual learning. Gamlem and Smith (2013, p.166) explains “students are receivers of feedback, and they are the ones who decide whether or not to use it”. In this vein, it tells us that even though a teacher has done the very best in order for the learner to enhance their accuracy levels

5.6 Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the study should be taken into account for a better interpretation of the findings and implications. Firstly, this quasi-experiment is limited to only Business Communication in English II course which involved students with
low intermediate to intermediate English proficiency levels. The choice of selection was for a practical reason as the researcher has been teaching this course for over five years. In the view of this particular limitation, the conclusions and implications are based on this course and learners. Secondly, the population of this study is not very big and as this is quasi-experimental in nature, the number of participants was limited in order to better control confounding variables that may affect the reliability of the results. Hence, the study cannot be generalized to other contexts. Thirdly, this study focused on only 21 grammatical errors which was based on the researcher’s preliminary observation and was supported by the literature review. Fourthly, this research lasted for only 12 weeks, which might be insufficient but it was not possible to carry out a longer research with the same participants as they need to enroll in other courses. Therefore, the results and findings cannot be applied to other grammatical areas. Fifthly, the fact that the researcher and the teacher was the same person, this may have influenced the students’ responses in the interview and questionnaire. Moreover, the findings of this research can only be cautiously applied to Thai learners whose first L1 is Thai as this study was conducted at an international university in a Thai context. This was based on practicality as the researcher is employed at this particular university. Lastly, considering the practicality of real classroom context, it may be difficult for a writing instructor to give only either direct or indirect corrective feedback.

Regarding the research design, this study was conducted in a classroom setting where extraneous variables could not be completely controlled. In addition, due to it being a quasi-experimental in nature, as the participants were not randomly selected, this decrease the generalizability of the findings to other contexts.

5.7 Recommendation for Further Research

This study may benefit the English language research community in terms of understanding and perceiving the role of written corrective feedback in L2 settings. It can also encourage further research on the subject of written corrective feedback on L2 writing. Based on previously mentioned limitations, future researcher may carry a similar research with a different L2 background to see the effect. Secondly, written
corrective feedback should be applied to other English courses with students that have different proficiency levels or even other target languages. Thirdly, a study with a bigger sample size may offer different insights about the efficacy of written corrective feedback. Fourthly, future research may try to examine other types of feedback in comparison with these two types of feedback. Fifthly, the variation in individual students’ response to error correction may be investigated as error feedback might work with particular kind of students. Lastly, there is also a need to investigate the teachers’ belief about written corrective feedback and to observe what really goes on in the classroom.

Considering other mediating variables can also be useful. Students’ linguistic targets and instructional context may influence their reception of corrective feedback (Yang & Lyster, 2010). Moreover, learners’ proficiency (Ammar & Spada, 2006), age and anxiety (Sheen, 2008) should also be taken into account. Additionally, it is important to mention that even though a certain type of feedback is more effective in one problem area and another type of feedback in others, various kinds of feedback may be needed in order for the learners to improve in different areas (Shute, 2008).

5.8 Conclusion

Feedback is of the utmost importance to the writing process. Without individual attention and sufficient feedback on errors, improvement will not take place. We must accept the fact that L2 writing contains errors; it is the teachers responsibility to help learners to develop strategies for self-correction and regulation. Indeed, L2 writers require and expect specific overt feedback from teachers. If this feedback is not part of the instructional process, then students will be disadvantaged, hindering the improvement of both writing and language skills.

This quasi-experimental study has answered some questions on the effect of teacher’s written corrective feedback on students’ grammatical accuracy and as well as their attitudes and perceptions regarding the written corrective feedback. It has resulted in a number of implications and recommendations have been made based on the findings which should be taken into consideration. It aimed to contribute to the literature of written corrective feedback and to find solutions for improving the
feedback practice and L2 writing and teaching at an International University in Thailand. Although, this study has accomplished its aim, the debate on the effectiveness of written corrective feedback will be ongoing as further research is required to address the many unanswered questions.
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APPENDIX A
CRITERIA FOR WORD COUNT
Wolfe-Quintero et al. (1997)

Word Count

1. Count contractions as one word whether correct or not.

2. Count numbers as one word.

3. Count proper nouns in English and in other language as they are written.

4. Do not count hyphenated words as single words. (well-written = 2 words)

5. Count words as they are written, even if they are incorrect. (e.g. alot = 1 word)
APPENDIX B

Errors Identification (Based on Polio, 1997)
Errors classification (Based on Wu & Garza, 2013)

Syntactic errors

Incorrect tense
Whole sentence or clause aberrant
Relative clause
Singular for plural
Plural for singular
Verb missing (not including auxiliary)
Subject formation
S-V agreement
Sentence Fragment
Run-on sentence

Grammatical Error

Pronoun
Article (missing, misused)
Preposition
Word form
Conjunction
Negation (never, ever, any some, either, neither misplaced negator)

Semantic errors

Word choice
Quantifier (much, many, this, these, a few, many kinds of)
Wrong comparative

Mechanical errors

Capitalization
Spelling

Note:

a. Don’t double penalized for subject-verb agreement
b. Count each error individually (If there are two errors in one sentence, count as two)
APPENDIX C
Examples of Students’ Errors

Wrong comparative: The manager has been in office more longer than weekday than weekend.

Wrong use of preposition and spelling mistake: the product shipping will approximately be on October.

Sentence fragment/Capitalization: In case that you ordered the wrong color of lipsticks and you request the company to give full refund. The company would like to apologize for the inconvenience that you can only exchange the Product if it still in package.

Subject-verb agreement: …especially when the customers orders the wrong color or number of particular products.
Wrong use of relative clause/ no –s ending for plural; we bought some new product from whose we purchase the cosmetics.

Run-on sentence/ subject formation/article missing/spelling mistake: the manager told me that your product ordered will come today to our office will give you tomorrow in afternoon with detail and give you paper to fill up detail of user and sign online gurantee for product to gurantee for two years.

One of the reasons she contacted us are the accounts payable problems. So, in this
APPENDIX D
Consent Form

Research Topic: The Effects of Direct VS Indirect Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy in Business Letter Writing

Researcher: Rusma Kalra

If you are willing to participate in the above research study please sign the statement below.

I have read and understood the information provided in this form, and I am willing to participate in this study I consent voluntarily to be a participant in this study. I understand that my data and responses will completely be kept confidential. I also understand that I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Thank you very much for your help. I greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Print Name of Participant__________________
Signature of Participant ___________________
Date ___________________________
Dear Student,
This questionnaire consisting of three parts is a part of the research that investigates the effect of feedback as well as students’ attitudes and preferences on written corrective feedback. Administering this questionnaire is one of the instruments that the researcher is using to collect the data. Your response to all the questions will be kept confidential and anonymous. Please make sure that you provide all the required data.
Thank you for your co-operation

Part I
Demographical Data
1. Age _____
2. Gender _____
3. Nationality ________
4. Cumulative GPA _____
5. Number of years studying English _____
6. Number of years studying in International school/abroad ________
7. Are you currently taking any extra English tutorial classes this semester?
   ____yes ____no

Part II Preferences and Attitude towards Feedback (put X mark)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I find my teacher’s feedback on my writing beneficial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I understand my teacher’s feedback on my writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would like to receive feedback from my teacher in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I prefer that my teacher corrects my errors on writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I prefer that my teacher shows my errors to let me correct myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not prefer to get feedback on my writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I prefer to get feedback than no feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teacher’s feedback on my writing doesn’t help me to improve my skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My teacher’s feedback discourages me to write in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My teacher’s feedback helps me improve my writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My teacher’s feedback makes me confident of producing a better writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My teacher’s feedback discourages me from producing a better draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

1. Do you think you benefit from the teacher’s feedback? Why or why not?
   Please explain.
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

2. Do you prefer that the teacher corrects your errors on the script or that
   she underlines your errors? Please explain your reasons
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

3. Do you make changes on your writing based on teacher's feedback?
   Please explain.
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

4. How do you feel when you get your teacher’s feedback on your writing?
   _________________________________________________________________
5. In what ways do you think that your teacher’s feedback makes you improve your business letter writing?

----Thank you very much for your time-----
APPENDIX F

Students' Interview Prompts

1. How do you benefit from your teacher's feedback? Please explain.

2. Do you prefer that the teacher corrects your errors on the script or that she underlines your errors?

3. Do you make changes on your writing based on teacher's feedback? Please explain.

4. How do you feel when you get your teacher’s feedback on your writing?

5. Do you think that your teacher’s feedback make you improve your business letter writing?
APPENDIX G

Evaluators’ Assessment on Relevance and Adequacy of Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Assessment Pretest</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Assessment Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance and adequacy of content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.</td>
<td>The answer bears no relation to the task set.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Answer of limited relevance to the task set. Possibly major gaps in the treatment of topic and/or pointless repetition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>For the most part answer the tasks set, though there may be some gaps or redundant information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Relevant and adequate answer to the task set with occasional deficiencies on certain parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Satisfactory and complete answer to the task set</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Letter organization**

<p>| 0.                          | No apparent organization of the content |                               |
| 1.                          | Very little organization of content. Underlying structure not sufficiently controlled. |                               |
| 2.                          | Some organizational skills in evidence, but not adequately controlled |                               |
| 3.                          | Overall shape and internal pattern clear |                               |
| 4.                          | Organizational skills adequately controlled |                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Obtaining samples and feedback time frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 (1.5 hr) 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>Introduction to the course</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1 (1.5 hr) 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>Internal and External communication in the organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 (1.5 hr) 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>Different types of Written Message in organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2 (1.5 hr) 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>Using you-attitude, positive emphasis in business writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 (1.5 hr) 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>Theory on writing correspondence to customers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3 (1.5 hr) 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; correspondence writing practice (informative message)</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4 (1.5 hr) 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; class</td>
<td>Theory on writing</td>
<td>(resubmission of the draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>correspondence to stakeholders and suppliers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5(1.5 hr) 1\textsuperscript{st} class</td>
<td>Communicating Across Cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} correspondence writing practice (request message)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>Adapting Your Message to Your Audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6(1.5 hr) 1\textsuperscript{st} class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>Midterm examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} correspondence writing practice (negative message)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7(1.5 hr) 1\textsuperscript{st} class</td>
<td>In class activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>Planning, Conducting, and Recording Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8(1.5 hr) 1\textsuperscript{st} class</td>
<td>Theory on building good relationship with business partners in correspondence writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>Working in teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9(1.5 hr) 1\textsuperscript{st} class</td>
<td>correspondence writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9(1.5 hr) 2\textsuperscript{nd} class</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Designing Documents, Slides, and Screens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(resubmission of the draft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Quiz II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>CSR project presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>CSR Presentation continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Final exam Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam (Post test)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Oak & Oak Furniture Manager,

Last Saturday, I visited your showroom “Oak & Oak Furniture” in Bangna and ordered an oak desk and two matching three-drawer filing cabinets for my study. When I arrived home this evening, I found the furniture had been delivered in my absence, but the filing cabinets were the four-drawer style. Unfortunately, I can use only the three-drawer style because I lack room for anything higher. I remember telling this information to one of your showroom assistants.

I will appreciate having these cabinets picked up and exchanged for the ones I ordered as soon as possible. Please call to arrange a time when I will be home. I trust this matter can be resolved very quickly, so I can get my files organized soon.

Sincerely,

Benny Cumber

You investigated the situation and discovered that Ms. Jenifer Hedes was one of the storeroom assistants and she put down the wrong order. She was usually assigned to customer service department but as the company needed more people in the order placement department due to some reason, she was the last minute choice to fill in the post.

Write a letter to Benny Cumber, assuring him that the matter will be investigated as well as giving him the reasons of the occurrence of such mistake. Also inform him when you would exchange the right filing cabinet for him. Make up any other necessary details. (150 words)
Dear George,

When I ordered your ‘BubByeFat Abdominizer’ exercise kit, I was not expecting miracles but for the price I did expect something more substantial than what I received last week.

The BubByeFat Abdominizer’ unit, despite being properly assembled and operated, proved flimsy and did not hold up under my weight of 85 Kg. Additionally, the poor-quality, photocopied instructions were obviously written by someone who knows nothing about the product at all, which made it even more difficult to assemble this ultimately faulty product.

Since your ad promises that satisfaction is guaranteed, I am requesting a full refund, including shipping and handling as I am by no means satisfied with this piece of junk you sent me. I expect to receive the refund within 30 days.

Sincerely,
Sarah

Imagine that you are Mr. George Slimfit, the Manager of BubByeFat, Inc. and you have just received this letter from an angry customer. After investigating the situation, you found out that the customer did not use the Video Demonstration kit which was clearly instructed to be used along with the BubByeFat Abdominizer. and that the ad clearly stated that for effective usage the products should be bought together.
Write a negative response to Sarah, your annoying customer, assuring her it is your company’s policy that once the product is purchased, customer cannot get the refund under any circumstances. Make up any other necessary details. (write at least 150 words)
People know they need life insurance, but are reluctant to buy it. Imagine that you work in an insurance corporation, Doe Insurance Corporation, which is one of Thailand’s largest and most trusted insurance companies with 50 years of experience. Your manager asked you to write a letter to your prospective customers, persuading them to buy life insurance policies from you. (Write at least 150 words)

You are an interior designer. You are interested in using the products of a furniture company. Write a letter to the sales manager of the furniture company to request for more information about their products and promotions. Please make up all necessary details.

Next month, your company will be organizing a program on the awareness of HIV AIDS. The show will consist of plays, music and speeches which will create awareness among people. Write a letter to request for sponsorship for the event. Please make up all necessary details.
You are the manager at RUSSIE Magazine Company and you noticed that most of your employees don’t really know how to operate the new photocopy machine that you had just bought from CHILLCHILLA COPIER COMPANY. Sometimes when they encountered paper jamming, or any other basic problems, they would just pick up their phones and dial the mechanic department. It would then take at least half an hour before someone would show up to inspect and resolve these problems. You realized that this action was inefficient to your company; it is time wasting. Write a letter to CHILLCHILLA COPIER COMPANY, requesting them to conduct a short seminar on the proper operation of the new copier machine so that your employees would know exactly what to do if they encounter problems.
APPENDIX J

Example of Direct Corrective Feedback on students’ Writing

Dear Mr. Benny,

Thank you for your order of a three-drawer cabinet on Friday. Unfortunately, this problem occurred because of the new staff at the marketing department. They filled in for another staff on the day you called to place the order.

As our policy is to make sure our customers’ happiness, we will get a gift for you if you will give us the new order form.

Lastly, we would like to apologize on this delay. It will not happen again.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
APPENDIX K

Example of Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students’ writing
APPENDIX M

Statistical reports

Independent sample T-test of both groups’ pre test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>33.898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paired sample T-test for Direct Corrective Feedback Group (Section A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired Differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paired sample T-test for Indirect Corrective Feedback Group (Section B)

Independent Sample T-test of both group pre test on **Syntactic Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Sample T-Test of both groups’ post tests on **Syntactic Errors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Sample T-test of both group pre test on Grammatical Errors

### Independent Samples Test (pre test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>errorCount</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Samples Test (post test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>errorCount</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>5.326</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>2.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Sample T-Test of both groups’ post tests on Grammatical errors
### Independent Sample T-test of both group pre test on Mechanical errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>errorCount</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent Sample T-test of both group Post test on Mechanical errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>errorCount</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-12.728</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent Sample T-test of both group post test on Semantic errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>errorCount</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>3.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX N

**Data from Professional Recruiters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Corrective Feedback Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post test</th>
<th>Indirect Corrective Feedback Group</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 30</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Student 32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX O

**Error Count for each Student**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Post test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Pre test</td>
<td>Post test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>Syntactic</td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td>Semantic</td>
<td>Mechanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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