

Rethinking error feedback on L2 writing

Katie Shih-Yin Deng
The Language Training and
Testing Center

Reference data:

Deng, K. (2010). Rethinking error feedback on L2 writing. In A. M. Stoke (Ed.), *JALT2009 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

This paper reports a study of teachers' and students' beliefs about error feedback in L2 writing by addressing the following questions: 1) What are the teachers' perspectives on correcting grammar errors in students' writing? 2) What are the students' perspectives on having grammar errors in their writing corrected? Quantitative and qualitative data were collected through questionnaires and follow-up interviews. Participants were fifty-four students and five teachers from three writing courses. Results indicated that teachers and students have certain beliefs about error feedback and that these are associated with preferences for particular feedback strategies. Mismatches were also found between teachers' and students' beliefs, and these mismatches affected their attitudes and behavior towards error feedback. It is suggested that teachers respond to grammar errors selectively and discuss their feedback strategies with the students. Teachers could also make more use of students' grammar errors as a guide to understanding the students' language development.

本研究は、第二言語としての英作文クラスにおいて、教師が行うエラーフィードバックに関して、教師と学習者のビリーフを明らかにしようとするものである。調査項目は、1) 教師は学習者が書いた英作文の文法誤りの訂正に関してどんな考えを持っているか。2) 学習者は自分の作文が訂正されることについてどんな見方をしているか。の2点に絞り分析考察した。調査方法はアンケートおよびその後のフォローアップ・インタビューの2種類を用い、量的・質的の両面からデータを集めた。調査協力者は三つのライティングクラスの学習者54名、教師5名からなる。結果、教師も学習者もエラーフィードバックについて特定のビリーフを持ち、なおかつそれらのビリーフは特定のフィードバックストラテジーを好むことと関係していることが明らかになった。その一方で、教師と学習者が持つビリーフに違いがあることも分かり、その違いがお互いのエラーフィードバックに対する取り組みや対処に影響を与えることが分かった。研究の考察に基づき、教師は学習者が犯す文法の間違いを適宜に選択して訂正することが望ましく、また訂正後、学習者と与えたフィードバックストラテジーを口頭で話し合うことを示唆する。そして、教師は学習者が犯す間違いを学習者の習得程度と理解し、活用するべきだと提言する。

TEACHERS' ERROR feedback on students' L2 writing has always been considered an essential element in writing courses, especially when learners go through a multiple-draft process. Although the issue of error feedback has generated a wealth of studies over the years, these studies have mostly looked at the different types of feedback strategies (Hamid, 2007; McGarrel & Verbeem, 2007); the effects of error feedback (Lee, 1997; Truscott, 2007); the appropriateness of error feedback (Ferris, 2006; Guenette, 2007); and the types of feedback strategies preferred by the students (Hedgcock & Leftkowitz, 1996; Jacobs, Curtis, Braine, & Huang, 1998). Very little work has studied this subject from either the teachers' or



the students' perspectives. This study aims to fill this gap by examining the beliefs and attitudes teachers and students have towards the practice of error feedback.

Literature review

Arguments against error feedback

Truscott (1999, 2007) argued strongly against the efficacy of grammatical feedback in L2 writing, pointing out the numerous practical problems associated with this practice such as the teachers' lack of grammar knowledge, their abilities to respond to errors, and the students' different behaviors after receiving teacher feedback.

In an earlier study, Zamel (1985) had already doubted the quality of teacher feedback, finding that teachers were neither consistent nor systematic in responding to student errors. Furthermore, Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990) also found the same inconsistencies. They even discovered teacher biases, where teachers provided grammar corrections according to the beliefs they held about a particular student's language abilities.

In addition, students' responses to teachers' feedback may also be problematic. For example, Cohen's study (1987) found that many students had difficulties understanding teachers' feedback, and did not know what to do with the feedback even if they understood it. In a more recent study, Fazio (2001) found that because of "the limited attention students paid to the corrections" (p. 245), teachers' feedback could actually impede students' ability to write accurately.

Arguments for error feedback

Ferris (1999, 2006) strongly rejected Truscott's views, and argued for error correction to be continued because most students value teachers' feedback. This belief was confirmed in Zacharias'

study (2007), where students were found to prefer teacher feedback to other forms of feedback.

In addition, Ferris pointed out the adverse effects that errors can have on the quality of students' writing, especially for students who are writing for academic purposes. As noted by Ferris (1999), grammar errors can jeopardize the overall evaluation of the composition for most academic contexts, as teachers at the university level are "less tolerant of typical ESL errors than of typical native speaker errors" (p. 8).

Furthermore, Ferris stressed the importance for learners to develop the habit of revising their own writing. She mentioned that if teachers do not provide an adequate amount of feedback, it will be extremely difficult for students to revise on their own, even when they perceive the importance of editing.

The opposing viewpoints between those who argue for error feedback and those who are against it have generated a wealth of studies over the years; nevertheless, only a small number of studies have examined this subject from either the teachers' or the students' perspectives.

Lee's 2004 study

Lee (2004) investigated secondary L2 writing teachers' and students' beliefs regarding error feedback in Hong Kong. Results showed that participants preferred comprehensive error feedback. It was also found that teachers used only a small range of feedback strategies, and their feedback was only accurate 50% of the time. In addition, the students were more or less dependent on teachers for error correction.

The current study aims to replicate Lee's (2004) study for the EFL context of Taiwan. As mentioned by McKay and Gass (2005), replication studies are important as they "provide important supporting or disconfirming information" related to the original study (p. 22). This study sets out to explore similar

issues examined by Lee. Both teachers' and students' beliefs and attitudes on four specific feedback strategies – comprehensive, selective, direct, and indirect – are examined. Furthermore, their perspectives on the use of error codes are also explored.

Significance of the study

The old national English curriculum in Taiwan gave very little attention to writing and saw it as a way of practicing the structures of English (Ministry of Education, 1999). English writing did not receive much attention until 2001 when the government revised the old curriculum. As a result, writing was no longer viewed as a tool for practicing grammar and vocabulary; instead, a process approach to writing was specified. Today, students are encouraged to work on multiple drafts and to revise their writing based on feedback from teachers or peers (Ministry of Education, 2000).

Nevertheless, error feedback in students' writing is still an area that has not been widely explored in Taiwan. In order to provide information on one aspect of this area (beliefs about feedback on grammar errors in writing), the present study attempts to address two research questions: 1) What are the teachers' perspectives on correcting grammar errors in students' writing? 2) What are students' perspectives on having grammar errors in their writing corrected? It is hoped that the findings can help offer insights into the beliefs about feedback on grammar errors in writing for the Taiwan context.

Research design

Context

This study looks at five English writing courses of three proficiency levels at the Language Training and Testing Center (LTTC) in Taiwan, an institution recognized by the Ministry

of Education as a cultural and educational foundation. These writing courses are part of an intensive program where students study English for a total of 150 hours. Students attend three classes a day, five days a week, and each class is approximately 50 minutes long. Classes focus on the four main areas of English learning: reading, writing, speaking and listening.

Students are streamed into levels according to the results of a pre-course test developed by the institute. These levels are: EH-2, EH-3, and EH-4. Compared to the IELTS band scales, EH-2 is approximately IELTS 3; EH-3 equates to IELTS 4; and EH-4 is around IELTS 5. In most classes, sizes range from around 8 to 18 students, with an average of 14.

Participants

Altogether, 54 students from the five writing classes and five teachers consented to participate. In addition, out of the 54 students, 15 were chosen randomly for follow-up interviews. All 15 students agreed to participate in the interview by consent. The students were all adults, aged 18 or above, and included both male and female. They all spoke Mandarin Chinese as their native language.

All teachers were native speakers of English, and most of them had four to six years of experience in teaching English. Two teachers were teaching EH-3 classes, two were teaching EH-2 classes, and one teacher was teaching the EH-4 class. Three teachers had an English-related certificate or a bachelor's degree in linguistics. Three teachers had a higher degree, but only two of them had a higher degree in a subject related to English. All teachers had at least three years of experience in teaching English writing.

Instruments

Two questionnaires were used. The one for teachers was written in English, and the one for students was in English and Chinese. Most of the questions were replicated from Lee's study in order to keep in line with the theoretical and conceptual issues behind the original work. However, since Lee's (2004) study looked at L2 secondary classrooms in Hong Kong, some questions were modified for the EFL context of Taiwan.

In the original teacher questionnaire, questions related to teaching experience in secondary schools were changed to inquire about teachers' overall teaching experience (see Appendix 1, Section 1). In addition, instead of following Lee's approach where follow-up interviews were conducted, additional open-ended questions were added to allow more elaboration on teachers' responses (see Appendix 1, Section 2).

For the student questionnaire, changes were made to the first four items only, where questions irrelevant to the current context were deleted. Statements such as "My English teacher does not underline/circle any of my errors" and "I have no idea about the above" were irrelevant because teachers in the current context were expected to provide feedback regardless of the strategies used. Also, as a school policy, teachers were required to explain the purpose of error feedback at the beginning of a writing course, so that students would know how to make use of the feedback during revision. The same principles apply for question 3 and 4 (see Appendix 2).

Furthermore, a protocol was used for the students' follow-up interviews (see Appendix 3). Questions were taken from Lee's study without any modifications, though Chinese translations were added so that questions could be asked and answered in Chinese when necessary.

Data collection procedures

The researcher distributed the questionnaires to all teachers (N=5) in a classroom setting, and to the students (N=54) in each of the five writing classes. No time limit was set, and teachers took approximately 30 minutes to complete the questionnaire, while students took roughly 40 minutes. The researcher was present in the room during the survey to answer queries and to collect the completed forms.

Random sampling was then carried out to select 15 students for the follow-up interviews. This was done by writing all the students' names on separate pieces of paper and mixing them together in an open container. The researcher drew five names out of the container for each level to decide the participants.

The researcher then carried out fifteen 40-minute individual interviews with 15 students. The interview was conducted in a mixture of English and Chinese depending on students' preferences. An interview protocol was given to the students 30 minutes before the interviews, allowing them some time to think about the questions. All interviews were audio recorded.

Data analysis

For the teachers' questionnaire, quantitative data were analyzed by totaling the number of response options selected. Qualitative data were summarized and categorized according to the five aspects of error feedback investigated in this study.

Students' responses were tabulated and percentages calculated for each answer. The interview data were transcribed, translated, summarized, and categorized according to the five main aspects of error feedback. Translation was carried out by the researcher, and later checked by two research assistants.

Results

Teachers' perspectives

Three teachers reported that they marked all grammar errors in students' writing, but for different reasons: school policy, students' expectations, and the teacher's sense of responsibility for pointing out all errors. Two teachers said that they gave selective error feedback, but their principles for error selection also differed significantly. One teacher said that errors were selected on an ad hoc basis, while another teacher said that errors were selected according to the suggestions given by either the school or the course coordinators.

Teachers reported making the most frequent use of indirect coded feedback followed by direct feedback. Indirect coded feedback was preferred due to its efficiency. One teacher wrote, "[codes] help save marking time...we have so many papers to go through." Direct feedback was preferred because some teachers thought it was not sufficient to just give students the codes. One teacher noted, "Codes alone are not enough, I correct the errors so they can work on these and avoid the same errors next time."

With indirect coded feedback, all teachers reported using and liking to use error codes, and all showed awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of codes. However, the sources of their codes differed significantly: they came from published textbooks, were self-developed, or developed by other teachers. All teachers said that they asked the students to correct their errors after providing feedback. Three teachers said they would hold conferences to go over common errors, while two teachers mentioned the difficulty of this due to time and workload constraints.

All teachers had positive comments with regards to the students' progress on writing skills but thought that students should bear more responsibility for their error correction.

Students' perspectives

Table 1 below lists the number of responses to each part of the student questionnaire.

Table 1. Students' responses to the questionnaire

Statements	Number	Percentage
I think my teacher corrects ALL errors	49	91%
I think my teacher corrects SOME errors	5	9%
I prefer my teacher correcting ALL errors	49	91%
I prefer my teacher correcting SOME errors	4	7%
I don't want my errors corrected	1	2%
I think my teacher gives me indirect error feedback	48	89%
I think my teacher gives me direct error feedback	6	11%
I prefer indirect error feedback	15	26%
I prefer direct error feedback	37	70%
I don't want any errors corrected	2	4%
I can understand and correct 76~100% of the codes	43	81%

Statements	Number	Percentage
I can understand and correct 51~75% of the codes	8	13%
I can understand and correct 26~50% of the codes	3	6%
I want my teacher to use error codes	50	93%
I don't want my teacher to use error codes	4	7%
I'm making GOOD/SOME progress in writing as a result of teachers' error feedback	51	94%
I'm making LITTLE progress in writing as a result of teachers' error feedback	3	6%
It's mainly the teachers' responsibility to correct errors	40	74%
It's mainly the students' responsibility to correct errors	15	26%

Almost all students (91%) reported preferring comprehensive error feedback. According to the interview data (which are quoted verbatim without editing), this is because they considered errors to be negative elements in writing that should be avoided altogether. One student stated, "I don't want write in the error grammar all the time." Students also perceive themselves being unable to detect and correct errors. One student said, "if I don't know what problem, I think I cannot correct my

mistakes." They also believed that having erroneous language would heavily impinge on the quality of their composition, especially in academic contexts. One student mentioned, "in my university, we shouldn't write errors."

Of all the students interviewed, only 4 students (7%) preferred selective feedback. Interview data showed that these 4 students think comprehensive feedback is de-motivating. One student said, "I don't like my teacher mark so many on my paper...it looks so much and I don't know how to start."

Most students (89%) indicated that teachers gave them indirect feedback; however, only a small percentage of students (26%) reported preferring this strategy. Most students (70%) preferred direct error feedback. According to the interview data, this is because they did not know how to correct their errors and self-correcting took too much time. One student said, "I know wrong but I don't know how to write the right way."

Overall, most students (81%) reported having positive attitudes towards error codes, they regarded error codes as being efficient and easy to understand. One student said, "codes very easy to understand...and tell me my errors." Only a small percentage of students (7%) preferred not having error codes due to confusion, "I don't want codes...they are hard to understand...I still don't know how to fix."

Almost all students considered teachers' error feedback effective, with as many as 94% of students attributing their improvements to the effectiveness of this practice. This corresponded to the high percentage of students (74%) who thought that it was mainly the teacher's responsibility to locate and correct errors for them.

Discussion of findings and implications

One limitation of the study was the small sample size, meaning that the results cannot be generalized. Secondly, participants'

viewpoints were based on self-reported statements rather than their actual writing samples. Nonetheless, despite these limitations, this study has uncovered a number of key issues regarding L2 error feedback in Taiwan.

Teachers' and students' perspectives

Both teachers and students reported having negative perceptions of errors in writing and preferred comprehensive error feedback because it helps to eradicate all errors. They value this practice and consider it an essential element in language learning. This finding is in line with Ferris' argument and supports the idea that the use of error feedback should be continued.

The same finding was also observed in Lee's study (2004) and reflects similar beliefs possessed by participants in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Similar to Hong Kong, the teaching and learning of grammar in Taiwan also receives the most attention in writing classes, while other aspects of the language, such as discourse, are much less valued.

There appears to be a mismatch between the strategies used by teachers and the ones expected by the students. Teachers reported using indirect coded feedback the most, while students expressed a clear preference for direct error feedback.

The teachers' preference for indirect coded feedback was also found in Lee's study (2004) and adds to the wealth of past studies that showed indirect error feedback to be the most commonly used method, one which leads to either greater or similar levels of accuracy over time (Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts, & McKee, 2000; Ferris & Helt, 2000; Lee, 1997). Furthermore, Lee (2004) also found the same student preference for direct error feedback in that most students wanted teachers to provide corrections for all their errors. This is another similarity to student beliefs in Hong Kong and Taiwan.

Teachers also reported using a wide range of error codes, all taken from different sources; however, students voiced a number of problems associated with error codes that were not mentioned by the teachers. Students mentioned that codes could be confusing because they may denote various meanings for different teachers. As a result, the more confusing the students consider error codes to be, the more they dislike having error codes in the feedback; thus, they opted for direct feedback from teachers instead.

Similarly, the use of codes was also popular among teachers in Hong Kong; however, Lee (2004) raised various issues regarding the effectiveness of error codes, all of which may be relevant to Taiwan. Lee thought that students' real understanding of the error codes was questionable, especially when codes were taken from different sources. She also mentioned the possible frustration learners can experience when they try to interpret the codes while correcting their errors, as well as the teachers' time availability when they have to categorize a wide range of errors using codes.

Lastly, the students were found to rely on teachers for error correction and to consider it the teachers' responsibility. Similarly, the teachers also considered it mainly their responsibility, but they thought that students should learn to take more responsibility for error correction. Nevertheless, the teachers did not appear to know how to help students to better identify and correct errors on their own.

Pedagogical implications

The first clear pedagogical implication is that feedback on grammar errors should be continued because both teachers and students have negative perceptions of grammar errors and strongly value error feedback. However, instead of trying to eradicate all errors, teachers can utilize errors in helping learners to discover

the rules of the language, and reinforce this belief to the students by responding to grammar errors selectively. For example, teachers may wish to focus on simpler grammar points such as the plural forms of nouns before looking at the more complicated structures of past forms of verbs.

Second, in order to prevent mismatches between teachers' and students' preferences for feedback strategies, teachers should establish better communication with students with regards to the feedback strategies used. Garret and Shortall (2002) recommended that teachers take time out regularly to listen to students' views on error feedback, during which the types of feedback strategies preferred by the students and the effectiveness of teachers' actual error feedback methods can be discussed.

Furthermore, care must be taken with the teachers' use of error codes. Without a systematic application of error codes, students can easily be confused about the meanings denoted by different codes. Therefore, it is important for teachers working in the same context to unify the sources of their error codes, and to regularly discuss the effectiveness of the error coding system, as well as the possible problems related to the codes.

Last, teachers should encourage more learner autonomy with error identification and correction. Activities such as peer editing and self-check lists can be utilized to promote more learner responsibility. In addition, teachers should also constantly self-develop their own grammar knowledge, along with their skills in providing adequate explanations of learners' grammar errors, so that the various practical problems associated with providing error feedback can be avoided.

Future research

The present study explores teachers' and students' attitudes and beliefs toward error feedback from their self-reports. Further research could investigate whether participants' actual practice

corresponds to their reported beliefs. In addition, studies could also look in greater depth at how participant variables (such as students' motivation, affective states, and age) affect the way they respond to error correction, as well as how these factors influence teachers' actual error correction practices.

Informed consent

The author hereby declares that the research subjects gave their informed consent.

Bio data

Katie Shih-Yin Deng has been teaching English as a second/foreign language since 1994. She lives in Taiwan, and is currently working as a teacher/researcher at the Language Training and Testing Center.

References

- Cohen, A. D. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. I. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177). New York: 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, 235-249.
- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1-10.

- Ferris, D. R., & Helt, M. (2000). Was Truscott right? New evidence on the effects of error correction in L2 writing classes. *Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conferences*, Vancouver, B. C., March 11-14, 2000.
- Ferris, D. R., Chaney, S. J., Komura, K., Roberts, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000). Perspectives, problems, and practices in treating written errors. *Colloquium presented at the International TESOL Convention*, Vancouver, B.C., March 14-18, 2000.
- Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garrett, P., & Shortall, T. (2002). Learners' evaluations of teacher-fronted and student-centered classroom activities. *Language Teaching Research*, 6, 25-57.
- Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 40-53.
- Hamid, M. O. (2007). Identifying second language errors: How plausible are plausible reconstructions. *ELT Journal*, 61(2), 107-116.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some input on input: Two analyses of student response to expert feedback in L2 writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 287-308.
- Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 307-317.
- Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*, 25(4), 465-477.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 285-312.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McGarrel, H., & Verbeem, J. (2007). Motivating revision of drafts through formative feedback. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 228-236.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). *Education in the Republic of China*. Retrieved from <http://www.edu.tw/statistics/English/d8.htm>
- Ministry of Education. (2000). *The nine-year joint curricula plan language arts guidelines for elementary and junior high schools*. Retrieved from <http://teach.eje.edu.tw/data/kunda/2001621130/news.htm?paperid=265>
- 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, 111-22.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 255-272.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback. *Regional Language Center Journal*, 38(1), 38-52.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-101.

Appendix I

Teachers' questionnaire

Section 1

1. How many years have you been teaching English?
2. What proficiency level are you currently teaching?
3. Do you have an English-related degree e.g. TESL/TEFL/TESOL, linguistics, translation?
4. Do you have a higher degree?
5. Do you have a higher degree in an English-related subject e.g. TESL/TEFL/TESOL, linguistics, translation?
6. How long have you been teaching English writing?

Section 2

1. In your opinion, what is the main purpose of providing feedback on students' writings?

2. Are you aware of the following terminologies? If so, could you please briefly describe what each of them mean, and/or what might be involved?

- » Direct feedback:
- » Indirect feedback:
- » Coded feedback:
- » Non-coded feedback:
- » Error feedback:
- » Error correction:

3. Which of the statements below best describes your existing error feedback practice?

- a. I mark ALL students' grammar errors.
- b. I mark students' grammar errors SELECTIVELY.

In one or two words, briefly explain why you use the above error feedback strategy.

4. How much grammar errors do you mark.

- a. About 1/3.
- b. About 2/3.
- c. More than 2/3.

In one or two words, briefly justify the answer you have chosen above.

5. Which of the following best describes the major principles for error selection?

- a. The selected errors are directly linked to the current instructional focus in class.
- b. The selected errors are related to students' specific needs.
- c. The selected errors are suggested by the center/course coordinators.
- d. The errors are selected on an ad hoc basis.
- e. Others.

6. Are your students aware of the type(s) of errors selected?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.

Do you think the students should be made aware of the type(s) of grammar error you will select? Why? Why not?

7. Do you use error codes in your feedback?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.

8. Does your school require you to use error codes?

- a. Yes.
- b. No.

If you use error codes, go to Question 9. If not, go to Question 10.

9. The error codes I use...

- a. were designed by another teacher.
- b. were designed by another teacher and adapted by me.
- c. were designed by myself.
- d. were taken from an external source.
- e. Others.

What is your opinion with regards to the use of error codes in providing feedback?

10. Rate the frequency with which you use each of the following error feedback techniques according to the scales below.

- 1 - Never or rarely
- 2 - Sometimes
- 3 - Always or often

I indicate (underline/circle) errors and correct them.	1	2	3
I indicate (underline/circle) errors, correct them and categorize them by using error codes.	1	2	3
I indicate (underline/circle) errors, but I don't correct them.	1	2	3
I indicate (underline/circle) errors and categorize them by using error codes. However, I don't correct them.	1	2	3

I hint at the location of errors.	1	2	3
I hint at the location of errors and categorize them by using error codes.	1	2	3

In one to two words, please explain why you utilize the above error feedback technique.

11. When providing feedback, do you follow the error feedback technique(s) prescribed to you by the center?
- Yes.
 - No.

If you follow the techniques given to you by the center, do you think some changes need to be made on it? If so, give some examples.

If your answer to Question 11 is "b", go to Question 12. If your answer is "a", go to Question 13.

12. What factors influence the error feedback technique(s) you always/often use?
- Students' requests.
 - My perception of students' needs.
 - The amount of time I have.
 - Others.

Do you think you are consistent with giving error feedback? If so, how do you maintain this consistency? Do you think improvements can be made? How?

13. What do you usually do after you have marked students' composition? You can choose more than one option.
- I do not do anything.
 - I hold a conference with each/some students.
 - I make students correct errors in/outside class.
 - I make students record their errors in an error log/error frequency chart.
 - I go through students' common errors in class.
 - Others.

14. Approximately, how much time do you spend marking one composition?
- Less than 10 minutes.
 - 10 to 20 minutes.
 - More than 20 minutes.
15. How would you evaluate the overall effectiveness of your existing error feedback practice on student progress in writing at the end of a term?
- Good progress.
 - Some progress.
 - Little progress.
 - No progress.
16. Indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements according to the scales below.
- Strongly disagree
 - Disagree
 - Agree
 - Strongly agree

There is no need for teachers to provide error feedback on errors.	1	2	3	4
Teachers should provide feedback on errors selectively.	1	2	3	4
It is the teachers' job to locate and correct errors.	1	2	3	4
Teachers should vary their error feedback techniques according to the error type.	1	2	3	4
Error codes are useful in helping students to correct their errors.	1	2	3	4
Error codes should be easy for students to follow and understand.	1	2	3	4
All error types deserve equal attention.	1	2	3	4

Students should learn to locate their own errors.	1	2	3	4
Students should learn to locate and correct their own errors.	1	2	3	4
Students should learn to analyze their own errors.	1	2	3	4

17. Do you have any concerns and/or problems regarding providing error feedback on student writing? Please elaborate.

Appendix 2

Student questionnaire

(All questions were in both English and Chinese on the actual questionnaire.)

Please circle the appropriate answers.

- Which of the following is true?
 - My English teacher underlines/ circles all my errors.
 - My English teacher underlines/ circles some of my errors.

If your answer to Question 1 is "b", answer Question 2. If your answer is "a", go to Question 3.

- Before/ after marking your compositions, does your teacher tell you the types of errors he/she will select to mark?
 - Yes.
 - No.
- Which of the following do you like best?
 - My English teacher underlines/ circles all of my errors.
 - My English teacher underlines/ circles some of my errors.
 - My English teacher does not underline or circle my errors in writing, but gives me some feedback on the content of my writing.

- Which of the following is true about your current writing class?
 - My English teacher corrects all grammar errors for me.
 - My English teacher corrects some grammar errors for me.
- With regards to grammar errors in writing, which of the following do you like best?
 - My English teacher corrects all grammar errors for me.
 - My English teacher corrects some grammar errors for me.
 - My English teacher does not correct my grammar errors.
- Does your English teacher use correction codes in marking your compositions (i.e., using symbols like *V*, *Adj*, *Voc*, *Sp*, etc.)?
 - Yes.
 - No.

If your answer to Question 6 is "a", answer Question 7 and 8. If your answer is "no", go to Question 9.

- What percentage of your English teacher's marking symbols (e.g., *V*, *Adj*, *Voc*, *Sp*) are you able to follow and understand when you are correcting errors in your compositions?
 - 76 ~ 100%
 - 51 ~ 75%
 - 26 ~ 50%
 - 0 ~ 25%
- What percentage of errors are you able to correct with the help of your English teacher's marking symbols (e.g., *V*, *Adj*, *Voc*, *Sp*)?
 - 76 ~ 100%
 - 51 ~ 75%
 - 26 ~ 50%
 - 0 ~ 25%
- After your teacher has corrected the errors in your compositions, do you think you will make the same errors again?
 - Yes.

- b. No.
10. Do you want your English teacher to use correction codes (i.e., using symbols like V, Adj, Voc, Sp, etc.) in marking your compositions?
 - a. Yes.
 - b. No.
 11. With regards to the result of your teacher's error feedback, which of the following is true?
 - a. I am making good progress in writing.
 - b. I am making some progress in writing.
 - c. I am making little progress in writing.
 - d. I am making no progress in writing.
 12. Which of the following do you agree with?
 - a. It is mainly the teachers' job to locate and correct errors for students.
 - b. It is mainly the students' job to locate and correct their own errors.

curacy? In your opinion, does teacher error correction help? Explain your answer.

6. Whose responsibility is it to correct errors in student writing? Why?

Appendix 3

Student interview protocol

(All questions were in both English and Chinese in the actual questionnaire.)

1. Do you want your teacher to respond to all errors or only some errors in writing? Why?
2. Do you want your teacher to provide corrections for all your errors or only some errors? Why?
3. Do you want your teacher to use error codes in error correction? Why or why not?
4. Are error codes easy or difficult to use? Elaborate on your answer.
5. Do you think you are making good progress in writing ac-