영어어문교육 16권 1호 2010년 봄

Effects of Ongoing Feedback on Students' Attitudes towards Writing

Taesun Yang
(Dongguk University)

Yang, Taesun. (2010). Effects of ongoing feedback on students' attitudes towards writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 16*(1), 171-188.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of ongoing feedback from the professor in students' processes of learning and developing writing skills. Specifically, the researcher was concerned with how ongoing feedback affected students' attitudes towards writing because in EFL contexts, motivating students to write is a first step to engage them in a challenging journey of academic writing. 20 freshmen taking a writing course, "Paragraph & Essay Writing", at A university participated in this study and they were asked to complete the questionnaire at the end of the spring semester 2009. The results revealed that receiving ongoing feedback from the professor had a positive influence on affective domain, was helpful to develop learning strategies, and was valuable in learning outcomes. However, they also expressed negative opinions: feeling a burden, focusing on forms, and feeling confused. To reflect their opinions, the following four suggestions were made to create a more effective learning environment: promoting learner autonomy, facilitating individual writing conferences, giving balanced feedback in between form and content, and using judicious feedback through careful streaming.

[academic writing/feedback/learner autonomy/learning strategies]

I. INTRODUCTION

In the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), many teachers and researchers believe that to facilitate successful language learning, teachers should engage in the interactive activity of error correction. Specifically, many researchers in the field of second language writing have been interested in how effective error correction is in developing students' writing abilities. This issue has been a controversial one in the field in that there have been inconclusive results from research studies (Ashwell, 2000; Chandler, 2004; Fathman & Whalley, 1990, Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1996, 1999). For

instance, Truscott (1996, 1999) had a negative view on giving feedback on students' grammatical inaccuracy and found out that correcting learners' errors in a written composition might enable them to eliminate the errors in a subsequent draft but has no effect on grammatical accuracy in a new piece of writing. However, Ferris (1999) was very positive about the efficacy of error correction and claimed that if the correction is clear and consistent, it will work for acquisition. In addition, some researchers in the field have conducted research studies to understand students' reactions to feedback (Cohen, 1987; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swale, 1988) and found out that students benefitted from receiving feedback in developing their writing skills.

As mentioned above, it is noticeable that feedback students receive in their processes of writing and its effectiveness are a key concern to many researchers in ESL (English as a Second Language) contexts. However, here in Korea, in EFL (English as a Foreign Language) context, we primarily need to come up with an idea of how to better support student writers to increase their familiarity in writing because many first year university students did not have ample chances to write in English back in high school. At this initial stage of experiencing academic writing, having a positive attitude toward writing is important in learning and developing students' writing skills because it can create an atmosphere where they can invest and enjoy writing. If they have a negative attitude toward writing, there is no point discussing the issue, the effectiveness of feedback on students' writing performance. In a sense, investigating its role in students' learning and developing writing skills is much more valuable than its effectiveness on their learning outcomes. Therefore, this study investigated the effectiveness of ongoing feedback on first year university students' attitudes towards writing by using the following three categories: affective domain, learning strategies, and learning outcomes. Thus, the following research question was investigated: what is the role of ongoing feedback from the professor in students' processes of learning and developing writing skills? The term, feedback, in the research question refers to the professor's supportive efforts to give suggestions to students' writing samples in the areas of form and meaning. In what follows, four comparisons were made in the field of writing (i.e., the comparisons of correction and non-correction, product-based and process-based feedback, form-focused and content-focused feedback, and direct and indirect feedback) and research studies in the area of students' reactions to feedback were also reviewed.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

As previously mentioned, the effectiveness of feedback on learning outcomes has been a debatable issue. Truscott (1996) was very pessimistic about giving feedback on students'

writing performance and emphasized that there is no convincing evidence that error correction helps improve students' writing performance, especially for grammatical accuracy. The findings of many research studies showed similar results that students receiving feedback did not make progress in accuracy over those who did not (Fazio, 2001; Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1984). On the other hand, some researchers believed that receiving feedback is an important way of learning writing skill and in fact, it is a way of improving grammatical accuracy (Ashwell, 2000; Chandler, 2004; Chin, 2007; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris, 1999; Kim, 2007; Ryoo, 2007).

In general, there are two approaches to teaching writing, product-based and process-based approaches, and the type of feedback given to students differs in these two approaches. First, in product-based approach, students are given feedback on their final product only once. That is, there is no interaction between students and teachers in writing processes and students feel less motivated when receiving feedback in the final stage (Tribble, 1996). However, in process-based approach, students receive feedback several times in their processes of writing, which eventually makes students actively participate in revising processes. Second, the roles of teachers and students differ in these approaches. In fact, product-based approach is teacher-centered in that teachers are active in evaluating and giving feedback. On the other hand, students are more active in process-based approach because students actively participate in their processes of writing after they receive feedback on an ongoing basis. Third, the focus of feedback differs in that forms are more emphasized in product-based approach but in process-based approach, meaning is more focused (Lee & Hong, 2001).

In addition, a comparison has been made in form-focused and meaning-focused feedback. Form-focused feedback emphasizes language forms, such as grammatical aspects and writing conventions, so it is beneficial to increase students' accuracy. On the other hand, structure and development of story, coherence, and cohesion are stressed in meaning-based feedback, so it is an effective way of increasing students' general writing abilities, especially for fluency in writing. Zamel (1985) compared these two types of feedback to examine whether error correction was effective in improving grammatical accuracy. However, in the long run, students receiving meaning-based feedback outperformed than students receiving form-based feedback. In a similar way, Semke (1984) utilized a process approach to investigate the role of error correction in accuracy. The results revealed that error correction did not help students improve their accuracy, so teachers make efforts in giving more meaning-based feedback. Unlike aforementioned studies, some researchers stress the importance of form in writing. Chandler (2004) found out a long-term effect of grammar feedback in writing and suggested that teachers help students pay more attention to accuracy. Ferris (1995) also pointed out that limited linguistic knowledge, grammatical and lexical accuracies, might be an obstacle when

students write. Eskey (1983) emphasized the importance of form-focused feedback because the development of fluency does not guarantee that of accuracy. It is noticeable that the efficacy of form and meaning-based feedback is controversial among researchers in the field of second language writing. However, Song (1998) found out a compromising position that a combination of form and meaning-based feedback was an effective way to increase students' writing skills.

Some studies have been conducted to investigate the extent to which direct and indirect feedback facilitate greater accuracy (Ferris, 1995; Ferris & Hedgecock, 1998; Lalande, 1982). Direct feedback is given to students with correct forms, while indirect feedback occurs when the teacher indicates an error without a correction and leaves students diagnose and correct error (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005). Frodesen (2001) stated the usefulness of indirect feedback by mentioning affective domain. According to him, giving correction on all errors made students feel overwhelmed and reduced their motivation for writing. Lalande (1982) also stated that indirect feedback might be more beneficial in editing processes because it could provide an arena where students could solve problems by themselves. In a similar way, some researchers investigated the effects of direct and indirect feedback and found out that indirect feedback played an important role in language outcomes (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2003). Unlike aforementioned studies, Robb, Ross, and Shortreed (1986) explored the influence of indirect feedback on students' accuracy, fluency, and syntactic complexity. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in the accuracy of students' writing among the two indirect groups or the direct group.

In the area of investigating students' reactions to feedback, many research studies were done to reflect students' opinions in the process of error correction and the results revealed that student generally felt that receiving feedback was helpful in enabling them to minimize grammatical errors and improved the quality of their writing (Cohen, 1987; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swale, 1988). Cohen (1987) first illuminated students' perceptions about error treatment by using a survey and found out that many students thought that the teacher's feedback was valuable for improving their writing skills. Leki (1991) also conducted a survey study to find out university ESL writers' perceptions on error correction. It was revealed that students valued error correction by teachers and they preferred comprehensive error correction over selective one. Similarly, Paulus (1999) studied the effects of peer and teacher feedback on students' writing. The results revealed that they preferred teacher feedback to peer feedback but they expressed that peer feedback was also a contributing factor in revision process.

Specifically, students' reactions to different types of feedback were investigated in the field of writing. Radecki and Swale (1988) investigated students' attitudes toward different types of feedback. In this study, there were three groups depending on their attitudes

toward teacher feedback: Receptor, semi-receptor, and resister. Both receptor and semi-receptor groups preferred an integration of content and grammar feedback and overall, they showed positive and appreciative reactions to error correction. In a similar vein, Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1996) investigated ESL and EFL students' preferences about error treatment and found out that EFL students favored form-focused feedback, while ESL students preferred feedback on both form and content. By analyzing the results of research studies done in this area, Ferris (2002) summarized students' reactions to feedback:

> Students feel that teacher feedback on grammar and errors is extremely important to their progress as writers.
> Students in the most recent studies also see value in other types of teacher feedback (i.e., ideas and organization).
> Student writers mostly favor comprehensive teacher marking of errors.
> Student writers, when given a choice of teacher marking strategies, tend to prefer that teachers mark errors and give them strategies for correcting them over either direct correction of errors or less explicit indirect methods.
> Students sometimes found teachers' marking systems confusing or cumbersome. (pp. 33-34)

Therefore, it is noticeable that although the effectiveness of feedback as a pedagogical tool is a controversial issue, students perceive that they can benefit from receiving feedback in developing their writing skills.

III. METHOD

1. Setting and Participants

This study was conducted at A university in Seoul. From the spring semester 2008, this university started an "English track" in which several electives are offered in only English. To take the courses in this track, students have to have certain degrees of English proficiency. To increase the efficiency of this program, the university administers a placement test by using a TEPS in the beginning of each spring semester.

This year, 1000 new students out of approximately 3000 students were eligible to take the courses from the English track. Among the courses, the data were drawn from the course named "Paragraph & Essay Writing". The class meets once a week and lasts two hours. 29 students with various major backgrounds (i.e., Japanese language & literature,

mathematics education, law, journalism, and advertising) took this course and only 20 students voluntarily participated in this study. Specifically, 10 male and 10 female students are the participants of this study and they are all freshmen at the university. According to the results of the placement test, their English level is advanced in this context because they fall in a upper 500 student category (i.e., The university does not reveal students' scores for confidential reasons.)

2. Data Collection and Data Analysis Procedures

The course, "Paragraph & Essay Writing", was offered during the spring semester 2009. The focus of this course was to increase students' understanding of how to write in an academic setting, so different types of paragraphs and essays (i.e., descriptive, compare & contrast, cause & effect, and classification paragraphs & essays) were the main concern for this course (For details, see Appendix A). During each class, the students were taught some content from each chapter for approximately 70 minutes according to the syllabus and they did in-class writing for the remaining 30 minutes. When there was time limitation, they did take-home writing instead.

Throughout the semester, students were required to collect all the work they had worked on, which is called "Writing Portfolio" where they put their in-class writing samples and revisions based on the professor's feedback. Both form and meaning-based feedback were given to the students on a weekly basis. For instance, in form-based feedback, students were given feedback in the areas of subject-verb agreement, comma splice, fragment, number, punctuation, run-on sentence, verb tense, word form, and faculty parallelism. On the other hand, students' attention was paid to structure and development of paragraph and essay, coherence, and cohesion in meaning-based feedback.

The following is the list of writing samples in students' portfolios. Since this course is about paragraph and essay writing, students started with the three basic concepts of paragraph, such as topic sentence, supporting sentences, and concluding sentence, and then moved to different types of paragraphs and essays.

1. Topic Sentences (1 in-class writing & 2 revisions)
2. Topic Sentences (1 in-class writing & 2 revisions)
3. A Descriptive Paragraph (1 in-class writing & 2 revisions)
4. A Cause & Effect Paragraph (1 in-class writing & 2 revisions)
5. A Paragraph (1 take-home writing & 1 revision: i.e., compare & contrast or classification paragraph)
6. A Descriptive Essay (1 take-home writing & 1 revision)

7. An Outline of a Cause & Effect Essay
8. A Peer Editing Sheet for the Cause & Effect Outline
9. A Cause & Effect Paragraph
10. A Cause & Effect Essay
11. A Revision of the Cause & Effect Essay
12. An Outline of a Compare & Contrast Essay
13. A Peer Editing Sheet for the Compare & Contrast Outline
14. A Compare & Contrast Essay
15. A Revision of the Compare & Contrast Essay
16. An Outline of a Classification Essay
17. A Peer Editing Sheet for the Classification Outline
18. A Classification Essay

Based on their experiences, they were asked to answer questions on the questionnaire at the end of the semester, the last day of the class (For sample, see Appendix B). They were given a clear direction to answer the questions and they were given approximately 30 minutes. To facilitate the process, a Korean version of the questionnaire was used and the students were allowed to use Korean when answering open-ended questions.

In terms of the questions on the questionnaire, they are mainly about students' responses to ongoing feedback from the professor throughout the semester. There are three categories in it: affective domain (i.e., confidence, security, creativity, interests, and motivation), learning strategies (i.e., reflecting, understanding processes involved in writing, recognizing grammatical errors, recognizing errors in writing conventions, monitoring progress, and recognizing learning evidence), and learning outcomes (i.e., increasing independent learning, increasing efficiency of making paragraphs and essays, increasing student-centered learning, and increasing positive effects on learning writing). To fully reflect students' feelings, two more open-ended questions were added, such as merits and demerits of receiving ongoing feedback.

As for data analysis, the answers were tallied for the closed questions. To analyze the answers from the open-ended questions, the researcher read the collected questionnaires several times to look for words, phrases, or events that seemed to stand out and created categories and subcategories. Second, she looked for relationships among categories that might suggest generalizations. For instance, she compared each category to make sense of the meaning of the data and did creative thinking in order to articulate underlying concepts about what particular patterns emerged. Then, she interpreted the findings inductively, synthesized the information, and drew inferences (McMillan, 2000).

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Affective Domain

The first five questions are concerned with affective domain of second language learning in that they are all about the role of affective factors, such as confidence, security, creativity, interests, and motivation in learning and developing writing skills.

TABLE 1
Results of Questions from Affective Domain

Questions/Scores	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
1 (Confidence)	6 (30%)	11 (55%)	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
2 (Security)	6 (30%)	10 (50%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
3 (Creativity)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)	11 (55%)	3 (15%)	0 (0%)
4 (Interests)	7 (35%)	9 (45%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	0 (0 %)
5 (Motivation)	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	4 (20%)	4 (20%)	0 (0 %)

As shown in Table 1, 17 (85%) students expressed that receiving ongoing feedback from the professor gave them more confidence in writing, and 16 (80%) students mentioned that receiving ongoing feedback from the professor made them less anxious in their writing processes. The results of these two questions are similar because they are related in a sense. The guidance from the professor in the form of ongoing feedback makes them confident and secure because it provides students with a less-anxious atmosphere where the professor scaffolds them step by step until they can reach certain levels of writing skills. Eventually, this step by step scaffolded help from the professor makes them confident in their writing processes.

Unlike the results from questions 1 and 2, the result from question 3 shows a neutral reaction to the professor's ongoing feedback. 11 (55%) students thought that receiving ongoing feedback from the professor was not really helpful to promote their creativity in writing. It can be interpreted that they thought that they were always under the guidance of the professor throughout their writing processes, which might confine their scopes of writing to the professor's feedback.

Questions 4 and 5 look similar in that they are concerned with interests and motivation but they are bit different because the former is about interests in writing itself and the latter is about motivation in reading more English. 16 (80%) students expressed that receiving ongoing feedback from the professor created more interests in learning and developing

writing. However, when they were asked to answer the question related to their motivation in reading more English, such as sample writings, articles, newspapers, and so on, 12 (60%) students were positive in this area. Overall, we can see that receiving ongoing feedback from the professor generally has a positive effect on students' attitude toward writing considering affective factors, except for the area, increasing creativity.

2. Learning Strategies

In general, questions from 6 to 11 in Table 2 are about how the professor's ongoing feedback plays a role in students' learning and developing writing skills.

TABLE 2
Results of Questions from Learning Strategies

Questions/Scores	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
6 (Reflection)	4 (20%)	11 (55%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7 (Process)	10 (50%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
8 (Grammar)	8 (40%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
9 (Writing conventions)	7 (35%)	6 (30%)	6 (30%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
10 (Monitoring)	6 (30%)	9 (45%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
11 (Evidence)	7 (35%)	9 (45%)	4 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Question 6 is about whether it gives students an opportunity to look at their writing in a critical way. The result revealed that 15 (75%) students were very positive about it because the revision processes they had to work on after receiving feedback made them approach their writing in a more critical way. The result of question 7 is highly positive because 18 (90%) students agreed that receiving ongoing feedback definitely helped them understand their processes of writing, such as choosing a topic, brainstorming, outlining, drafting, revising, and proofreading.

In a sense, questions 8 and 9 are related because they both are concerned with recognition of errors in the areas of grammar and writing conventions. It is shown that 16 (80%) students thought that receiving ongoing feedback was helpful to recognize grammatical errors but when it comes to writing conventions, they expressed that it was helpful to a certain extent not to the full.

As for questions from 10 and 11, approximately 80% of the students expressed that receiving ongoing feedback played a role in monitoring their progress and in checking their learning evidence. Since they had to collect all the work they had worked on throughout the semester in the form of writing portfolio, it was easy to monitor their work

and to see what they did by leafing through. In sum, it is noticeable that positive answers are more prevalent again in this category, learning strategies.

3. Learning Outcomes

Questions from 12 to 15 in Table 3 are related to students' learning outcomes they can obtain through receiving ongoing feedback (i.e., facilitation of independent learning, development of effective writing, facilitation of student-centered learning, and positive impact on learning writing skills).

TABLE 3
Results of Questions from Learning Outcomes

Questions/Scores	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Neither Agree nor Disagree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
12 (Independence)	4 (20%)	7 (35%)	8 (40%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
13 (Development)	4 (20%)	10 (50%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)
14 (Student-centered)	5 (25%)	10 (50%)	5 (25%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
15 (Positive Impact)	8 (40%)	11 (55%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Among the four questions, the result (55%) from question 12 is less positive although the role of ongoing feedback gives students a chance to revise their work outside the classroom to create an independent learning atmosphere. 70% of the students expressed that receiving ongoing feedback was helpful to make effective paragraphs and essays and 75% of them thought that it could create a more student-centered learning environment. The last question is a sweeping one in that it asks students how effective or positive it is in terms of learning and developing writing skills. 95% of the students benefitted from receiving ongoing feedback in learning and developing their writing skills.

4. Merits and Demerits of Ongoing Feedback

In addition to the 15 closed questions, two more open-ended questions were utilized in the questionnaire. The first open-ended question is about advantages of receiving ongoing feedback and the results were categorized into the following three categories: affective domain, learning strategies, and learning outcomes. As shown in Table 4, in affective domain, many students felt that they were being supported in every stage of learning and

developing their writing skills, which eventually made them confident and satisfied. As shown in learning strategies, receiving ongoing feedback played a role in understanding writing itself, self correcting, recognizing their weaknesses, using proper words, and monitoring their learning progress. The results from learning outcomes revealed that it was good for obtaining accuracy, understanding different stages of writing, and improving writing skills.

TABLE 4
Merits of Receiving Ongoing Feedback

Factors	Merits
Affective Domain	Feeling confident Feeling satisfied Feeling familiar with the professor Feeling the professor's efforts
Learning Strategies	Recognizing weaknesses & errors Useful for selecting proper words Useful for reviewing Increasing a better understanding about writing Monitoring progress Providing learning evidence Providing a chance to correct errors
Learning Outcomes	Useful for grammatical accuracy Useful for understanding writing processes Useful for improving writing skills

On the other hand, some students expressed disadvantages of receiving ongoing feedback. Unlike the various responses in Table 4, their responses fall into the three categories, such as feeling a burden, focusing on forms, and feeling confused. Specifically, many of the students expressed that revisions accompanied with ongoing feedback were too demanding and they also felt that content feedback lacked. In addition, they were sometimes confused when they did not agree with the professor's feedback. In other words, they might want to have a chance to interact with the professor to clarify uncertain things.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The overall results of this study revealed that ongoing feedback from the professor positively affected affective domain, such as confidence, security, interests, and motivation except creativity. It was also helpful to develop learning strategies, such as increasing a critical way of looking at one's own writing, understanding different stages of writing, recognizing weaknesses, monitoring, and checking learning evidence. In the area

of learning outcomes, students expressed that it increased a student-centered learning environment and was valuable in learning and developing writing skills but when it comes to promotion of independent learning, they had neutral opinions compared to the results of other items. It is interesting to see that receiving ongoing feedback did not play an effective role in promoting students' creativity and facilitating independent learning.

According to the analysis of merits of receiving ongoing feedback, it is also categorized into the three areas mentioned above. Among them, it is noticeable that they came to have an awareness of learning strategies which is a viable factor in learning and developing their writing skills in an academic setting. However, they expressed that revising their work based on the professor's feedback was too much a burden and they also felt that they were sometimes confused in the revision processes due to lack of chances to clarify and negotiate ambiguities with the professor. In addition, they also wanted to receive more feedback on content along with form-focused feedback like ESL students in Hedgecock and Lefkowitz's (1996) study. Like students' reactions in Ferris' (2002) study, it is found that receiving ongoing feedback has a positive impact on students' writing processes.

To create a more effective learning environment, the following four pedagogical suggestions should be implemented in academic wiring courses. First, promoting leaner autonomy is required. Increasing creativity and facilitating independence learning are interrelated in that both are all concerned with the concept of learner autonomy, taking responsibility for one's own learning. Brown (2007) stressed the importance of learner autonomy:

> Successful mastery of a foreign language will depend to a great extent on learners' autonomous abilities both to take initiative in the classroom and to continue their journey to success beyond the classroom and the teacher. (p. 70)

To successfully implement the concept of learner autonomy, professors help students develop a sense of autonomy through guiding practice, praising students for trying out language beyond their current capacity, and remembering their roles, facilitators, when providing feedback.

Second, more interactions between students and professor are needed in the form of individual writing conferences where students and professors meet outside the classroom and discuss their weaknesses and strengths in writing. In fact, both students and professors can benefit from it. For instance, it can give professors a good understanding of students' writing skills and their individual differences and it also gives students a chance to make uncertain things clear, both of which eventually create a collaborative learning environment.

Third, a balance should be struck in between content-based and form-based feedback. It is natural that professors give more form-focused feedback to students in first year academic writing courses in EFL context because writing in academic settings is a new experience to many students. However, overemphasis on forms is not helpful to apprentice students as good writers. Thus, it is suggested that professors increase an awareness of how to respond to students' writing according to proficiency levels and individual differences.

Fourth, judicious use of ongoing feedback is needed. It is generally believed that receiving ongoing feedback is effective in developing and learning writing skills. However, it does not apply to all levels of students. In fact, it is a very meaningful process for students who can successfully handle the revision processes accompanied with it. On the other hand, for students without necessary proficiency levels, it will be a painful journey. Thus, the level of challenge should be considered through careful streaming. If the four suggestions above are successfully implemented in writing courses, we can expect more fruitful learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

송미정. (1998). 문자피드백의 유형과 영작문 실력 향상간의 관계. *영어교육*, *53*(2), 135-156.

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to students writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9*(3), 227-257.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191-205.

Brown, D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (3rd ed.). Pearson Longman.

Chandler, J. (2004). A response to Truscott. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 345-348.

Chin, C. S. (2007). EFL students' beliefs and processing behaviors toward writing and teacher response. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(4), 1-32.

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

Eskey, D. E. (1983). Meanwhile back in the real world: Accuracy and fluency in second language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*(2), 315-323.

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

Fazio, L. L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority and majority language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(4), 235-249.

Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student' reactions to teacher response in multi-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 33-53.

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-10.

Ferris, D. S. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language students writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. S., & Hedgcock, J. S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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.

Folse, K. S., Solomon, E. V., & Clabeaux, D. (2007). *From great paragraphs to great essays*. Thomson: Heinle.

Frodesen, J. (2001). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 233-248). Heinle & Heinle.

Hedgecock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback on L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal, 80*(3), 287-308.

Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal, 75*(3), 305-313.

Kim, B. J. (2007). The effects of different types of form-focused instruction on Korean university students' writing accuracy. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 13*(2), 63-90.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition error: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal, 66*(2), 140-149.

Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices, and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing, 8*(3), 216-237.

Lee, J., & Hong, Y. (2001). The effects of processed-based feedback on the development of English writing proficiency. *English Teaching, 56*(2), 265-285.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*(3), 203-218.

McMillan, J. H. (2000). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer*. New York: Longman

Paulus, T. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(3), 265-289.

Radecki, P., & Swale, J. (1988). ESL student reactions to comments on their work. *System, 16*(3), 355-365.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*(1), 83-95.

Ryoo, Y. S. (2007). Korean college students' English writing with and without error correction. *The Journal of English Education, 19*(3), 69-87.

Semke, H. M. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals, 17*(3), 195-202.

Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "the case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(2), 111-122.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(2), 79-101.

APPENDIX A

Syllabus

Spring 2009

Paragraph & Essay Writing

Wednesdays from 11:00-1:00

Professor: 000

Office: 000 Office Phone: 000

Cell: 000 Email: 000

Course Description & Goals

In general, this course is designed to help students understand various types of academic writing. Specifically, this course goes from writing different types paragraphs (i.e., descriptive, compare & contrast, cause & effect, & classification paragraphs) to writing different types of essays (i.e., compare & contrast, cause & effect, and classification essays). At the end of this semester, students will get a sense of how to develop paragraphs & essays in an academic setting.

Textbook

Folse, K. S., Solomon, E. V., & Clabeaux, D. (2007). *From Great Paragraphs to Great Essays.*

Grading Policy

Attendance & Class participation: 10%

In-class Writing Assignments (3% for each): 24%

Midterm Portfolio Checkup: 20%

End of Semester Writing Portfolios: 46% (Put all of your first drafts & revised ones in a file & turn in your portfolio week 16)

Classroom Procedure

1. Lecture & Doing Exercises
2. In-class writing (Approximately 30 mins)

Course Requirements

1.Attendance & Class Participation

You are required to attend all classes. No more than one unexcused absence will influence your grade (3 lates=1absence/4 absences=F). In addition, you are expected to complete all the assigned readings.

2. In-Class Writing Assignments

Throughout the semester, you have a chance to write in class several times.

3. Midterm Writing Portfolio Checkup

You need to turn in your revised writing samples (from 1-5) with your first drafts week 8.

4. End of Semester Writing Portfolios

You need to turn in your portfolio with all of your writing samples including first & second drafts (from 1-8) week 16. Writing samples in your portfolio should be typed & double-spaced. Please use 12 point & Times New Roman.

Weekly Schedule

Weeks	Topics	Assigned Readings & Due
Week 1	Course Overview	
Week 2	Introduction to Paragraphs	Assigned Reading In-class Writing 1
Week 3	5 Elements of Good Writing	Assigned Reading In-class Writing 2
Week 4	Types of Paragraphs I: Descriptive Paragraph & Compare & Contrast Paragraph	Assigned Reading In-class Writing 3
Week 5	Types of Paragraphs II: Cause & Effect Paragraph & Classification Paragraph	Assigned Reading In-class Writing 4
Week 6	Moving from Paragraph to Essay I	Assigned Reading In-class Writing 5
Week 7	Moving from Paragraph to Essay II	Assigned Reading
Week 8	Midterm Portfolios Checkup	Midterm Portfolios Checkup
Week 9	Compare & Contrast Essay I	Assigned Reading
Week 10	Compare & Contrast Essay II	Assigned Reading

		In-Class Writing 6
Week 11	Cause & Effect Essay I	Assigned Reading
Week 12	Cause & Effect Essay II	Assigned Reading
		In-Class Writing 7
Week 13	Classification Essay I	Assigned Reading
Week 14	Classification Essay II	Assigned Reading
		In-Class Writing 8
Week 15	Classification Essay III	Assigned Reading
Week 16	End of Semester Writing Portfolios Due	End of Semester Writing Portfolios Due

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with items by circling one of the responses ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"

Affective Domain

1. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor gives you confidence in writing?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
2. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor makes you feel secure in writing process?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
3. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor promotes your creativity in writing?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
4. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor creates interests in learning writing?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
5. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor motivates you to read more in English? (i.e., sample writings, articles, etc.)
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

Learning Strategies

6. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor gives you a chance to look at your writing in a critical way?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
7. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor helps you understand the processes of writing (i.e., choosing a topic, brainstorming, outlining, drafting, & revising)?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
8. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor helps you recognize grammatical errors in writing?
Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree
9. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor helps you recognize errors in writing conventions?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

10. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor is an effective way to monitor your progress?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

11. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor provides you with evidence of learning?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

Learning Outcomes

12. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor facilitates independent learning?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

13. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor helps you develop clear & effective paragraphs/essays?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

14. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor facilitates student-centered learning?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

15. Do you think ongoing feedback from the professor has a positive impact on learning writing skills?

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor disagree Disagree Strongly disagree

16. Please write down merits of receiving ongoing feedback from the professor.

_____

17. Please write down demerits of receiving ongoing feedback from the professor.

_____

Thanks for Your Time & Effort

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: College

Taesun Yang
Dept. of General Education
Dongguk University
M409 26, 3, Pildong, Junggu Seoul, Korea
Tel: 02-2260-8776 CP: 010-3850-3093
Email: tyang@dongguk.edu

Received in January, 2010
Reviewed in February, 2010
Revised version received in March, 2010