

An Analysis of written feedback from teachers on the writing of students composition

Zainul Arifin

Research on English Language Education
Postgraduate University, Islamic University of Malang, Indonesia
email: zainularief1982@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The aim of this analysis was to investigate the form of remedial guidance a teacher requires for the writing of students. Twelve students from ten levels of state higher secondary school were studied according to certain criteria. The study employed a qualitative approach. The data sources collected in this analysis included written corrective feedback from the instructor on the development of students in class, concentrating on three types of mistake: the subject-verb error, choice of words, and sentence form in the descriptive text of the students. Such results have been analyzed and used the corrective feedback theoretical frameworks (2009) of Ellis, which include: direct feedback, indirect corrective feedback and metalinguistic corrective feedback, by analysis and interpretation of the teacher's written corrective feedback. The results of the study show the type of corrective to correct the descriptive writing of students used by the state high school teacher. Specific revisions are the form of corrections mainly used by teachers when reviewing their students' grammar mistakes.. The students could understand their errors by providing the right way of doing this with direct corrective feedback.

Keywords: Corrective feedback, Writing Composition, Direct Corrective Feedback, Indirect Corrective Feedback, Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

INTRODUCTION

Students' composition in writing has been one of the main attentions of many researchers who are aware of students' weaknesses in this area. One of the variables which has been studied by some researchers is by giving feedback to the students' writing assignment. They have studied several techniques of giving feedback in the writing instruction, such as peer response groups, teacher-student conferences, audio-taped, and computer-based feedback. There are three reasons, why students need corrective feedback that is given by the teacher for their writing (Raimes, 1985). First, students still have less skill in writing. The students take less time to think about their ideas, so, the students cannot develop their ideas. Second, the students take large segments to their work. It is usually emerged the purpose of their assignments. Thus, their writing needs correction to make focus on writing. The last is the students often take ideas from other sources without scanning the idea. They rewrite the idea from those sources. It makes the students cannot explore the topic. If the students are given enough time, they can write better writing. The instructor simply teaches how to discuss the subject and offer ample advice and feedback, and the students should be able to develop their writing. The results should be taken from the positive input that a study of foreign language teaching practices

can be given. It ensures that the teacher allows positive feedback, which has significant consequences for enhancing the writing of students.

Ellis (2009: 3) explained that corrective feedback contributes to language learning, both structure and communication. Communication is divided into two skills; writing and speaking skills. Both of them need a good structure to make others understand what the writer means moreover in writing. To create good writing and structure, the students need feedback for their assignments. Corrective feedback can be given not only by the teacher but also by peers, book, or experience. The educator provides feedback on corrections to the students in composition the class room practices, It is one powerful strategy to provide learners guidance as the educator realizes the circumstance and the requirements very clearly. The teacher not only knows the situation and condition of the students, but also gives clearly transform of knowledge to improve students' learning. Ferris and Roberts (2001: 179) defined that teacher responses to student's writing can and should cover a variety of concerns, including students' ideas and rhetorical strategies. That is why teacher's feedback is one of powerful to influence students' learning and achievement.

Instructor feedback is capable of developing student writing skills, but it depends on the type of input the instructor provides. It is one of the key elements of excellent education. The appropriate type of corrective feedback that the students receive will be provided with appropriate writing skills. If the teacher does not provide the students with the appropriate feedback, the result may be different. A type of constructive guidance is most important to determine the quality of the input of teachers and to improve the writing of students.

Three forms of constructive suggestions are available. But Ferris (2003) stated two types of corrective feedback; direct and indirect. Direct feedback is divided into two parts; direct and meta-linguistic corrective feedback. Direct feedback is divided into two parts; direct and meta-linguistic corrective feedback. Direct corrected feedback means that the teacher provides the students with the right structure. Metalinguistic constructive input means providing grammatical rules at the conclusion of debugging to areas in which the mistake has happened. And indirect corrective feedback is indicated that in some ways, an error has been made without explicit attention drawn, for example underlining, questioning mark, or circling. Second, direct corrective feedback provides sufficient information to resolve complex error. The last, direct corrective feedback provides students with more immediate feedback on hypotheses that they may have made.

The study is conducted in Senior high school level with different approach as the previous research. In this case, the research is presented to explore the written corrective feedback which focuses on students problems, it is Form-focused feedback / grammar correction / grammatical errors (errors that may be corrected by applying grammar). Related to the Indonesian students' ability in English, the students get difficulty to understand the good concept of the grammatical well and choose the correct vocabulary/diction, it is effected by their mother's language, and the students often use their mother's language in delivering their idea in English, especially in writing skills. Based on government curriculum teaching English in Indonesia, it is needed the suitable method and approach to teach them in English which is suited with the students' condition and situation in their schools, because there are some different characters and ability of the students in Indonesian school.

This study is hoped to have a valuable contributions for teachers, students and researchers dealing with the effectiveness of corrective feedback on students' writing assignment. The study is based on Ferris (1997) that corrective feedback is helpful for the students to improve their accuracy. Ferris's statement was supported by others researchers, Sheen (2007) said that corrective feedback has an aim to improve students' writing grammatical accuracy.

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine the teacher's constructive input on the student writing assignment. Based on the research questions and the objective that have been discussed in chapter 1, the design of this research study was qualitative research. The character of this research study was describing studying, and experimenting the phenomenon, and Enhance the natural environment, comprehension, oral histories and robust nature (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001).

This subjects of this study were the twelfth graders of Senior high school. This class was chosen because the students wrote descriptive text in the first semester. This study took two Social classes which consisted of Class A (N=20) and Class B (N=26) which were taught by one teacher. The participants were heterogeneous in terms of learning program. Based on assessment results, this school established that Class Social A was the excellent class program.

The students' scores helped the researcher decide if the students get the highest, average and lowest score. The scores' criteria used by the researcher was the students who received highest score (86-100), average score (81-

85), and lowest score (61-80) for their descriptive writing. Therefore, the researcher took two students randomly for each criteria score. After considering the criteria, the researcher decided twelve students' assignments descriptive text to become the subject of this study.

The sets of data gathered in this analysis were written positive input from the educator on the individual student writing assignment. In this analysis, the data in the descriptive text of the instructor are accurate input on the language features. The analysis unit of this study included corrective comments on Ferris & Robert's (2001) suggested errors, words and sentence structure.

This study used three kinds of research instruments. First, the researcher here if was the one to collect and analyze the data through description and explanation based on the theory proposed by Ferris & Roberts (2001) and Ellis (2009). The second instrument was checklist. The checklist was used to list three categories of language features corrective feedback used by the teacher. The checklist included three main indicators, namely suggested errors, words and sentence structure. The last instrument was students' scores obtained by students' writing assignments from the teacher. These students' scores were very useful for the researcher as a guideline to determine the participants of this review split into three categories based on the Writing skills. The researcher obtained the data through several steps. The investigator requested the educator's approval to gather details and pupil reports for the purpose of writing. Each student wrote a descriptive text on the same topic describing a place for the students' writing assignment.

The preliminary data began with the regular reading of twelve students' paper. The researcher therefore identified the mistakes in the writing of students containing Ferris and Roberts' language features (2001). Language elements which would be divided into errors in the subject, word selection and sentence structure. Consequently, the researcher made every type of error code or symbol. SV was used to represent errors of the subject, WC represented errors of word selection, and SS represented mistakes of the sentence structure. The teacher provided the wrong language form in direct corrective feedback. On the contrary, errors were reported in indirect corrective feedback, but there were no corrected language forms. In the meantime, the teacher uses only the language?, ((d) in metalinguism, or remarks over and under the written errors of the students.

Furthermore, in order to answer research question number 1, the researcher employed the following table (Table 3.1) to know the information of what types of teacher's written corrective feedback related to kinds of language features on students' writing errors.

Table 3.1
Analysis of Language Features

Type of Corrective Feedback
Language Features

Language Features			
Class	Students' Code	Student's Error	Teacher's Written Corrective Feedback
A	Student 1		
	Student 6		
B	Student 1		
	Student 6		

Just use the conceptual frameworks of Ellis' correctional feed back (2009), notably: direct corrective feedbacks (producing or correct composition), indirect corrective feedback (give marks) and metalinguistic cooperation, the researcher analyzes and interprets all written feed back from educators on participants' written work to the board.

After analyzing the types of corrective feedback used by the teacher, the researcher counted the frequency of each type of corrective feedback. The researcher also applied the following table (Table 3.2) Responding to the frequency of Teacher's corrective feedback in every type, as indicated in research question No 2.

Table 3.2
The degree with which the educator used correctives

Class's code	Student's Name	Tape Sentence	Type of Corrective Feedback									Total
			Direct			Indirect			Metalinguistic			
		sv	wc	ss	sv	wc	Ss	sv	wc	ss		
TOTAL												
%												

Note :

Sv : Subject-Verb errors

Wc : Word Choice

Ss : Sentence Structure

RESULT

The investigator analyzed the information to detect the teacher's corrective feedback. Some types of corrective feedback are direct, indirect and metalinguistic. This study found corrections to linguistic features given to students during the writing process. The investigator focused only on the utilization of corrective feedback in language features that include errors of subject-verb, word choice and sentence structure. The researcher presents the results of data analysis by giving some examples of types of corrective feedback in language features. The language features in the writing text assignment were subject-verb agreement, word choice, and sentence structure. Furthermore, the percentage of each types of corrective feedback in the student's writing was counted. The Table 4.1 shows how often the teacher provides positive input on the writing activities of the pupils. The table below shows the frequency of the teachers ' corrective input on the writing assignments of the students (for more detail on corrective guidance used by the teacher in the table category.

Table 4.1
The amount of appropriate input the teacher uses

Class's Code	Types of Corrective Feedback									Total
	Direct			Indirect			Metalinguistic			
	sv	wc	ss	Sv	wc	ss	sv	wc	ss	
A	17	10	20	1	1	3	1	1	0	
B	24	8	14	1	3	4	0	0	1	
Total	41	18	34	2	4	7	1	1	1	
	93			13			3			109
%	85,32 %			11,93 %			2,75 %			100%

The constructive suggestions the teacher provides on a student writing assignment is shown in Table 4.1 above. The effects of the teacher's disciplinary input is 109 events. The professor also used direct corrective feedback predominantly. The direct corrective feedback included 41 (44.09) verb errors in the case of the subject, 18 (19.35%) word choices and 34 (36.5%) sentence structures, while indirect remedies were 2 (15.38%) verb mistakes in the subject matter, 4 (30.77%) word choices and 7 (53.85%) phrase systems. But among other issues, metalinguistic was the lowest, since it has scarcely been used in written remedies. The following is an explanation and events of the correcting written feedback of each type of teacher.

Direct corrective feedback used.

Direct corrective feedback is the type of corrective feedback used by the instructor most of the time. This kind of educator not only noticed and suggested faults, but also offered the right form of their mistakes to remind students automatically of the proper shapes of their mistakes. Clear criticism helps students to revisit their mistakes. Direct feedback may deal with complex errors in writing.

Table 4.2
The Teacher has used direct remedial feedback

Total corrective feedback	Total number of direct corrective feedback	Percentage
109	93	85,32 %

Table 4.2 above provides a total of 93 (85.32 per cent) of the teachers ' direct corrective reactions to the description of the teacher's work. It can be seen that the teacher used this kind primarily to correct the writing of his pupils. Thus, the frequency of direct corrective feedback on verb errors, word choices, and sentence structure are presented in the following table 4.3. These are the following explanations;

Table 4.3
The duration of direct correctional response

Direct Corrective Feedback	Language Feature			Total
	SV	WC	SV	
	41	18	34	
Percentage	44,09%	19,35%	36,56%	100%

Based on the Table 4.3 above demonstrates that the teacher used direct corrective feedback with the total number 93. The teacher mainly uses this type to provide feedback on the writings of students. Thus, it can summarized that language features of subject verb errors ranks the top, sentence structure is the second most frequent language features, word choice is the third most common language features.

Indirect corrective feedback used.

Giving indirect corrective feedback with codes is a good strategy. It was also used by my past teachers when the researcher was a student, but it seems that it is more practical only for advanced students whereas direct feedback is needed for poor students. In indirect corrective feedback, the student concentrate on error corrections with the help of the teacher's comments. Students in indirect corrective feedback tend to correct their errors rather than to modify the content.

Table 4.4
The educator provided conditional remedial guidance

Total corrective feedback	Total number of indirect corrective feedback	Percentage
109	13	11,93%

Table 4.4 already indicates a minimum of 13 or 11.93 percent of teacher's conditional constructive input. It indicates that the teacher had very few indirect input on the learning of the pupils. Particularly for the teacher, who wanted to assist the students with their present mistakes and requested them to be autonomous in recognizing mistakes

.Furthermore, in order to know the frequency of each language features of indirect corrective feedback, Table 4.5 presents the teacher indirect corrective feedback on their students' writing. Topic mistakes, choice of words, and sentence structures are present.

Table 4.5
Indirect remedial feed back scale

Indirect Corrective Feedback	Language Feature			Total
	sv	Wc	Ss	
	2	4	7	
Percentage	15,38%	30,77%	53,85%	100%

Table 4.5 is clearly shows that the teacher rarely used this kind of corrective feedback. There were only 13 (11,93%) indirect corrective feedback. The teacher employed indirect corrective feedback focused on language features of subject verb errors, word choices, and sentence structures. Based on table above, the teacher applied mostly indirect uncoded corrective feedback. The result in this study shows that the teacher simply circles or underlines the errors. The teacher rarely marked the errors with using symbols.

The finding of this study revealed that indirect corrective feedback was the second type of corrective feedback frequently employed by the teacher after direct corrective feedback. The teacher was more likely to give indirect corrective feedback on sentence structures which were 7 (53,85%), followed by word choices with the total number 4 (30,77%), and subject verb errors with the total number 3 (15,38%).

Metalinguistic corrective feedback used.

Metalinguistic corrective feedback is almost the same with the direct corrective feedback. It provides the students with some forms of explicit comments about the nature of the errors. This type of additional form of direct corrective feedback which is defined as comments, information, or questions related to correctness of student are writing (Ellis, 2009). Metalinguistic corrective feedback uses codes to correct students' errors. The codes are like s for subject, V2 as past form, conj for conjunctions, etc. for example He *climb*^{V2} the top of the mountain yesterday. Henceforth, Table 4.6 below shows the use in the teaching of students of the instructor of the metalinguistic constructive input.

Table 4.6
Metalinguistic feedback the teacher uses

Total corrective feedback	Total number of Metalinguistic corrective feedback	Percentage
109	3	2,75%

Table 4.6 shows that the teacher rarely employed this kind of corrective feedback type on their students' writing. The total number of using this kind of corrective feedback was only 3 (2,75%). The reason behind this rare use of corrective feedback of this type might have been due to as the same as the reason proposed by Ellis (2009). She found in her study that direct corrective feedback had a clear advantage in the use of some grammatical areas. Students could correct errors which were stressed considerably more than errors, either that were not marked or that were only slightly marked. She also clarified that not because students do not have grammatical skills, they do not correct mistakes, they can not spot them. You can correct more errors if you provide clear tips. This type is therefore rarely used in writing by the educator.

Table 4.7
Frequency of reviews from metalinguistic

Indirect Corrective Feedback	Language Feature			Total
	sv	Wc	Ss	
	1	1	1	
Percentage	33,33%	33,33%	33,33%	100%

Table 4.7 above showed that errors in the metalinguistic corrective feedback were also common for subject verb, word choice, and sentence structure. The rate of error was only 1 (33.33 percent) in three language apps. It indicates that the tutor rarely uses metalinguistic suggestions on the grammar principle in learning.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study received positive guidance on the amount of instructor corrections used, which was 108, to students who were written work. There are different statistics for each form of corrective input for that total number of corrections. Among other corrective feedback types the highest proportion used was 85.32%, followed by indirect corrective feedback types, which were 11.93%, and metalinguistic type was 2.75%.

The first question was what types of remedial feedback the teacher used in the writing assignment of high-school students. The study has shown that the teacher of the State Senior School has used a corrective feedback typology by Ellis (2009) to correct the mistakes of their students in descriptive writing. This study focuses only on linguistic features consisting of the error in the subject, the choice of words and the structure of the sentence. The study did not include comments concerning certain elements of literature, such as language, material or suggestions and feedback.

The teacher used mostly used direct corrective feedback in language features; subject-verb errors. For instance, the common errors in subject-verb errors are singular plural, tense, article, addition word, and omission word. Singular and plural means one and more than one. Indonesian has different pattern to show plural by repeating the same word. Meanwhile, in English pattern, add 's/es' is the last of the word to show a plural or some word involve into irregular plural. These differences make the students get the difficulty to find an exact meaning in writing (e.g. School has [many room]). The correct one is "School has many [rooms]".

The result further indicates that the instructor used the remedial input system correctly for various types of mistakes. The result of this study shows that the teachers' remedy between Social Class A and Social Class B is without significant differences. Every class has the same advanced, intermediate and beginner stages in having the instructor's written instructional guidance. Based on the analysis above, both two types of corrective feedback help for students' writing improvement, but direct corrective feedback has more predominantly used than indirect corrective feedback. Ellis (2009) also pointed out that theoretically, the distinction between Required constructive suggestions directly and indirect is problematic. The students in Clear reviews on correction were under less pressure in correcting errors when the right forms had been offered. Meanwhile, students in indirect corrective feedback had to devote more time and energy to decoding teacher's marks or comments.

The results of this study can help the teacher make the most helpful corrective feedback available to the student to ensure that they improve themselves in writing. In comparison to other forms of presentations, the instructor who received positive input on the activities of students used direct accurate guidance. Bitchener (2012) suggested that direct corrective feedback could be more beneficial for them, because 'less skilled teachers... may not draw on such extensive or thoroughly processed linguistic knowledge.

The teacher offers various phases of the writing process (Hyland, 2010 cited in Azizi, Behjat, Sorahi, 2014). This study demonstrates that the teacher applied all kinds of corrective feedback, direct, indirect and metalingual, that were proposed by Ellis (2009). Data show that the teachers use direct corrective feedback to correct grammatical errors in the writing process of their students mainly. With the hope they wouldn't make the same error again, as they already know the right one, students would be aware of their errors.

Based on the classroom observation and analyses of the students' assignment given written corrective feedback, it is noticed that the students had still get difficulty to write the composition of descriptive text given. During the first lesson, the feedback was purposely designed to help the students' ability to revise their errors on the students' assignment of descriptive text. But the students still have difficulty to understand verb, to infinitive, gerund and preposition, etc. so, Students received direct feedback for the following lesson to help them revisit their errors in writing the descriptive text.

Based on the student's essay, It can be said that the teacher's corrective feedback can help the students' ability to revise their grammatical errors, teacher's written corrective feedback can help the students' ability or not, it depends on the teacher's corrective feedback given to the students, and how the teacher gives the feedback to them, if the teacher gives positive feedback to the students' errors, the students can understand well and have good motivation to revise their errors, but if the students are given the negative errors to their errors, the students will be very lazy and can be frustrated to correct it, because the students will feel boring to meet the teacher. Because the students think that they will get angry from their teacher because of their errors.

CONCLUSION

With comparison to the significance of writing, Educators must make certain learners talented authors contribute to pupils' competence. Since there are no barriers to success, it is also hard for the students to know how to write. Furthermore, by having accurate input on their writing the professor may help students improve their mistakes. Making constructive feedback is a teacher's appropriate role because the number of mistakes a pupil will greatly decrease.

The researchers analyzed the form of corrective feedback the teacher like to write a task in high school students. The documentation from this study were written feedback from Speech language pathologist Ferris and Roberts (2001) proposed categorizing language features into three: subject-verb error and word choice. To gather data the researcher requested for teacher consent to duplicate and compose material on the language characteristics of the student term paper to be examined for corrective feedback.

The results of this study had shown that the teacher used constructive input to clarify the written exam paper of learners on the basis of Ellis' (2009) schema. In short, the most frequent rectification feedback in occurrences were 91 (84.25%), preceded by in-direct corrective feedback 14 (12.47%) and meta-linguistic feedback just 3 (2.78%). To summarize, a teacher provided direct corrective feedback. The students can take a straightforward clarification and retroactivity in their writing by direct corrective feedback, as the teacher indicates the correct technique.

The written guidance of the instructor will help students to correct their writing mistakes, particularly in grammatical mistakes, while assigning descriptive texts. After obtaining written corrective feedback from the teacher, the research has accumulated valuable information from the student writing of the descriptive text.

This research might provide the teacher with useful input on the writing of the learning in providing constructive feedback on the writing of the students. Teachers could be recommended to be conscious of the mistakes in expression so that they can understand the challenges their students face in teaching.

The study is best known especially for the critical guidance on writing to students. The students should improve their language skills so that they are conscious of the mistakes they made. To order to decrease the mistakes to learning concise language, it is required that students should build up writing skills.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. (2003). L2 Output, Reformulation and Noticing: Implications for IL Development. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 347-376.
- Amrhein, H.R. & Nassaji, H. (2010). *Written Corrective Feedback: What do Students and Teachers Prefer and Why?*. CJAL: University of Victoria.
- Azizi, M., Behjat, F., & Sorahi, M.A. (2014). Effect of Metalinguistic Teacher Corrective Feedback on Writing Performance of Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Special Issue: Innovations in Foreign Language Teaching*, 2(6-1), 54-63.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Dadashi, M. (2011). *The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students' Spelling Errors*. University of National de Colombia.
- Barnet, M.A. (1992). *Writing as a Process*. Northeast Conference: University of Virginia.
- Beuningen, C.G., de Jong, N.H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). *The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners' Written Accuracy*. Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication: University of Amsterdam.
- Bitcheener, J. (2012). Written Corrective Feedback for L2 development: Current knowledge and future research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(4), 855-860.
- Bitcheener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Month Investigation. *Applied Linguistic*, 31 (2), 193-214.

- Brookhart, S.M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. United States America.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (4th Ed)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy (2nd Ed)*. New York: Pearson Education.
- 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.
- Cook, V. (1991). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Ellis, R. (2007). A typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. Oxford University Press: *ELT Journal*, 63(2).97-107.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development*. eScholarship Repository: Shanghai International Studies and University of Auckland.
- Ferris, D.R. (1997). The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Ferris, D.R. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Ferris, D.R. (2011). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D.R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classses. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.
- Ferris, D.R., Liu, H.Sinha, A., & Senna, M. (2013). Written Corrective Feedback for Individual L2 Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22, 307-329.
- Goldschneider, J.M. & Dekeyser, R.M. (2001). *Explaining the "Natural Order of L2 Morpheme Acquisition" in English: A Meta-Analysis of Multiple Determinants*. *Language Learning*, 51, 1-50.
- Harmer, J. (2002). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (3rd Ed)*. London: Longman
- Hashemnezhad, H. & Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A Case for Direct and Indirect Feedback: The Other Side of Coin. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 230-239.
- Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1996). Some Input on Input: Two Analysis of Student Response to Expert Feedback in L2 Writing. *Modern Language Journal*, 80, 287-308.
- Hedge, T. (1998). *Writing: Resource book for teachers*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The Impact of Teacher Written Corrective Feedback on Individual Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring The Pill-Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185-212.
- McMillan, J.H. (2008). *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer (5th ed)*. United States of America: Pearson Education.
- McMillan, J.H. & Schumacher. (2001). *Research in Education. A conceptual Introduction (5th ed)*. New York: Longman.
- Mendez, E.H., Cruz, R.R., & Loyo, G.M. (2010). *Oral Corrective Feedback by EFL teachers at Universidad de Quintana Roo*. Memorias Del ViForo De Estudios En Lenguas Internacional (FEL 2010).
- Raimes, A. (1985). What unskilled ESL Students Do as They Write: A classroom Study of Composing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19 (2), 229-238.

- Rezaei, S., Mozzaffati, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective Feedback in SLA: Classroom Practice and Future Directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 1 (1).
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.
- Schwartz, B. (1993). Input Enhancement in Instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 147-163.
- Tompkins, G. E. (1994). *Teaching Writing: Balancing Process and Product*. NY: Merrill.
- Tran, T.H. (2013). *Approaches to Treating Student Written Errors*. Midtesol: Missouri University of Science and Technology.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46 (2), 327-369.