Impacts of indirect feedback on Vietnamese lower-intermediate learners’ writing performance
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1. Background

- **Errors:**
  - a natural product of learning (Han, 2002)
  - represent a gap between the interlanguage and the target lang.

- **Corrective feedback** “refers to the responses to a learner’s nontargetlike L2 production” (Li, 2010: p.309)

- 1990s: revitalization of focus-on-form feedback
1. Background

- **Direct feedback**: the correct forms of errors for the students
- **Indirect feedback**: teachers’ indication of errors, leaving the students to self-correct them (Ferris & Roberts, 2001)
1. Background

- **Treatable errors** “occur in a patterned, rule–governed way” (Ferris, 1999, p.6)
- **Untreatable errors** are “idiosyncratic” and students can hardly refer to any handbook or set of rules to correct these errors (Ferris, 1999)

E.g.: S-V agreement, articles and spelling
E.g.: missing words, unnecessary words
2. Research questions

1. Does feedback help lower intermediate students self-correct their errors?

2. Does feedback have impact on students’ self-correction ability of different types of errors (treatable and untreatable)?

3. To what extent does feedback have impact on students’ performance in a new writing assignment?

4. What are students’ preferences towards teachers’ feedback?
3. Methodology

3.1 Participants:
- 30 Vietnamese students of lower-intermediate proficiency
- 3 groups: coded, non coded, no feedback

3.2 Design
- Grammatical test
- Writing 1, writing 1 revision, writing 2
- Writing diary
- Questionnaire
4. Results & Discussions

• Research question 1
• Research question 2
• Research question 3
• Research question 4
RQ 1: Does feedback help lower intermediate students self-correct their errors?

- Grammar test score (one way ANOVA): similar grammar proficiency
- Quantitative study (repeated measure analysis): the interaction between writings and types of feedback is SIGNIFICANT at p<.05
RQ 1: Does feedback help lower intermediate students self-correct their errors?

- Post-hoc analysis: coded FB >>> no FB
- Possible reason:
  - Participants in the current study: EFL learners
  - Participants in the previous studies: ESL learners in the US → more exposure to English → better acuteness to errors
RQ 1: Does feedback help lower intermediate students self-correct their errors?

→ Conclusion:
For learners who have little exposure to the target language, more explicit indirect FB is likely to be more beneficial.
RQ 2: Does feedback have impact on students’ self-correction ability of different types of errors?

- FB has no impact on students’ self-edition of different types of errors ($p > 0.05$)

- Possible reason:
  - Participants might not get used to a quick change in feedback giving practice from direct FB (in the previous 2 semesters) $\rightarrow$ indirect FB
RQ 2: Does feedback have impact on students’ self-correction ability of different types of errors?

→ Conclusion:

- Teachers should be consistent in using feedback
- Students really need time to get used to feedback practice
RQ3: To what extent does feedback have impact on students’ performance in a new writing assignment?

- Feedback has no impact on students’ performance in the subsequent assignment
- Support Truscott (1996)
RQ3: To what extent does feedback have impact on students’ performance in a new writing assignment?

- When assigned writing homework:
  - 15-30 minutes/day: 71%
  - 30-1 hour/day: 19%
  - >1 hour/day: 10%

- Writing practice outside classroom:
  - 19%
  - 10%
  - 0%
RQ3: To what extent does feedback have impact on students’ performance in a new writing assignment?

→ Conclusion

- Success in revision task does not determine better performance in a new writing task

→ “revision is not a predictor, even a very weak predictor, of learning” (Truscott & Hsu, 2008, p.299)

→ Further studies should include an independent, new writing task
RQ4: What are students’ preferences towards teachers’ feedback?

The most beneficial writing feedback

- Error underlining: 10%
- Error labelling: 44%
- Both underlining and labelling: 6%
- Other: detailed comments: 40%
- No feedback: 0%
RQ4: What are students’ preferences towards teachers’ feedback?

- All students welcome FB → against Truscott (1996)
- The most effective type of FB: coded FB
- Reasons:
  - Students’ limited ability in detecting errors (low marks in the grammar test)
  - “Codes address errors clearly” ~ labeling “helps students to acquire linguistic structure and reduce errors over time” (Ferris, 2004, p.21)
RQ4: What are students’ preferences towards teachers’ feedback?

Is writing diary effective?

- 83% Effective
- 17% Not effective
RQ4: What are students’ preferences towards teachers’ feedback?

- Writing diary
  - self-reflect their writings (Ferris and Helt, 2000)
  - record “error logs” (Ferris, 2002) → useful for students to monitor their errors and keep track of progress
RQ4: What are students’ preferences towards teachers’ feedback?

→ Conclusion

• Feedback is beneficial and should be provided

• Writing diary should be widely applied in EFL writing classes
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