

## **The Effect of Error Correction on Taiwanese EFL Students' Writing Accuracy**

**Chia-Ti Tseng**

Ming Chuan University, Taiwan

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijelt.13/vol11n4719>

Published August 3 2023

---

**Citation:** Tseng C. (2023) The Effect of Error Correction on Taiwanese EFL Students' Writing Accuracy, *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, Vol.11, No.4, pp.,34-46

---

**ABSTRACT:** *This paper aims to investigate the effect of teacher's error correction feedback on EFL students' ability to correct their own writing errors for better accuracy. It intends to find out whether the instructor's explicit error feedback followed by students' extensive revisions, has any effect on students' ability in revising their errors with their own writing pieces. A group of nineteen EFL Taiwanese college students, with low to intermediate English level proficiency, participated in this study. The results indicated that the effect of teachers' error feedback on students' ability to self-correct was not significant. Most of the errors, after given extensive feedback and revision, were not significantly revised after a three-month interval. The result of this case study tends to support the claim that teachers' error feedback does not help much with EFL students improving their writing accuracy. Other findings regarding students' interpretation towards their writing errors and unsatisfactory self-correction results and teacher's perspective and observation are discussed.*

**KEY WORDS:** error correction, self-correction, writing accuracy

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Error correction, particularly grammar correction in writing has long been practiced in L1 writing and the use of it in L2 writing has always been regarded as essential since there are simply even more grammatical problems involved. The practice of grammar correction in L2 has been first and foremost challenged since Truscott published his 1996 article, "The case against grammar correction in L2 Writing", which claimed

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK that “grammar correction has no place in writing classes and should be abandoned” (p. 361). Ever since, there has been rigorous debate among scholars on whether or how to give teacher commentary and grammatical error feedback in L2 students’ writing (Carroll, 2001; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1999, 2002, 2004, 2007, 2010, 2012; Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007, 2016).

In the atmosphere of this heated dispute over the last few decades, more carefully designed, and well controlled experiments are needed before either party would be convinced otherwise regarding effectiveness of error feedback. Writing teachers should carefully examine the two polarized views and try to understand their underlying rationales, so that they can be more resourceful in deciding on their own eclectic approach in the classroom based on the perceived needs of their students. In addition, the writer of this paper intends to take on a more active role in investigating whether teachers’ error feedback help EFL students self correct their grammatical errors in writing for better accuracy. A small- scale case study is thus conducted to examine the effect of error correction on EFL students’ ability in self-correcting their writing errors.

It is hypothesized in this study that if the instructor’s error feedback provided with an effective means for students to be aware of their errors, students should be able to correct their own errors with their writing pieces after a certain time interval. That is, if these errors were teachable, students should be able to notice, identify and correct these same errors accordingly. Given the limitation regarding the design (i.e., lack of experimental group), and the scale (i.e., only nineteen participants with low intermediate level language proficiency) of this study, the results would only represent tentative result to the hypothesis proposed. Nevertheless, the results do shed some insights on the issues at stake for every writing teacher— the effectiveness of error feedback, and the discussion on how writing teachers should react to students’ grammatical errors in their compositions.

Research questions:

1. Does the instructor’s explicit error feedback help EFL students self correct their grammatical errors in writing?
2. How do the participating students’ interpretate their inability to self correct their errors with their previous writing in this study?

3. What are participating students' attitudes and preferences towards the effectiveness of teachers' error feedback in English writing?

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Since Truscott published his 1996 article, "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes", debate has been heatedly generated ever since. Concluded from studies done by Kepner (1991), Semke (1984), Robb et al (1986), and Sheppard (1992), Truscott argued that error correction, specifically grammar correction, was "not only unhelpful in these studies but actually hinders the learning process" (Truscott, 1996, p.333).

Truscott's argument was based on two grounds (1996, 1999, 2007, 2016). First, he believed that the nature of correction process was basically incongruent with SLA development processes. According to Truscott, grammar correction dealt only with the surface grammatical problems without tapping into L2 learners' developmental underlying system. He claimed that grammar correction, acting as transfer of knowledge, only resulted in "pseudolearning", since research showed that interlanguage development of certain forms took relatively a long time (Truscott, 1996, p.345). Thus, that grammar correction does not result in positive effect on the accuracy of L2 students' writing is expected. In addition, Truscott (1996, 1999, 2004) outlined the practical problems and possible negative side effects in teachers' giving and students' receiving error feedback. Problems such as teachers' failure to notice errors, teachers' inability to explain the grammatical rules, and students' confusion regarding the feedback were examples to be named a few. Based on these arguments, Truscott reached the conclusion that error correction was harmful and therefore, should be abandoned in the practice of L2 writing (1996, 1999, 2007).

Truscott undoubtedly challenged the very core belief held for as long as it has been regarding error correction in L2 writing. Among all, Ferris refuted most rigorously with Truscott's point of view. Ferris (1999, 2001, 2004, 2007) pointed out that Truscott compared studies different in nature, and therefore, the conclusion generated from such incompatible studies was premature and over strong. She also believed that Truscott overstated negative evidence and disregarded the research findings

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK contradicting to his thesis (Ferris, 1999, 2001, 2004, 2007, 2010, 2012). In fact, it was further pointed out by Ferris (1999) that teachers should continue correcting grammatical errors because: 1) L2 students wanted it, 2) students needed to produce academic text with manageable errors to proceed to mainstream curriculum, and 3) students should become self-sufficient in editing. For these reasons, Ferris strongly believed writing teachers should continue correcting L2 students' writing errors until substantial research proved harmful for its existence.

Ferris (2004) argued that although the controlled and longitudinal studies did not strongly show the efficacy of error feedback, the existing research evidence pointed out the continuing use of error feedback in the classroom. Aside from the reasons addressed above, Ferris (2004) indicated that error correction, particularly focusing on the language forms, was strongly suggested on its importance in SLA research (e.g., Doughy & Varela, 1998; Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 1998; James, 1998; Lightbown, 1998). These studies firmly suggested that problematic language forms should be made salient to adult language learners so that they could avoid fossilization which might hinder their further language development. It's thus claimed by Ferris (2012) that error feedback should be continuously practiced and would receive its effectiveness pedagogically by varying feedback types in accordance with nature of errors, by giving supplemental grammar instruction at the time in need, by error charting, and by teaching students' how to self-edit. Ferris (2007) also pointed out the importance in preparing pre-service and in-service teachers to effectively respond to student writing. She believed that a "selective, prioritized, individualized" approach to responding to student errors would be more effective and realistic to help with L2 students' writing (Ferris, 2007, p.170).

Investigations were also probed into the effects of different feedback strategies on improved accuracy in L2 students' writing. However, by using a meta-analysis to see the actual effect size of error correction, Truscott (2007) re-examined some of the controlled experiments (Sheppard, 1992; Kepner, 1991; Smeke; 1980, 1984; Fazio; 2001; Polio et al. 1998), and found the effect size shown in these studies were "merely ineffective or mildly harmful" (p.p. 262-263)", regardless of the various types of feedbacks were given. In examining the additional evidence which looked at the given gains by corrected students without control groups for comparison (Lalande, 1982;

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK  
Chandler 2003, Fazio, 2001; Polio et al. ,1998; Bitchener et al., 2005; Ferris , 2006), Truscott (2007) pointed out that only Chandler’s study (2003) yielded significant effect size of error feedback on students’ L2 writing. However, Truscott (2007) argued that cautions should be made in attributing observed gains to correction alone. “Avoidance”, for instance, might explain students’ improved accuracy since students might produce simpler text in avoiding errors made in writing text (Truscott, 2007, p.269). Thus, according to Truscott (2004), Chandler’s study did not offer evidence on the effectiveness of grammar correction and its results could only be “conjectures” (Truscott, 2004, p.342).

Regarding the issue of variability questioned by Ferris, Truscott argued that when similar result could be drawn upon from different studies, its generalization pointed out that “the phenomenon is a general one - error correction still does not work” (2007, p.114). As for the students’ belief regarding error correction, Truscott claimed that this false faith was based on intuition and it has been reinforced by teachers’ error correction (Truscott, 1996, 1999, 2007).

To summarize, this literature review has presented the polarizing views regarding the effect of grammar correction on EFL students’ accuracy in writing. Writing teachers in the field should have thorough understanding of these different rationales behind grammar correction. It would then be feasible for them to assume their positions, based on the existing literature and possibly on their carefully conducted research in the language classrooms.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Participants**

Nineteen EFL freshman students enrolled in a general English class participated in this study. These students have studied English for ten to twelve years. As for students’ language proficiency level, their average TOEIC score was 510, ranged from the 580 to 465. Thus, participants were equipped with low-intermediate to intermediate level of English language proficiency.

### **Study design**

The effect of teacher's explicit grammatical error feedback on EFL students' ability in self-correction with their writing was examined in this study. Participants were given a writing topic, "The person I admire the most..... ", and were assigned to write a 500-word essay, including introduction, body, and conclusion. This composition was completed in class, and Chat GPT or other kinds of apps which assisted writing was not allowed. After the composition was completed, students were then given explicit grammatical error feedback in one-on-one tutorial sessions from the instructor to clarify their grammatical errors. According to the error feedback, participants then revise their compositions accordingly. Three months after, students' self-corrections on their original writing pieces were conducted and collected as final drafts. The errors made on the first drafts and final drafts were categorized and calculated for comparison.

This study adopted the error codes designed by Ferris et al., (2001), and six error categories: verbs errors (V), noun-ending errors (NE), article errors (ART), wrong word (WW), sentence structure (SS), and punctuation errors (Punc) were used to categorize the errors for the analysis of this study. These error codes were not given explicitly for students' self-correction but were used later for the purpose of data analysis. Explicit error feedback on grammatical errors was given to individual students' one-on-one writing conference. Thus, both written and oral feedbacks were provided to each participant in the study.

Finally, students were given the opportunity to compare the errors made on their first drafts and final drafts, and were asked to elaborate on their opinions for:1) their biggest problems in six categories adopted in this study, 2) their own interpretations of the result of revision, and 3) their opinions for the effectiveness of grammatical error correction. A questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were adopted in this study as means of obtaining participants' background information, their experiences in English writing, and reaction and interpretation towards the correction results.

### **RESULTS**

Students' first and final drafts were collected for error analysis. For the first and final drafts, all the errors were classified as categories mentioned above. The total number

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK of errors made in each category by all the participants for their first and final drafts were listed below.

The results showed that for the first drafts, participating students made most errors in the category of SS (122 in total). It was then closely followed by V (120), WW (88), Punc (27), ART (15), and finally NE (13). As for the final drafts, the total number of errors made in each category by all the participants were V (104), SS (99), WW (75), Punc (25), ART (14), and NE (11). From the comparison of the errors made from the first and final drafts, it was apparent that punctuation errors, article errors and noun ending errors made on the first drafts were hardly identified and corrected on the final drafts. As for the other three categories (verb errors, word choice errors, and sentence structure errors), the total number of errors made in these categories were reduced, but not in any significant manner. In total, the number of errors accurately identified and corrected from first drafts in the sentence structure category was only 23 out of 122, followed by verb category 16/120, and finally word choice 13/88 (See Table 1).

To sum up, the delayed effect of the instructor's error feedback on students' ability in self-editing their own writing errors was insignificant in this study. The extensive error feedback and revisions done previously did not seem to have any significant effect on students' ability in self correcting their errors, since most of the students were either unable to identify or failed to correctly revise their errors.

Table1: Number of errors made in each category on first and final drafts by participants

	V	NE	Art	WW	SS	Punc	Total
First draft errors: Total numbers	120	13	15	88	122	27	385
Final draft errors: Total numbers	104	11	14	75	99	25	328
Total number of errors reduced:	16	2	1	13	23	2	57

As for the information obtained from interviews, most students indicated that SS errors were the most problematic part for them. From the analysis of student texts,

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK  
most SS errors were resulted from errors made in sentence and clause boundaries such as run-on sentences and/or comma splices. Awkward sentence construction resulted from direct translation from Chinese also made up a big part of SS errors. Participants also indicated that WW errors were the other challenging part for them, and these errors were mainly caused by unfamiliarity with word or idiomatic usages. As for the misuses in verb forms, students pointed out that they were able to understand them during the writing tutorial session but still failed to correct them on the final drafts.

Regarding students' interpretations of the results for their own performances in this study, most students believed the reason of their poor performance on the final draft was because they were not attentive enough on their first revision. Some of the students indicated that if they had spent more time in studying more grammar, they would have made fewer errors. Others believed that if they did more writing practices on their own, there would be more errors identified and corrected on the final drafts.

From the interviews, almost all participants believed grammar correction was important, regardless of their own unsatisfactory performance on the final drafts in this study. Most students revealed that although there were only very few errors identified and corrected on the final drafts, the practice of grammar correction should be continued. Some students believed that it should continue unconditionally because it will work with practice. Others believed grammar correction should be effective because they were more aware of some of their errors, although they did not yet know how to correct them. When students were specifically asked if they did carefully attend to all the grammar feedback provided by their English composition instructor, some students pointed out that they were sometimes frustrated by the extensive feedback from their teacher and decided to overlook them if no revisions were required afterwards. Others indicated that some teachers' error feedbacks were confusing either because of the illegible handwriting or the incomprehensible grammar corrections.

## **DISCUSSION**

The results of this study revealed that the writing teacher's grammar error correction on students' self-correction for better grammar accuracy was insignificant. For noun

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK  
ending errors, article errors, and punctuation errors, participants' total numbers of error reduction were extremely limited. As for errors made in sentence structure, verb, and wrong word categories, the total number of errors did reduce, but the numbers of reduction were also insignificant. The result of the current study revealed that the instructor's explicit and extensive error feedback did not seem to help participants' self-correction in their own L2 writing. Thus, the result was more in line with Truscott's argument that error correction did not help students' grammar accuracy in L2 writing (2007).

As for students' perceived problems in sentence structure and wrong word categories, some of the errors made were global errors which were the result of interlingual influences, as participants indicated that those problematic expressions were the product of direct translation from their L1 (Chinese). Other errors in this category such as comma splice, sentence fragments and run-on sentences were mostly indicative of students' insufficient knowledge of English syntax. In fact, some students pointed out in the interview that even the very explicit grammatical feedback for these errors was often hard for them to understand. Apparently, when students' target language development did not reach a certain level, some of the grammar correction feedback was hard for students to comprehend.

Thus, the poor results of the final draft revision could be expected since most error feedback might not correspond to students' current level of L2 language development. Furthermore, the difference between acquisition and learning proposed by Krashen (1981, 1982) also provides possible explanations for students' poor performance on their final drafts in this study. Some participants revealed they were able to notice and had learned how to correct their own errors according to the grammar feedback. However, these learned knowledge did not make its way to the final revisions as most of the errors remained in the final drafts. This corresponds to Krashen's claim (1982) that learning can not become acquisition, which may explain why students repeatedly made the same mistakes since they did not truly acquire those forms of language. This phenomenon might be further interpreted by Ellis' (1997, 2008) model of language acquisition that students did notice their errors when explicit error feedback was given. However, these operations only stayed in their short-term memory as intake and were not successfully integrated in the long-term memory in their developing interlanguage

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK  
system and thus students failed to produce satisfactory output in making proper corrections on their final revisions (Ellis, 1997, 2008).

As for students' attitude and perception towards error correction, it was vividly portrayed in the students' reaction in the questionnaire that it was simply faith on error correction which made them believe it would work for them. As Truscott (1966) pointed out that most of the error corrections were practiced in isolated points without reference to learners' current linguistic developmental system or stage. Error correction, under this circumstance, was only "transfer of knowledge" and could only result in "pseudolearning" (Truscott, 1996, p.347). In fact, it was further elaborated by Truscott (2004) that by using error correction, students' false faith was reinforced by their writing teachers. This viewpoint was clearly validated from students' faithful attitude towards error correction obtained from this study.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is apparent from this study that effect of error correction on students' ability in self-correcting their own writing errors for better accuracy is not significant. It could be that students' writing errors were resulted from problems occurred in developmental sequences, and these errors could not be overcome by teachers' direct transfer of knowledge, since students are not yet capable of comprehending these error feedback (Truscott, 1996). The difference of acquisition and learning might also be accountable for some students' unsatisfactory results in their final revisions since most of the participants have never truly acquired these forms of target language into their interlanguage system. Students simply did not attend to their errors effectively and since the operations were only limited in short-term memory, they could not effectively correct their grammar errors in the final drafts.

Due to the limited scale of this study, the result can only be tentative. However, it does provide some insights on the possible explanations of why error correction, particularly explicit grammar correction, does not help with EFL students' self-correction in their writing errors at this developmental level. It should also be noted that other types of feedback, such as indirect or coded feedback was not employed in this case study; therefore, the result can not speak for the effect of other types of feedback on students' ability in self-revision.

Thus, how can writing teachers help EFL students improve their writing in the classroom? Since grammatical error correction has long been adopted and has not been proven to be working effectively in many occasions, writing teachers may adopt less extensive revision in class. In addition, teachers' feedback can be more focused on the overall fluency or clarity of content in students' writing. As for the grammatical error feedback, they should be kept in minimum and be reserved only for those interfering with the meanings that students wish to convey. Finally, the connection of reading and writing is strongly intertwined as Grabe (2003, p.242) pointed out that "reading and writing reinforce or accelerate the learning of content, the development of literacy skills and the acquisition of language abilities". Thus, instead of learning isolated language usage and discrete grammatical points, students should be provided with meaningful, and interesting language input and be encouraged to read extensively. By providing contextualized language input, and channels to produce meaningful output with constructive feedback, students will then be equipped with means to truly acquire target language and reflect it with better fluency and accuracy on their writing work.

## REFERENCES

- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 14,191-205.
- Carroll, S. (2001). Input and evidence: The raw material of second language acquisition. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267-296.
- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom SLA*. Cambridge.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL*

---

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK  
*Quarterly*, 32, 39-60

- Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. Oxford : Oxford 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),1-11
- Ferris, D. R. (2001). Teaching writing for academic purposes. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (Eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 298-314). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2004). The “grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where re we, and where do we go from here? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13. 49-62
- Ferris, D.R.,& Hedgcock, J.S. (2005). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process and practice (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R.(2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16. 165-193.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181-201.
- Ferris, D. R. (2012). Treatment of error in second language student writing. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10,161-184.
- Guiora, A.Z., Brannon, R.C., & Dull, C.Y. (1972b). Empathy and second language learning. *Language Learning*, 26, 326-351.
- 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, 305-313.
- James, C. (1998). Errors in language learning and use: *Exploring error analysis*. London: Longman.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford:

---

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development-UK  
Pergamon Press.

- Lalande, J.F., (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66,140-149.
- Lightbown, P. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom SLA*. Cambridge.
- Polio, C., Flerk, D., & Leder, N. (1998). "If I only had more time:" ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 43-68.
- Semke, H.D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17,195-202.
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23, 103-110.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999) The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes" A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 8,111-122.
- Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 13, 337-343.
- Truscott, J. (2007) The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 16, 255-272.
- Truscott, J. (2016). The effectiveness of error correction: Why do meta-analytic reviews produce such different answers? In Y.-n. Leung (Ed.), *Epoch making in English teaching and learning: A special monograph for celebration of ETA-ROC's 25th anniversary*, (pp. 129–141). Taipei: Crane.