



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

교육학석사학위논문

Effects of Teacher's Written Feedback
Types on Korean High School Students'
English Writing

교사의 다양한 종류의 수정 유형이
한국 고등학생들의 영어 작문에 미치는 영향

2016년 8월

서울대학교 대학원
외국어교육과 영어전공
백 정 완

Effects of Teacher's Written Feedback
Types on Korean High School Students'
English Writing

by
Jung Wan Baik

A Thesis Submitted to
the Department of Foreign Language Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

At the
Graduate School of Seoul National University

August 2016

Effects of Teacher's Written Feedback Types on Korean High School Students' English Writing

교사의 다양한 종류의 수정 유형이
한국 고등학생들의 영어 작문에 미치는 영향

지도교수 김진완

이 논문을 교육학 석사 학위논문으로 제출함
2016년 6월

서울대학교 대학원
외국어교육과 영어전공
백정완

백정완의 석사학위논문을 인준함
2016년 8월

위원장 _____
부위원장 _____
위원 _____

Effects of Teacher's Written Feedback
Types on Korean High School Students'
English Writing

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE:

SUN-YOUNG OH

YOUNGSOON SO

JIN-WAN KIM

ABSTRACT

Providing feedback is one of the most important elements in a foreign language learning context because merely ensuring learners have plenty of writing opportunities does not guarantee the accuracy of their writing (Seker & Dincer, 2014). Thus, this study aimed to investigate the effects of different types of written corrective feedback a teacher can give on students' English description writing. In particular, this study focused on three questions: (1) What are the effects of the different types of teacher's written feedback on the EFL students' description writing quality? (2) How do the effects differ according to students' L2 writing proficiency? (3) How are the students' writing develop over the process of writing and revision? To answer the questions, 78 high school students participated in an experiment, watching a silent film for approximately five minutes and then spending forty minutes writing a description about what they had watched. A teacher then gave the students different types of written feedback—namely, direct corrective feedback (DF), coded feedback (CF), uncoded feedback (UF), and no-feedback (NF). After receiving the feedback, the students revised their works and submitted them again.

From the analyses of students' first and last writing, the data revealed that DF and CF were the most beneficial types of written feedback in improving students' writing proficiency while UF did not show a more positive effect on the improvement of students' writing than NF. Moreover, the different feedback type effects were detected in accordance with the students' English writing proficiency. For example, DF was the most helpful feedback for higher-level learners than UF and NF, no difference in feedback types occurred with the middle-level learners, and for the lower-level group, three feedback types showed a significantly better effect on learners' description than NF.

Key words: English writing, written corrective feedback, coded feedback, direct corrective feedback, uncoded feedback, writing proficiency development, second language writing

Student Number: 2010-23563

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Need for This Study	1
1.2 Research Questions	6
1.3 Organization of the Thesis	8
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Types of L2 Teacher’s Written Feedback	9
2.2 Previous studies on Effects of Feedback on L2 Learners’ Writing	11
2.3 Revision in English Writing	18
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 Participants	20
3.2 Writing Task Type	21
3.3 Feedback Types	23
3.4 Procedure of the Experiment	25
3.5 Data Analysis	30
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	34
4.1. Effects of Different Feedback Types on Students’ Writing Quality	35
4.2. Effects of Different Feedback Types on Students’ Writing Quality at Different Proficiency Levels	40
4.2.1 Higher Level Group Students	42
4.2.2 Intermediate Level Group Students	44
4.3.3 Lower Level Group Students	47
4.3 Students’ Development over the Process of Writing and Revision: Three Learners Showing Much Improvement	51
4.3.1 Seoyeon’s Case	52
4.3.2 Minjoon’s Case	56

4.3.3 Seojoon’s Case	62
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSION	66
5.1 Summary of the findings	66
5.2 Pedagogical Implications	68
5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Types of Written Feedback to Each Group.....	24
Table 3.2 General Procedure of Experiment.....	26
Table 3.3 Scoring Rubric for Learners' Writing.....	33
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics of First and Third Writing Score.....	36
Table 4.2 Descriptive Statistics of Difference Scores.....	38
Table 4.3 One-way ANOVA of Difference Scores.....	38
Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Learners' First Writing Holistic Scores....	41
Table 4.5 Descriptive Statics of HL Students.....	42
Table 4.6 One-way ANOVA of HL Groups' Difference Scores.....	43
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics of IL Students.....	45
Table 4.8 One-way ANOVA of IL Groups' Difference Scores.....	46
Table 4.9 Descriptive Statistics of LL Students.....	48
Table 4.10 One-way ANOVA of LL Groups' Difference Scores.....	49
Table 4.11 Student's Improvement in Each Category.....	52
Table 4.12 A Student's Errors in Category.....	53
Table 4.13 Student's Improvement in Each Category.....	57
Table 4.14 Student's Improvement in Each Category.....	63

CHAPTER 1.

INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the purpose and the expected pedagogical implications of the research we will develop theories to further the field. The first section discusses the necessity of this study, while the second develops questions for further research in the field and their anticipated implications. Finally, the last section outlines the overall organization of this thesis.

1.1. Need for This Study

Improving writing proficiency has become one of the most important goals in the context of language learning and the teaching environment. In particular, as there is a growing interest in language learners' communicative competence (Swain, 1985), researchers and teachers have focused on boosting learners' writing skills as a means of better communicating with people. Indeed, the importance of writing is well-reflected in the Korean national curriculum, which requires all English textbooks to include writing tasks in the last part of every chapter, allowing students to summarize and apply what they learned in the chapter.

Given the importance of writing, in foreign language teaching and learning, a variety of research has been conducted to help learners improve their writing skills. The research is mainly centered on the error analyses of students' writing as well as the investigation of the locus of the errors. To illustrate, Wu and Garza (2014) analyzed five Taiwan EFL students' writings in terms of 22 categories of errors (e.g., the grammar, lexis, semantics, and mechanics errors). Their analyses showed that the most frequent errors were found in ensuring subject-verb agreement, producing sentence fragments and structures, choosing singular/plural forms, omitting verbs, and using prepositions, articles, and pronouns. Lasaten (2014) also analyzed 100 compositions of college students and found that verb tense errors were the major type of errors, followed by errors with sentence structures, punctuation, word choice, spelling, and use of prepositions and articles. Similarly, Sawalmeh (2013) examined 32 essays from Arabic-speaking learners and found that errors related to verb tense were the most common, followed by errors in word order, singular/plural forms, subject-verb agreement, double negatives, spelling, capitalization, the use of articles, sentence fragments, and prepositions.

Similar results have also been found in the Korean EFL learning environment. For example, in an analysis of 264 essays from 42 Korean

students, 91% of errors were form based (e.g., article uses, grammar, word choices, and tenses) while only 9% were meaning based (Jung, 2013). Similarly, Cha (2004) examined 115 essays written by college-level students in Korea. Conducting error analyses based on the modified linguistic taxonomies by Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982), Cha showed that the most common error type in the students' writing was in a noun phrase (e.g., vocabulary, expressions), followed by a verb phrase error (i.e., verb forms, voices, and verb tenses), and determiner use (e.g., indefinite article omission).

These previous findings explaining learners' most common errors have led many researchers to search for effective feedback in order to reduce the errors (Jung, 2013). Such efforts can be divided into two streams: one from second language acquisition (SLA) researchers, and the other from researchers in the writing field (e.g., writing teachers) itself (Beuningen, 2010). SLA-based researchers' main focus is the acquisition¹ of grammar and language development. Meanwhile, researchers in the writing field are interested not only in grammar learning (acquisition), but also development in content, vocabulary, rhetoric, and mechanics to improve learners' writing. Yet not all research can be easily divided into these two separate streams;

¹ Acquisition takes place when explicit knowledge gradually becomes implicit knowledge.

some research falls between the two.

Research on creating feedback loops to students focuses on two types of knowledge that can be fostered in learners: explicit knowledge and implicit knowledge (Shintani & Ellis, 2013). For instance, Bitchener (2012) discussed whether providing feedback to students boosts their explicit knowledge only or leads to a general language development including both explicit and implicit knowledge. Generally agreeing with other studies, Bitchener found the effect of feedback to be exclusively confined to fostering explicit knowledge (Bitchener, 2012; Polio, 2012; Truscott, 1996). In previous research, Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) investigated the effects of different types of feedback on three types of errors—namely, prepositions, past simple tense, and definite articles—in the essays of 53 immigrant students. They employed three feedback types in their study: direct and explicit written feedback accompanied with a 5-minute oral conference, direct and explicit written feedback only, and no corrective feedback. The results of this study revealed that learners who received both written and oral feedback showed more improvements in reducing errors than the others. However, the effect of feedback was limited to increasing students' explicit knowledge (e.g., the accurate use of prepositions for these learners).

Thus far, previous studies that have investigated the effect of written

corrective feedback have focused mostly on grammar-specific features, such as the correct use of articles, verb tenses, and prepositions. Few attempts have been made to seek advantages of written feedback in facilitating learners' writing skills in more general domains. To date, little research has investigated what advantages may exist from a broader corrective feedback regarding writing skills. With a focus on developing students' writing skills for use as a communicative tool, it is necessary to develop the research and determine the effects of feedback on general writing skills rather than on the current grammar accuracy. Efforts to find and develop facilitative feedback tools that can be used broadly to help language learners are expected to develop not just the explicit knowledge on specific language forms, but also the implicit knowledge associated with communicative writing. Because it is important to help students develop writing skills as a communicative tool, it is necessary to explore the effects of feedback in general, multi-faceted areas, not just in correcting the accuracy of grammar. Such efforts to find a facilitative effect of feedback on diverse domains of writing are expected to help learners develop not just explicit knowledge on specific language forms, but also implicit knowledge associated with communicative writing skills. With these considerations in mind, this research investigates the effect of different types of written corrective feedback on students' performance in

general writing domains, including grammar accuracy, mechanics accuracy, and content dimensions (Lee, Gentile, & Kantor, 2008). In addition to exploring the effect of different types of feedback on these areas, this thesis also investigates the degree to which each feedback type affects learners' writing performance at different proficiency levels. The findings of the current study are expected to provide high applicability to actual classroom situations, helping writing instructors employ the most appropriate feedback types according to students' current writing proficiency.

1.2 Research Questions

The focus of the present study is to investigate the effects of different feedback types (direct feedback, coded feedback, uncoded feedback, no-feedback) on L2 learners' description quality in English. The research also analyzes the feedback type effect at different writing proficiency levels. Finally, the work of four of the 78 students whose writing skills improved the most during the process of writing and revision were deeply analyzed. The present study posed the following three research questions:

1. What are the effects of the different types of teacher's written feedback on the EFL students' description writing quality?
2. How do the effects differ according to students' L2 writing proficiency?
3. How are the students' writings develop over the process of writing and revision?

1.3 Organization of the Thesis

Chapter Two provides a detailed summary of background knowledge relevant to the inquiries discussed thus far, focusing specifically on the (inter-)relationship between writing skills and written feedback, types of written feedback, and the effects of written feedback on second language learners' writing skills. Chapter Three defines the methodology adopted in this research—namely, participant information, the overall procedure of the experiment, and data analysis. Chapter Four then presents the results of the study, exploring the research questions and interpreting the findings to contemplate pedagogical implications possibly induced from the results. Finally, Chapter Five recapitulates what has been explored and identifies the limitations of the present study and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 2.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the general background knowledge informing this research. First, the discussion specifies the types of teachers' written feedback. The discussion then deals with the impact of written feedback on (second language) learners' writing skills, particularly Korean learners of English.

2.1 Types of L2 Teacher's Written Feedback

The purpose of giving feedback is to improve writing performance (Anseel, Lievens, & Schollaert, 2009), and many types of feedback exist. A number of types of written feedback have been identified, including direct (i.e., explicit) feedback, indirect (i.e., implicit) feedback, coded feedback, uncoded feedback, focused feedback, unfocused feedback, peer feedback, and teacher feedback (Ellis, 2008).

Direct feedback is a kind of traditional correction strategy that provides learners with the correct forms for deleting and subsequently addressing

errors (Afraz, 2012). Normally, the instructor crosses out the wrong part and writes the correction near the error (Ellis, 2008). In indirect feedback, the instructor does not provide correct forms or expressions straightforwardly, but underlines the problem area. In other words, the instructor points out the error without drawing learners' explicit attention (Ferris, 2003). Therefore, the learners need to catch their errors and correct them themselves (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009).

Indirect feedback includes errors coded, errors circled, errors underlined, errors underlined and coded, error underlined and description, and errors counted in the margins, but neither marked or coded (Guenette, 2007). In coded feedback, the instructor indicates the error using a symbol to facilitate learners' efforts to correct the errors themselves (Sampson, 2012). For example, if a learner wrote "the rabbit is eating a carrot," the instructor would underline "the" and write "Cap."² below it. In uncoded feedback, the correct forms are written above the errors (Sampson, 2012).

Unfocused feedback, which is also regarded as "extensive," involves giving students feedback on all range of errors that instructors normally provide to learners (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008). Conversely,

² Write in a capital letter

focused feedback predetermines one or a few target structures that the instructor provided feedback on (Frear & Chiu, 2015).

The distinction between external and internal feedback is related to the sources of the feedback: Any feedback from peers and teachers is considered external feedback whereas feedback created by the learners themselves is internal feedback (Narciss, 2008).

In this research treating all types of errors (unfocused feedback), direct feedback, coded feedback, uncoded feedback (underline feedback), and no-feedback were employed. These types of feedback were selected because they are the most commonly used types of feedback in the Korean educational context. In addition, research into learners' reactions to teachers' feedback has found that most learners prefer direct feedback for all errors (Cohen, 1987; Radecki, 1988).

2.2 Previous studies on Effects of Feedback on L2 Learners' Writing

Providing feedback in writing is crucial in developing students' writing proficiency (Black & William, 1998; Moreno, 2004). Researchers and

teachers in the English writing fields are continuously looking for better types of corrective feedback that can improve students' accuracy in writing over time (Bitchener, 2010). Among the various types of feedback, the most widely adopted one has been feedback on linguistic errors (Van Beuningen, 2010).

In the extensive literature on feedback in writing and its effect, two researchers—Truscott and Ferris—have received the most critical attention, mainly because of their heated debate in the late 1990s on the issue of whether written feedback has a practical effect in increasing learners' accuracy on language forms (Bichener, 2005). The debate began with Truscott's (1996) argument that written corrective feedback is not effective and can even be harmful in promoting L2 acquisition. Inspired by his claim, several researchers in the SLA field tested the effectiveness of feedback and reported findings questioning its effects (e.g., Afraz, 2012). However, Ferris (1999) challenged Truscott's argument and the follow-up findings supportive of his claim. Although she acknowledged that feedback does not always have a positive impact on learners' writings, she argued that different methods, techniques, and approaches could lead to different results; thus, she called for a reexamination of Truscott's work and that of many other previous researchers. Ferris (1999) further noted that previous studies had only investigated the short-term effects of feedback, raising the possibility that

positive effects of written feedback could be found in the long term. She further acknowledged that feedback could influence students' efforts to fix certain types of errors; thus, she classified errors as treatable and untreatable.

Many second language researchers and scholars in the English writing fields joined this vigorous debate in the 1990s and reported different findings either supporting or dismissing each side of the claim (e.g., Bitchener, 2005). Truscott (2007) recently pointed out some serious problems with the previous research identifying the positive effects of feedback. Specifically, he raised two main problems with the previous studies: most studies did not include a control group, and they focused only on the measure of the language forms on which students received the instructor's feedback, making it difficult to see whether the feedback would also increase learners' accuracy on other types of forms.

Following these arguments, many researchers attempted to test the effects of different types of feedback. One such effort involved testing the effects of focused feedback (FF) with unfocused feedback (UF). FF predetermines the target grammatical structures before an experiment and measures the acquisition of these structures after the experiment (Afraz, 2012). In contrast, UF provides students with all errors in most grammatical structures (Ellis, 2008). Ferris (2002) also suggested that providing focused

feedback on learners' frequently made mistakes may have a greater effect on students' writing than providing feedback on all types of errors. Some studies have demonstrated that no significant difference exists between focused and unfocused feedback. For example, Frear (2015) investigated which feedback type (i.e., focused indirect written corrective feedback, unfocused indirect written corrective feedback) is more effective in improving the accuracy of using weak verbs.

Yet some studies found no difference between using focused and unfocused with students. Saeb (2014) analyzed 79 EFL students' writing to investigate the effect of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback on learners' grammatical accuracy improvement. The unfocused group received corrections for all errors while the focused group received feedback only on the target structure (third person singular *-s*). Both groups showed improved grammatical accuracy, but no difference emerged between the focused and unfocused groups. Both focused and unfocused feedback positively influenced the posttest and delayed posttest compared to learners in the control group who did not receive any feedback.

Thus far, existing studies have provided different results on the effects of feedback depending on their types (Ferris, 2011). Interestingly, unlike in the writing field, when providing oral feedback in speaking, focused feedback

has a greater effect than unfocused feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009). Bitchener (2009) investigated the effect of focused feedback by keeping track of students' use of articles (e.g., "a" for first mention; "the" for subsequent mention) as the target grammar for 10 months. He organized students into four groups and gave different types of feedback to each. Group one received direct error correction as well as written and oral metalinguistic explanation. Group two also received direct error correction, but with written metalinguistic explanation only. Group three received direct error correction only. Group four did not receive any feedback and served as the control group. After the 10 months of focused feedback, all three experiment groups showed significant improvements in their use of articles. From these results, Bitchener concluded that it is sufficient to provide written corrective feedback only on selected target structures even though there is a possibility that some good students can make more progress with additional feedback.

Much of the previous research has also examined the comparison of the effect between direct and various types of indirect feedback³ (Chandler, 2003; Frantzen, 1995; Frear, 2015; Lalande, 1982; Sheen, 2012). For instance, Sheen (2012) investigated the effect of focused feedback using direct-only

³ Indirect feedback types include coded feedback, uncoded feedback, metalinguistic explanation feedback, etc.

correction and direct metalinguistic correction. The results showed that both the learners who received direct correction and those who received metalinguistic correction showed better accuracy than the control group learners. In the delayed posttests, however, the learners who received metalinguistic correction did better than those who received direct correction. Diab (2015) investigated feedback type effect on improving students' pronoun agreement and lexical error. The researcher divided students into three groups that received different types of feedback. Group one received direct error correction with metalinguistic feedback, group two received metalinguistic feedback, and group three (the control group) did not receive any feedback but self-edited their works. The results of the immediate post-test showed that learners in all three groups reduced errors in the pre-determined error types. However, only learners in group one reduced their errors significantly. At the delayed post-test, none of the three groups showed any differences, but learners who received metalinguistic feedback showed significant differences in lexical errors.

To date, many positive effects of various written feedback types on learners' writings have been reported. Such research results can be explained by the noticing hypothesis, which emphasizes that exposure to plenty of L2 does not always lead to awareness, but with feedback, learners can become

aware of the gap between their incorrect knowledge and correct target knowledge in order to understand and acquire language (Ahangari & Amirazdeh, 2011). Another hypothesis that supports the effect of feedback is the output hypothesis (Swain, 1985), which argues that producing language itself is not enough to develop learners' linguistic ability so learners must be forced to modify their errors. Written feedback can function as a tool for making learners fix their language to make it comprehensible when they receive negative feedback (Ahangari & Amirazdeh, 2011).

In summary, extensive literature has shown the effects of different types of feedback on improving L2 learners' accuracy on language forms. Although the effects of feedback vary depending on their types and target forms, it is generally reported that written corrective feedback is effective for increasing students' accuracy on the target forms. Nevertheless, it remains unclear whether written feedback gives rise to improvements in more general areas of writing than target grammar features. As Truscott (2007) pointed out, it is necessary to identify the effect of feedback on new pieces of writings other than the part on which the instructor's feedback focuses. Thus, it is necessary to investigate a broad range of writing areas as the target measures to reflect the effect of written feedback. Therefore, the present study measured Korean EFL students' writing skills in general writing areas after providing them with

three types of written corrective feedback (i.e., direct corrective feedback, coded feedback, and uncoded feedback).

2.3 Revision in English Writing

When the learners are asked to revise their writing, they write a new draft with correcting their errors based on the instructor's error corrections. As the learners given direct corrective feedback were asked to revise their writing, there is a possibility that learners accept the teachers' correction, copy them, and notice the structure, and get metalinguistic understanding (Frear, 2012). If the learners receive indirect feedback (i.e., coded feedback, uncoded feedback) they have to re-examine their writing errors, find correct expressions, and write again. So far, many of the studies investigated the effect of revision on increasing the accuracy in new pieces or writing (Shintani & Ellis & Suzuki, 2014). Fathman and Whalley (1990) revealed that regardless of the feedback types (content only, grammar only, content and grammar), learners' content score in writing improved when they revise their writing. Stay (1983) reviewed the learners' revisions of learners who got feedback from Mount St. Mary's writing center and found out that learners who got feedback made more extensive revision compared to the learners

who did not get any feedback. In addition, they made more microstructure changes that they amended their sentences with not changing the holistic meaning of the text. In addition, learners who received feedback on their writing felt much easier in revising their writing and better revised their first writing than the ones who did not receive any feedback (Stay, 1983).

There was also a research on different aspects of revision between proficient writer and novice writer; the proficient writer revised their essay on holistic view but novice writers focused on minor parts, for example, corrected only for grammars and mechanics (Beach, 1976). Good writers tend to revise their writing including multiple word change or paragraph change (Stallard, 1974). Good writers tend to revise more in amount than the poorer writers (Birdwell, 1980). In addition, Zamel (1983) found out that skilled writers tend to edit their writing globally (e.g., reordering of paragraph). With the revision effect mentioned above, this research employs revision in investigating the effect of different types on learner's writing quality.

Until now, most of the researches were mainly focused on feedback type effect on grammatical features. Furthermore, feedback type effect on improving learners' overall writing proficiency was rarely investigated. Therefore, exploring different types of teacher's feedback on learners' development in writing is worth investigation.

CHAPTER 3.

METHODOLOGY

The main goal of this study was to investigate the effects of different types of feedback on students' descriptive writings. To answer these questions, a comparison of different types of feedback was quantitatively measured and valued. In addition to the group comparison in general, students' improvements in writing were also analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively, depending on students' proficiency levels (i.e., lower, intermediate, and higher levels).

The next section describes the participants who engaged in this research. The two subsequent sections present information on the writing task type and feedback types used in this research, respectively. The final two sections show the procedure of the experiment and summarizes the guidelines for evaluating learners' descriptive writings in this research.

3.1 Participants

A total of 78 tenth-grade EFL students (12 female students and 16 male

students) in a science high school in Korea were recruited. They were 16 to 17 years old, and most had studied English for 9 years in public high schools. A background questionnaire conducted during the first session clarified that none of the students had lived in English-speaking countries for more than two years. The participants were allocated into four groups: 20 in the direct-feedback (DF) group, 19 in the coded-feedback (CF) group, 19 in the uncoded-feedback (UF) group, and 20 in no-feedback (NF) group.

3.2 Writing Task Type

In the writing research, various types of writing tasks have been employed, and different writing tasks may lead experiments' results in different ways. This thesis employs a description as a means to measure students' writing skills. Description can be defined as an article that gives a description about a person, thing, place, etc. (Nur'aini, 2013) or describes someone or something using words (Langan, 2001). Such a description enables readers to draw the image of the scene vividly by employing sights, sounds, tactile sensations, etc. (Nur'aini, 2013). It is assumed that a description provides an opportunity to look into whether students are capable

of describing a story in formal writing expressions as well as investigating their ability to express their ideas on the story. This approach is also expected to alleviate students' cognitive burdens and lower the affective filter associated with writing as it provides students with plenty of contents, easily motivating them to write, unlike the situation in which they should create the writing contents based on their own experiences or ideas.

In this research, the learners watched three 5-minute silent films and then were asked to describe the stories and the scenes in more than 150 words. The first film was a PIXAR animation (Birds on a Wire), which was about the small birds who wanted to bullying a big bird. As time passes, the small birds were rather harmed due to their tricks. The second animation (Fishing with Sam) was a short animated film made by Atle Blakseth, which was a prizewinning animation in a film festival. In the film, there was a penguin which fishes very well but he was very greedy and selfish. It even stole other animals' fish. In the end, other animals revenged to the mean penguin by cooperating with each other. The third film was one of the Charlie Chaplin films. In the film, Charlie accidently got into a lion's cage and did stupid things to escape from the cage. At last, Charlie was rescued but never felt grateful but rather boasted of what he did. All three films were very simple funny, which also could be used for very small children, but also provided

some moral and logical judgment lessons, which attract people in all age.

3.3 Feedback Types

For each writing sample, different types of written corrective feedback were given to learners in different groups as in Table 3.1. All the feedback provided each time was unfocused—that is, students’ errors were identified and corrected as much as possible, without predetermining the types of errors for correction. Feedbacks were not only focused on grammatical features but also content, flow of the writings. The DF group received direct corrective feedback, in which the instructor explicitly corrected learners’ errors into correct forms, expressions, and flow. The CF group received coded feedback, in which the instructor underlined or circled on the error and wrote “error codes” (e.g., “VT” means “correct the error in right verb tense”, “FL” means “think of the flow of the article”, “TR” means add or revise transition word”) near the errors. The UF group received uncoded feedback: The instructor underlined the errors but did not provide learners with types of the errors. Finally, the NF group did not receive any feedback, thereby serving as a control group.

Table 3.1

Types of Written Feedback to Each Group

Group	Student's Writing	Teacher's feedback
DF	<p>There was time when the Arctic and the Antarctic was together. Mr. Smith, a muscular polar bear was fishing with a fishing rod. Three penguins were hunting in the ocean, swimming, and catching fishes. Two of them were just ordinary penguins, and they caught just ordinary-size fish.</p>	<p>There was a time when the Arctic and the Antarctic were together. Mr. Smith, a muscular polar bear was fishing with a fishing rod. Meanwhile, three penguins were hunting in the ocean, swimming, and catching fish. Two of them were just ordinary penguins, and they caught just ordinary-size fish.</p>
CF	<p>A man run a way from horse. Man go inside to some cage. Man look lound the cage. The lion is in the cage with a man. But the door is locking. So he come back to the lion's cage.</p>	<p>A man <u>run</u> <u>a way</u> from horse. WF Sp. Tr. Man <u>go</u> inside <u>to some</u> cage. Ag. WW Tr. Man <u>look</u> <u>lound</u> the cage. Ag. WW ^ Tr. <u>The</u> lion is in the cage with a Art. man. But the door is <u>locking</u>. WF</p>

		So he <u>come</u> back Ag. to the lion's cage.
UF	It was nice day. There was a hungry polar bear at the south pole. He tried fishing to eat fish for lunch. But he couldn't get any fish. There was 3 penguins and a seal next to polar bear.	It was ~ nice day. There was a hungry polar bear at the <u>south pole</u> . He tried <u>fishing</u> to eat fish for lunch. But he couldn't get any fish. _____ There was 3 penguins and a seal next to polar bear.
NF	There're a small birds on the cable. At that time, a giant bird appear and claim to play with.	There're a small birds on the cable. At that time, a giant bird appear and claim to play with.

3.4 Procedure of the Experiment

The research was conducted for 7 weeks, from October to November 2015, during regular class time. One regular class lasts for 50 minutes, during which students were engaged in writing activities. The writing activities lasted for seven sessions: one for a pre-writing questionnaire, five for writing training, and one for a post-writing questionnaire.

During the writing training sessions, participants watched a movie and

wrote essays about the film. Students were aided by an instructor with some unfamiliar vocabulary, but no explicit teaching on writing was provided during training. Table 3.2 summarizes the general procedure of the experiment

Table 3.2
General Procedure of Experiment

session	DF	CF	UF	NF
	pre-writing questionnaire			
1 st session	orientation			
	-	lecture on 'error codes'	-	-
2 nd session (first writing)	watch animation # 1 (Title: Fishing With Sam) & write description of animation #1			
feedback (teacher)	direct correction	coded feedback	uncoded feedback (underline)	none
3 rd session (revision of first writing)	revise #1			
4 th session (second writing)	watch animation # 2 (Title: Birds on Wire) & write description of animation #2 (Second Writing)			

feedback (teacher)	direct correction	coded feedback	uncoded feedback (underline)	none
5 th session (revision of second writing)			revise #2	
6 th session (third writing)	watch silent film # 3 (Title: The Lion's Cage) & write description of #3			
7 th session	post-writing questionnaire			

The first session was an orientation. The teacher explained to the students in the four groups what they would be required to do in the subsequent five sessions and asked students to complete a pre-test questionnaire asking students for information on their age, how long they have lived in English-speaking countries, and what the students want to be corrected when they write an article (grammar, idea, organization, etc.) (see Appendix 3). The students were also allowed to bring their own laptop computers in case they were more comfortable typing their work on a computer. Otherwise, students were given a worksheet for their writing during the training sessions. After general explanations on the whole course given to all groups, each group was separately instructed in accordance with the group conditions. Students in the CF group received an additional handout,

including an explanation of the error codes employed during the following sessions. The error codes contained explanations of frequent errors found in students' writing, such as errors in verb tense, punctuation, sentence structure, and text organization (see Appendix 4). These explanations were provided to help students in this group familiarize themselves with the codes and utilize them in their writing revision during the training sessions. The students in the other groups were not informed of the error codes.

In the second session, students in all four groups watched a 5-minute silent film entitled *Fishing with Sam* (see Appendix 5). While watching the film, students were allowed to briefly note some keywords or storylines, if they wanted. After they finished watching the film, the teacher showed the students a list of useful vocabulary on PowerPoint slides. The words and expressions were selected from among those high-level vocabulary words that were beyond the students' current English proficiency (see Appendix 6). Then, for 30 minutes, the students wrote a description essay (used as the pre-writing data) of what they saw in the film, using at least 150 words, on their own laptop computers or on the worksheet provided (see Appendix 7). Their essays were collected electronically (using a USB drive for the typed ones) and manually (for the handwritten ones). After the class, the teacher gave each group different types of written feedback, as illustrated in Table 3.2. For

example, the CF group received written feedback in which errors were underlined and the corresponding error codes were noted below the underlined text. The DF and UF groups received direct correction and simple underlines, respectively. The NF group received no written feedback as this group was the control group. Appendix 8~10 includes feedback samples from the groups.

In the third session, the students in the DF, CF, and UF groups received teachers' written feedback on their first writing. They were then given 30 minutes to revise their writing based on the feedback. Unlike the experimental groups, the students in the NF group revised their writing without any teacher-oriented written feedback. After the revision period, the students submitted their works either on paper or in an electronic file, as they did in the second session.

In the fourth session, the students watched another 5-minute silent film entitled *Birds on Wire* (see APPENDIX 11). After watching the film, the students wrote a description essay (second writing) about the silent film and handed it in to the teacher in the same way as they did in the previous sessions (see APPENDIX 12). After the session, the teacher again gave the students written feedback on their writings. The procedure of the fifth session (revision of second writing) was the same as that of the third session.

In the sixth session, the students watched one of the Charlie Chaplin's films, *The Lion's Cage* (see APPENDIX 13), for around 5 minutes. Again, after they watched the film, the students wrote a description essay (third writing) about the film for about 30 minutes and handed in their work to the teacher in the same way they did in the previous sessions (see APPENDIX 14).

In the seventh and last session, the students were asked to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix 15) related to their impressions and preferences on the writing activities and feedback received during the five training sessions. The questionnaire took about 20 minutes to complete.

3.5 Data Analysis

To measure the improvements in students' writing over the writing sessions and the effects of written feedback types on their English description writings, this thesis employed the holistic and analytic scoring rubric, adapting the ETS writing rubric. The ETS analytic scoring rubric further included subcategories such as the development of ideas, organization, vocabulary, sentence variety and construction, grammar and usage, and mechanics scoring (excerpted from the Computer-Based Test Score User

Guide, 1998). Among these categories, the present thesis adopted the holistic and three analytic categories (i.e., grammar and usage, mechanics, organization), which are considered the most appropriate for measuring the constructs of the description writing in the current experiment (see Appendix 16).

By regarding each essay as a single entity, the holistic scorer graded the essays, providing one score to each essay (Cynthia, 2012). Due to the economic feature of holistic scoring, large-scale exams employ the method, including the National Certificate of Educational Achievement New Zealand graduation certificate, the Graduate Record Examination, the North Carolina Writing project, and the Washington Assessment of Student Learning. The method is globally used but does not provide objectifiable conditions. Therefore, only experts who can use skilled impressions can grade the texts in holistic scoring (Hyland, 2002; Weigle, 2002).

The holistic scoring method (ETS) was adopted and modified in this thesis, and rubrics were provided to the scorer. Three subcategories from ETS were adopted and modified for a specific task (i.e., description) for this study. The rubrics used in the thesis contained how well the text is organized and developed, how clearly it describes the details of the movie, how well the text shows consistent facility in language usage, the use of syntactic variety and

word choice, etc. The rubric consists of a 6-point Likert scale for the holistic scoring and a 5-point Likert scale for the analytic scoring, with higher scores being better (see Table 3.3). *Grammar and usage* measured how correct learners' writings were, how many sentences included grammatically wrong sentences, and whether the grammatical errors impeded understanding of the main points. *Mechanics* measured the correct use of the correctness of punctuation and spelling errors. *Contents (organization, rhetoric)* included how clearly the text described the movie and whether the details displayed unity, progression, and coherence.

Table 3.3
Scoring Rubric for Learners' Writing

Component of Writing	Indicator	Scores
Holistic	overall writing score	1 2 3 4 5 6
grammar	grammatical accuracy	1 2 3 4 5
mechanics	mistakes in spelling, punctuation, capitalization etc.	1 2 3 4 5
Analytic	clearly describe the movie, logically ordered and easy to understand	1 2 3 4 5
contents (organization, rhetoric)		

The students' writings were scored by an experienced EFL teacher using the rubric. The grader had more than 7 years of teaching experience. She had extensive experience scoring the National English Adaptive Test (NEAT) and had earned her Teaching English in English (TEE) master's certificate. She scored all first and third writings (without being revised) for each scoring component based on the rubric. Both holistic scores and analytic scores were analyzed in the thesis; the holistic score was used as the quantitative method to discover the effect of different types of feedback, and the analytic score was used as the qualitative analysis of four students' work.

CHAPTER 4.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the results from the experiment and discusses the pedagogical implications. The first section compares the effect of three different types of written corrective feedback (i.e., direct correction, coded feedback, uncoded feedback) on students' description writing. The second section investigates the relationship between the students' English writing proficiency levels (i.e., higher level, intermediate level, and lower level) and the different feedback types on description writing. The final section provides a detailed analysis of each student's four descriptions (i.e., first writing, revision of the first writing, second writing, revision of the second writing, and third writing), targeting a subset of students who showed significant differences in their writings over the treatments.

4.1. Effects of Different Feedback Types on Students'

Writing Quality

The first research question investigated the effects of different types of written corrective feedback on students' description writing. For group comparisons, the descriptive statistics were preliminarily performed on the holistic score of the first and third writings. The rationale for selecting the holistic score as the quantitative measure for the group comparison in this study is based on the current scoring system of IBT TOEFL writing, which adopts this score.

Table 4.1 summarizes the mean holistic scores for each group in the first and third written texts. As soon as the students completed their first writing during the second session, their texts were scored by the rater before being asked to revise their writing. After the two feedback and revision processes, students' third description writings were scored and analyzed again. Among the four groups in the first writing, the UF group scored the highest (mean = 4.47), followed by the NF group (mean = 4.30), DF group (mean = 4.05), and CF group (3.90). The four groups' scores, however, did not indicate statistical

significance when the group scores were compared using a one-way ANOVA ($F(3, 77) = 0.000, p = .278$), indicating that all four groups were the same in terms of their holistic writing scores in the first writing.

For the third writing, the UF group scored the highest (mean = 4.79). The NF group, whose mean score was the second highest in the first writing, scored lowest on the third writing (mean = 4.10), suggesting that this group did not improve as much over the training sessions compared to the other groups. Following the UF group, the CF group ranked the second highest (mean = 4.65), followed by the DF group (mean = 4.58).

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics of First and Third Writing Score

Writing	Group	N	*Mean	Std. Deviation
First Writing	DF	19	4.05	1.026
	CF	20	3.90	1.021
	UF	19	4.47	1.020
	NF	20	4.30	0.865
Third Writing	DF	19	4.58	1.071
	CF	20	4.65	0.875
	UF	19	4.79	0.787
	NF	20	4.10	0.968

Maximum: 6

To investigate how much each group improved during the training sessions, the difference in scores between the first and the third writing texts (difference score) was calculated. The difference score compared the increase rates of each group score instead of focusing on the group score in either the first or the third texts. Table 4.2 shows the descriptive statistics of the difference score. The result shows that all feedback groups, except for the control group, improved their writing scores. Among the three feedback groups, which showed improvements, the CF group showed the largest improvements, indicating that the coded feedback was the most effective of the different types of feedback. On the whole, DF and UF also showed improvements, however, NF showed a slight drop in the writing quality.

Table 4.2**Descriptive Statistics of Difference Scores**

Group	N	*Mean	Std. Deviation
DF	19	0.53	.772
CF	20	0.75	.851
UF	19	0.32	.946
NF	20	-0.20	.616
Total	78	0.35	.865

*Maximum: 6

To explore the difference score among groups in detail, a one-way ANOVA was conducted for the four groups. As Table 4.3 depicts, a significant difference emerged among the groups ($F(3, 77) = 5.090, p = .003$).

Table 4.3**One-way ANOVA of Difference Scores**

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between	9.862	3	3.287	5.090	.003
Within Groups	47.792	74	0.646		
Total	57.654	77			

Post-hoc tests (Tukey HSD) revealed that the difference score of the DF group was significantly higher than that of the NF group, ($p = .031$); similarly, the CF group had a significantly higher difference score than the NF group, ($p = .002$). These results imply that direct corrective feedback and coded feedback had a significantly more positive effect on improving the learners' writing proficiency than no-feedback.

Most foreign studies have so far suggested that indirect feedback is more effective than direct feedback in improving learners' writing accuracy (Ferris, 1995, Lalande, 1982). In particular, their results show that indirect feedback has more effect than direct feedback in the long term (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008). The researchers point out that when learners receive indirect feedback, they easily engage in guided learning and problem solving, which can facilitate the reflection process (Ferris & Robert, 2001) and lead to improvement in writing accuracy improvement. However, researches in Korea, Jin (2014) claimed that direct feedback is more effective than indirect feedback for Korean EFL students. The result is in line with the result with this experiment. Generally, direct feedback avoids students' confusion, helps correcting complex errors, and provides immediate feedback to wrong hypotheses that learners may make (Chandler, 2003) and it facilitates learners'

acquisition of linguistic forms.

Among these conflicting conclusions from previous studies, the result of this experiment also has to be explained in consideration of the special context of science high school and learners in South Korea. Normally, Korean learners are very passive in interacting with instructor (Kim, 2014), and very accustomed to authoritative feedback (Kim & Kim, 2005). In the situation, learners might have received the feedback as usual, and applied what they have learnt from DF given by an instructor.

4.2. Effects of Different Feedback Types on Students' Writing Quality at Different Proficiency Levels

To investigate the relationship between students' English writing proficiency levels and the different feedback types used for the description writing, all students were categorized into three levels: higher level, intermediate level, and lower level. The three levels were determined based on the relative ranking of the pre-test scores within each group. The highest-ranking third were included in the higher-level (HL) group, the middle third were included in the intermediate-level (IL) group, and the bottom third were

included in the lower-level (LL) group. Table 4.4 shows the descriptive statistics of learners' first writing holistic scores. Depending on the feedback type groups, the number of learners allocated to the higher level group, intermediate level group, and lower level group varies. The number of learners in each level group are relatively equal in DF, CF has more intermediate learners than the others, lower level learners in UF are relatively few, NF has relatively more learners in higher level group.

Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics of Learners' First Writing Holistic Scores

Group (score)	Higher Level (5~6)	Intermediate Level (4)	Lower Level (2~3)
DF	7	6	6
CF	5	9	6
UF	8	8	3
NF	11	4	5
Total	31	27	20

4.2.1 Higher Level Group Students

In each Group, about 1/3 of the students (e.g., 5 to 11 students from each) were allocated into higher level group (HL) students. The purpose of dividing students into different levels was to investigate whether there were different effect at different proficiency level learners. The Table 4.5 shows description of the higher level learners' first writing score and third writing score.

Table 4.5
Descriptive Statistics of HL Students

	Group	N	Mean *	Std. Deviation
first writing	DF	7	5.14	.378
	CF	5	5.20	.447
	UF	8	5.50	.535
	NF	11	5.00	.000
	Total	31	5.19	.402
third writing	DF	7	5.71	.488
	CF	5	5.60	.548
	UF	8	5.25	.707

	NF	11	4.64	.505
	Total	31	5.19	.703
difference score	DF	7	0.57	.535
	CF	5	0.40	.548
	UF	8	-0.25	.707
	NF	11	-0.36	.505
	Total	31	0.00	.683

*Maximum: 6

One-way ANOVA was applied to the difference scores in each feedback group of HL learners. As Table 4.6 shows, there was a significant difference among group ($F(3,30) = 5.063, p = .007$).

Table 4.6

One-way ANOVA of HL Groups' Difference Scores

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.040	3	1.680	5.063	.007
Within Groups	8.960	27	0.332		
Total	14.000	30			

The post-hoc test result revealed that the difference score in DF was

significantly larger than the score of UF ($p = .048$), and than the score of NF ($p = .012$). This implies that among three types of feedback, the most effective feedback to HL was the most explicit feedback. These results are consistent with the findings from the analysis of the whole students, which showed that the direct was more effective than the indirect feedback in improving students' writing scores.

4.2.2 Intermediate Level Group Students

Approximately 33% of the students (i.e., 4 to 9 students from each group) were allotted into IL. Table 4.7 summarizes the general descriptive statistics of IL students including the first writing score, third writing score, and the difference score. The results revealed that the IL students in UF had the largest improvement (difference score of 0.38), followed by the students in CF (difference score of 0.33), then by the students in NF (difference score of 0.25). The IL students in DF, by contrast, did not show any improvement.

Table 4.7**Descriptive Statistics of IL Students**

	Group	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation
first writing	DF	6	4.00	.000
	CF	9	4.00	.000
	UF	8	4.00	.000
	NF	4	4.00	.000
	Total	27	4.00	.000
third writing	DF	6	4.00	.894
	CF	9	4.33	.500
	UF	8	4.38	.744
	NF	4	4.25	.957
	Total	27	4.26	.712
difference score	DF	6	0.00	.894
	CF	9	0.33	.500
	UF	8	0.38	.744
	NF	4	0.25	.957
	Total	27	0.26	.712

*Maximum=6

One-way ANOVA on difference scores from each group was conducted on the holistic scores in order to find out the effect of different types of

feedback on IL students' improvements. The analysis found no statistical difference ($F(3,26) = .340$, $p = .796$) among four different types of feedback (Table 4.8). These results are inconsistent with the findings from the students in HL, who showed the largest improvement in DF. It appears that any type of feedback, regardless of direct or indirect, had very few effects on the IL students.

Table 4.8
One-way ANOVA of IL Groups' Difference Scores

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	0.560	3	0.187	0.340	.796
Within Groups	12.625	23	0.549		
Total	13.185	26			

Despite the fact that there was no significant difference, comparing the group means in the difference score reveals an important aspect of the effect of feedback. Though not significantly different, improvement of UF was the largest (+ 0.38) whereas DF showed no improvement (+ 0). Interestingly, the opposite results are found for the HI learners, to whom DF was the most effective feedback type compared to UF and NF. Besides from NF, we can

briefly say, but not strongly, that the effect of feedback is opposite between HL and IL: That is, the direct feedback was more effective for the HL students, whereas the indirect effect was more effective for the IL students.

4.3.3 Lower Level Group Students

Approximately one-third of the students in each group (i.e., 3 to 6) were allotted into LL. Table 4.9 provides the general descriptive statistics of the LL students including the first writing score, third writing score, and the difference score. The descriptive statistics show that all the LL students who received the feedback had improvements in their writing scores. The LL students in CF and DF had the largest improvements (difference score of 1.67), followed by the IL students in DF (difference score of 1.00). Unlike these feedback groups, those who did not receive feedback showed poorer performance in the post-writing compared to the pre-writing.

Table 4.9**Descriptive Statistics of LL Students**

	Group	N	Mean*	Std. Deviation
first writing	DF	6	2.83	0.408
	CF	6	2.67	0.516
	UF	3	3.00	0.000
	NF	5	3.00	0.000
	Total	20	2.85	0.366
third writing	DF	6	3.83	0.408
	CF	6	4.33	1.033
	UF	3	4.67	0.577
	NF	5	2.80	0.447
	Total	20	3.85	0.933
difference score	DF	6	1.00	0.632
	CF	6	1.67	0.816
	UF	3	1.67	0.577
	NF	5	-0.20	.447
	Total	20	1.00	.973

*Maximum=6

One-way ANOVA was conducted on difference scores from each group in order to find out the effect of different types of feedback for LL students

(see Table 4.10). There was statistical difference ($F(3,19) = 8.784$, $p = .001$) among four different types of feedback.

Table 4.10
One-way ANOVA of LL Groups' Difference Scores

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1st writing	Between Groups	11.200	3	3.733	8.784	.001
	Within Groups	6.800	16	0.425		
	Total	18.000	19			

A post-hoc test revealed that DF ($p = 0.35$), CF ($p = .001$), UF ($p = .006$) are statistically different from NF, while these three feedback groups did not differ from one another in their difference scores. Unlike the case for the HL and IL students, all three types of feedback had a significant influence on the LL learners' proficiency improvement. Such finding implies that difference in student writers' level can function as a factor in deciding the most effective feedback type in the classroom. For the lower-level learners, for example, instructors may consider providing any type of feedback whereas for the higher level students, direct feedback is more strongly recommended. By providing feedback appropriate for learners' current proficiency level,

learners' writing proficiency may be more facilitated.

In sum, the group comparisons on the students' holistic scores between pre- and post-writing for each proficiency level demonstrated that feedback types had different impacts on students' writing depending on the students' current writing levels. It was found that for the higher-level students, direct feedback was more effective, whereas for the lower-level-students, both direct and indirect feedback was effective. For the intermediate-level learners, on the other hand, none of the feedback types had any effects on their scores.

The findings of this thesis cast some pedagogical implications on the EFL writing instruction. First, the fact that the students in LL benefited from all feedback types implies that it is more important for teachers to consider the provision of feedback than focusing on what type of feedback to give to these learners. Since these learners had yet much to improve, simply providing any type of feedback may help them improve their writing. As these learners gain sufficient proficiency, however, it may become important to consider the type of feedback, as indicated by the results of the HL students, who showed the largest improvements in DF. It seems that for these HL students, who had less developed cognitive capabilities relative to adult learners relative to adult learners, direct rather than indirect feedback may be more effective. Therefore, teachers may consider providing direct feedback

when they teach young EFL students with higher-level proficiency.

There still remains a question as to the lack of group difference in the scores of IL students. One reason for the lack of statistical significance may come from the small number of learners in each level (DF= 6, CF=9, UF=8, NF=4), reflecting a typical type II error. Another reason that the IL students did not show significant improvements depending on feedback types may be explained by the nature of the intermediate-level learners. That is, learners at this level are in the transitional process of advancing to a higher level, and thus show mixed properties of both lower-level and higher-level learners. Because of such vague and indeterminate status of the intermediate-level learners, the feedback types may not have affected these learners in this study. Further research is needed to investigate what aspects of the intermediate learners make corrective written feedback less effective compared to students at other proficiency levels.

4.3 Students' Development over the Process of Writing and Revision: Three Learners Showing Much Improvement

Among 78 learners participated in this research, three learners who showed much improvement in writing quality were selected for a qualitative analysis.

4.3.1 Seoyeon's Case

Seoyeon, who received coded feedback, improved her writing quality most in her group as well as in all participants. As shown in Table 4.11 her first writing (holistic) score was 3 out of 6 (grammar: 3, mechanics: 3, contents:3), which was 18th highest among 20 students in CF. But the score improved into the top score in the third writing; scoring 6 (grammar:5, mechanics: 5, contents: 5). It is worth investigating in depth what had driven its surge of the score in the effect of teacher's two time feedback and student's two time revisions and three writings.

Table 4.11

Student's Improvement in Each Category

	holistic	grammar	mechanics	contents
1 st writing	3	3	3	3

3 rd writing	6	5	5	5
improvements	+3	+2	+2	+2

Let us first take a closer look at her writings. Majority of Seoyeon 's errors were missing articles; On the first writing, the teacher gave feedback for 12 errors, but 9 of them were on missing articles. As seen in the Table 4.12, in the first writing, Seoyeon didn't seem to know the very basic principle that every noun needs an article.

Table 4.12

A Student's Errors in Category

Category	Number	Description
Art.	9	Missing articles
WW	2	confused other with others
P	1	confused '.' with ','
Total	12	

As we can see in the following (1), after receiving the teacher's feedback, she began to recognize the obligatory use of an article and revised her writing inserting an article for every noun. However, in the second writing, she still missed an article for some nouns. She sometimes used the correct

articles, but sometimes missed them. So, the teacher gave feedback on articles again, like the feedback on the first writing. After receiving the feedback, Seoyeon revised it correctly. In the third writing, she wrote all the articles properly. This shows that giving indirect feedback on one item only once is not enough but giving more than once can help student pay attention to it.

(1)

W1⁴: Three penguins, seal, and polar bear are in the video.

T1: Three penguins, seal, and polar bear are in the video.
Art. Art.

W1R: Three penguins, a seal, and a polar bear are in the video.

W2: The big bird's color was blue, which was same as small birds.

T2: The big bird's color was blue, which was same as small birds.
Art.

W2R: The big bird's color was blue, which was same as the small birds.

⁴ W1: first writing W1R: first writing revision W2: second writing W2R: second writing revision W3: third writing T1: teacher's feedback on the first writing T2: teacher's feedback on second writing

W3: Charlie was in great chaos since he saw the lion. He tried to open the door, but the door latch was locked, so he couldn't go out.

As (2) shows, Seyeon's revision of the first writing, however, shows that she sometimes misunderstood the feedback and provided wrong corrections in her revision. What the teacher intended by underlining 'other's' is to ask student to correct it into *others*'. However, Seoyeon corrected it into *others fish*. This seems to be the problem that even with the teacher's written coded feedback, students sometimes correct their errors incorrectly, which may develop into fossilization without teachers' specific corrections. When the researcher reviewed 2nd and 3rd writing to find out whether she made the same mistake with the word 'other' again, however,, but she didn't used the word any more. So it was hard to decide whether a student's misunderstanding of a feedback code is due to a fossilized error or simply a mistake.

(2)

W1: Not stopping from there, the red scarf penguin steals other's fish.

T1: Not stopping from there, the red scarf penguin steals other's fish.
WF

W1R: Not stopping from there, the red scarf penguin steals others fish.

One interesting thing in her writing is that when she was revising her first writing based on the teacher's feedback, she not only revised the errors that the teacher had marked. She wrote additional phrases, sentences and even one more paragraph. This is rarely seen in other students' writing revisions. Normally, other students seemed to write very simple sentences with very simple structures to avoid the errors. But Seyeon was very different from others. It can be said that she took an active action in her revision rather than passively accepting teacher's feedback, though there is potential to make more mistakes in her writing.

4.3.2 Minjoon's Case

The second most improvement in the in the whole students was shown by Minjoon, whose first writing score was the lowest in the CF. Table 4.13 shows Minjoon's first scores and improvements. The score of Minjoon's first writing was 2 (grammar: 2, mechanics: 3, contents: 2) and the last writing score was 4 (grammar: 4, mechanics: 5, contents: 4). The scores of all four category (holistic, grammar, mechanics, contents) improved by 2points.

Table 4.13

Student's Improvement in Each Category

	holistic	grammar	mechanics	contents
1 st writing	2	2	3	2
3 rd writing	4	4	5	4
improvements	+2	+2	+2	+2

Minjoon received feedback for 33 cases from the teacher after writing the 1st writing covering his paper with teacher corrections. The following (3) ~ (4) excerpts from his first writing and revisions.

(3)

W1: Because It looks easy for friends.

T1: Because It looks easy for friends.
Cap.

W1R: Because it looks easy for friends.

(4)

W1: when It catch the fish, It's eyes are cute. and when seal's fish taken away from penguin with red scarf, seal was poor.

T1: when It catch the fish, It's eyes are cute, and when seal's fish taken
Cap. Cap. VF. Cap.WW VT Pun Act./Pas.

away from _ penguin with _ red scarf, _ seal was poor.
Art. Art. Art.

W1R: When it caught the fish, its eyes were cute. And when seal's fish was taken away from the penguin with a red scarf, the seal was poor.

In the first writing, Minjoon didn't even know the very basic principle that every sentence begins with a capital letter and others begin with small letters. Many of the Minjoon's sentences began with small letters and some sentences included words with capital letter, which is the place for a small letter. Even when the teacher gave some feedback on them, however, he did not fix some of the capital letters in the revision as in the example (5). The teacher gave feedback on '*Penguin*' to change into '*penguin*' but he did not fix it.

(5)

W1: At last, the polar bear, the seal and the Penguin with a red scarf's friends made a fascinating team work, and my mind was delightful

T1: At last, the polar bear, the seal and the Penguin with a red scarf's friends
Cap.

made a fascinating team work and my mind was delightful.

RW

W1R: At last, the polar bear, the seal and the Penguin with a red scarf's friends made a fascinating team work and I was delightful.

As shown in (6), from the second writing (a new writing), however, Minjoon began to write the proper capital letters and small letters without any mistakes.

(6)

W2: The ugly bird was sandwiched among the group of mini birds with normal facial expressions.

W2: Therefore the ashamed mini birds hide themselves behind the ugly bird.

Minjoon's writing showed one interesting change that his sentences became longer and longer which can be seen in (7), though his writing includes some mistakes. His first writing included very simple sentences that consist of only five to six words, such as 'It is amazing for me', 'I will love my friends.' In the third writing, his writing included complex sentences like 'The woman saw him and he finally went down to the ground.', 'I think this

video indirectly described how men try to attract women's attention and interest'.

(7)

W1: I felt strange watching animation.

W2: Its facial expressions and act seemed like begging to hang out with together.

W3: A woman appeared and he wanted to show her that he is brave, so he pretend to threaten the lion.

As was the case for Seyeon, Minjoon's writing reveals one problem underlying coded feedback, in that the learners cannot explicitly change the right expressions or words to the teacher's feedback. As shown in (8), the teacher gave feedback on 'another' by using the error code (WW=wrong word). The teacher's intent was to change 'another bird' into 'one another', because there were many birds which collided. This was also seen as a fossilized error, like in Seoyeon's case.

(8)

W1: When the bird came to the cable one by one, the birds collided with another bird.

T1: When the bird came to the cable one by one, the birds collided with
Sg./Pl.
another bird.
WW

W1R: When the birds came to the cable one by one, the birds collided with the other.

Minjoon was a student who was not fluent in English, but after receiving a reply e-mail⁵ from the teacher, it seems that he began to write his writing with more care. As a researcher, I was very curious and interested in his improvement in writing. The answer could be found from the questionnaire in the last class, in which he wrote “When I’ve sent you an e-mail, you replied with encouraging words. I felt grateful at that moment. From then, I was encouraged and began to think that I should study more. Thank you for encouraging me.” This shows that the teacher’s comments influence the learners’ motivation and writing effort. Indeed, Busse (2013) pointed out

⁵ Basically, the learners are required to hand in their writings with USB or worksheet. But Minjoon was absent one day and handed in his writing by an e-mail.

that during feedback process, some amounts of positive feedback should be considered as a factor that could influence the learners' writings.

4.3.3 Seojoon's Case

Seojoon was the student who showed the most improvement in DF. His improvement was also one of the top three students among 78 students. In the first writing, Seojoon's holistic score was 2.00 (grammar: 2, mechanics: 2, contents: 2), which was the lowest in DF and also among 78 students. However, the last writing score was 4.00 (grammar: 4, mechanics: 4, contents: 4), which is in about top 65%, showing 35% improvement in the ranking. As shown in the Table 4.14, the scores in all category improved by 2 point respectively. This is worth investigating his writing and revision processes more deeply deeply.

Table 4.14

Student's Improvement in Each Category

	holistic	grammar	mechanics	contents
1 st writing	2	2	2	2
3 rd writing	4	4	4	4
improvements	+2	+2	+2	+2

The first writing shows an overall impression that he seemed to have no experience of English writing. The questionnaire of asking the student's experience of English writing showed that he indeed had no experience in writing. In the first writing, he wrote each sentence in one line with arranging it in the center as in (9). In addition, he wrote all the sentences beginning with a small letter. Furthermore, most of his sentences were so simple in structure that most people would regard those as an elementary school students' writing. Also, he did not seem to know that each sentence must include at least one verb. For example, he wrote '*they kidding polar bear*' without using a verb. Besides, did not seem to have any knowledge on articles (a, an, the) in the beginning of the writing project.

(9)

W1: three penguins and one polar bear and one seal are
 main character of this video.
 polar bear use fishing rod.
 but polar bear miss fish.
 three penguins steal seal's fish.
 and they kidding polar bear.
 so polar bear and seal catch one penguin.

In the revision of the first writing, he amended his first writing relatively correctly, because the teacher gave the right words directly to Seojoon's writing (Some students didn't alter the errors into the correct expressions that the teacher gave). One interesting thing is that he added additional sentences which was not included in the teacher's feedback. Writing additional sentence boosts risk of making mistakes, so most of the students rarely wrote additional sentences in their revising works. This impressive phenomenon was found in students whose writing scores dramatically improved.

One of significant observations in Seojoon's first writing was an overuse of 'be' verb. Among 17 sentences in his first writing, he used 'be' verbs (are, is) 10 times (59% of the sentences included 'be' verb even though

there was a lexical verb. Indeed, he did not use 'be' verbs properly as in (10). The teacher corrected his writings and he amended the writing correctly. Yet, he misused 'be' verb in the second writing (new) again. Among 17 sentences, Seojoon used 7 'be' verbs (41%), which is dropped 18%. Clearly, his overuse of 'be' verb was reduced, but he still use 'be' verbs inaccurately. In the third writing, among 26 sentences, 'be' verbs were used on 8 times and 2 of them were used inappropriately. In addition, Seojoon began to use passive voice from the third writing, which was found in four sentences. This seems to be very intriguing development in his writing development process.

(10)

W1: polar bear is fail.

W2: A very big bird is very heavy.

W2: I think a big bird is 15 little birds' mother.

W2: Because a big bird is wisdom.

Aside from his development in using new structure (passive voice), his sentences in the third writing were still very short in simple structure, such as 'He was so frightened', 'She fainted', 'So he sprinkles water to her' and so on. He needed to write more essays and develop writing skills with more complex structure with more words.

CHAPTER 5.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to find out different effect of different types of feedback and track students' improvement in writing proficiency. In 5.1, summary of the research is presented. Pedagogical implications are shown in 5.2, and limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are provided in Section 5.3.

5.1 Summary of the findings

This research was designed to find effects of different types of feedback (direct corrective feedback, coded feedback, uncoded feedback, and no-feedback). Specific research questions this study asked were: (1) What are the effects of the different types of teacher's written feedback on the EFL students' description writing quality? (2) How do the effects differ according to students' L2 writing proficiency? (3) How are the students' writing develop over the process of writing and revision?

In order to answer the research questions, students watched three silent films. After watching the silent film, students wrote (handwriting or typing) summary of the film for 40 minutes. After writing, the teacher collected them, gave feedback, and scored them. But the scores were not given to the students.

First descriptive writing scores showed no difference among four groups. After revising the first writing with the teacher's feedback, students watched the second silent animation film, and the same procedure repeated two more times. The score of the third summary writing were analyzed and three among four groups had significant improvements on their writing (mechanics, contents, holistic scores).

In the analysis depending on the level of the students, for the high level students, coded feedback was more effective than no-feedback, and direct correction had more positive influence on students writing than underline feedback. For the intermediate group, coded feedback was more effective than direct correction feedback. Lastly, for the lower level group, coded feedback was significantly effective than no-feedback.

According to the result of different types of feedback on learners' writing, considering the learners' writing proficiency in the beginning (before the treatment), the result was a little different from above. For the advanced language learners, providing CF was the most effective to improve learners'

writing proficiency compared to UF and NF.

5.2 Pedagogical Implications

The results obtained in this research cast some pedagogical implications on writing instruction in the Korean EFL context. Although there is a growing interest in the importance of writing instruction, there have been few attempts to establish systematic guidelines on feedback types that a teacher can apply to teach writing to students. The current research identified effects of different types of written corrective feedback on EFL learners' writing performance. Among three types of feedback employed in this study, DF and CF were found to be the most effective. Generally, teachers in writing class, due to a limited amount of time, tend to provide students with only minimum feedback, which includes a general score based on the overall impression on the writing along with brief comments such as, "Good!" "Excellent!" "Bad", etc. However, the results from this investigation point to the need that teachers provide specific feedback to students, especially DF and CF, in order to improve students' writing proficiency and quality. Certainly, teachers in school have a restricted amount of time. Even though it is important to

provide learners with correct forms and expressions to the errors (Eslami, 2014), it is true that such attempts require much time and effort. Therefore, for the sake of time efficiency, teachers may simply give CF which requires relatively less time and efforts than DF.

Considering that the process of writing improvement is slow and gradual, writing instructors need to be cautious not to push learners. As shown in the cases for Seoyeon and Seojoon in this study, some learners show inconsistent developmental tendency, demonstrating a U-shape pattern, in which student's writing skills decrease at some point of development and begin to increase again at a later point. In addition, learners are subject to affectional factors, and it is often important to provide emotional support to students, as shown in the Seojoon's case that his writing ability soared after the instructor's warm words and compliments. In this regard, writing ability improvement is not only influenced by the technical method used in the classrooms but also the relationship between the instructor and the learners.

5.3 Limitations and Suggestions for Further Research

Although this study revealed diverse aspects of the relationship between written corrective feedback types and writing performance, there are several possible limitations and areas for further studies that remain to be explored.

First of all, the amount of the writing data used in this study is relatively small enough to make full use of the statistical technique adopted above (i.e., ANOVA). Generally, analyzing more than 30 participant in one group is suggested in analyzing with ANOVA. However, due to the small number of students in the school and dividing the students in one group into three levels made the sample number less. In the future research, an analysis with more sample size is recommended.

Next, even though the employed human rater was a very experienced English teacher, as well as having plenty of experience in scoring learners' writings, using one human rater's score seems to be weak for obtaining much reliable results. Employing more than one scorer is suggested.

For the future research, it is desirable to conduct delayed post-tests with the same experiment setting. With a few delayed post-test, we can better ascertain the effects of different types of written corrective feedback on writing performance and the pedagogical implications induced from the observations.

In addition, in this experiment, writing proficiency improvement was

measured according to the rubric which not only contains holistic score but also grammar, mechanics, and contents. However, no distinctive difference was captured among groups in the scores of grammar, mechanics, and contents. Some of the previous research included counting the numbers of errors and investigated the improvement of accuracy. However, this research was highly focused on holistic improvement and did not count the number of errors. If grammatical and mechanical errors were counted, it would provide more fertile data.

Regardless of the limitations mentioned above, the findings from this study provide a deeper understanding of written feedback effect on Korean middle school EFL learners' writing, and offer insight in providing feedback to learners' writings.

REFERENCES

- Afraz, S. (2012). the Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback of Contrastive Analysis on Efl Learners ' Acquisition of Verb Tenses. *Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in the World*, 2(November), 48–61.
- Anseel, F., Lievens, F. & Schollaert, E. (2009). Reflection as a strategy to enhance task performance after feedback. *Social and Behavioral Science*. 110, 23-35.
- Ahangari, S. & Amirazdeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 29, 1859 – 1868
- Beach, R. (1976). Self-evaluation of extensive revisers and non revisers. *College Composition and Communication*, 27, 160-164.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S. & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing, *Journal of Second Language Writing* 9: 227–58.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 69–124.

- Bitchener, J., (2009) Measuring the effectiveness of written corrective feedback: A response to “Overgeneralization from a narrow focus: A response to Bitchener (2008)”. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(4), 276-279.
- Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. (2012). A reflection on the language learning potential of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21, 348–363.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009a). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System*, 37(2), 322–329.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009b). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal*, 63(3), 204–211.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: a ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics* 31(2), 193-214.
- Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14(3), 191–205.
- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning.

Assessment in Education, 5(1), 7-74.

Busse, V., (2013). How do students of German perceive feedback practices at university? A motivational exploration. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 22, 406–424.

Cha, K. (2004). An Error Analysis of Korean University Students' Writing. *Foreign Languages Education*, 11(2).

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267–296.

Cohen, A. (1987). *Student processing of feedback on their compositions*. In A.L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cynthia, S. (2012). A Comparison of the Performance of Analytic vs. Holistic Scoring Rubrics to Assess L2 Writing. *Iranian Journal of Language Testing*, 2(1).

DeKeyser, R. (1993). The Effect of Error Correction on L2 Grammar Knowledge and Oral Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(4).

Diab, M. (2015). Effectiveness of written corrective feedback: Does type of error and type of correction matter? *Assessing Writing*, 24. 16–34.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353–371.

Gee, T. C. (1972). Students' responses to teacher comments. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 6, 212–221.

Fathman, A. K., & Whalley, E. (1990). *Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content*. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178–190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly* 31(2), 315-339.

Ferris, D. (1999). The case of grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime?). *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13(1), 49-62.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues (pp.81-104)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frantzen D., (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *The Modern Language Journal* 79(3), 329-344.
- Frear D., & Chiu Y. (2012). The effect of focused and unfocused indirect written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing. *System* 53, 24-34.
- Frear, D. (2012). *The effect of written corrective feedback and revision on intermediate Chinese learners' acquisition of English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Frear, D., & Chiu, Y. (2015). The effect of focused and unfocused indirect

- written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in new pieces of writing. *System*, 53, 24–34.
- Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 40–53.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bitchener, J. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207–217.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment, *Modern language Journal* 66: 140-49.
- Langan, J. (2001). *College Writing Skills with Readings*, (New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc., 2001), p. 32.
- Lee, Y., Gentile, C. & Kantor, R. (2008). *Analytic Scoring of TOEFL CBT Essays: Scores From Humans and E-Rater*. TOEFL Research Reports. RR-81.
- Moreno, R. (2004). Decreasing cognitive load for novice students: effects of explanatory versus corrective feedback in discovery-based multimedia. *Instructional Science*, 32, 99-113.

- Narciss, S. (2008). *Feedback strategies for interactive learning tasks*. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Van Merriëboer, & M. P. Driscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (3rd ed.). (pp. 125e143) New York: Erlbaum.
- Nur'aini, S. (2013). *The effectiveness of using clustering technique towards students' descriptive writing* (A quasi-experimental study of second grade students at department of English education faculty of Tarbiyah and teachers training Syarif Hidayatullah state Islamic. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ayarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.
- Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 375–389.
- Radecki, P., & Swales, J. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16, 355-365.
- Sampson, A. (2012). “Coded and uncoded error feedback: Effects on error frequencies in adult Colombian EFL learners’ writing.” *System*, 40(4), 494–504.
- Shintani, N. & Ellis R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners’ explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article.

Journal of Second Language Writing 22 286–306.

Shintani, N., & Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). *The comparative effect of metalinguistic explanation and direct written corrective feedback on the acquisition of the indefinite article*. The University of Auckland.

Stay, B. (1983). When re-writing succeeds: An analysis of student revisions. *The Writing Center Journal*, 4(1), 15-28.

Stallard K., (1974) An analysis of the writing behavior of good student writers'. *Research in the Teaching of English* 8: 206-18.

Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input and second language acquisition* (pp. 91 – 103). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 158-164.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.

Truscott J. (1999). The case for “the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 111-122.

Truscott, J. (2004). Dialogue: Evidence and conjecture on the effects of

- correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 337-343.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983), *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Van, B. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies* 10.2, 1–27.
- Weigle, S. (2002). *Assessing Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, H., & Garza, E. (2014). Types and Attributes of English Writing Errors in the EFL Context—A Study of Error Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, Vol. 5, No. 6.
- Zamel, V. (1983). The composing processes of advanced ESL students: Six case studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 7(2), 165-190.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. Types of Feedback	82
APPENDIX 2. Error Families and Error Types.....	85
APPENDIX 3. Pre-test Questionnaire.....	86
APPENDIX 4. Error Codes.....	89
APPENDIX 5. Fishing With Sam (1st Writing).....	93
APPENDIX 6. PPT Slide (1st Writing)	93
APPENDIX 7. Worksheet (1st Writing)	94
APPENDIX 8. Direct Correction Feedback (DF)	95
APPENDIX 9. Coded Feedback (CF).....	96
APPENDIX 10. Uncoded Feedback (UF).....	96
APPENDIX 11. Birds on Wire (2nd Writing)	97
APPENDIX 12. Worksheet (2nd Writing)	98
APPENDIX 13. The Lion’s Cage (3 rd Writing).....	99
APPENDIX 14. Worksheet (3rd Writing)	100
APPENDIX 15. Post-test Questionnaire.....	101
APPENDIX 16. Rubrics for Scoring.....	105

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. Types of Feedback (Ellis, 2008)

* CF = corrective feedback

Type of CF		
Direct CF	The teacher provides the student with the correct form.	The teacher provides the student with the correct form.
Indirect CF	Indicating + locating the error	The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction.
Metalinguistic CF	Indication only Use of error code Brief	This takes the form of an indication in the margin that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text. The teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error. Teacher writes codes in the margin (e.g. ww ¼ wrong word; art ¼ article). Teacher numbers errors in text and

<p>The focus of the feedback</p>	<p>grammatical descriptions</p>	<p>writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text.</p> <p>This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students' errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options.</p>
<p>Electronic feedback</p>	<p>Unfocused CF Focused CF</p>	<p>Unfocused CF is extensive. Focused CF is intensive.</p> <p>Description Studies</p> <p>The teacher provides the student with the correct form.</p> <p>The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction.</p> <p>This takes the form of underlining and use of cursors to show omissions in the student's text.</p> <p>This takes the form of an indication in the margin that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text.</p> <p>The teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error.</p>

	<p>Reformulation</p>	<p>Teacher writes codes in the margin (e.g. ww = wrong word; art = article). Teacher numbers errors in text and writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text.</p> <p>This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students' errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options. Unfocused CF is extensive. Focused CF is intensive.</p> <p>The teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a concordance file that provides examples of correct usage.</p> <p>This consists of a native speaker's reworking of the students' entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact.</p>
--	----------------------	---

APPENDIX 2. Error Families and Error Types

(Hartshorn, 2008)

<p><u>I. Grammatical Error Family</u></p> <p>Sentence Structure Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Run-on sentences2. Incomplete sentences3. Sentence-level punctuation <p>Determiner Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Articles2. Possessive nouns/Pronouns3. Numbers4. Indefinite pronouns5. Demonstrative pronouns <p>Verb Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Subject-verb problems2. Verb tense3. Other verb form <p>Numeric Shift Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Count-non-count2. Single-plural <p>Semantic Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Unclear Meaning2. Awkwardness3. Word order4. Insertion/omission	<p><u>II. Lexical Error Family</u></p> <p>Vocabulary Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Word Choice (spelled correctly but wrong word)2. Word Form (spelled correctly but wrong form of an appropriate word)3. Prepositions (spelled correctly but wrong preposition) <p><u>III. Mechanical Error Family</u></p> <p>Mechanical Errors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Spelling (misspelled)2. Capitalization3. New paragraph4. Non-sentence level punctuation
--	--

APPENDIX 3. Pre-test Questionnaire

설문지

1학년 반 번 이름:

※ 자신의 생각을 솔직하게 써 주세요.

<p>영어로 글을 썼을 때 <u>어떤 부분에 대해 수정(feedback)</u> 받기를 바라나요? (복수 응답 가능하며 가장 원하는 항목의 순서를 써주세요)</p> <p>①내용 ②아이디어 ③문법 ④단어(spelling) ⑤기타:_____</p> <p>가장 중점적으로 수정 받고 싶은 순서:___>____>____>____>___</p>
<p><u>내용</u>이 적절하지 않은 경우 어느 정도 수정 받기를 원하나요? ①100% ②80% ③60% ④40% ⑤20% ⑥0% ⑦기타:_____</p> <p>(모든 내용을 다 수정받는 것을 100%라고 정함.)</p>
<p>적절하지 않은 <u>아이디어(창의성, 타당성)</u>는 어느 정도 수정 받기를 원하나요? ①100% ②80% ③60% ④40% ⑤20% ⑥0% ⑦기타:_____</p> <p>(적절하지 않은 모든 아이디어 내용을 수정받는 것을 100%라고 정함.)</p>
<p>틀린 <u>단어</u>는 어느 정도 수정 받기를 원하나요? ①100% ②80% ③60% ④40% ⑤20% ⑥0% ⑦기타:_____</p>

(모든 spelling 오류를 수정받는 것을 100%라고 정함.)

문법적으로 틀린 것은 어느 정도 수정 받기를 원하나요?

①100% ②80% ③60% ④40% ⑤20% ⑥0% ⑦기타:-----

(문법적으로 틀린 모든 부분을 수정받는 것을 100%라고 정함.)

내용은 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다. ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다.

③틀린 항목(예:'spelling', 'tense(시제)', '전치사', '태')의 이름만 써 준다.

④틀린 부분을 바른 표현으로 고쳐준다. ⑤기

타:-----

아이디어는 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다. ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다.

③틀린 항목(예:'spelling', 'tense(시제)', '전치사', '태')의 이름만 써 준다.

④틀린 부분을 바른 표현으로 고쳐준다. ⑤기

타:-----

문법은 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다. ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다.

③틀린 항목(예: 'spelling', 'tense(시제)', '전치사', '태')의 이름만 써 준다.

④틀린 부분을 바른 표현으로 고쳐준다. ⑤기

타:-----

단어는 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다. ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다.

③틀린 항목(예: 'spelling', 'tense(시제)', '전치사', '태')의 이름만 써 준다.

④틀린 부분을 바른 표현으로 고쳐준다. ⑤기

타:-----

- 수고하셨습니다 -

APPENDIX 4. Error Codes

번호	code	의미	details	예문
1	WW	wrong word	단어를 바꾸기.	I went <u>on</u> school. → I went <u>to</u> school.
2	WF	wrong form	현재분사(-ing), 과거분사(-ed), 능동태, 수동태, to부정사, 원형부 정사를 확인	I am <u>fished</u> . → I am <u>fishing</u> .
3	VT	verb tense	동사의 시제 확인	I <u>go</u> to school and <u>ate</u> lunch. → I <u>went</u> to school and <u>ate</u> lunch. (또는) →I <u>go</u> to school and <u>eat</u> lunch.
4	Ag.	agreement	주어가 3인칭 단 수, 시제 현재이 면 동사에 s 붙이 기	He <u>eat</u> an apple. → He <u>eats</u> an apple.
5	WO	word order	어순(단어 배열 순서) 확인.	I <u>go often</u> to school. → I <u>often go</u> to school.
6	Sp.	spelling error	철자법 확인	distinuish →distinguish

7	P	punctuation	구두점(쉼표, 마침표, 물음표 등) 확인	I went to school_ →I went to school.
8	X	extra word	단어를 빼기	It was because <u>of</u> at in the rain. →It was because <u>of</u> the rain.
9	MW	missing word	단어 추가하기	It was because the rain. →It was because <u>of</u> the rain.
10	Art.	article mistake	관사(a/an/the/무관사)를 확인하세요.	He reads book. →He reads <u>a</u> book.
11	/	separate words	두 개 이상의 단어로 분리. (띄어쓰기)	Class is over <u>atthree</u> . →Class is over <u>at three</u> .
12	()	should be one word	한 단어로 만들기. (붙여 쓰기)	<u>Every body</u> is late today. → <u>Everybody</u> is late today.
13	Sg./Pl.	singular/plural	단수, 복수 확인.	I have three <u>sister</u> . →I have three <u>sisters</u> .
14	#	countable/uncountable mistake	셀 수 있는 명사인지, 셀 수 없는 명사인지 확인.	How <u>many</u> money did you bring? →How <u>much</u> money did you bring?

15	CON	conjunction mistake	적절한 접속사를 썼는지 확인.	They are handsome <u>and</u> crazy. →They are handsome <u>but</u> crazy.
16	RW	rewrite	다시 써보기.	Our vehicle flies, we snow find, over mountains you saw it. →As our vehicle flies, we saw snow over the mountains which you saw.
18	Tr	transition (connectives)	적절한 연결사 사용	They ate pizza day and night. They became very fat. →They ate pizza day and night. <u>So</u> they became very fat.
17	Cap./SL.	capital letter small letter	대문자 / 소문자	<u>a</u> cat was sleeping on the sofa. →A cat was sleeping on the sofa.
18	?	not clear	무슨 의미인지 이 해가 어려움. 모 호함.	I like Mr.Kim sleeping. And he likes Sam.

19	!	silly mistake	어이 없는 실수	As our plane flew over the mountains we <u>seed</u> snow. →As our plane flew over the mountains, we <u>saw</u> snow.
20	←		앞으로 당기기	
21	★	find a better expression	조금 더 좋은 표 현 찾아보기	
22	FL	think about the flow of the text	글의 흐름을 고치 기	

APPENDIX 5. Fishing With Sam (1st Writing)



APPENDIX 6. PPT Slide (1st Writing)

1. 비디오 내용을 설명해 보세요.
2. 조건: 150 단어 이상
3. 참고 단어

penguin (펭귄), seal (물개), fishing rod (낚싯대),
scarf (목도리), the South Pole (남극)

APPENDIX 7. Worksheet (1st Writing)

1학년 반 번 이름:

Writing #1. Fishing with Sam

★방금 본 애니메이션 내용을 150단어 이상의 영어 단어로 요약(summarize)해 보세요.

5

10

15

20

1줄당 ()단어 x ()줄 총: 단어 (정도)

APPENDIX 8. Direct Correction Feedback (DF)

Today, I saw a short video which is called 'Fishing with Sam.' The main characters of this video are three penguins, polar bear and seal. They like to enjoy fishing but each of them uses different ways to get fish. Penguins and seal are swimming to get the fish and polar bear use fishing rod. Few days later, penguins and seal get some fishes. However, polar bear doesn't. Penguins eat their fish and especially a penguin who wears a scarf also ~~eat~~ seal's fish. Then they go to the polar bear and tease him. So the bear and seal get angry and they try to revenge the penguin. The idea is simple, 'using penguins instead of bait' when they enjoy fishing. Their plan succeed and finally they can enjoy happy fishing with everyone (polar bear, seal, penguins.). I think this video is so interesting and I was surprised that it is possible to make people fun without words. When I saw seal and polar bear get angry, I can guess they will revenge. However, they didn't. They choose, cooperate. I think that is the most great point of this short video. !!

(-titled)
a *a*
a *the* *the*
the *the* *uses* *the* *the*
get any fish.
steals *toward*
the
(are)
(could) *the*
the *the*
the *the* *getting*
could *Surprisingly,* *to*
greatest

APPENDIX 9. Coded Feedback (CF)

The story is about three penguins and seal, polarbear in The South Pole. The polarbear was fishing for food, and other animals tried to catch the fish too, and rude penguin which wearing scarf was steal the seal's fish and swear to other two penguins and polarbear. The angry polarbear and angry seal made a trap for rude penguin. The next day, The rude penguin steal the other penguin's two fishes again and run away. Suddenly the seal appeared and attract a rude penguin to climb. Then the rude penguin fall down on the climb. The polarbear catch him with a net. and The next scene, The rude penguin was tied on the end of the fishing rod and was used for other animal's fishing. This story shown us the rude behavior makes bad effect for me.

APPENDIX 10. Uncoded Feedback (UF)

There were Three penguins, seal and polar bear at the southpole. All of them wanted to eat fishes for there meal. Polar bear was using fishing rod to catch the fishes. Penguins and seal swam to catch fishes. One of the penguins who wear scarf was so smart that he always eat many fishes by stealing others?. He stole other penguins and seal's fish with smart way. Also when polar bear couldn't catch fishes, he tease polar bear very bad say. Polar bear, seal, and other penguins were very mad to him. One day, seal and polar bear Plan to catch him. When three Penguins were eating there meal, penguin who wear scarf stole other penguin's fish one more time. Other penguins were very mad so they were chasing him. When he tried to go out with ice hole, seal prevent him from hole. And seal made he go to cliff and when he fall to go to sea, Polar bear got him with net. After, except for annoying Penguin, they used him to catch fish. I feel we have to live with friends happily.

APPENDIX 11. Birds on Wire (2nd Writing)



APPENDIX 12. Worksheet (2nd Writing)

1학년 반 번 이름:

Writing #2. Birds on wire

★방금 본 애니메이션 내용을 150단어 이상의 영어로 요약(summarize)해 보세요.

5

10

15

20

1줄당 ()단어 x ()줄 총: 단어 (정도)

APPENDIX 13. The Lion's Cage (3rd Writing)



APPENDIX 15. Post-test Questionnaire

설문지

1학년 반 번 이름:

※ 자신의 생각을 솔직하게 써 주세요. (성적에 전혀 반영되지 않습니다.)

1년 동안 영어 A 수업에서 가장 재미있었던 것은 무엇이며, 그 이유는 무엇인가요?

1년 동안 영어 A 수업에서 가장 재미 없었던 것은 무엇이며, 그 이유는 무엇인가요?

1년 동안 영어 A 수업에서 영어 실력 향상에 가장 도움이 된 것은 무엇이며, 그 이유는 무엇인가요?

1년 동안 영어 A 수업에서 가장 도움이 되지 않았던 것은 무엇이며, 그 이유는 무엇인가요?

1년 동안 영어 A 수업에서 가장 힘들었던 것은 무엇이며, 그 이유는 무엇인가요?

1년 동안 영어 A 수업에서 가장 기억에 남는 것은 무엇이며, 그 이유는 무엇인가요?

이번 영어 작문을 하기 전에 영어 작문을 몇 번이나 해 보았나요?

이번 영어 작문 수정을 받기 전 영어 작문 수정을 몇 번, 어디서 받았었나요?

영어로 글을 쓰고 선생님이 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 쳐 주었는데, 영어 실력 향상에 도움이 되었나요?

① 전혀 도움이 되지 않았다 ② 그냥 그랬다 ③ 조금 도움이 되었다 ④ 도움이 되었다 ⑤ 매우 도움이 되었다 ⑥ 기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

영어로 글을 쓰고 선생님이 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 주었는데, 직접 바른 표현으로 고쳐주는 것에 비해 어땠나요?

① 밑줄만 그어 주는 것이 가장 좋다 ② 틀린 항목(code)를 써 주는 것이 더 좋을 것 같다 ③ 바른 표현으로 직접 고쳐주는 것이 좋을 것 같다 ④ 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 긋고 어떤 항목이 틀렸는지 알려주면 좋을 것 같다 ⑤ 어떻게 해도 상관이 없다 ⑥ 기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

영어로 글을 쓰고 선생님이 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 주었는데, 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 긋고 틀린 항목을 써 주는 것에 비해 어땠나요?

① 밑줄만 그어 주는 것이 가장 좋다 ② 틀린 항목(code)를 써 주는 것이 더 좋을 것 같다 ③ 바른 표현으로 직접 고쳐주는 것이 좋을 것 같다 ④ 틀린 부분에 밑줄을 긋고 어떤 항목이 틀렸는지 알려주면 좋을 것 같다 ⑤ 어떻게 해도 상관이 없다 ⑥ 기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

선생님이 어느 정도의 아이디어를 수정해 주는 것이 적당하다고 생각하나요?

① 100% ② 80% ③ 60% ④ 40% ⑤ 20% ⑥ 0% ⑦기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

선생님이 어느 정도의 내용을 수정 해 주는 것이 적당하다고 생각하나요?

① 100% ② 80% ③ 60% ④ 40% ⑤ 20% ⑥ 0% ⑦기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

선생님이 어느 정도의 문법을 수정해 주는 것이 적당하다고 생각하나요?

① 100% ② 80% ③ 60% ④ 40% ⑤ 20% ⑥ 0% ⑦기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

선생님이 어느 정도의 단어를 수정 해 주는 것이 적당하다고 생각하나요?

① 100% ② 80% ③ 60% ④ 40% ⑤ 20% ⑥ 0% ⑦기타:

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

앞으로는 틀린 아이디어를 어떻게 수정 해 주기 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다 ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다 ③틀린 항목의 이름만 써 준다 ④틀린 부분을 적절한 아이디어로 고쳐준다 ⑤기타

그 이유는 무엇인가요?

앞으로 틀린 내용은 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다 ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다 ③틀린 항목의 이름만 써 준다 ④틀린 내용을 바르게 고쳐준다 ⑤기타

그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

앞으로 틀린 문법은 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다 ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다 ③틀린 항목의 이름만 써 준다 ④틀린 부분을 바른 문법 표현으로 고쳐준다 ⑤기타
그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

앞으로 틀린 단어는 어떻게 수정 해 주기를 바라나요?

①전혀 수정 해 주지 않는다 ②틀린 부분에 밑줄을 그어 준다 ③틀린 항목의 이름만 써 준다 ④틀린 부분을 바른 단어로 고쳐준다 ⑤기타
그렇게 생각 한 이유는 무엇인가요?

글쓰기 수업에 대해 선생님께 하고 싶은 말이 있으면 적어주세요.

APPENDIX 16. Rubrics for Scoring

1. Holistic Scoring Rubrics

Points	Description
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- effectively addresses the writing task- is well organized and well developed- uses clearly appropriate details to support a thesis or illustrate ideas- displays consistent facility in the use of language- demonstrates syntactic variety and appropriate word choice, though it may have occasional errors
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- may address some parts of the task more effectively than others- is generally well organized and well developed- uses details to support a thesis or illustrate an idea- displays facility in the use of the language- demonstrates some syntactic variety and range of vocabulary, though it will probably have occasional errors
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- addresses the writing topic, but slight parts of the task- is adequately organized and developed- uses some details to support a thesis or illustrate an idea- displays adequate but possibly inconsistent facility with syntax and use, and it may contain some errors that occasionally obscure meaning
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- inadequate organization or development- inappropriate or insufficient details to support or illustrate generalizations- a noticeably inappropriate choice of words or word forms- an accumulation of errors in sentence structure and/or usage
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- serious disorganization or underdevelopment

	- little or no detail, or irrelevant specifics - serious and frequent errors in sentence structure or usage - serious problems with focus
1	- may be incoherent - may be underdeveloped - may contain severe and persistent writing errors
0	- contains no response - merely copies the topic - is off-topic, is written in a foreign language, or consists only of keystroke characters

2. Grammar (Usage) Scoring Rubrics

Points	Description
5	There are few, minor grammatical errors across the paper so that it is easy to understand the main point and sub points. One-quarter or less than one-quarter of the sentences contain grammatical errors (0–25%). The types of errors are aspects of usage that are acquired at later stages of second language development.
4	There are not as many grammatical errors across the paper and these errors do not interfere with understanding the main points and subpoints. Half or less than half of the sentences contain grammatical errors (26–50%). Also, the types of errors tend to be aspects of usage that are acquired at later stages of second language development (such as the rules for the use of prepositions and articles).
3	There are frequent errors across the paper, but the errors do not interfere with understanding the main points. More than half of the sentences contain grammatical errors (51–74%).
2	Grammatical errors are constant—75% of the sentences have

	grammatical errors. OR the grammatical errors are so serious that it is hard to understand the main points.
1	Due to the limited response given, the writer's pattern of grammatical errors cannot be judged. Because the response has less than eight full typed lines of text (or less than 90 words), there is not enough evidence to judge the writer's control over usage.

3. Mechanics Scoring Rubrics

Points	Description
5	There are few errors across the paper. One-quarter or less than one-quarter of the sentences contain errors in mechanics (0–25%).
4	There are not as many errors across the paper and the errors do not interfere with the understanding of the main points and most of the subpoints. Half or less than half of the sentences contain errors in mechanics (26–50%).
3	There are frequent errors across the paper, but the errors do not interfere with understanding the main points. More than half of the sentences contain errors in mechanics (51–74%).
2	Mechanical errors are constant—75% of the sentences have mechanical errors. OR the errors in mechanics are so serious that it is hard to understand the main points. This sometimes happens with frequent spelling and punctuation errors.
1	Due to the limited response given, the writer's command of mechanics cannot be judged. Because the response has less than eight full typed lines of text (or less than 90 words), there is not enough evidence to judge mechanics.

4. Contents (Organization) Scoring Rubrics

Points	Description
5	<p>-clearly describe the movie and task is well organized and well developed, using clearly appropriate explanations, examples, or details</p> <p>-displays unity, progression, and coherence</p> <p>-idea flow smoothly and there is effective use of transition markers to link ideas both within and between paragraphs</p>
4	<p>- describe the movie well, though some points may not be fully elaborated is generally well organized and well developed, using appropriate and sufficient explanations, examples or details displays unity, progression, and coherence, though it may contain redundancy, digression, or unclear connections</p> <p>-the ideas generally flow fairly smoothly, but sometimes transition markers are lacking or inappropriate.</p>
3	<p>-describe the movie and task using somewhat developed explanations, example or details displays unity, progression, and coherence, though connection of ideas may be occasionally obscured</p> <p>-the ideas only occasionally build on one another and few, if any, appropriate transition makers are used</p>
2	<p>-serious disorganization or underdevelopment irrelevant specifics or questionable responsiveness to the task little or no detail</p> <p>-the ideas almost never build on one another and appropriate transition markers are not used</p>
1	<p>-an essay at this level merely copies words from the topic, rejects the topic, is otherwise unconnected to the topic, or in blank</p> <p>-the ideas never build on one another and no appropriate transition markers are used</p>

국 문 초 록

영어를 공부하는 데 있어 작문은 가장 고차원의 것이며 자신의 생각을 기록하고, 다른 사람과 공유할 수 있다는 점에서 매우 중요하다. 그러나 영어로 글을 많이 쓴다고 해서 영어 작문 실력이 향상되는 것이 아니다. 모국어로 쓴 글은 다른 사람들의 feedback을 받을 기회가 많이 있지만 외국어로서의 영어의 경우에는 교사가 교정을 해주지 않으면 틀린 것들이 화석화(fossilization)에 이를 수 있다. 이에 학자들은 학습자들이 영어 작문에서 feedback을 받는 것은 매우 중요하다고 여긴다. 이러한 feedback의 종류에는 여러 가지가 있지만 가장 많이 쓰이는 것은 다음 세 가지다. (1) direct corrective feedback (2) coded feedback (3) uncoded feedback. 본 연구에서는 위 의 세 가지 서로 다른 feedback 종류가 학습자들의 영어 작문에 어떤 효과를 주는지 알아보기 위해 전체적(holistic) 점수와 항목별(analytic) 점수를 비교했다. 학습자들의 발전을 보기 위해 채점 기준표에 따라 작문을 채점하였고 서로 다른 feedback을 받은 집단의 평균을 비교했고 그 결과는 다음과 같다. direct

feedback은 uncoded feedback과 no-feedback보다 학생 작문 성적에 통계적으로 유의한 도움을 주었다. 상급 집단 학생들에게는 direct feedback이 uncoded feedback과 no-feedback보다 통계적으로 유의미하게 좋은 효과가 있었으며, 중급 집단 학생들에게는 특정 피드백 종류가 학생들에게 유의미하게 도움이 되지는 않았다. 하급 집단 학생들에게는 direct feedback, coded feedback, uncoded feedback 모두가 no-feedback에 비해 유의하게 더 효과가 있었다. 작문 수업을 진행하는 교사는 학생의 수준과 관계 없이 direct feedback을 주는 것이 가장 합리적이다. 그리고 하급 집단의 학생에게는 특히 feedback의 효과가 유의미하고 feedback을 받지 않을 경우에는 작문의 질이 많이 낮아지게 되므로 반드시 feedback을 주는 것이 중요하다.

주요어: 영어작문, 피드백, 수정 유형, 직접 수정, 코드 수정,

밑줄 수정

학 번: 2010-23563