

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Marking time: is there a differential effect on L2
written accuracy following focused or unfocused
written corrective feedback?**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

in

Teaching and Learning

at

Massey University, Manawatu,

New Zealand.

Rachel Kim Hamlin

2013

Abstract

Marking time: is there a differential effect on L2 written accuracy following focused or unfocused written corrective feedback?

(Under the supervision of Dr. Karen Ashton and Dr. Alyson McGee)

Educational assessment in Brunei Darussalam is currently in a period of change as it transitions from an emphasis on traditional assessment methods to School Based Assessment for Learning (SBAfL). This research investigated whether traditional feedback in the form of direct focused written corrective feedback (CF) or direct unfocused CF produced differential effects on the accurate use of grammatical forms by Bruneian secondary school ESL learners. The results were considered with regards to the aims of SBAfL. Using two secondary school ESL classes totaling 38 students, two groups were formed: a Focused written CF group (n=19) and an Unfocused written CF group (n=19). The results of a pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test quasi-experiment indicated that there was no differential effect in the overall accuracy rate between either group. However, the unfocused group demonstrated a significant decline in their accurate use of the irregular past tense in the post-test, although this differential effect was not present in the delayed post-test. Overall, these findings suggested that both focused and unfocused written CF were of limited pedagogical value and raised questions about their use within an Assessment for Learning context.

Table of contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	9
1.1 The context of the study	9
1.2 Purpose of the study	12
1.3 Significance of the research problem	13
1.4 Organisation of the thesis	14
Chapter 2: Literature Review	15
2.1 Scope of the literature review	15
2.2 Feedback	16
2.2.1 Definition of feedback	16
2.2.2 Variability of effect of feedback	17
2.2.3 Feedback and culture	20
2.3 The process of writing and the place of feedback in L1 writing	21
2.4 The place of feedback in L2 writing	24
2.5 Arguments against written CF for L2 writing	27
2.6 Arguments to support written CF for L2 writing	30
2.6.1 Arguments to support written CF: studies including a control group	31
2.6.2 Arguments to support written CF: studies using subsequent writing	
Tasks	34
2.7 Summary of literature review	38
Chapter 3: Methodology	40
3.1 Research approaches	40

3.2 My research approach	42
3.3 Sampling and participants	46
3.4 Research design	48
3.5 Methods	50
3.5.1 Pre-test, post-test and delayed post-tests	50
3.5.2 Weekly written CF sessions	52
3.5.3 Written corrective feedback protocol	55
3.5.4 The questionnaire	57
3.6 Ethics	59
3.7 Role as the researcher	60
3.8 Triangulation of data	61
3.9 Validity	62
3.9.1 Internal validity	62
3.9.2 External validity	64
3.10 Data Analysis	65
3.10.1 The data collected	65
3.10.2 Establishing the nature of the test data	65
3.10.3 Analysing the test data	67
3.10.4 Analysing the student questionnaire	69
3.11 Summary of methodology	69
Chapter 4: Results	71
4.1 Pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test	71
4.1.1 Calculating writing accuracy scores	71

4.1.2 Testing for homogeneity of variance	72
4.1.3 Testing for normal distribution of data	73
4.1.4 Comparison of overall writing accuracy scores	75
4.1.5 Comparison of writing accuracy scores for each linguistic feature	77
4.1.6 Post-hoc analysis of the unfocused group's irregular past tense accuracy score	78
4.1.7 Summary of key results from the pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test	80
4.1.8 The feedback sessions	80
4.2 The questionnaire	82
4.2.1 Analysis of student perception ratings of usefulness of the written corrective feedback they received	82
4.2.2 Content analysis of student perception of preferred type of corrective feedback	82
Chapter 5: Discussion	84
5.1 Research Question 1: <i>Is there a differential effect on L2 written accuracy following focused or unfocused written CF?</i>	84
5.1.2 Similarities and differences of findings to other research	85
5.1.2.1 The systematic nature of focused feedback	85
5.1.2.2 Differences between secondary school students and university students	87
5.1.2.3 Length of time taken to write	90
5.1.3 The effect of written CF on individual linguistic features	90

5.1.3.1 Rule governed and non-rule governed language structures and written CF	92
5.1.3.2 Differentiation and written CF	93
5.1.4 Summary of findings regarding research question 1: <i>Is there a differential effect on L2 written accuracy following focused or unfocused written CF?</i>	95
5.2 Research Question 2: <i>What are students' perceptions of written CF?</i>	97
5.2.1 Students' expectations of written CF	97
5.2.2 Summary of findings regarding research question 2: <i>What are students' perceptions of written CF?</i>	100
5.3 Wider implications of the study	101
5.3.1 Focused or unfocused written corrective feedback?	101
5.3.2 Focused written corrective feedback and differentiation	101
5.3.3 Student perception and uptake of written corrective feedback	102
5.3.4 Focused and Unfocused written CF and School Based Assessment for Learning (SBAfL)	103
Chapter 6: Conclusion	105
6.1 Limitations of the study	107
6.2 Suggestions for future research	110
Chapter 7: References	112
Chapter 8: Appendices	126
Appendix 1: Pre-test, post-test and delayed post-test	126

Appendix 2: An example of student writing in the delayed post-test	129
Appendix 3: The first of the eight Mousedeer narratives used in the written CF Sessions	130
Appendix 4: Grammatical error tally sheet	130
Appendix 5: Graphs displaying linguistic scores for both the focused and unfocused groups which are not normally distributed	131

List of Tables

Table 1: Design of the study	49
Table 2: Levene test of homogeneity of variance	73
Table 3: Group Means and Standard Deviation for the Error Correction Tests	75
Table 4: Group Means for the Error Correction Tests	75
Table 5: Differences in medians for each linguistic feature	76
Table 6: Differences in medians for each linguistic feature	78
Table 7: Focused Group Irregular Past Tense Means for Error Correction Tests	79
Table 8: Focused Group's Accuracy Scores in the Error Correction Tests	80