Effectiveness of written corrective feedback: Does type of error and type of correction matter?
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A B S T R A C T

The study examines the effect of form-focused corrective feedback (FFCF) on students’ ability to reduce pronoun agreement errors and lexical errors in new essays. Two experimental groups received on three assignments: direct error correction along with metalinguistic feedback, and only metalinguistic feedback, respectively; while the control group self edited their errors. All groups revised their errors before the next assignment. Students took pretest, immediate and delayed post-tests, and the two experimental groups were interviewed about the FFCF received. Results of the immediate post-test revealed a significant difference in pronoun agreement errors of the direct metalinguistic group; no significant difference appeared in lexical errors. At the delayed post-test, there was no significant difference among the groups in pronoun agreement errors, but a significant difference appeared in lexical errors of the direct metalinguistic group. Theoretical explanation and pedagogical implications are discussed.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Truscott’s (1996, 2007) argument that error correction is not only useless in developing learners’ language skills but also harmful has led to a series of form-focused corrective feedback (FFCF)
studies in an attempt to test his claims. These studies resulted in conflicting findings regarding the efficacy of FFCF because they employed different designs and methodologies and examined different variables. Some studies used a quasi-experimental pretest, post-test, control group design. They examined whether FFCF (with no error revision) helped learners acquire few linguistic structures in new pieces of writing. Other research studies were carried out in class using regular course assignments and investigated whether FFCF applied on a variety of language errors improved students’ revised writing and prepared them to become better writers. Thus, FFCF research studies differed in the following aspects: their purpose (assessing the acquisition of certain linguistic structures versus assessing writing improvement), the number of errors examined (few versus many errors), and the type of writing used for data collection (revised versus new writing). In an attempt to reconcile the differences between these FFCF studies, Ferris (2010) recommended carrying out research studies that adopt a blended research design. A study that employs a blended research design would be quasi-experimental and carried out in a classroom using regular course assignments; it would also involve a control group, examine few linguistic errors; require error revision, and monitor the existence of these errors in revised and new essays.

To address the need for blended research, the present classroom study employs a blended design that combines quantitative features of second language acquisition (SLA) research and qualitative characteristics of second language (L2) writing research, thus contributing to a research interface between SLA and L2 research (Ortega, 2012). Similar to SLA research, the study adopts a quasi-experimental control group, pretest, immediate, delayed post-test design and examines the efficacy of different types of feedback on students’ language accuracy in new essays. In this study, feedback refers to teachers’ direct and/or coded correction of student language errors. The study addresses only two language errors; and includes form focused instruction (FFI) sessions on the two language structures under investigation. On the other hand, the study also depicts characteristics of L2 research. It models error revision; requires revision of these errors; and interviews students to seek their opinions of teacher feedback and error revision in developing their writing skills.

2. Literature review

2.1. Quasi-experimental studies

Recent quasi-experimental studies examining the effects of different kinds of error feedback on increasing the accuracy of specific language structures in new pieces of writing are those by Bitchener (2008), Bitchener and Knoch (2009, 2010a, 2010b), Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005), Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima (2008), and Sheen (2007). They all used a control group, pretest, immediate post-test, and delayed post-test design; gave students only one practice session of FFCF; and did not require students to correct their errors after receiving FFCF. However, they differed in the type of FFCF provided and the linguistic errors addressed.

Bitchener et al. (2005) examined the effect of different types of feedback on reducing three types of errors: preposition, past simple tense, and the definite article in new pieces of writing over a 12-week period. Group 1 received direct written feedback with a 5 minute student-researcher conference and 20 hours of instruction/week; Group 2 received direct written feedback alone and 10 hours of instruction/week; while Group 3 did not receive any feedback but had 4 hours of instruction/week. Results revealed significant gains in accuracy for the first type of feedback, only when correcting the past simple tense and the definite article, but no improvement when the three types of errors were measured together. However, the fact that Group 1 was exposed to language instruction the most may have affected the findings of this study.

Subsequent studies by Bitchener (2008) and Bitchener and Knoch (2009, 2010a, 2010b) examined the effects of different types of feedback on students’ accuracy in the use of the English article. Bitchener (2008) gave three experimental groups different FFCF methods (direct FFCF, written, and oral metalinguistic explanation; direct FFCF and written meta-linguistic explanation; and direct FFCF only) on students’ use of the article. The control group was not given any feedback. Results revealed that at the immediate post-test (new essay), all groups who received FFCF significantly outperformed the control
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