Corrective feedback in L2 writing

Lisa Nicole Tyson

ENGL 679

December 6, 2016

Typology of written corrective feedback

From Ellis (2009)

- Direct
  - Teacher provides correct form
- Indirect
  - Indication & location
  - Indication only
- Metalinguistic
  - Error codes
  - Brief grammatical descriptions

- Focused vs. unfocused
- Electronic
  - Concordance file with examples of correct usage
- Reformulation
  - Native speaker reworks entire text

Meta-analysis of current research

From Liu & Brown (2015)

- 32 published studies & 12 dissertations

- Narrowed focus on studies that investigate long-term gains in accuracy

- 95% include control and comparison groups

- 86% use pre-test/treatment/post-test

- Only 30% include a delayed post-test

English Articles

From Thomas (1989)

- Referential/Nonreferential

  - Known/Unknown

- Definite/indefinite

  - Unknown, referential = indefinite (first mention)

  - Known, referential = definite (anaphoric mention)

Direct form-focused corrective feedback for L2 writing

	Bitchener (2008)	Sheen (2007)	Bitchener & Knoch (2010)	Shintani & Ellis (2013)
# of students	75	91	52	49
# of groups	4	3	4	3
# of students per group	17-20	28-31	13	13-15
Length of study	2 months	2 months	10 months	10 days
L1s represented	63% East Asian	Korean, Hispanic, Polish	44% East Asian	34% Arabic 15% East Asian
Level	Low-intermediate	Intermediate	Low-intermediate	Low-intermediate
Average age	22.7	Range 21-56	31.7	22.6

Findings

Bitchener (2008)	Sheen (2007)	Bitchener & Knoch (2010)	Shintani & Ellis (2013)	Stefanou & Revesz (2015)
Written and oral corrective feedback added to DCF and DCF alone were better than written metalinguistic and DCF	Direct metalinguistic group performed better than direct only in delayed post-test	DCF outperforms control, no differences between the groups	DCF showed no benefit Metalinguistic explanation assisted learners on post-test but not on delayed post-test	Advantage for direct feedback over control but no clear benefit for metalinguistic explanation

Measurements for learner differences

- Sheen (2007)

  - Otto's (1998) language analysis test

    - 14 multiple choice items of translations from an artificial language and English translations

- Stefanou & Revesz (2015)

  - Grammatical sensitivity: adapted words-in-sentences from MLAT

    - Match underlined word in one sentence to a choice of five in a separate sentence

  - Metalanguage knowledge: Bloor (1986) instrument

    - Identify words and phrases that correspond to 10 grammatical terms

No answers...

From Ellis (2010)

- Do socially driven differences affect the internal processes responsible for converting input and output to acquisition?

- What kind of theory is needed to explain how and for whom CF works and does not work?

- How can teachers most effectively take account of individual differences in learners when providing CF?

Metalinguistic explanation

- Written
  - Error codes above word or phrase
  - Error codes in the margin
    - Examples ww = wrong word; art = article
  - Numbered errors in text with grammatical description at the bottom of the text
- Oral
  - One-on-one conference
  - Mini-lesson

Language Analytic Ability

- Skehan's (1991) combination of Carroll's (1973) grammatical sensitivity and inductive language-learning ability

- Multicomponential, making it difficult to measure

- Statistically one of the highest indicators of success, along with motivation
  - Other factors: personality, attitude toward CF, language anxiety, cognition(noticing, uptake, etc.)

Future research

- How do learner differences in language analytic ability affect their ability to use metalinguistic feedback?

References

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 17*, 102-118.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2009). The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback. *ELT Journal, 63*(3), 204-211.

Bitchener, J. & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: a ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193-214.

Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D.R. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97-107.

Ellis, R. (2012). Cognitive, social and psychological dimensions of corrective feedback. In R. Batsone (ed.) *Sociocognitive Perspectives on Language Use and Language Learning,* (pp. 151-165). New York, NY: Oxford.

References, cont.

Liu, Q. & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 30*, 66-81.

Ottó, I. (1998). The relationship between individual differences in learner creativity and language learning success. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(4),763-773.

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.

Shintani, N. & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22*, 286-306.

Skehan, P. (1999). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 13*, 275-298.

Stefanou, C. & Revesz, A. (2015). Direct written corrective feedback, learner differences, and the acquisition of second language article use for generic and specific plural reference. *The Modern Language Journal, 99*(2), 263-282.

Thomas, M. (1989). The acquisition of English articles by first- and second-language learners. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 10*, 335-355.