

**The Saigon International
University**



Graduation

Thesis

Ho Chi Minh City - 2023

GRADUATION THESIS

Major

English Language

Title

AN INVESTIGATION INTO L2 WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Instructor name:

NGUYEN THI BICH HAN, M.A

Student name:

TRUONG NGOC TUYET NHI

Student ID: 97011901713



Lewis Campus

Email: admission@siu.edu.vn
Website: www.siu.edu.vn

I. Introduction:

1.1 Rationale of the study

Second language (L2) Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is an important area of research in language acquisition and pedagogy. The aim of WCF is to provide learners with feedback on different aspects of writing regarding structures, content, vocabulary, grammar, etc. with the ultimate goal of improving L2 learners' writing proficiency. Previous studies have carried out research on the effectiveness of WCF, its role in learners' writing development, and students' perception of WCF. Research has shown that the effectiveness of WCF is largely dependent on the types of feedback learners are provided and how they respond to the feedback.

Effective feedback plays a crucial role in language learning and development, particularly in the context of L2 writing. Among various types of corrective feedback such as electronic feedback, metalinguistic CF, and error explanation, there are two types of corrective feedback that scholars often refer to: direct feedback and indirect feedback. Direct feedback involves explicitly correcting errors and providing the correct form, while indirect feedback involves indicating the presence of an error without providing the correct form (Bitchener, 2012). The provision of written corrective feedback (WCF) has long been recognized as an essential component of effective English as a foreign language (EFL) writing instruction. However, despite its potential benefits, research has shown that the effectiveness of WCF is highly dependent on different kinds of feedback learners receive. Thus, insights into the types of L2 written corrective feedback teachers provide are crucial in informing L2 writing instruction.

One specific problem related to the effectiveness of WCF is the question of how EFL learners perceive and respond to different types of written corrective feedback. For example, studies have suggested that direct corrective feedback, which explicitly identifies and corrects errors in learners' writing, may be more effective than indirect corrective feedback, which highlights errors without providing specific corrections. This indicates a need to investigate whether learners receive direct or indirect feedback in writing classes.

Moreover, the study aims to explore the components of writing that receive the most attention in the written corrective feedback given to EFL learners. By analyzing the frequency regarding the addressed components such as grammar, vocabulary, content, organization, and coherence, the research can provide insights into the areas of writing that are emphasized in the feedback process.

Another important aspect of the study is the investigation of focused feedback versus unfocused feedback. By examining the distribution and prevalence of these two types of feedback, the research seeks to determine whether there is a preference for addressing specific errors or a more general approach to feedback provision. This analysis can contribute to understanding the instructional strategies used by teachers and the potential impact on students' language development.

In summary, the rationale of the study is to gain insights into the prevalence and distribution of direct and indirect corrective feedback, the addressed components of writing, and the use of focused versus unfocused feedback among EFL learners. By investigating these aspects, the research aims to provide valuable information on the patterns and preferences of written corrective feedback in the EFL context, ultimately informing effective instructional practices and enhancing language learning outcomes.

1.2 Research objectives

The purpose of this research is to provide insights into the types of written corrective feedback that EFL learners receive more frequently, specifically focusing on direct and indirect feedback, the components of writing addressed, and the distinction between focused and unfocused feedback. By examining the frequency of feedback, the study seeks to provide insights into the types of feedback that are most commonly received by EFL learners.

To examine the prevalence and distribution of direct and indirect corrective feedback received by EFL learners. To explore the different components of writing (such as grammar, vocabulary, content, organization, and coherence) addressed in the corrective feedback. To investigate the frequency of focused and unfocused feedback provided to EFL learners. To determine the type of corrective feedback that EFL learners receive most frequently. To analyze the patterns and preferences regarding the types of corrective feedback received by EFL learners.

1.3 Research questions:

What types of Written Corrective Feedback do EFL learners receive more frequently?

1.4 The significance of the study:

The study focuses on the frequencies of types of written corrective feedback in L2 writing, which holds significant value in the field of second language acquisition and pedagogy. The significance of the study can be demonstrated through the following points, supported by relevant scholarly sources:

Insight into Feedback Practices

Investigating the frequencies of different types of written corrective feedback learners receive provides valuable insights into the prevalent practices used by instructors in L2 writing instruction. This understanding can be enriched by referring to sources such as Ferris (2003), who highlights the implications of response to student writing, including the feedback approaches employed.

Pedagogical Implications

The findings of this study have direct pedagogical implications for L2 writing instruction. By understanding the frequency of feedback types, educators can make informed decisions regarding the selection and utilization of specific strategies. This pedagogical significance is supported by research such as that of Ellis (2009), who discusses the importance of effective feedback in L2 writing instruction.

Research Advancement

This study contributes to advancing research in the field of L2 writing by addressing a gap in the existing literature and expanding our knowledge base. It builds upon existing studies such as Sheen's (2007) research on corrective feedback in second language writing, thus contributing to the scholarly discourse on feedback practices.

Learner-Centered Approach

Analyzing the frequency of feedback types underscores the importance of tailoring feedback to meet the needs of L2 learners. Research by Hyland and Hyland (2006) emphasizes the significance of learner engagement and individualization of feedback to promote L2 writing development.

1.5. Scope of the study

The current study was conducted to examine the types of written corrective feedback EFL learners receive frequently. The study focuses on direct and indirect feedback, focused and unfocused feedback, and components of writing including grammar, content, vocabulary, structure, ideas. The research was carried out at a university in southern Vietnam. A total of 59 non-English major

students volunteered to participate in the study. The participants are undergraduate students majoring in Economics, such as Business Administration, Logistics, and Marketing, as well as students from Natural Sciences disciplines, such as Biochemical Engineering and Biotechnology. With a sample size of 59 participants, the study seeks to investigate the frequencies of different types of WCF learners receive.

1.6. The organization of the study

This study “Types of written corrective feedback EFL learners receive more frequently”, with a focus on their frequency receiving different types of written corrective feedback, is organized into several sections. The study includes the following components:

Chapter 1 - Introduction: This chapter provides rationale of the study, rationale, research objectives, research questions, significance of the study, scope of the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2: Titled “Literature review”, this chapter focuses on definitions of corrective feedback, the role of corrective feedback and the types of WCF that students usually receive from their instructor. This chapter also reviews previous studies related to roles of WCF and the types of writing feedback.

Chapter 3: The “Methodology” section focuses on the research design, tools, participants, research methods, data collection procedures, and data analysis.

Chapter 4: Titled “Result”, this chapter provides the results of the study.

Chapter 5: Titled “Discussion”, this chapter discusses and interprets the results of the study, which is compared and contrasted with the existing literature, highlighting similarities, differences, and new insights generated by the research.

Chapter 6: Titled “Conclusion”, this chapter provides a summary of the findings, limitations and recommendations for the future research. Based on the limitations and gaps identified, recommendations are made for future research endeavors to further explore and expand upon the topic.

II. Literature review

2.2 Definitions of corrective feedback

Corrective feedback, as defined by Ellis (2009), encompasses any response to learner language that indicates problematic aspects and provides guidance on how to address them. Similarly, Sheen

(2007) characterizes corrective feedback as information given to learners to improve their language proficiency by focusing on the accuracy of their utterances. Providing corrective feedback involves identifying and addressing errors or inaccuracies in performance or understanding with the aim of promoting learning and improvement (Lightbown & Spada, 2013). In the context of L2 writing, written corrective feedback, according to Bitchener and Knoch (2008), specifically pertains to feedback given on learners' written compositions. It includes various types, such as direct error correction, metalinguistic explanation, and error indication, which guide learners in identifying and rectifying errors in their writing. Understanding the frequency of corrective feedback is crucial as it reveals the rate or occurrence of different feedback types provided to L2 learners in their writing instruction. This aspect sheds light on the instructional practices and pedagogical strategies employed by educators in supporting L2 learners' writing development (Sheen, 2007).

2.1 Roles of different WCF types

To gain a deeper understanding of the role of written feedback on second language (L2) learners, it is crucial to delve into the specific types of feedback employed by teachers to address different types of errors. Several studies, including those by Ferris and Roberts (2001), Chandler (2003), Bitchener et al. (2005), and Bitchener (2008), commonly categorize feedback as either direct or indirect. Many studies distinguish between these two feedback strategies (Ellis et al., 2006; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Bitchener et al., 2005; Chandler, 2003).

Direct feedback involves the teacher explicitly providing the correct linguistic form or structure to the student, specifically indicating the error and offering the appropriate correction (Ferris, 2003). On the other hand, indirect feedback highlights the presence of an error without explicitly providing the correct form (Ellis, 2008). It is important to note that both types of feedback involve the teacher identifying an error and addressing it, but the distinction lies in how the teacher responds to the error. According to Ferris (2002), direct feedback occurs when the instructor supplies the correct linguistic form, which may involve removing unnecessary words, inserting missing elements, or offering the accurate form or structure. Furthermore, research has explored the focus of feedback, whether it corrects all errors or only specific ones, and other aspects such as electronic feedback and reformulation. Focusing on the two main types of feedback—direct and

indirect—research has examined their impact on language accuracy and improvement among L2 learners (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Chandler, 2003; Bitchener et al., 2005; Bitchener, 2008).

Studies have shown that direct feedback, particularly when it involves simple underlining and correction, can be more effective in producing accurate revisions compared to indirect feedback (Chandler, 2003). Bitchener et al. (2005) investigated the effect of two types of feedback on specific error categories and found that the combination of written and oral feedback had a positive impact on the use of certain grammatical features. Similarly, Bitchener (2008) observed that learners who received feedback on specific error types outperformed those who did not receive feedback. These findings highlight the potential benefits of providing direct feedback targeted at specific error categories.

Additionally, research has emphasized the importance of focused feedback, where teachers concentrate on specific types of errors rather than correcting all errors (Ellis, 2008). Studies by Bitchener and Knoch (2008) and Sheen (2007) support this notion, indicating that providing written feedback targeting a single linguistic feature or focusing on specific error categories can enhance learners' accuracy and reduce the cognitive burden associated with addressing multiple error types.

2.3 Types of Corrective Feedback

2.3.1 Corrective feedback

There are various methods of providing feedback to enhance students' writing skills. Mi-mi (2009) outlines four distinct approaches, namely Teacher Written Feedback, Peer Feedback, Self-monitoring, and Teacher-learner Conference, and Computer-mediated Feedback. However, this study focuses primarily on investigating teacher written corrective feedback.

When it comes to writing in English, Truscott (1999) suggests that instructors provide feedback on different components such as essay structure, word choices, and vocabulary.

Bitchener and Ferris (2012) highlight a key issue related to written corrective feedback, which is the choice of errors or language features to target for correction. Some researchers argue that feedback should focus on global issues like content, organization, and coherence, rather than local errors such as grammar and vocabulary. However, others contend that written corrective feedback can effectively improve learners' accuracy and fluency at the local level, especially when provided in a timely and specific manner.

The mode of delivery is another important aspect of written corrective feedback. While traditional methods include written comments on students' papers or face-to-face conferences with teachers, technological advancements have introduced computer-assisted programs and online platforms like Turnitin and Grammarly as means of delivering feedback.

Despite ongoing debates, evidence suggests that written corrective feedback can positively impact learners' writing skills, particularly when integrated into a comprehensive writing program that includes meaningful practice and feedback opportunities (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). It should be viewed as part of a broader language teaching program aiming to develop students' writing proficiency through various activities and tasks.

Regarding the effectiveness of direct and indirect feedback, studies supporting indirect feedback argue that it engages learners in guided learning and problem-solving, promoting noticing, attention, and long-term acquisition (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). However, Chandler (2003) presents three arguments in favor of direct feedback. Direct feedback is considered more helpful to learners as it reduces confusion and provides linguistic descriptions that aid understanding and remembering the error. In contrast, indirect feedback may rely on codes that learners might forget later on. Besides, direct feedback offers explanations that help learners address related issues and acquire additional knowledge. It goes beyond correcting specific errors to provide guidance on usage and idiomatic expressions.

2.3.2 Direct written corrective feedback

According to Ferris (2006), direct corrective feedback involves providing students with accurate linguistic structures to rectify their errors. In this approach, teachers directly present the correct form of the students' errors or mistakes in written format. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) describe direct corrective feedback as a technique that not only brings learners' attention to errors but also offers specific solutions to address them. Similarly, Bitchener and Knoch (2015) define direct written corrective feedback as a type of feedback that provides clear and explicit corrections directly above or near the incorrect linguistic forms and structures, such as unnecessary words, missing words, or incorrect forms. It encompasses various forms of correction, including cross-outs, rewrites, and additions.

The objective of direct corrective feedback is to assist students in revising their writing and improving their performance in future texts (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012). Scholars highlight several reasons why the direct corrective approach can benefit L2 teachers and learners. It helps

minimize confusion among lower proficiency students who may struggle with error codes and provides them with sufficient information to address complex errors (Ferris, 2000; Roberts, 2001; Leki & Roberts, 1999). By offering detailed explanations and guidance, teachers support students in effectively addressing and enhancing their writing skills.

Ferris (2002) suggests that direct corrective feedback is particularly effective in addressing errors related to prepositions and idiomatic expressions. It is valuable during the writing process, especially in the final stages, as it helps learners identify and rectify lingering errors, preventing their recurrence in future writing. However, the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback may vary based on learners' proficiency levels. Advanced learners are more likely to benefit from this approach, as it reduces misunderstandings and provides the necessary information to correct complex errors. On the other hand, learners who have not fully acquired specific forms or structures may require further explanation.

Several studies have investigated the effectiveness of direct corrective feedback. Bitchener et al. (2005) examined the use of direct error correction and direct error correction with oral metalinguistic explanation among advanced ESL learners, finding an advantage for the latter. Bitchener (2008) conducted a study with low intermediate ESL learners, demonstrating the effectiveness of direct error correction with written and oral metalinguistic explanation. Sheen (2007) compared direct error correction and direct error correction with written metalinguistic explanation, showing the latter to be more effective in the delayed post-test. Stefanou (2014) observed no significant difference between direct error correction and direct error correction with written metalinguistic explanation in a group of EFL Greek learners.

2.3.3 Indirect written corrective feedback

According to Bitchener and Storch (2016), indirect corrective feedback is a type of correction that highlights the location of an error but does not provide the correct answer. This type of feedback can take various forms, such as underlining or circling the error. Similarly, Ferris (2002) describes indirect corrective feedback as "indicating an error through circling, underlining, highlighting, or in any other way marking its location in a text, with or without a verbal rule reminder or an error code, and asking students to make corrections themselves."

Indirect error correction, as described by Hendrickson (1984), refers to an implicit method of correcting errors that involves providing learners with codes indicating the causes of the errors. These codes can take the form of symbols, abbreviations (e.g., PL/Sing for Plural/Singular errors),

or even certain punctuation marks (e.g., '?' for requesting further clarification). By using these codes, learners become aware of the locations and types of errors in their original texts. Hyland (1990) suggests that the use of codes as a form of error correction can be advantageous, as it allows teachers to provide effective implicit feedback while preserving the positive effects of error correction. Harmer (2005) further argues that employing codes for error correction can reduce the potentially negative psychological impact of seeing red ink on learners' texts. In this regard, teachers need to instruct students to carefully read their errors and correct them. Indirect corrective feedback places emphasis on the learners' responsibility to understand their errors and make corrections themselves, rather than relying on their teachers for correction, Ferris (2002).

In a study conducted by Sheen (2007), the researcher investigated the effectiveness of direct and indirect corrective feedback on the acquisition of English articles by second language learners. The findings suggest that indirect corrective feedback, particularly when combined with explicit instruction, can be just as effective as direct corrective feedback in promoting the accurate use of English articles.

2.4 Feedback on different components of writing

2.4.1 Feedback on grammar

Comments on grammar encompass specific feedback given to learners concerning their grammatical errors and language usage has been highlighted in studies conducted by Truscott (1996). According to Hedgcock (2005), the objective of this feedback type is to identify and rectify inaccuracies in sentence structure, verb tense, word order, agreement, and other grammatical elements. Its purpose is pivotal in steering learners towards enhanced grammatical accuracy and linguistic proficiency. Truscott (1996) argues that furnishing explicit feedback on grammar can prove advantageous in aiding learners' comprehension and rectification of their grammatical errors. The study underscores the significance of precise and focused comments that target specific grammatical issues, providing explanations or suggestions for improvement.

Examining the efficacy of grammar-oriented feedback in second language writing, Ferris and Hedgcock (2005) delve into the subject. The research posits that well-crafted comments on grammar can assist learners in developing their grammatical competence by highlighting recurring errors and offering guidance on correct usage.

2.4.2 Feedback on vocabulary

In previous study of Zhang (2015), Zhang's research investigates the effects of vocabulary feedback on second language writing. It explores how different types of vocabulary feedback impact learners' development of vocabulary and written expression. The study sheds light on the advantages of vocabulary feedback in enhancing learners' lexical proficiency. Feedback on vocabulary involves specific comments given to learners to address their word usage and expand their lexical knowledge, aiming to enhance their word choice, lexical accuracy, and overall language proficiency.

2.4.3 Feedback on content and ideas

In the realm of written corrective feedback, the work of Hyland and Hyland (2006) sheds light on the significance of content and ideas feedback in enhancing learners' overall coherence and argumentation skills. This type of feedback plays a crucial role in refining the clarity and organization of ideas presented in the text. By providing guidance on structuring arguments, developing logical connections between ideas, and offering suggestions for improving overall coherence, content and ideas feedback supports learners in effectively conveying their thoughts and developing compelling arguments. Through targeted interventions in this area, learners are empowered to refine their writing by delivering coherent and well-constructed compositions.

2.4.4 Feedback on spelling errors

The significance of spelling errors feedback in improving learners' orthographic accuracy has been emphasized in previous research by Ellis (2009). This type of feedback plays a vital role in addressing and rectifying spelling errors, ensuring error-free written communication. By providing explicit guidance and corrective measures, spelling errors feedback assists learners in developing their spelling skills, expanding their vocabulary, and enhancing their overall written proficiency. By paying attention to the correct spelling of words, learners can effectively convey their intended meaning and avoid any confusion or misinterpretation that may arise from inaccurate spelling. Therefore, incorporating spelling errors feedback into the writing instruction process is essential for nurturing accurate and polished written communication skills.

2.4.5 Feedback on structures

Ferris (2003) explores feedback in second language writing and addresses various aspects, including feedback on structure. The research delves into the challenges and considerations associated with providing effective feedback on structural elements. It offers valuable insights into the role of structure-focused feedback in enhancing learners' writing skills. Lee (2008) continues

to study the effects of instructor feedback on various aspects of students' writing, including structure. The research investigates how feedback on structure influences students' writing fluency, accuracy, and complexity. The findings provide insights into the importance of structure-focused feedback in improving students' overall writing proficiency.

2.4.6 Focused and unfocused feedback

2.4.6.1 Focused feedback

According to Ferris (2006), focused feedback in second language writing refers to corrective feedback that offers learners specific linguistic structures to rectify their errors. It aims to draw learners' attention to and address particular error types. Focused feedback, also known as specific feedback, refers to targeted and specific comments provided to learners in order to address particular aspects of their language production or written work. It involves directing learners' attention to particular areas for improvement, such as grammar, vocabulary, or organization. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) describe focused feedback as a technique that provides learners with specific solutions to address their errors. It involves clear and explicit corrections directly related to the incorrect linguistic forms and structures. For example, study by Lyster and Ranta (1997) investigated the frequency of focused feedback in a French immersion classroom. They found that teachers provided more frequent and targeted feedback on grammatical errors compared to other error types, indicating the tendency to focus on specific linguistic features. Additionally, Ellis et al. (2008) conducted a study on the effects of different types of corrective feedback in the L2 context. Although their study did not specifically examine the frequency of focus feedback, it highlighted the importance of providing focused feedback on specific error types to promote learners' language development.

2.4.6.1 Unfocused feedback

Unfocused feedback corresponds to traditional error correction, where teachers correct a range of errors without specific error targeting (Ferris, 2006). Similarly, Bitchener and Ferris (2012) pointed out that unfocused feedback treats multiple errors without specific attention to particular error types (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). It discusses the importance of providing comprehensive and unfocused feedback as a means to address a wide range of errors and support overall language improvement. Ferris and Roberts (2001) present counterarguments to Truscott's claims "non-effectiveness of grammar correction in L2 writing class" and highlight the benefits of unfocused feedback in language learning.

2.5 Previous studies on L2 written corrective feedback

2.5.1 Effects of written corrective feedback

Previous research has reported mixed results of the effectiveness of giving corrective feedback on L2 learners' writing skills. Numerous research studies have demonstrated the positive effects of CF on language learners. For instance, Ferris (2006) conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis of studies focusing on the impact of CF in various language learning contexts. The findings revealed that CF contributes to enhanced accuracy and language development. Students who received explicit and targeted corrective feedback demonstrated improved performance in subsequent writing tasks. Although CF offers benefits, it is crucial to consider its limitations. Truscott (1996) critically examined the effectiveness of CF and argued that it may not lead to long-term improvements in language accuracy. He proposed that CF can be demotivating and overwhelming for learners, leading to anxiety and a negative affective state. Truscott's perspective highlights the need for a balanced approach to CF implementation. The benefits of CF can be attributed to its ability to provide learners with explicit guidance and error correction. Ferris (2010) emphasized that timely and focused CF helps learners to identify and rectify specific errors, thus promoting language accuracy. Additionally, CF enables learners to develop metalinguistic awareness and improve their understanding of grammatical structures and conventions (Lyster, 2007). Overall, much of previous research has examined the effectiveness of WCF and learners' perceptions on WCF. Given that L2 written corrective feedback can influence learners' attitudes towards the feedback and their writing performance, researchers and educators also need to take into account the types of feedback teachers provide in different writing contexts. Insights into the kinds of feedback learners receive will contribute to teachers' provision of WCF, allowing them to tailor their interventions to meet students' needs and also provide feedback in a way that would promote students' writing development. The following section will shed light on existing studies on different types of feedback teachers provide in L2 writing classes. (câu này em nói là phần bên dưới sẽ viết về existing studies on **different types of feedback, nhưng những nội dung em viết bên dưới k focus về different types of feedback. Em chỉnh sửa lại nhé.**

2.5.2. Previous research of different types of Written Corrective Feedback

The initial studies examining the effectiveness of corrective feedback on learners' accuracy can be categorized into two groups. Firstly, one group of studies focused on investigating the role of

corrective feedback during the revision process (e.g., Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris, 1997; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Secondly, another set of studies aimed to determine whether correction has a positive impact on learning (e.g., Chandler, 2003; Kepner, 1991; Polio et al., 1998; Semke, 1984; Sheppard, 1992).

In the study by Fathman and Whalley (1990), 72 French as a Second Language (FSL) students from two US colleges were divided into four groups. Each group received a different type of corrective feedback. Two groups received comprehensive feedback, including indirect and un-coded grammar feedback with all errors underlined. These students were given 30 minutes to revise their work based on the marked errors. The learners who received grammar feedback showed a significant reduction in the number of errors, while the two groups without grammar feedback did not exhibit any improvement in writing accuracy.

Ashwell (2000) conducted a study involving 50 Japanese university students in an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context. They were divided into four treatment groups, and three of the groups received form-based feedback before revising their texts. The students who received form-based feedback demonstrated a significant improvement in the accuracy of their revised drafts compared to a control group that did not receive any feedback.

Ferris and Roberts (2001) worked with 72 English as a Second Language (ESL) students who were divided into three treatment groups. Two groups received error feedback on five major error types and were given 30 minutes to revise their marked errors. The students who received error feedback successfully corrected approximately 60-64 percent of their total errors, demonstrating a significantly higher correction ratio compared to a control group.

Truscott and Hsu (2008) conducted a study with 47 English as a Foreign Language (EFL) graduate students. They were divided into two treatment groups, with the experimental group receiving underlined and un-coded feedback on errors, and the texts and revisions being written in a classroom setting. The students in the experimental group showed a significant improvement in their ability to self-correct errors during the revision process compared to the control group.

III. Methodology

Cấu trúc mới của em không có mục research design riêng, em nhập nội dung vào đúng các mục ở bên dưới, Nội dung nào không phù hợp với mục thì em có thể loại.

Các nội dung em viết bên dưới sắp xếp không đúng trọng tâm của mục. Tiêu đề mục và nội dung không match với nhau. Em xem lại cấu trúc của chương này, comment cô đã đưa ra của file trước và sắp xếp lại các ý cho đúng tiêu đề.

3.1. Research design:

In order to find out the perception of writing corrective feedback while students write English. I decided to use a quantitative method approach. According to McLeod (2017), quantitative research gathers data in a numerical form. It involves collecting and analyzing data through structured surveys, questionnaires, and experiments, and is often used to measure and quantify phenomena. The study will utilize a survey questionnaire to gather quantitative data from a small sample of participants. In addition, interviews and focus groups will be conducted to gather qualitative data from a smaller sample.

Trong bài em sao lại có interview và focus group? Em có làm interview không? Nhi đọc và chỉnh sửa bài thật kỹ nhé. Cô thấy có nhiều nội dung không nằm trong phạm vi bài em nhưng em vẫn chưa chỉnh sửa

This research will focus on a total of 59 non-English major students at the International University based on their experiences when learning writing, including 59 students who joined the survey. I involved AE2 students as the target of investigation because at the second year they get used to writing essays for their specific major. Besides, writing skills is also considered one of necessary skills of university students, which helps them make the report in the future.

The survey involved 59 first-year students at the International University. The participants' proficiency level was verified through an entrance test, which simulated the format of the IELTS exam or had an IELTS entry score of 6.5. The survey questionnaire was designed using a rating scale ranging from 1 to 5 (never to always) to collect feedback on students' writing frequency.

Previous research has examined various aspects of L2 written corrective feedback. Some studies have investigated the impact of different types of feedback on learners' writing performance and the extent to which learners incorporate feedback into their writing. For example, Bitchener and Knoch (2010) found that direct corrective feedback was more effective than indirect feedback in improving the linguistic accuracy of advanced L2 writers.

3.1.1. Research site (địa điểm thực hiện nghiên cứu)

The survey instrument was adapted from Chen, Nassaji, and Liu (2016) in their article "EFL learners' perceptions and preferences of written corrective feedback: a case study of university

students from Mainland." It was further developed and revised (see Appendix). The main purpose of the survey was to elicit participants' awareness of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF). The questionnaire was designed in a 5-point Likert scale format to measure participants' frequency of receiving written feedback evaluations during their learning process, with the scale ranging from Never (1) - Rarely (2) - Sometimes (3) - Usually (4) - Always (5). The questionnaire was relatively concise, consisting of 20 Likert-scale questions and 4 open-ended questions with qualitative components aimed at investigating their English language proficiency. The questionnaire was designed with the following considerations in mind:

1. Use minimal technical terminology to ensure the survey questions are easily understood.
2. Keep the number of questions manageable to be completed within 10 minutes.
3. Focus more on practical aspects rather than theoretical aspects related to L2.

Lastly, to ensure the best survey instrument, the questionnaire was also translated into Vietnamese for easy accessibility by the participants.

i. Participants: đối tượng nghiên cứu

Em chỉnh sửa lại nội dung mục này theo như comment cô đã đưa ra trong file trước.

To carry out my research, I opted to select fresher at International University (IU

AE2 students in IU is a group of students who have IELTS band 6.0 up, because they hand in an IELTS certificate or have a test equivalently to join the class. The age range of the participants is around 19-20, with some slight variation due to a few students repeating courses and studying for an additional year. A common characteristic among them is their demonstrated English proficiency, either through submitting an IELTS certificate with a score of 6.5 or by completing a mock IELTS exam that assesses all four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing

3.2. Research methods (phương pháp nghiên cứu)

My research methodology includes 20 questionnaires with 59 students from AE2 class. The questionnaires were based on the preference types of written corrective feedback, the researcher distributed a paper questionnaire to 59 research targets of 3 class and asked them to fulfill the questionnaires as honesty as possible based on the experiences that they gained during their learning writing skills. The duration of data collections was 2 weeks began from 1st May to 15th May by using questionnaires. Thanks to the assistance and permission from my advisor Ms. Han

and school, the paper questionnaire was delivered to these classes. After collecting data I will use SPSS to analyze the quantitative data from the questionnaires.

3.2.1 Data collection instrument – công cụ thực hiện nghiên cứu (survey)

Em đề cập chi tiết về survey ở đây

I used Google Form due to their convenience to collect data by distributing online questionnaires to the participants, which allowed me to gather data in person and potentially obtain more accurate and reliable responses.. This scale typically consists of response options that range from always to never. Using a 5-point Likert scale allows researchers to collect detailed data and SPSS analyze the results for trends and patterns in the responses.

3.2.2 Data analysis

The responses from the questionnaire were recorded in an Excel spreadsheet and subsequently transferred to SPSS 29.0 for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were obtained to examine the types of (WCF) the participants received.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Findings

This chapter presents the results, including the frequencies of indirect feedback and direct feedback, as well as the frequencies of receiving feedback on different components of writing such as content, grammar, structure, vocabulary, idea, and spelling errors, and focus and unfocused feedback. The findings highlight the importance and significance of the results in understanding the feedback practices in relation to the different aspects of writing.

Table 4.1

Descriptive statics of the frequency of indirect feedback and direct feedback

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Indirect Feedback	2.565	59	.669	.087
	Direct Feedback	3.429	59	.868	.113

Table 4.1.1

Paired samples t-test for the frequency's receiving indirect feedback and direct feedback

		Paired Differences		T	Significance
		Mean	Std. Deviation		One-Sided p
Pair 1	Indirect Feedback - Direct Feedback	-.86441	1.13882	-5.830	<.001

Table 1

Table.....illustrates the indirect and direct feedback learners received. As shown in the table, learners received direct corrective feedback (M=3.4294; SD=0.66990) more than indirect corrective feedback (M=2.5650; SD=0.86890).

A paired-samples T-tests was conducted to examine whether there was a differences in the frequencies of indirect and direct feedback. Table 4.1.1 shows that there is a significant difference between the frequencies of indirect and direct feedback, $t=-5.830$, $p<.001$. Overall, this indicates that learners received direct feedback more frequently compared to indirect feedback.

Descriptive statistics of the types of feedback learners received

Descriptive statistics results of frequency's components of writing

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Content	59	3.64	.924
Grammar	59	3.98	.861
Structure	59	3.64	1.156
Vocabulary	59	3.68	1.136

Idea	59	3.51	1.120
Spelling errors	59	3.78	.911
Valid N (listwise)	59		

As shown in table 4.1.2, comments on grammar received the highest frequency, with a mean score of 3.98. This was followed by components related to spelling errors, it had the second-highest frequency, with a mean score of 3.78. Comments on vocabulary followed closely behind, with a mean score of 3.68. The fourth and fifth are common components of writing that participants receive were related to content and structure, but they had a slightly lower frequency, with a mean score of 3.64. On the other hand, comments on the idea was determined as the least common frequency, with a mean score of 3.18.

4.1.3 Descriptive statistics results of the frequency's types of corrective feedback

Descriptive statistics results of frequency's types of corrective feedback

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Focus Feedback	59	2.8178	.73671
Unfocused Feedback	59	3.0960	.87549
Valid N (listwise)	59		

Vì e làm t-test cho indirect và direct, nên em cần làm cho focused và unfocused. Nếu kết quả của em không khác nhau thì làlearners received focused feedback as almost frequently as unfocused feedback.

Table 4.1.3 presents the descriptive statistics of the frequency at which participants received two types of corrective feedback including Focus Feedback and Unfocused Feedback. For Focus Feedback, the mean frequency of 2.8178 indicates that, on average, participants received this type of feedback moderately during the study. Regarding Unfocused Feedback, the mean frequency of