

Instructors' Use of Written Corrective Feedback at a Korean University

John Burrell*

Woosong University

Je-Young Lee

Sehan University

Jee Eun Lee

Woosong University

Burrell, John, Lee, Je-Young & Lee, Jee Eun. (2015). Instructors' use of written corrective feedback at a Korean university. *Modern English Education*, 16(4), 91-111.

The study's aim was to determine how teachers at a Korean university give students written corrective feedback (WCF) in their writing classes. Unlike previous research the participants were not asked how they gave WCF or told to use a specific method, but were asked to show how they gave WCF. Twenty-five Korean and twenty-five foreign professors were given three authentic student texts to mark. The teachers' marking was coded according to a typology developed by Ellis (2009a) and the number of instances of each type of correction was recorded. Overall, the most commonly used method was Direct CF, whereby the teacher gives the student the correct form. This was followed by Indirect A, where the error is indicated and located, but no clue as to the nature of the error is given. The third most common was Metalinguistic A, locating the error and using a code to give the student a hint as to the nature of the error. However, rather than using a single method it was far more common for the teachers to use a combination of WCF, most often using direct correction and some type of indirect correction. The vast majority of the teachers provided Unfocused CF, giving feedback on all types of errors, not limited to one or two specific types. Furthermore, individual teachers used different methods or combinations of methods for each of the three texts. A suggestion for teacher development was presented.

[written corrective feedback/L2 writing/error correction/teacher feedback/
서면교정적피드백/제2언어작문/오류수정/한국대학]

* First author: John Burrell, Second author: Je-Young Lee, Corresponding author: Jee Eun Lee

I. INTRODUCTION

Every teacher who has taught a writing class, or a four skills class with a large writing component, has had the experience of carrying home, or to their office, large, heavy stacks of student work. The subsequent hours providing Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) on student writing can easily be the single most time consuming part of teaching a class dedicated to writing. For most ESL and EFL teachers, there is no debate as to whether they should give their students this feedback or not. Teachers feel it is an important part of their job, the students expect it, and, one could almost say, demand it. Given the large number of editing styles and correction methods available, what do teachers actually do in the classroom regarding WCF? The research in the field focuses mainly on how and what teachers should correct; however, there has been no definitive answer to those questions yet and it is unlikely one will be forthcoming any time soon. Until that question is solved, if it ever is, some more interesting questions for research may be: how do teachers actually correct student writing, do teachers use only one method with their students, and how do teachers come to use the methods that they do? This study was designed to answer two of these questions: How do teachers at a university give corrective feedback on their students' written class work, and do they use more than one method?

From the beginning of the 2015 academic year, at the university where the current study was conducted, a decision was made to emphasize writing in all of the required freshman and sophomore classes. A writing portfolio was required as part of the course assessment to evaluate the students' skill in process writing. The implementation of process writing requires a large amount of revision by the students and feedback on the revisions (Keh, 1990). The change in the curriculum provided an impetus and an opportunity for the researcher to gather data, because the teachers were teaching writing in most of their classes.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of WCF is a very contentious one in the literature. The major questions of what to correct and how to correct have not been settled. Studies in the literature can be used to support almost any view. One of the biggest controversies in the recent literature came when Truscott (1996) argued that there should be no WCF on grammar and that it actually "has significant harmful effects" to the student (p. 328). This viewpoint brought out spirited opposition led principally by Ferris (1999). As fashionable as this debate, and those concerned with error correction in general have been in the literature, the situation faced by the majority of classroom teachers is best summarized by Lee (2004): "However

unnecessary and out of vogue error correction is to some writing researchers, in the classroom, error correction is a real and urgent issue that commands teachers' attention" (p. 286). This point is further supported by a study conducted by Evans, Hartshorn and Tuioti (2010) that surveyed 1,053 L2 writing teachers. The results demonstrated that 99% of teachers provided at least some error correction. Also it was demonstrated that 92% of teachers emphasized that it "is typically part of what they do as L2 writing teachers" (p. 57). However, the study did not investigate the actual feedback types the participants gave.

While the issue of whether or not to give WCF on grammar may not be relevant to the average teacher, the issue of how to give correction is a concern. One major issue is whether direct feedback, providing the correct form for the student writer, or indirect feedback, providing the student with the indication an error has occurred, is more effective. The most vociferous in support of indirect feedback is Ferris (2011) who states: "Classroom error correction research to date points to the overall long-term superiority of indirect feedback" (p. 32). Ferris points to three long term studies (Ferris, 2006; Frantzen, 1995; Lalande, 1982) to support her contention (p. 32); however, more evidence may be necessary to support such a strong position. On the other hand, there are numerous researchers who advocate the opposite view; that direct feedback is superior to indirect feedback (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; S. S. Jang, 2012; B. R. Suh, 2014; Van Beuningen, De Jong, & Kuiken, 2008, 2012). Given the amount of research supporting the superiority of both direct and indirect feedback it is difficult to say who is unequivocally correct.

The situation is further complicated by other research that seems to indicate different combinations of methods may be equally or more effective. An interesting study was conducted by Morra and Asis (2009) whereby written feedback in the form of correction codes was given to some groups and taped comments by the teacher given to others. Both methods were found to be effective. Bitchener, Young, and Cameron (2005) found that full explicit feedback when combined with student conferences helped students improve in their use of the simple past tense. Ellis (2009b) advocates that teachers should use a variety of methods, starting with implicit methods (indirect), and move to the more explicit forms (direct feedback).

In order to determine which method of WCF is best, one trend is towards quasi-experimental studies where different types of WCF are compared. Small groups are given a pre test, followed by different error treatments. Finally, a post test is given. Examples of this type of study can be found in Bitchener et al. (2005), Ferris (2006), Van Beuningen et al. (2012), S. S. Jang (2012) and B. R. Suh (2014). The possible difficulties with this type of study are identified by Storch (2010) as the limited range of structures targeted the length and duration of treatment. However, this does not take into consideration affective factors, such as student attitude to the type of feedback, the

feedback provider, and learner goals. Ferris (2006) pointed out another problem with quasi-experimental studies which occurred in her study, “the three instructors did not adhere consistently to the error-marking scheme on which we had agreed” (p. 87). This raises an important question. How confident can a reader be that the teachers in such studies did strictly adhere to one type of correction? This type of study may be slowly expanding the body of knowledge about WCF, but because they are not carried out in completely authentic classroom conditions they may not be that relevant to the average language teacher (Storch, 2010).

It may be that making recommendations for best teaching practice on the basis of quasi-experimental experiments is not that useful. An example is B. R. Suh (2014) where 43 Korean students were broken into 3 groups: a control of 16 students, a group of 15 students who received indirect WCF, and a group of 12 students who received direct WCF. It was suggested that “direct error correction seems to be a more effective instructional method than indirect coded feedback in improving the accuracy with which Korean university learners use a complex syntactic structure (in new pieces of writing) in a short-term period (p. 810).” This advice was given even though there was no statistically significant difference between the group that received direct written feedback and the group that received indirect coded feedback (p. 807).

While there are many studies that include assumptions of what teachers do concerning WCF, there are very few studies in the literature which actually ask teachers to show how they generally give WCF to their students. Hyland (2003) observed two teachers as they taught their writing courses. The study found that the teachers used error codes with their students, both indirect and metalinguistic. The indirect codes indicated where the errors were by circling or underlining the error. The metalinguistic codes indicated where the error was and gave a clue to what the error was; for example, a “T” above the error indicates the error has to do with tense. However, the teachers used other methods of correction as well: writing comments in the margins, general comments at the end of the work, and direct corrections where the teacher would cross out an error and write the correct form. Lee (2004) in a study of Hong Kong secondary school teachers found they used mainly direct correction and metalinguistic coded feedback. Ferris (2006) found that even when the two teachers were instructed to give feedback using 15 specific codes, they ended up using different methods such as direct correction, marking where an error occurred but giving no code to indicate what type of error it was, and using a code not included in the 15 specific codes developed for the survey.

III. METHOD

1. Subjects

The participants in the study were all English instructors employed at a Korean university. It was decided to give a questionnaire to a convenience sample of 25 native speaking teachers and a population sample of 25 Korean speaking teachers. The surveys were administered and collected in spring semester, 2015.

2. Instrument

The researchers did not construct a survey that asked the participants to report the methods they used to provide WCF; instead it was decided to construct an instrument that asked the participants to demonstrate the actual methods they use to provide WCF. The participants were given three examples of authentic student writing and were asked to give the type of written feedback they generally gave to their students. The goal of the study was to find exactly what methods teachers used in class, not ideal methods or what they thought they should do. Towards this end, the participants were asked to assume that this was not the first time they had given the students feedback and the students understood whatever method the teacher used. They were then encouraged to mark the examples in the same way they would in their classes. There were also 6 demographic questions on the instrument concerning native language, level of education, additional training, and the amount of time they have taught writing and EFL/ESL in general. At the end of the instrument, there were two open ended questions: one to ask the teachers how they handled student work that was submitted electronically and the other a chance for the participants to give additional or general comments.

The texts used in the survey were chosen from a large body of authentic student writings. The first student text is the most problematic and is a good example of writing which needs a lot of corrective feedback in all areas of writing. The second passage is a representative example of a student text produced in the middle of a semester in an intermediate class at the university where the research was conducted. The third text is more ambitious than the others, while still in need of a lot of revision. The texts used were representative of the writing the participants see in their classes on a regular basis.

The instrument was piloted using a small, select group of teachers. As a consequence, one major change and some minor changes were made. In the original instrument, on each page after the student text there were blank lines. The participants in the pilot asked if they had to write comments on the lines provided. This made the researchers realize that the lines would skew the response by having the participants think they may have had to

provide some sort of feedback at the end of the student texts. The lines were removed for the final version of the instrument.

In addition to the survey, five of the participants agreed to a follow up interview a few weeks after the survey was given. A semi structured interview was conducted in a classroom. The interview was recorded and transcribed.

3. Analysis

A review of the literature included an article by Ellis (2009a) in which he laid out a typology of possible teacher options for giving WCF to students. The researchers decided to use his typology with some modifications as a priori codes in analyzing the data. The codes are as follows (Ellis, 2009a, p. 98):

TABLE 1
Codes Used in the Analysis

Code	Explanation
Direct CF (Di)	The teacher provides the student the correct form, usually above the location of the error. The error is often crossed out.
Indirect CF Two Types:	The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction.
Indirect A (IndA)	Indicating and locating the error – This often takes the form of underlining or circling errors and the use of cursers or arrows to show omissions in the students' texts.
Indirect B (IndB)	Indication only – This takes the form of an indication in the margins that an error or errors have taken place in a line of text.
Metalinguistic CF Two Types:	The teacher provides some type of a metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error.
Metalinguistic A (MA)	The error is located and an error codes (ww = wrong word) is written above the error or in the margin.
Metalinguistic B (MB)	Teacher numbers the errors in the text and writes a brief grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text or in the margin.
Reformulation (REF)	The teacher reworks the student's entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the original content intact.
The focus of the feedback (FOC):	This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the student's errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct.
Unfocused CF	CF is extensive - all error types are treated, but every instance of an error may not be treated.
Focused CF	CF is intensive – only 1 or 2 types of errors are treated such as articles or verb tense.
GenComGram (GCG)	General comments about grammar with no indication of where the errors occurred or how many of them there were.
GenComPara (GCP)	General comments about paragraph structure, indenting, etc.
GenComInstruc (GCI)	These were various specific instructions to the student that did not pertain to grammar, vocabulary, or paragraph structure, such as: "rewrite", "see me", or "do not use a translator."
GenComEncour (GCE)	These were any comments of encouragement, such as "good job".

After reviewing a number of the questionnaires, these codes proved very useful, but it was apparent that additional codes were needed. Even without the lines below each text, many of the teachers included general comments at the bottom of the pages. The last four codes were created to describe this type of WCF.

Once the codes were determined the surveys were examined and every example of each feedback type was counted for each student text. To ensure intercoder reliability, 10 random surveys were picked out and given to another researcher to examine. The coders agreed on a total of 402 out of 428 codes for an intercoder reliability of 94%.

The data was recorded in a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and then imported into SPSS. While the results were primarily descriptive, Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis test were used, in order to determine if there was any association between subgroups in the study. The results of Kolmogorov-Smirnov were used to determine the responses were not normally distributed. This necessitated the use of non-parametric tests.

IV. RESULTS

The demographic questions on the questionnaire provided a clear picture of the participants in the study as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Participants' Profiles

	Number	% of Total
<u>Education</u>		
No answer	1	2
MA	31	64
PhD	18	36
<u>Years Teaching ESL/EFL</u>		
0 - 1	2	4
1+ - 5	9	18
5+ - 10	19	38
10+ - 15	14	28
15+ - 20	3	6
20 +	3	6
<u>Years Teaching Writing</u>		
0 - 1	13	26
1+ - 5	16	32
5+ - 10	16	32
10+ - 15	4	8
15+ - 20	1	2
<u>Native Language</u>		
No answer	1	2
English	22	44
Korean	25	50
Other	2	4

The majority of the participants have an MA, but a significant number have a PhD (36%). Regarding the participants teaching experience, 78% have been teaching more than five years. However, only 42%, less than half have been teaching writing for as long. Perhaps this difference can be attributed to the practice of having native speaking English teachers teach more conversation oriented courses, or the lack of emphasis given to writing courses in some overseas university programs.

The results clearly answered the research question: How do teachers at one Korean University give corrective feedback on their students' written class work and do they use more than one method? The teachers do use a variety of methods and most use more than one method at a time. The teachers also showed variation in their methods between the different student texts.

Table 3 breaks the number of teachers out of fifty that used each method in the different student texts. The method need only be used once to be counted.

TABLE 3
Number of Teachers that Used Each Method of WCF

Codes	Student Text #1		Student Text #2		Student Text #3	
Direct CF	31	62%	41	82%	40	80%
Indirect A	25	50%	23	46%	28	56%
Indirect B	6	12%	3	6%	4	8%
Metalinguistic A	18	36%	26	52%	16	32%
Metalinguistic B	5	10%	16	32%	4	8%
GenComGram	20	40%	14	28%	12	24%
GenComPara	13	26%	8	16%	14	28%
GenComInstruc	15	30%	10	20%	12	24%
GenComEncour	7	14%	8	16%	10	20%
Reformulation	8	16%	3	6%	0	0%
Unfocused CF	45	90%	45	90%	44	88%
Focused CF	5	10%	5	10%	6	12%

Overall, Direct CF, where the teacher gives the student the correct form, was the most commonly used method. This was followed by Indirect A where the error is indicated and located, but no clue as to the nature of the error is given. The third most common was Metalinguistic A, locating the error and using a code to give the student a hint as to the nature of the error. The vast majority of the teachers provided Unfocused CF, giving feedback on all types of errors, not limited to one or two specific types.

Table 4 shows the total number of times each method was used by all teachers in each student text. Every instance of use of each method was counted.

TABLE 4
Total Number of Times Each Method Was Used

Codes	Student Text #1		Student Text #2		Student Text #3	
Direct CF	245	44%	686	65%	612	60.2%
Indirect A	120	21%	185	18%	202	19.9%
Indirect B	8	1%	5	.47%	8	.8%
Metalinguistic A	72	13%	91	8.6%	101	10%
Metalinguistic B	21	4%	24	2.3%	11	1%
GenComGram	46	8%	26	2.5%	20	2%
GenComPara	17	3%	15	1.4%	34	3.6%
GenComInstruc	17	3%	13	1.2%	15	1.5%
GenComEncour	7	1.2%	9	.9%	10	.98%
Reformulation	8	1%	3	.3%	0	0%

As with the number of teachers who used each method, Direct CF was used many more times in total than any other method. This was followed by Indirect A and Metalinguistic A, with the total use of the other methods lagging far behind.

While the totals of the methods provide valuable insight, the majority of the teachers did not use a single method; they used a combination. It would be impractical and unwieldy to show all of the combinations due to the high number of eclectic combinations of the 10 methods that were used by only a single teacher. Table 5 shows the most common combinations of the first five methods.

TABLE 5
Instances of Use of Combinations of Methods

Method combination	Student Text #1	Student Text #2	Student Text #3
Direct CF	9	16	16
Reformulation	8	3	0
Direct CF, Indirect A, & Metalinguistic A	8	9	12
Indirect A & Metalinguistic A	6	0	0
Direct CF & Indirect A	5	5	6
Indirect A	2	3	6

Notable is how the teachers' use of methods changed over the course of giving WCF on the three student texts. For the first text, reformulation was used by 8 of the teachers, the second text 3, and for the third text no teachers used the method. The exclusive use of Direct CF increased in use over the three texts, with 9 teachers using it for the first text, but 16 teachers using it for second and third. An interesting point is that only 5 of the teachers, who used Direct CF exclusively in the first text, used it exclusively in the second text. For the third text 7 of the 9 teachers used Direct CF exclusively. Two of the teachers reverted back to exclusive use of Direct CF for the third text. Of the 16 teachers who used Direct CF exclusively on the second text, 5 did not use it exclusively in the third text, choosing a combination of methods, while a different group of 5 teachers decided to use Direct CF exclusively for this text, having used a combination of methods for texts 1 and 2. To sum

up, the majority of the teachers used a variety of methods and did not limit themselves to the same method, or combination of methods, for each student text.

TABLE 6
Results of Mann-Whitney Tests between Education and Native Language and the Methods of WCF

Method	Di		IndA		IndB		MA		MB		REF	
	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z
Student Text 1												
Ed		-.610		-.111		-1.11		-.072		-.217		-.526
MA 31	24.08		25.16		25.98		25.10		24.82		25.55	
PhD 18	26.58		24.72		23.31		24.83		25.31		24.06	
Lang		-.503		-.251		-.055		-.832		-2.19*		-1.34
Eng 22	25.05		24.50		24.07		22.52		21.50		25.86	
Ko 25	23.08		23.56		23.94		22.66		26.20		22.36	
Student Text 2												
Ed		-.989		-.630		-1.34		-1.73		-1.62		-.393
MA 31	23.47		25.90		25.87		27.24		23.37		25.21	
PhD 18	27.64		23.44		23.50		21.14		27.81		24.64	
Lang		-.503		-.486		-1.52		-2.41*		-2.86**		-1.06
Eng 22	22.93		24.95		25.14		28.16		20.00		23.43	
Ko 25	24.94		23.16		23.00		20.34		27.52		25.28	
Student Text 3												
Ed		-1.41		-1.07		-.502		-1.31		-.437		.000
MA 31	28.81		26.60		25.37		26.71		25.32		25.00	
PhD 18	28.78		22.25		24.36		22.06		24.44		25.00	
Lang		-1.00		-1.35		-.198		-2.02*		-1.93		.000
Eng 22	21.86		26.77		24.20		27.57		22.00		24.00	
Ko 25	25.88		21.56		23.82		20.86		25.76		24.00	
Method	GC		GCG		GCP		GCI		GCE		FOC	
	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z	MR	Z
Student Text 1												
Ed		-.057		-1.28		-.672		-2.26*		-1.07		-.158
MA 31	24.92		23.22		25.81		27.84		25.95		24.87	
PhD 18	25.14		28.06		23.61		20.11		23.36		25.22	
Lang		-.270		-.852		-.072		-3.14*		-.701		-.619
Eng 22	23.48		25.57		24.11		29.45		23.14		24.70	
Ko 25	24.46		22.62		23.90		19.20		24.76		23.38	
Student Text 2												
Ed		-.657		-.574		-.210		-1.33		-1.78		-1.78
MA 31	25.92		24.29		24.79		26.68		26.03		25.16	
PhD 18	23.42		26.22		25.36		22.11		23.22		27.47	
Lang		-.762		-.231		-1.60		-2.27*		-.588		-1.16
Eng 22	22.55		23.64		22.02		27.45		24.77		25.90	
Ko 25	25.28		24.32		25.74		20.96		23.32		22.94	
Student Text 3												
Ed		-.479		-.413		-.521		-1.48		-.999		-.183
MA 31	25.66		24.52		25.65		26.65		26.03		25.16	
PhD 18	23.86		25.53		23.89		23.89		23.22		24.72	
Lang		.000		-.637		-.501		-2.02*		-.196		-.619
Eng 22	24.00		24.93		24.84		27.18		24.27		24.70	
Ko 25	24.00		23.18		23.86		21.20		23.76		23.38	

The researchers wanted to know if there were any associations between the level of education, native language, years teaching, and years teaching writing of the instructors and any particular methods of written corrective feedback. In order to determine if parametric or non-parametric tests should be used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run for all of the methods of WCF to determine if the responses were normally distributed. The results for all of the methods were significant at < 0.05 indicating the responses were not normally distributed except for Direct WCF in Student Texts one and two which were above 0.05. This indicated that the responses in these two cases were normally distributed. However, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is very conservative and when the responses for both were plotted on histograms the results in both cases were quite deviated to the left, showing the lack of normal distribution.

The results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests and the histograms showed the need to use the non-parametric tests Mann-Whitney and Kruskal-Wallis. Table 6 shows the results of the Mann-Whitney tests that were run to determine if there were any associations between Education and Native Language and any of the methods of WCF.

The results of the tests failed to show any significant associations between level of Education or Native Language in all three Student Texts except for one case. In the case of General Comments giving Instruction (GCI) there was a significant association between Native Language and the use of this method. An examination of the frequencies found that English speakers gave more of this type of comment than did Korean speakers. Other research has shown differences between teachers in how they give WCF according to educational background (Hartshorn, Evans & Tuioti, 2014); however, the results were obtained through teacher self reporting rather than actual examples of WCF. Lee (2009) demonstrated that there were significant differences in what teachers believed about WCF and how they actually carried it out. There are many recommendations for using Direct correction for students with less proficiency (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009, 2010; Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, 2008; Lee, 2004; Sheen, 2007); however, there is not enough research that shows teachers actually use Direct correction more with lower proficiency students.

Table 7 shows the results of the Kruskal Wallis tests between years of teaching, years of teaching writing, and the different methods of WCF.

TABLE 7
Results of the Kruskal-Wallis tests between Years of Teaching and Methods of WCF

Method	Di	IndA	IndB	MA	MB	REF	
	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	
Student Text 1							
Years	Number						
0 - 1	2	27.50	27.25	22.50	29.50	23.00	30.00
1+ - 5	9	33.78	18.83	25.17	19.78	31.44	24.44
5+ - 10	19	28.47	29.37	26.61	27.29	24.29	26.68
10+ - 15	14	19.89	21.82	25.93	22.57	24.75	21.07
15+ - 20	3	10.00	43.67	22.50	33.83	23.00	30.00
20+	3	22.17	18.83	22.50	34.00	23.00	21.67
Student Text 2							
0 - 1	2	28.00	28.50	24.00	32.25	21.50	26.50
1+ - 5	9	30.94	23.56	24.00	22.11	27.22	26.50
5+ - 10	19	24.37	23.16	25.34	23.89	26.50	26.50
10+ - 15	14	25.25	23.75	25.71	24.29	25.00	22.93
15+ - 20	3	14.50	38.50	32.50	41.50	21.50	26.50
20+	3	26.83	20.33	24.00	27.67	21.50	26.50
Student Text 3							
0 - 1	2	21.25	29.00	23.50	29.25	23.50	25.50
1+ - 5	9	29.11	19.67	26.11	24.17	32.00	25.50
5+ - 10	19	25.55	28.39	26.21	26.21	24.74	25.50
10+ - 15	14	26.71	22.00	25.29	22.64	23.50	25.50
15+ - 20	3	8.33	40.67	23.50	33.67	23.50	25.50
20+	3	28.67	23.50	23.50	27.67	23.50	25.50
Method	GC	GCG	GCP	GCI	GCE	FOC	
	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	
Student Text 1							
Years	Number						
0 - 1	2	20.50	27.25	19.00	30.00	22.00	23.00
1+ - 5	9	30.39	26.72	29.44	29.50	27.56	25.78
5+ - 10	19	25.84	23.95	25.58	27.24	23.32	26.95
10+ - 15	14	23.18	25.96	20.68	21.43	29.14	23.00
15+ - 20	3	24.17	21.33	28.83	26.00	22.00	31.33
20+	3	24.17	32.50	36.67	18.00	22.00	23.00
Student Text 2							
0 - 1	2	24.25	31.75	21.50	32.25	21.50	23.00
1+ - 5	9	28.44	24.94	24.17	31.50	26.94	23.00
5+ - 10	19	26.74	25.37	26.19	23.50	24.08	26.95
10+ - 15	14	21.04	24.79	23.21	22.18	27.04	24.79
15+ - 20	3	28.00	18.50	21.50	36.17	21.50	31.33
20+	3	28.00	34.17	38.67	20.50	29.67	23.00
Student Text 3							
0 - 1	2	24.75	33.25	28.50	31.50	33.00	22.50
1+ - 5	9	28.89	24.50	23.33	30.17	26.06	25.28
5+ - 10	19	27.24	25.95	28.45	25.18	24.45	23.86
10+ - 15	14	21.39	24.89	20.43	22.93	24.07	27.86
15+ - 20	3	20.83	19.50	26.33	19.50	20.50	30.83
20+	3	28.67	29.33	34.17	27.50	37.17	22.50

TABLE 8
Results of the Kruskal-Wallis tests between Years of Teaching Writing and Methods of WCF

Method		Di	IndA	IndB	MA	MB	REF
MR		MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR
Student Text 1							
Years	Numbers						
0 - 1	13	25.73	23.08*	24.35	22.31	27.08	22.31
1+ - 5	16	27.59	18.78	18.78	23.97	27.50	23.75
5+ - 10	16	25.31	33.19	33.19	28.72	23.00	28.44
10+ - 15	4	21.00	26.00	26.00	24.88	23.00	30.00
15+ - 20	1	10.00	39.50	39.50	42.50	23.00	30.00
Student Text 2							
0 - 1	13	33.46	19.81*	24.00***	19.85*	27.19	26.50
1+ - 5	16	22.50	21.50	24.00	24.41	28.00	23.38
5+ - 10	16	22.59	33.44	25.59	26.88	22.88	26.50
10+ - 15	4	26.88	25.63	30.00	38.63	21.50	26.50
15+ - 20	1	11.00	36.00	49.50	42.00	21.50	26.50
Student Text 3							
0 - 1	13	32.77	19.35*	25.42	22.58	27.46	25.50
1+ - 5	16	25.31	21.34	24.97	23.78	26.53	25.50
5+ - 10	16	22.22	33.56	26.72	28.50	23.50	25.50
10+ - 15	4	20.75	26.38	23.50	25.13	23.50	25.50
15+ - 20	1	5.50	39.50	23.50	44.50	23.50	25.50
Method		GC	GCG	GCP	GCI	GCE	FOC
MR		MR	MR	MR	MR	MR	MR
Student Text 1							
Years	Numbers						
0 - 1	13	25.42	28.19	25.00	24.12	28.77	28.77
1+ - 5	16	27.72	24.59	24.88	27.47	24.56	24.56
5+ - 10	16	24.22	23.28	24.88	27.00	24.56	25.56
10+ - 15	4	20.50	27.38	26.38	18.00	23.00	23.00
15+ - 20	1	31.50	33.00	48.50	18.00	23.00	23.00
Student Text 2							
0 - 1	13	24.31	25.00	25.54	26.69	21.50	24.92
1+ - 5	16	28.06	24.38	26.22	27.84	27.63	26.13
5+ - 10	16	23.59	26.66	24.50	22.28	26.09	24.56
10+ - 15	4	24.25	28.75	27.50	20.50	28.63	29.25
15+ - 20	1	35.50	18.50	21.50	44.00	21.50	23.00
Student Text 3							
0 - 1	13	24.77	27.81	24.46	25.46	22.42	26.35
1+ - 5	16	24.88	22.31	25.84	25.50	25.19	27.19
5+ - 10	16	26.22	25.44	25.47	25.91	26.75	22.50
10+ - 15	4	24.75	32.50	23.50	25.50	33.00	28.75
15+ - 20	1	36.50	19.50	42.00	19.50	20.50	22.50

There were no instances of significant association between any of the methods of WCF and years of teaching. There was only one instance where there was a significant association between the number of years teaching writing and a specific method of WCF over all three of the student texts. There was a significant association between the number

of years of teaching writing and Indirect Method A where the teacher underlines or circles errors and uses cursers or arrows to show omissions in the students' texts. For student texts 1, 2, and 3 the p values were 0.032, 0.040, and 0.035 respectively. Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate pair wise differences among the five groups. The results of the tests indicated a significant difference between teachers with more than five years of teaching writing but less than ten years of teaching writing. Also, there was a difference between teachers with zero to one year and teachers with more than one year but less than five years of teaching writing. The use of the Indirect A method of WCF was greater in the group of teachers with more than five, but less than ten years of teaching writing.

Looking at the data from the focus group the biggest concern that the participants had was the time that WCF took, especially if the teachers had large classes. More than one mentioned they would like to do more for their students but just didn't have the time. Other concerns were if the students understood the WCF they were given. This shaded in to concerns of whether the students paid attention to the teachers' WCF at all. One participant linked the amount of WCF a student receives to the amount of effort the student puts in, "If the student seems to have put in some effort, he/she gets extensive feedback. Otherwise, it tends to be perfunctory."

When asked how they come to use the methods they do, the responses were more varied. Two participants developed their way of giving WCF over time on their own. One participant stated they were taught how to give WCF in their graduate program, but their actual practice had changed over time through experience. Another participant explained they still used the method that was required by an institution in the Middle East they had worked at previously. The focus group further illustrated the variety in how the teachers gave WCF and the process by which they decide on specific methods of WCF.

V. DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to determine how teachers at one Korean university gave WCF to their students and the study succeeded in answering this question. The teachers used a variety of methods and were not confined to the same methods when marking different texts.

There were only two significant associations with a specific method of WCF and a group of teachers. The first was between native language and giving general Comments of Instruction. The study found English speaking teachers gave more General Comments of Instruction than Korean speaking teachers. The English speaking instructors' comments tended to be instructions to rewrite the entire passage, especially for the first Student Text, but not on specifics of how to do it. There were also a number of instructions not to use

electronic or online translation software.

The second significant association found in the study was between the teachers' years of teaching writing and the method indirect A, where the teacher indicates and locates errors by underlining or circling errors and uses cursors or arrows to show omissions in the students' texts. This method was the second most common method in the study after direct correction. Two of the four teachers with more than ten, but no more than fifteen years' experience, used the indirect method of WCF, as well as the single teacher with more than fifteen years of teaching writing. The study found teachers with more than five, but no more than ten years of teaching writing used this method significantly more than teachers with less experience. The reason why the method was favored by this group of teachers is not answered in this study. Is it because they have found it to be more effective in helping their students improve their writing, or perhaps because it can be done quickly? Indirect correction is considered by many prominent researchers as the most effective (Ferris, 2011). There is also research that points to the preference for indirect correction by students (Ferris, 2006; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Leki, 1991). While there seems to be a trend towards a preference for indirect correction in the literature by a significant segment of researchers, further research must be done to determine if indirect correction is actually more effective than other methods.

Reformulation was the least used of the methods of WCF, but had the most dramatic difference in use between the three student texts. In regards to the first student text, the nine teachers who used reformulation may have come to the decision due to the large number and severity of problems of all types in the relatively short passage. They may have believed that the student would be better served to have a correct model to emulate rather than attempt to repair all of the errors. In the subsequent texts they made the decision that the errors were not serious enough to warrant a complete rewrite of the student's work. The length of the Student Texts may also have had an effect. The first text was relatively short, so rewriting would not be as time consuming for the teacher. The large number of errors and short length of the first text would account for the greater usage of reformulation in that text. Even though Reformulation was little used by the teachers in the current study, it does have a great deal of potential to help students improve their writing ability not only at the lexical and form level, but also at the macro level of organization and content (Yang & Zhang, 2010). The biggest impediment to implementing Reformulation on a wide scale is the time it takes.

The fact that teachers used a wide variety of methods shows flexibility in responding to different student texts. Exposing the students to a wide range of WCF may better respond to students' diverse needs (Morra & Asis, 2009). A combination of methods may better target the different types of errors. If the error is something the student has no knowledge of, for example specific vocabulary, Ellis (2009b), proposes that direct correction should

be used; however, if they have some knowledge of the vocabulary, indirect correction should be used. Further support for this can be found in S. S. Jang (2014) where the higher proficiency group benefitted more from indirect correction than the lower proficiency group. When the error was just pointed out, the higher proficiency students were able to self-correct because they had some knowledge about the error. On the other hand, B. Kim (2009) found that low level students benefitted more from direct corrective feedback. Additionally lower level students may benefit from an emphasis on meaning based feedback as opposed to an emphasis on form based feedback (W. Y. Kim, 2012). Interestingly, J. H. Kim (2010) found that teachers may unconsciously or automatically adjust their correction method to suit the students' level. There were only two teachers in the study, but it brings up the intriguing question if such unconscious adjustment to student level has any relationship to the amount of teacher experience. A general recommendation may be that if the teacher is aware of what aspects of the language the students have and have not been exposed to, perhaps a combination of direct and indirect feedback methods would be the most effective.

Flexibility may also help to account for the large number of teachers who used unfocused correction and marked at least some examples of all types of errors. Only two teachers used focused feedback for all three passages. Of the two, one dealt with different grammatical points in each passage and the other only commented on the content. This runs counter to a lot of the literature which recommends focused correction (Bitchener, 2008; Semke, 1984; Truscott, 2001). However, the texts in the study were relatively short and there were only three to mark. It would be worth investigating if the use of focused correction would go up if the texts were considerably longer. A number of the general comments on the survey used the words "time consuming" when describing teaching writing and the members of the focus group remarked on the time providing feedback takes. Unfortunately the amount of time it takes to mark longer student texts for a large class may have a negative impact on the method of correction and focus of the feedback used by the teacher.

If one method of providing WCF is found to be superior then certainly the use of other methods would be a waste of time or even harmful to student development. It is unknown how many EFL or ESL teachers exclusively use one method to give WCF, but in the present study only five exclusively used one method (Direct CF) in all three student texts. There is the possibility that the variety of methods shows an inconsistency in the training the teachers have received in the field of teaching writing in general. It is possible to go through an MA TESOL program and take no course specifically on the teaching of writing. This would certainly be true for any other MA or PhD programs that had nothing to do with education. There were no instructors in the study with a DELTA qualification, and it would be interesting to see if teachers who had this particular course of training were more

consistent in how they give WCF. In addition, the accuracy of teachers' WCF in general is an area for concern. Lee (2004) found that from the 58 teachers in the study, the amount of accurate feedback was only slightly above fifty percent (p. 302). This is surprising given that the participants were licensed teachers in the Hong Kong school system in dedicated writing classes.

One possible recommendation to alleviate any concerns about the quality of writing instruction and WCF given by teachers would be a workshop or series of workshops dedicated to writing instruction in general. In regards to WCF, the teachers could do an exercise similar to the one in the study and have them discuss why they chose their particular method. The range of possible methods of WCF could then be presented. At this point in time the workshops probably should not be used to advocate one particular standard method of WCF, but to expose teachers to a variety of methods of WCF, as the superiority of one method has not yet been established. The purpose of such seminars would be to introduce the faculty to methods of WCF they may not have covered in their previous training, with the intention of making them more well-rounded and versatile teachers.

VI. CONCLUSION

The present study demonstrates through a questionnaire given to fifty teachers, how the teachers at one Korean university give WCF to their students. As Ferris (2006) also found, the teachers used a variety of methods with direct correction being the most common followed by indirect A where the error was indicated and located. However, the teachers did not just use a single method, but used a combination of methods that varied even between the three examples of student work. Given the few number of studies which show what teachers actually do in their classes, more work should be done in this area. A lot more research would have to be done to see if teachers at other universities and teaching environments give WCF in the same way. The study does not definitively answer the obvious follow up question of why the teachers used a variety of methods. Further, are their choices of WCF based on a particular paradigm or did they come to use them gradually over time as they had more experience teaching writing? Is there a difference in the ESL compared to the EFL environment? These are all questions that would be fertile areas for future research.

Another issue arising from the study is how the teachers' methods of WCF compare with the students' preferences for WCF. A number of studies have found that students prefer direct correction (Alshahrani & Storch, 2014; Elwood & Bode, 2014; Hajian, Farahani & Shirazi, 2014; Hamouda, 2011). While direct correction was the most common

method used by the teachers in the present study, it was closely followed by Indirect correction. How students and teachers adapt to a mismatch in preference and practice is another area for further research.

One limitation to the study was that it included instructors at only one university. The results of the study cannot be generalized to other instructors at other institutions. Involving instructors from a wide range of institutions would be a valuable next step in researching WCF. In addition, more in depth follow up interviews should be conducted with instructors to help more fully understand how they come to use their choice of the methods of WCF.

REFERENCES

- Alshahrani, A., & Storch, N. (2014). Investigating teachers' written corrective feedback practices in a Saudi EFL context: How do they align with their beliefs, institutional guidelines, and student preferences? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37(2), 101-122.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 193-214.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
- 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.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- Ellis, R. (2009a). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Ellis, R. (2009b). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
- 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.
- Elwood, J. A., & Bode, J. (2014). Student preferences vis-à-vis teacher feedback in university EFL writing classes in Japan. *System*, 42, 333-343.

- Evans, N. W., Hartshorn, K. J., & Tuioti, E. A. (2010). Written corrective feedback: Practitioners' perspectives. *IJES*, 10 (2), 47-77.
- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: Response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-11.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on short-term 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, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10(3), 161-184.
- Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *Modern Language Journal*, 79, 329-344.
- Hajian, L., Farahani, A. A. K., & Shirazi, M. A. (2014). A study of students' and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Iranian EFL context. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(5), 287-297.
- Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128-141.
- Hartshorn, K. J., Evans, N. W., & Tuioti, E. A. (2014). Influences on teachers' corrective feedback choices in second language writing. *Writing & Pedagogy*, 6(2), 251-282.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System*, 31(2), 217-230.
- Jang, Sung-Soo. (2012). Effects of written corrective feedback-based revision on L2 acquisition. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 28(4), 187-215.
- Jang, Sung-Soo. (2014). Learners' proficiency level and the efficacy of written corrective feedback on L2 acquisition. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 30(3), 27-49.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: Model and methods for interpretation. *ELT Journal*, 44 (4), 294-304.
- Kim, Boram. (2009). Proficiency level and the relative effects of different corrective feedback options on EFL student writing. *English Teaching*, 64(4), 203-222.
- Kim, Ji-Hyun. (2010) Grammar correction in L2 writing: Effects, types of errors, and types of feedback. *Foreign Languages Education*, 17(1), 1-30.
- Kim, Woo-Young. (2012). A study of teacher feedback types on English writing among Korean students. *Journal of Linguistic Studies*, 17(3), 25-44.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: Experiment. *Modern Language*

- Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in the L2 secondary writing classrooms: Case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285-312.
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13-22.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3), 203-218.
- Morra, A. M., & Asís, M. I. (2009). The effect of audio and written teacher responses on EFL student revision. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 39(2), 68-81.
- Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(3), 195-202.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283.
- Storch, N. (2010). Critical feedback on written corrective feedback research. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 29-46.
- Suh, Bo-Ram. (2014). The effectiveness of direct and indirect coded written feedback in English as a foreign language. *Language Research*, 50(3), 795-814.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (2001). Selecting errors for selective error correction. *Studies in English Literature and Linguistics*, 27(2), 93-108.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156, 279-296.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62(1), 1-41.
- Yang, L., & Zhang, L. (2010). Exploring the role of reformulations and a model text in EFL students' and a model text in EFL students' writing performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 14 (4), 464-484.

Examples in: English

Applicable Languages: English

Applicable Levels: Tertiary

John Burrell
Department of General English Program
Woosong University

196-5, Jayang-dong, Dong-Ku, Daejeon,
Korea, 300-831
Tel: 042-630-9780
Email: johnburrell@woosong.org

Je-Young Lee
Department of English Education
1113, Noksaek-ro, Samho-eup, Youngam-gun, Jeollanam-do,
Korea, 526-702
Tel: 061-469-1231
Email: zepp94@sehan.ac.kr

Jee Eun Lee
Department of General English Program
Woosong University
W6-402 63, Jayang-dong, Dong-Ku, Daejeon,
Korea, 34415
Tel: 042-630-9782
Email: kkaching@hanmail.net

Received 15 September 2015

Revised 1 November 2015

Accepted 20 November 2015