กลวิธีการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของครูที่มีต่อการแก้ไขงานเขียนของผู้เรียน
: กรณีศึกษาวิชาการเขียนของวิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ
Strategies in Giving Feedback by Writing Teachers and
Their Effects on Learners' Revisions : A Case Study of Writing
Classes for English Majors

สุภาพร สีสังข์ [1]และ พิมพ์ยุพา ประพันธ์ [2]
Supapohn Seesang and Dr. Pimyupa W. Praphan

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อศึกษากลวิธีการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของครูต่องานเขียนของผู้เรียน เพื่อศึกษาผลการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของครูที่มีต่อการแก้ไขงานเขียนผู้เรียนโดยมีการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับที่แตกต่างกัน แก่นักศึกษาวิชาเอกภาษาอังกฤษ จำนวน 20 คนซึ่งลงทะเบียนวิชาการเขียนเชิงขยายความและแสดงความคิดเห็น และจูงใจให้ผู้อ่านเห็นคล้อยตาม(Expository and Argumentative Composition) และวิชาการเขียนเชิงพรรณนา และเชิงบรรยายความ (Narrative and Descriptive Composition) โดยใช้วิธีการสอนแบบเน้นกระบวนการ ตลอด ระยะเวลา 16 สัปดาห์งานเขียนของผู้เรียนประกอบด้วย 3 รูปแบบ อันได้แก่ การเขียนแสดงความคิดเห็นและ จูงใจให้ผู้อ่านเห็นคล้อยตาม (argument)การเขียนเชิงพรรณนา (narration) และเชิงบรรยายความ (description) โดยผู้เรียนได้รับมอบหมายให้เขียนตาม 3 รูปแบบดังกล่าว จำนวนรูปแบบละ 2 หัวข้อเครื่องมือที่ใช้ในการวิจัย ได้แก่ แบบบันทึกการสังเกตการจัดกิจกรรมการเรียนการสอน และเครื่องบันทึกเสียงสถิติที่ใช้ในการวิเคราะห์ข้อมูล ได้แก่ ค่าเฉลี่ย ร้อยละ ส่วนเบี่ยงเบนมาตรฐาน และการทดสอบค่าที การวิเคราะห์ข้อมูลได้มาจากการเปรียบ เทียบการเขียนฉบับร่างที่ 1 กับฉบับร่างที่ 2และหัวข้อแรกกับหัวข้อต่อไปของแต่ละรูปแบบการเขียน เพื่อตรวจ สอบการพัฒนาการเขียนของผู้เรียน (คุณภาพการเขียนแบบองค์รวม และข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียน) ผลการวิจัย พบว่ากลวิธีการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของครูต่องานเขียนของผู้เรียนที่ใช้มากที่สุดได้แก่ การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับด้วยการ เขียนและด้วยการวาจาแบบตรงโดยไม่มีคำอธิบายทางภาษาศาสตร์ (direct non-metalinguistic and explicit correction)และผลการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของครูที่มีต่อการแก้ไขงานเขียนผู้เรียนทางด้านความถูกต้องทางไวยากรณ์ พบว่าข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนในลดลงอย่างมีนัยสำคัญทางสถิติ แสดงให้เห็นว่าผู้เรียนมีการพัฒนาคุณภาพการเขียน ทางด้านความถูกต้องตามหลักไวยากรณ์ด้านองค์ประกอบและความคิดแต่ไม่ลดข้อผิดพลาดในการเขียนในหัวข้อ หรืองานเขียนชิ้นต่อไป ผลการวิเคราะห์ข้อผิดพลาดด้านการเขียนของผู้เรียนพบว่า ข้อผิดพลาดที่พบมากที่สุดคือ โครงสร้างประโยครองลงมาคือการใช้คำผิด คำกริยา ส่วนเติมท้ายคำ และคำนำหน้านาม ตามลำดับ

คำสำคัญ : การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับของครู, ข้อผิดพลาดด้านการเขียน

---

[1] Graduate English Language Teaching, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University

[2] PhD,Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Mahasarakham University

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate writing teachers' strategies in giving feedback and their effects on learners' revisions. Different types of feedback were given to 20 college learners majoring in English enrolled in a 16-week Expository and Argumentative Composition, Narrative and Descriptive Compositioncourses using a process approach in a Thai university. The learners wrote writing task of three different genres (argument, narration and description) with two topics for each genre.The research tools consisted of classroom observations and an audio-recorder. Error rate reduction means of five error categories, percentage, word count, standard deviation and t-test were used for data analysis. The total of first and seconddrafts, the first and the later-topics of writing taskswere compared to see the improvement of student writing (holistic writing, targetedlinguistic errors).The results showed that direct non-metalinguistic written correction and direct oral corrective feedback named-explicit correction, were used most frequently in teachers' strategies in giving written feedback on learners' writing.The effect of teachers' corrective feedback on Thai EFL learners' revision,Paired Sample T-Test revealed a highly significant improvement in thelearners' holistic writing and reduction of errors in comparing first and last writing, but there was no significant difference in the later topics. The result of error analysis shows that the highest error rate was found in sentence structure, followed by wrong word, verb, noun endings, and articles, respectively.

Key Words : Teacher feedback, Error correction

Introduction

Generally, it is very hard to learn English effectively for Thai learners in the context of using English as a foreign language. They lack sufficient competence in any of the English language skills, especially writing, due to the infrequently use of it. Writing is also complex in terms of both teaching and learning. In EFL composition writing class difficulty is undoubtedly encountered by many of these leaners as they are assigned to write an essay. Their difficulties include selection of appropriate words, grammatical forms, discourse organization and rhetorical features to use in the way they wish to convey the meaning, apart from the content of their com-position. In a Thai classroom, errors found in English written communication are apparent among college students. Thus, grammatical rules were carefully taught and error correction was a main focus. Hyland (1998) indicates giving feedback effectively to students is the main concern for any writing teacher. The main reason why writing is difficult for students needs to be clarified first in order to give effective feedback. Furthermore, it requires teachers to deal with errors and mistakes in students' writing.

There are a number of research studies on error correction that have been done to find out the best approaches for improving students' writing ability by giving feedback. Some scholars of writing believe that to give feedback is one of the most important methods and strategies of helping student writers to improve their written work. The students learn by comparing their own first drafts with the reformulation that helps them more in selecting appropriate words, idioms, using correct grammatical forms and improving discourse organization in revision. To cite some examples, Ferris (2002) suggests that teacher feedback tailored to students' linguistic knowledge and experience is one of the suggested techniques to solve this problem. That is to make students learn from their errors in order to avoid future errors and also to improve their writing skills. According to Ferris (1995), although many things such as contrast in form and content, compared to the process of writing and the final draft, as well as trends in the teaching have changed in decades, the roles of the teacher in providing feedback to students are still evolving. Effectiveness of providing feedback to students to help them improve the accuracy and/or fluency in their writing has been investigated.

In addition, Jean Chandler (2003) studied the efficiency of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in accuracy and fluency of L2 students writing. The samples were Chinese, Korean, Japanese and Taiwan students. Direct correction and simple underlining of errors feedback were compared.

Measures included the change in accuracy of both revisions and of subsequent writing, the change in fluency, and the change in holistic ratings. Findings suggested that both direct correction and simple underlining of errors were significantly superior to describing the type of error, even with underlining, for reducing long-term error. Direct correction is best for producing accurate revisions, and students prefer it because it is the fastest and easiest way for them as well as the fastest way for teachers over several drafts. However, students feel that they learn more from self-correction, and simple underlining of errors takes less of the teacher's time on the first draft. Both are viable methods depending on other goals. Furthermore, Bitchener, Young & Cameron, (2005) investigated which types of feedback affect students' writing ability. Types of feedback were given to 53 adult migrant students including (1) direct, explicit written feedback and student–researcher 5 minute individual conferences, and (2) direct, explicit written feedback only no corrective feedback on three types of error (prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article). The study found a significant effect on the combination of written and conference feedback on accuracy levels in the use of the past simple tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing but no overall effect on accuracy improvement for feedback types when the three error categories were considered as a single group.

Another study is Truscott (2007) examined how error correction affects learners'

ability to write accurately. They concluded that correction has a small negative effect on learners' ability to write accurately. It showed that corrective feedback on an assignment helps learners reduce their errors on that assignment during the revision process. Similarly, he studied error correction, revision, and learning. Learners were assigned to write a narrative essay in one class and then revised their writing during the next class. Half the students had their errors and used corrective feedback in the revision task while the other half did the same task without feedback. Results matched those of previous studies and found that the underlining group was significantly more successful than the control group. One week later, all of the students wrote a new narrative to determine short-term learning by measuring the change in error rate from the first narrative to the second. Thus, successful error reduction during revision is not a predictor of learning. Improvements made during revision are not evidence of improving learners' writing ability (Truscott and Hsu, 2008).

Based on observing and reviewing of the literature, there are significant communicative problems with college learners' English writing, including Mahasarakham University learners such as inappropriate language use, incomprehensible passages, and disorganized text, especially in technical education learners. These problems may have been a result of insufficient feedback, the teacher's heavy workload, large class sizes, and learners' low English language proficiency and motivation. Thus, feedback

on writing can be selected as a means of helping learners to make revisions, and it can also help learners improve their writing skills. Teachers need to be aware of the issues surrounding the methods of giving feedback. These include the fact that there are different types of errors found in EFL writing as well as different types of written feedback (e.g. direct feedback, coded feedback, and uncoded feedback). Teachers also need to find out which feedback types are appropriate for the treatment of specific types of error, and which are appropriate for students at different levels. For these reasons, in order to provide a better understanding of these issues, the present study aims to find out what the effects of different types of written feedback from teachers are on learners' writing, and what strategies teachers used in giving feedback for revising learners' written work.

The Purposes of the Study

1. To investigate the teachers' strategies in giving feedback on learners writing.

2. To investigate the effects of teachers' feedback on learners revision.

Methodology

Participants

The participants selected by purposive sampling consisted of nine fourth-year and eleven third-year English majors at Mahasakham University, divided into two classes which; were a) an Expository and Argumentative Composition class (nine learners), an elective course in the second

semester of the academic year 2013 and, b) a Narrative and Descriptive Composition (eleven learners), an elective prescribe course in the second semester of the academic 2014 instructed by two writing teachers with doctoral degrees in Applied Linguistics and over 7 years' experience in teaching.

Procedures

This case study followed a mixed approach of quantitative and qualitative methods. Both methods were combined to obtain a more reliable understanding of the study. Learners in both classes were assigned to write five writing tasks; two for Argumentative Composition class and three for Narrative and Descriptive Composition class during the course and were given feedback on grammar and organization; a) all errors on grammar were counted in order to calculate the error rates, b) the mean error rates were analyzed, c) the results were concluded with discussion and suggestions.

Tools

The data collection tools used in this study were classroom observations, a background questionnaire,the calculation of each error,an error code and the learners' written works. It is important to mention that the results of this study cannot be generalized due to the small number of participants.

Data Collection

The data collection was carried out in three phases during the course. Each phase lasted one week with two weeks between each phase. At the end, a sample of writing was chosen to give the participants the opportu-

nity to be acquainted with the feedback and revision techniques. The researcher observed teachers during both stages and took notes to record the teachers' procedures in class, as well as used an audio-recorder to record the teacher and learners interaction technique. No active role was taken by researcher in any of the stages.

The five writing tasks used for this study received from two writing classes as follows; writing 1: Argumentative Writing Task 1 on controversial topic (we'll brainstorm these) and writing 2: Argumentative Writing Task 2 on controversial topics (Expository Writing Task was analyzed because learners were assigned in pair work). Writing 3: Narrative Writing Task 1, writing 4: Narrative Writing Task 2 and writing 5: Descriptive Writing Task 1, writing 2: Argumentative essay 1 on controversial topic (we'll brainstorm these) and writing 3 : Argumentative essay 2 on controversial topics. The teacher conducted a group discussion eliciting information on the topics for the writing tasks. After learners finished their paper, the teacher focused on using the corrective feedback technique. The teacher collected all of the drafts for analysis. End comments were used to praise the learners' work and to give organization and content suggestions while a correction code was used for language suggestions. A correction code was supplied to the learners as well. The learners received their essays with feedback from the teacher and were asked to revise them for a final draft. Most of the participants were allowed to finish their first and final drafts as homework.

Data Analysis

All five essays involved the writing of a first draft, and revisions. Errors made by students in their writing were coded, categorized, and analyzed. The procedure for analyzing data was as follows:

1. Errors were underlined and given a description categorized by the error code. These were then counted and organized in the chart.

2. The researcher calculated the error rate based on the result. The error rate was calculated using the number of errors present in the drafts and each final essay; a measure of errors per 100 words was calculated (total number of errors/total number of words x 100).

3. Each type of error in all five essays was counted in order to study the effect of repetition of each error type.

4. Lastly the teacher interview was analyzed with the purpose of identifying the teacher's opinions concerning the use of feedback and their preference for feedback. Also the learner's preference questionnaires were analyzed in order to obtain the students' perceptions and preferences concerning the feedback techniques.

Results

Analysis of the teachers' strategies in giving feedback on learners' writing

Research Question 1 What are the teachers' strategies in giving feedback on learners' writing?

The result from the analysis of the percentage of teacher's feedback techniques used on Argumentative Writing Task revealed that direct non-metalinguistic written correction was used most in giving written feedback on learners' writing (51.45%), followed by indirect written correction (using error code) (24.85%), reformulation, indirect written correction (located) (8.58%), indirect metalinguistic written correction direct (4.80%), metalinguistic written correction and direct written correction (not located) (1.60 and 0.15 %), respectively. Similar result from the analysis of the percentage of feedback techniques used on Narrative and Descriptive Writing Tasks showed that direct non-metalinguistic written correction was used most frequently in giving written feedback on learners' writing (50.45%). Subsequently, after receiving written corrective feedback, the teacher used oral corrective feedback on Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task 1. The result showed that direct oral corrective feedback named explicit correction was used the most (46.60 %), followed by explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation (39.27 %) this is indirect oral feedback type, metalinguistic clue, clarification requests and Elicitation (9.95, 3.14 and 1.05%). On the other hand, some types of oral corrective were not used in giving feedback included didactic recast, conversational recasts and repetition.

Analysis of the Mean Error Rate of Each Draft and Subsequent Writing Task

Research Question 2What are the effects of teachers' feedback on learners' revision?

The following Table 1 and Table 2 presented the comparison of the mean errorrates calculated in each draft of each writing task.

Table 1 Comparison of Draft 1 and Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task 1

Argumentative WT 1	N	Mean	Mean diff.	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
Draft 1	9	5.56	2.16	2.03	9.455**	.000
Draft 2	9	3.40		2.15		

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

The mean error rate of Draft 1 was 5.56 and the mean error rate of Draft 2 was 3.40. Showing a reduction in error rate of 2.16; indicating that the learners reduced error rates and improved grammatical accuracy in Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task1. The t-test, which was 9.455, suggested a significant difference reduction of error rates between Draft 1 and Draft 2 at the 0.01 level.

Table 2 Comparison of Draft 1 and Draft 2 of Narrative Writing Task 1

Narrative WT 1	N	Mean	Mean diff.	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
Draft 1	11	14.70	8.85	3.68	9.169**	.000
Draft 2	11	5.85		1.66		

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Similarly, the result of comparison of Draft 1 and Draft 2 of Narrative Writing Task 1 showed that the mean error rate of Draft 1 was 14.70 and the mean error rate of Draft 2 was 5.85. The mean reduction in error rate was 8.85; showing that the learners reduced error rates and improved grammatical accuracy in Draft 2 of Narrative Writing Task1. The t-test, which was 9.169, suggested a significant difference reduction of error rates between Draft 1 and Draft 2.Table 1 and 2 indicate that the mean of error rates decreased in Argumentative and Narrative Writing Task 1. This proved that the learners reduced error rates and improved grammatical accuracy in the next draft of their writing after receiving written and oral corrective feedback.

Table 3 Comparison of Argumentative Writing Task 1 and 2 Mean Error Rates

Writing Task	N	Mean	Mean diff.	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
Argumentative E1	9	5.56	0.33	2.03	0.497	.632
Argumentative E2	9	5.23		1.40		

The result revealed that the mean error rate of the Argumentative Writing Task 1 was 5.56 and the mean error rate of Argumentative Writing Task 2 was 5.23. The mean difference in error rate was 0.33; showed that the learners reduced error rates in subsequent Writing Task. The percent difference in error rate also indicates that they improved grammatical accuracy 5% in Argumentative Writing Task 2. However, the t-test was 0.497 indicating that there was no significant difference between the Argumentative Writing Task 1 and 2. This proved that the learners only show a small improvement in grammatical accuracy in subsequent essay after receiving written corrective feedback.

Table 4 Comparison of Narrative Writing Task 1, 2 and Descriptive 1 Mean ErrorRates

Writing Task	N	Mean	Mean diff.	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
Narrative E1	11	14.70	-2.01	3.68	-1.277	.230
Narrative E2	11	16.71	4.79	6.19	2.674	.023
Descriptive E1	11	11.92		4.29		

When looking at each genre, it can be seen that there were different results regarding the improvement of writing quality. For Narrative Writing Task, the mean error rate of Narrative Writing Task 1 was 14.70 and the mean error rate of Narrative Writing Task 2 was 16.71. The percent difference in error rate was -2.01. The t-test was -1.277; indicating that the learners performance in reduced in Narrative Writing Task 2, but the difference was not significant between the result of Narrative Writing Task 1and 2.Conversely, the result revealed that the mean error rate of Narrative Writing Task 2 was 16.71and the mean error rate of Descriptive Writing Task1 was 11.92. The mean difference in error rate was 4.79; showing that the learners reduced error rates and improved grammatical accuracy in the subsequent essay. However, the t-test was 2.674 and found that there was no significant difference between Narrative Writing Task 2 andDescriptive Writing Task1.

Table 5 Comparison of Narrative Writing Task 1, 2 and Descriptive 1 Mean Error Rates

Writing Task	N	Mean	Mean diff.	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
Narrative E1	11	14.70	2.78	3.68	2.674	.023
Descriptive E1	11	11.92		4.29		

In addition, the result revealed that the mean error rate of Narrative Writing Task 1 and Descriptive Writing Task1 were 14.70 and 11.92. The mean difference in error rate was 2.78; showed that the learners reduced error rates and improved grammatical accuracy in the different genre. The t-test was 2.674 and found that there was no significant difference between Narrative Writing Task 2 andDescriptive Writing Task1 at the 0.01 level.

To sum up, the different mean of error rate between drafts and subsequent writing tasks tended to decrease; indicating that the feedback helps leaners improve accuracy in their writing and reduces the repetition of the same mistake in revision on learners' writing. However, the mean of error rate of Narrative Writing Task 1 and 2 increased slightly; meaning that the number of errors made by learners also increased. They were not reducing their mistakes! Although the learners reduced their errors and improved grammatical accuracy in their writing after receiving written corrective feedback, some types of written corrective feedback had no effect on learners' revision.

Analysis of Grammatical Error Repetition

The effects of different types of teacher written feedback on the learners' grammatical accuracy in revision were presented in Table 6. This table presented the results of the analysis of descriptive statistics for the mean of the five errors categories i.e., noun ending (NE), article (Art), wrong word (WW), verb (V), and sentence structure (SS) errors occurred in Draft 1 and 2 of two genres were compared and those of the analysis of Paired Samples Test to show the comparison of the mean of error rates found in two genres when the learners received teacher written feedback and oral feedback in Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task.

Table 6 Comparison of Each Mean Error Rate in Each Draft of Argumentative and Narrative Writing Task 1

Writing Task	Error types	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Draft 1		Draft 2			
Argumentative E1	V	0.88	0.97	0.39	0.53	2.784	.024
	NE	0.69	0.57	0.58	0.62	1.154	.282
	Art	0.30	0.24	0.22	0.26	1.134	.290
	WW	1.34	0.44	0.72	0.35	4.280**	.003
	SS	2.36	0.79	1.49	0.76	4.349**	.002
	Total	5.56	3.01	3.40	2.52		
Narrative E1	V	2.94	1.12	0.97	0.64	6.447**	.000
	NE	0.63	0.36	0.29	0.26	3.352**	.007
	Art	0.62	0.42	0.30	0.32	3.160**	.010
	WW	3.75	1.42	1.82	0.62	5.831**	.000
	SS	6.76	1.96	2.46	1.16	7.699**	.000
	Total	14.69	5.28	5.84	3.00		

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Overall, the result of the mean of error rate as shown in blankets showed that in Draft 1 of Argumentative Writing Task 1and Narrative Writing Task 1, the errors mostly occurred in sentence structure errors (2.36 and 6.76), followed by wrong word (1.34 and 3.75), verb (0.88 and 2.94), noun ending (0.69 and 0.63), and article (0.30 and 0.62), respectively. After receiving teacher written corrective feedback on writing Draft 2 of both Writing Tasks, the learners reduced all their errors. Mean of the errors in verb, noun, ending, article, wrong word and sentence structure found in Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task was 0.39, 0.58, 0.22, 0.72 and 1.49, respectively.

For Narrative Writing Task, the mean of error rates in verb, noun, ending, article,

wrong word and sentence structure was reduced slightly. It was at 0.64, 0.26, 0.32, 0.62 and 1.16, respectively. Alsothe result from the analysis of Paired Samples Test when receiving teacher written corrective feedback showed that there was a significant reduction of error rates between Draft 1 and Draft 2 of Narrative and Descriptive Writing Task in all errors types.

Furthermore, the results of the effects of different types of teacher written feedback on subsequent writing were analyzed by comparing draft 1 of all genres. Different results were found in Argumentative Writing Task 1 and 2 as shown in Table 17, as well as Narrative and Descriptive Writing Task as shown in Tables 7-9.

Table 7 Comparison of Each Mean Error Rate in Argumentative Writing Task 1 and 2

Error types	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Argumentative E1		Argumentative E2			
V	0.88	0.97	0.55	0.46	1.123	.294
NE	0.69	0.57	0.34	0. 20	1.567	.156
Art	0.30	0.24	0.28	0.27	0.272	.793
WW	1.34	0.44	1.44	0.48	-1.003	.345
SS	2.36	0.79	2.61	0.84	-1.084	.310
Total	5.56	3.01	5.23	2.05		

The result from the data analysis showed that in Argumentative Writing Task 1 and 2, the errors mostly occurred in sentence structure errors (2.36 and 2.6), followed by wrong word (1.34 and 1.44), respectively. After receiving teacher written corrective feedback, these meant that the learners did not reduce their errors. They still repeated the same type of mistakes.

However, the mean of error rates of writing tasks in verb (0.88 and 0.55), noun ending (0.69 and 0.34) and article (0. 30 and 0.28) was reduced a little. After receiving te-acher written corrective feedback, the learners reduced these types of errors.

Additionally, the result from the analysis of Paired Samples Test when receiving teacher written corrective feedback showed that there was no significant difference in both of reduction and repetition of error rates in Draft 1 of Argumentative Writing Task 1 and 2 in all errors types.

Similar results were found in Narrative and Descriptive Writing Task as shown in Tables 8-9.

Table 8 Comparison of Each Mean Error Rate in Narrative Writing Task 1 and 2

Error types	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Narrative E1		Narrative E2			
V	2.94	1.12	3.10	1.88	-0.380	.712
NE	0.63	0.36	1.53	1.29	-2.630	.025
Art	0.62	0.42	2.28	1.36	-4.049**	.002
WW	3.75	1.42	4.54	2.12	-1.216	.252
SS	6.76	1.96	5.26	1.83	2.460	.034
Total	14.70	5.28	16.71	8.48		

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

The result from the comparison of mean error rate showed that in Narrative Writing Task 1 and 2, the errors occurring commonly repeatedly were in sentence structure (6.76). , but after receiving teacher written corrective feedback, this error reduced. Conversely, the mean of error rates of both Writing Tasks followed by wrong word (3.75and 4.54), verb (2.94 and 3.10), noun ending (0.63 and 1.53) and article (0. 62 and 2.28), respectively, was increased considerably. After receiving teacher written corrective feedback, the learners did not reduce their errors, and they also still repeated the same types of mistakes in wrong word, verb, noun ending and especially article error in Narrative Writing Task 2.

As well, the result from the analysis of Paired Samples Test when receiving teacher written corrective feedback showed that there was no a significant reduction of error rates in Draft 1 of Narrative Writing Task 2 in the four error types with exception of the article error.

Table 9 Comparison of Each Mean Error Rate in Narrative and Descriptive Writing Task 1

Error types	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t-test	Sig.(2-tailed)
	Narrative E1		Descriptive E1			
V	2.94	1.12	1.80	1.15	3.313**	.008
NE	0.63	0.36	1.02	0.69	-1.574	.146
Art	0.62	0.42	1.91	1.31	-2.894	.016
WW	3.75	1.42	3.38	1.71	0.752	.469
SS	6.76	1.96	3.82	1.57	4.990**	.001
Total	14.70	5.28	11.93	6.43		

**The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

When compared the result of mean error rates in Narrative Writing Task 1 and Descriptive Writing Task 1 found that the learners could reduce some types of error; sentence structure errors (6.76 and 3.82), followed by wrong word (3.75 and 3.38) and verb (2.94 and 1.80), respectively, but there were some noun ending (0.63 and 1.02) and article (0. 62 and 1.91) errors found in Descriptive Writing Task 1. The analysis of Paired Samples Test when receiving teacher written corrective feedback showed that there was also no significant reduction of error rates in Draft 1 of Descriptive Writing Task 1 in noun ending, article and wrong word errors types.

In conclusion, Tables 6-9 displayed the mean error rates of each type of error made in five writing tasks, in order to study the effect of repetition of each error. The type of error which occurred most frequently in the five writing tasks was sentence structure error, followed by wrong word, verb, noun ending and article, respectively. The learners showed a remarkable improvement in Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task 1, Narrative Writing Task 1and Descriptive Writing Task 1. This means that most learners could reduce the amount of repetition of the same mistakes at the end of the course. The mean differences between five Writing Tasks indicated that the learners made less improvement than Draft 1 and Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task 1 and Narrative Writing Task 1and even increased their errors in five categories of error in the subsequent writing task.

Conclusion

1. Direct non-metalinguistic written correction was used most frequently for teachers' strategies in giving written feedback on learners' writing. Additionally, after receiving written corrective feedback, learners received oral corrective feedback. The type of direct oral corrective feedback named explicit correction was used most repeatedly.

2. Teachers' feedback effect on learners' revision was as follow;

a. The effect on the learners' improvement of writingin grammatical accuracy

To assess the results of the learners' improvement in grammatical accuracy on revision among the five writing tasks focus centered on five error categories (verb, noun ending, article, wrong word, and sentence structure). It was found that after written and oral feedback, there was a significant difference in error rate reduction on Draft 2. It was revealed that overall the error rates found between Draft 1 and 2 of two genres of writing were reduced significantly in all categories, indicating that the learners' grammatical accuracy improved. Finally, when Draft 1 of different writing tasks were compared, it was found that there was a significant difference in the later topics of Argumentative, Narrative and Descriptive writing tasks, the mean error rate was slightly higher than that for the first topic for those tasks. However, comparing Draft 1 of Narrative writing task 2 to Descriptive writing task 1, it was found that learners were able to reduce their error rate, there was also no significant difference in different genre writing tasks.

b. The effect on the learners' improvement of writingin organizations and ideas

When draft 1 and draft 2 of different writing tasks were compared, it was found that learners were able to revise all their organization and idea errors in the later topics and the next draft of Argumentative, Narrative and Descriptive writing tasks. However, there was only a few total number of giving feedback. Most oral and written corrective feedbacks used frequently for

teachers' strategies in giving feedback on learners' writing were direct corrective feedback type.

Discussions

1. The teachers' strategies in giving feedback on learners' writing

The result from the analysis of the percentage of teacher's feedback techniques used on Argumentative, Narrative and Descriptive writing tasks revealed that direct non-metalinguistic written correction was used the most in giving written feedback on learners' writing, followed by indirect written correction (using error code). After receiving written corrective feedback the teachers then followed-up with oral corrective feedback on Draft 2 of Argumentative Writing Task 1. It was found that direct oral corrective feedback referred to as explicit correction was used the most regularly, followed by explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation. There was a significant difference in error rate reduction on Draft 2. It was revealed that overall the error rates found between Draft 1 and 2 of two genres of writing were reduced significantly in all categories, indicating that the learners' grammatical accuracy improved. Both teachers prefer direct corrective feedback. This tied in with Chandler's (2003) conclusion that direct feedback or correction by the teacher was the best of the four methods (correction, underlining and description, description, and underlining) used, as measured by changes in accuracy of the student writing. The

superiority of direct feedback cooperate other methods is that the students can correct significantly more of their errors on revisions with this method than either coded or uncoded feedback and might be due to the fact that it is "the fastest and the easiest way for them to revise".

Also, the results were supported by Sheen, Wright, and Moldawa (2009), their finding found that a direct-only correction performed much better in language analytic ability. However, language analytic ability was more strongly related to acquisition in the direct metalinguistic group than in the direct-only group. The results showed that written CF targeting a single linguistic feature improved learners' accuracy, especially when metalinguistic feedback was provided and the learners had high language analytic ability. Ferris (1997) also valued teacher feedback followed by students' revision stating, "when changes (whether minimal or substantial) were made, they overwhelmingly tended to improve the students' paper".

2. The effects of teachers' feedback on learners' revision;

Regarding the results of the improvement of grammatical accuracy, there was a significant reduction of error rates between Draft 1 and 2 all two writing tasks of two genres. These errors reduced significantly after receiving teachers' feedback of any type. These finding were supported by the conclusion of some previously conducted research which valued the pattern of

teacher's error correction followed by learners' revision stating that writing accuracy could improve, especially when learners are required to revise or rewrite their papers after receiving teachers' feedback (Ferris, 1995 and Ferris, 2002). A number of other studies also gathered empirical evidence suggestions improvements support when the students revise their paper after receiving error feedback (Fathman and Whalley, 1990; Ferris, 1997; Chandler, 2000; Ferris et al, 2000; Ferris and Roberts, 2001). Furthermore, the results substantiate earlier findings by Aschwell (2000), Chandler (2003) and Fathman and Whalley (1990) who found that to increase accuracy in student writing, teachers should give error feedback, followed up by students making revisions. Thus, it might be concluded from this study that the grammatical accuracy improved significantly because these students were given teacher written feedback and then required to correct their own errors over the 16-week period. The findings also showed that on revision, errors were reduced the most when the learners received direct and indirect written correction followed by oral feedback. The results of the analysis of the learners' writing errors illustrated that the learners made the commonest errors in sentence structure, followed by wrong word, verb, noun endings, and articles, respectively. It was also observed that they were more successful in correcting errors in verbs, than other error category; wrong word and sentence structure, noun endings and articles, which supported

Ferris and Roberts' (2001) claim that the students can correct their treatable errors more successfully as compared with the untreatable errors.

The comparison between Drafts 1 and 2 among the five writing tasks showed that a positive effect on fluency was achieved initially. The comparison between Drafts 1 and 2 of the final two writing tasks, results revealed that overall there was a significant improvement of writing at the end of the semester. This might possibly be due to the fact that when the learners learned more from their errors, teacher correction, revision activity, and from practicing their writing over a period of time (16 weeks): learners felt more confident to write even more challenging genres. The results corresponded to the positive effects of teacher written feedback on fluency reported in Robb et al's (1986) research on Japanese EFL students and Chandler's (2003) investigation of Hispanic, Asian, and South East Asian students. However, there was no statistically significant difference of writing improvement on subsequent essays. The t-test indicated that there was no signifi-cant difference at 0.01 level. The average number of error rate in Argumentative writing task 1 and 2 was 5.6 and 5.23, as well as Narrative writing task 1and 2 was 14.70 and 16.71. These findings partially confirm those of Truscott, 1996 that having student correct errors is ineffective and it also discourages many students to write accuracy. It could be said that teachers' feedback cannot be consi-

dered as an all-purpose treatment to prevent repetition of the same mistakes. In the case where learners were to be given corrections for a stage they had not yet reached, such correction might not be effective. It does not seem that this teachers' feedback affected accuracy. Furthermore, learners can reduce all types of error in Narrative 2 to Descriptive 1, but t-test showed no significant improvement in writing accuracy. The number of error rates decrease only slightly; it is assumed that this was because the topic for the later task was considered decreasingly difficult and their submissions were shorter and easier. The levels of difficulty of different genres was pointed by Weigle (2002) as stating "... discourse mode makes a difference in performance – narrative and description are often seen as cognitively easier and lend themselves to less complex than do exposition..." (p. 100).

In conclusion, teachers' written feedback of any type has a demonstrably positive effect on learners' grammatical accuracy. For writing quality on grammatical accuracy, with changing learners' original writing tasks, teacher feedback seemed to have a positive effect (as measured by five error categories), and writing fluency (as measured by word count), it was found to be significant as a benefit. In addition, the present study reflected a positive view of the provision of teacher feedback in which it seems likely that assigning learners to rewrite and correct their written work after receiving teachers' written feedback "not only will improve the quality of writing under immediate consideration but will also cause writers to become more aware of and attentive to patterns of errors" (Ferris 2002, p. 26). In this study, teacher written feedback played a critical role in the improvement of Thai EFL learners' revision. The method of using teachers' written feedback followed by learners' revision is a way to draw students' attention to their writing and learn from their errors.

Recommendations for Further Studies

1. Replication of the present study in other universities both in the same and different regions of Thailand.

2. Replication of the present study with different genres of writing.

3. Investigation of specific or other types of teacher feedback or other techniques that could help EFL student improve their writing skills.

4. Replication of the present study with foreign writing teacher. There should be a comparative study in teaching writing based on the teachers' strategies in giving feedback to learners who study composition with foreign and Thai writing teacher both in the same and other universities in Thailand.

5. Investigation of the methods of teacher feedback in specific type of error which occurred repeatedly with effective revising strategy training.

References

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, 191-205.

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

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

Ferris, D. R. (1995).Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft Compo sition classrooms.**TESOL Quarterly,** 29, 33-53

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

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

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

Hyland, F. (1998).The Impact of Teacher Written Feedback on Individual Writers. **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 7(3), 255-286

Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & A. Moldawa (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult EFL learners. **System**, 37, 556-569.

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

Truscott, J. (2007).The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. **Journal of Second language Writing**, 16, 255-272.

Truscott, J., Hsu, Y. A., (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. **Journal of Second language Writing**, 17, 292-305.

Weigle, S. (2002).**Assessing writing**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.