Effectiveness of Using Grammar Logs With Explicit Corrective Feedback in Improving Grammatical Ability for Writing Skill of Grade 9 Students

ประสิทธิผลของการใช้บันทึกไวยากรณ์และการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับ
ในการพัฒนาความสามารถด้านไวยากรณ์สำหรับการเขียน
ของนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3

Phatcharaphan Sakanlai[1]
พัชรพรรณ สาคันลัย
Panida Sukseemuang[2]
พนิดา สุขศรีเมือง

Abstract

The objectives of this research were to study the effectiveness of the use of grammar logs with explicit corrective feedback of Grade 9 (G.9) students in improving the grammatical ability for writing and to survey students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs. The

[1] Government Employee (teacher), Banrapoo School, Krabi Primary Educational Service Area Office, Thailand

ข้าราชการครู โรงเรียนบ้านร่าปู สำนักงานเขตพื้นที่การศึกษาประถมศึกษากระบี่ ประเทศไทย

[2] Lecturer, Ph.D., Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Liberal Arts, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai Campus, Thailand

อาจารย์ ดร. สาขาวิชาภาษาต่างประเทศ คณะศิลปศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยสงขลานครินทร์ วิทยาเขตหาดใหญ่ ประเทศไทย

Corresponding: phatcharaphan11@hotmail.com

population was Grade 9 students studying at Khlong Thom Ratrangsan Secondary School, Krabi and 30 students were randomly selected as participants in this study. The instruments employed in this study were writing tasks, grammar logs, a questionnaire and teaching materials. The findings showed that the use of grammar logs with explicit corrective written feedback had significant differences in improving students' overall grammatical ability for writing and the students had strong positive opinions towards the use of grammar logs. The findings suggest that the grammar log with the explicit corrective feedback is beneficial in writing; however, low proficiency students may need more time to record grammar logs and finish the writing tasks.

Keywords: effectiveness of using the grammar log, writing, grammatical ability, grammar log, explicit written corrective feedback

บทคัดย่อ

วัตถุประสงค์ของการวิจัย คือ การศึกษาประสิทธิผลของการใช้บันทึกไวยากรณ์และการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับในการพัฒนาความสามารถด้านไวยากรณ์สำหรับการเขียนของนักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3 กลุ่มประชากร คือ นักเรียนชั้นมัธยมศึกษาปีที่ 3 โรงเรียนคลองท่อมราษฎร์รังสรรค์ จังหวัดกระบี่ ใช้วิธีการสุ่มตัวอย่าง นักเรียนจำนวน 30 คน และใช้เครื่องมือในการวิจัย คือ แบบทดสอบวัดทักษะการเขียน งานเขียน แบบบันทึกไวยากรณ์ แบบสอบถาม และสื่อการสอน ผลการวิจัยพบว่า ความสามารถด้านไวยากรณ์เพื่อการเขียนของนักเรียนก่อนการใช้บันทึกไวยากรณ์มีความแตกต่างอย่างมีนัยสำคัญ หลังจากที่นักเรียนมีการใช้บันทึกไวยากรณ์ จากที่นักเรียนได้รับข้อมูลย้อนกลับ พบว่านักเรียนสามารถแก้ไขและพร้อมอธิบายได้ นอกจากนี้นักเรียนยังมีความคิดเห็นในเชิงบวกต่อการใช้แบบบันทึก

ไวยากรณ์ในการพัฒนาความสามารถด้านไวยากรณ์เพื่อการเขียน ผลการศึกษาครั้งนี้
แสดงให้เห็นว่าแบบบันทึกไวยากรณ์พร้อมข้อมูลย้อนกลับนั้นมีประโยชน์สำหรับ
ทักษะการเขียน อย่างไรก็ตามจากงานวิจัยพบว่า นักเรียนที่มีความสามารถทางด้าน
ภาษาน้อย อาจมีความจำเป็นต้องเพิ่มเวลาในการบันทึกแบบบันทึกไวยากรณ์และทำ
แบบฝึกทักษะการเขียนให้สำเร็จ

คำสำคัญ: ประสิทธิผลการใช้บันทึกไวยากรณ์ การเขียน
            ความสามารถด้านไวยากรณ์ บันทึกไวยากรณ์
            การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับ

Introduction

English plays an important role in communication. People all over the world use English as a tool or medium language to communicate. Among the four skills, writing has been regarded as the most difficult skill (Richard & Renandya, 2002). Students are concerned and nervous about word choice and grammatical mistakes, which cause incomprehensibility. Many EFL students' grammatical mistakes concern verbs, punctuations, articles, tense, subject - verb agreement, sentence construction and etc. (Al-Sobhi et al., 2017). The use of English is important in global communication, particularly writing skill. However, Thai students feel that English writing is difficult. Therefore, improving writing skills is essential. In academic writing, vocabulary and grammatical structure seem to be a big problem for Thai students whose English proficiency is relatively low when compared to those in neighbouring countries (Wiriyachitra, 2001). The above problems may contribute to unsatisfactory O-NET (Ordinary National Education Test) scores of M. 3 students. The O-NET results

in 2017, 2018, and 2019 were 28.31, 29.45 and 33.25 out of 100 respectively. Even though the O-NET results seem to improve gradually, it is not quite satisfactory. Moreover, the grammatical ability is one of the factors that influences and motivates students to write. The lack of grammatical ability of Thai students is viewed as a hindrance in achieving good writing (Kaweera & Usaha, 2008). In Thai context, students still have a problem applying the grammatical structure of English to create a correct language use in writing, and they lack the ability to select an appropriate form (Lush, 2002).

Another factor that influences and motivates students to learn English is a positive opinion. Weinburgh (2000) mentioned that the opinions toward language seemed to be useful for students to succeed in language learning.

In order to solve the above mentioned problems, some experts suggest some teaching methods to improve students' writing skills. One teaching method is called corrective feedback to promote grammatical ability in writing. Liu (2008) suggested that after students receive feedback, their writing accuracy would be improved in the second, third draft, and so on. It showed that using feedback should be a useful tool for reflecting and revising students' writing. According to Bitcherner and Knoch (2009), there are two types of corrective feedback: explicit and implicit.

The explicit corrective feedback refers to the explicit provision of the clear explanation of correct form. While providing the correct form, the teacher clearly indicates that the student has made an error (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). On the other hand, implicit feedback refers to the teacher's rephrasing of the student's utterance by changing

one or more components without changing the central meaning (Ellis, 2008). The teacher does not tell the students directly about their grammatical mistakes. They have to find out the mistakes and correct them. In this study, the explicit corrective feedback is the main focus. The explicit written corrective feedback seems to be one of the common techniques used to improve written grammar on EFL students. This type of feedback provides learners with guidance that shows them how to correct errors. This feedback is not only more immediate, but also may be effectively determined by the goals and proficiency of the second language writers (Bitcherner & Knoch, 2010). Also, it is believed that by requiring students to use a grammar log to record and correct their errors, students can not only notice their errors but also achieve greater awareness of their own outputs (Hirsche, 2011). Besides, the grammar log is a piece of paper in which students record and correct their grammatical mistakes. It is a direct and simple tool to record students' grammatical errors when they find some mistakes in their work. Moreover, it is a tool to engage the students in improving their grammatical ability.

There are limited studies on students' performance using grammar logs with the explicit written corrective feedback, and most of the studies were carried with adult learners. According to Hirschel (2011) who only examines the effectiveness of using grammar logs with corrective feedback, there are very few studies conducted in Thai context with secondary school English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students who have low proficiency level. Based on the lack of research on this issue, this study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of using grammar logs in improving written grammar of Grade 9 students and the six aspects from the most frequent grammatical errors based on the O-NET were chosen to be the main focus of the study: verb tense, word

order, subject-verb agreement, article, parts of speech and gerunds and infinitive. This study also investigated students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs.

Objectives

This present study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of the use of grammar logs of Grade 9 students studying writing in the second semester of 2019 academic year at Klong Thom Ratrangsan School in Klongthom District, Krabi and to survey students'opinions toward the use of grammar logs. In particular, the research questions addressed were:

1. Was there a difference before and after participants used grammar logs, and to what extent did their use have on their accuracy scores and their writing ability?
2. What did Grade 9 students think of the use of grammar logs?

Research Methodology

1. Research Design and Participants

This study used a quasi-experimental method. The population of this study were 250 Grade 9 students enrolling in an English course in the second semester of 2019 academic year at Klong Thom Ratrangsan School in Klongthom District, Krabi. Thirty students were purposively selected as the participants. Their English proficiency level was quite similar based on their grades in the English grammar and writing subjects of the first semester. The participants were asked to write three writing tasks and recorded the mistakes in the grammar log

after receiving the explicit feedback. All the participants were Thai native speakers aged between 14 to 16 years old.

2. Data Collection Instruments

2.1 Piloting Instruments

There were three instruments in this study: a pre and post-test, a questionnaire, and training materials but only the pre and post-test and the questionnaire were required to be piloted. The aim of the pilot study was to determine the reliability and the feasibility of the instruments. In this study the pre and post-test was given to students in Nuaklongprachabumrung School in Nua Khlong District, Krabi to figure out the suitability of the selected topic and the time allocation. Likewise, the questionnaire was piloted to assure its reliability.

2.2 Pre and Post-Test

Two writing tests, a pre-test and a post-test, were used to measure students' grammatical ability before and after the experiment in six aspects: articles (Art), verb tenses (VT), parts of speech (PS), subject-verb agreement (SVA), gerund and infinitive (GI), and word order (WO). The six aspects were from the most frequent grammatical errors based on the use and usage and the writing ability parts in the O-NET (Nonkukhekhong, 2013). The participants were assigned to write one 80-100 word essay on the topic "My friend" in the pre-test and the other on the topic "My best friend" in the post-test. These topics were related to the participants' current learning tasks from the textbook content which they were studying. The writing test was piloted with 30 Grade 9 students at another high school in Krabi in order to determine the suitability of the selected topic as well as the time allocation. This

group of students shared a similar background with the participants of the main study in terms of their proficiency and age. It was determined through the pilot study that students were able to write a paragraph on the assigned topic, and within the allotted time of 50 minutes. And the result from the pilot showed that the students could finish the writing assignment in 50 minutes.

2.3 Questionnaire

The questionnaire was adapted by the researcher based on Strijbos and Sluijsmans (2010) to investigate students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs. There were 17 items of questions. It was used to check the students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs. There were three parts of the questionnaire. The first part consisted of close-ended questions in an effort to obtain students' general information. The second part contained 15 items regarding the students' use of grammar log to correct six aspects of the most frequent grammatical errors based on the O-NET: articles, verb tenses, part of speech, subject-verb agreement, gerund and infinitive, and word order. The third part included open-ended questions to explore students' opinions regarding the benefits of teacher feedback and the obstacles while using grammar log. This questionnaire was designed using a five-point Likert scale. The questionnaire was written in Thai to ensure that the intended meaning was conveyed and understood by all participants. It was piloted with 20 Grade 9 students who were in the same group the pre-post test was piloted. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.76.

2.4 Training Materials

Training materials included lesson plans and grammar worksheets. The training lesson plans were used to teach students how to use grammar logs and how to write a paragraph. The training consisted of approximately two periods. The grammar worksheets were used as exercises, so the students could review the six types of most frequent grammatical errors based on the O-NET including articles (Art), verb tenses (VT), part of speech (PS), subject-verb agreement (SVA), gerund and infinitive (GI), and word order (WO). Each worksheet consisted of two parts: structure and practice. In Structure Part, the grammar rules and the explanation were provided. And in Practice Part, students had a chance to do exercises about each aspect of grammar. The training periods took six hours within three weeks.

2.5 Writing Tasks

The participants were required to perform three writing tasks. They were asked to write 80-100 words for each task. Each task was related to what the participants had studied in their current book. To avoid possible interventions, such as help from other, participants were not allowed to write outside of the classroom. After writing each task, the students were asked to hand in their works to the teacher. After receiving the teacher's feedback, the students recorded and made corrections of their own grammatical errors.

2.6 Grammar Log

The grammar log was designed by the researcher. It was a form consisting of five columns for the students to record their grammatical mistakes. The first column was the original sentence, the

second was the error type, the third was the explanation, the fourth was the revised sentence and the last column was comments by the teacher.

Original sentences	Error type	Explanation	Revised sentences	Comments by the teacher
She sit there every morning.	Subject-verb agreement	Singular subject (she) requires singular verb adding 's' at the end of the verb (sits).	She sits there every morning.	Correct

3. Data Collection Procedure

The study was conducted in 8 weeks from February 2020 until April 2020 as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Data Collection Procedure

Week	Procedure
1	Pre-test
2	Teach how to write a paragraph and train students to use grammar logs.

Week	Procedure
3-4	Students review and practice most frequent grammatical errors in the written work (Grammar worksheets and exercises are provided.)
5	1st writing task and grammar logs
6	2nd writing task and grammar logs
7	3rd writing task and grammar logs
8	Post-test and questionnaire

In the first week, the pre-test (writing test) was administered to the participants. From the second week to the fourth week, the training on how to write a paragraph and six grammatical aspects were taught and practiced. In the fifth week, the students started to do writing tasks and record their grammatical errors on grammar logs after getting explicit feedback from the teacher. In the grammar log, when students received the writing tasks and feedback from the teacher about the grammatical errors they had made, they added each error in the table. Then they searched for the resources that would help them correct these errors. Possible resources included student's worksheets, English grammar books, dictionaries, and writing guides. Then, the students

identified the type of errors, and wrote a correct sentence. Finally, they submitted the grammar log back to the teacher to check it. Finally, in the last week, the post-test and the questionnaire were administered. Then, all the data were collected and later analysed.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Pre- and Post-Test

To examine the effects of the use of grammar on students' use of the six grammatical aspects as well as the frequency of the correct use, the aspects were calculated by means of obligatory occasion analysis (Pica, 1984) using the following formula:

$$\frac{n \text{ correct suppliance in context}}{n \text{ obligatory context} + n \text{ suppliance in non} - \text{obligatory contexts}} \times 100$$

The frequency of the correct use of the six grammatical aspects was coded and counted by two coders who were non-native English teachers. Then to compare the difference between the accuracy scores of the pre-test and the post-test, the data were analyzed using t-test.

4.2 Questionnaire

The participants' responses to the questionnaire were calculated using percentages to identify students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs.

Findings

1. Accuracy Scores of the Pre- and Post-Tests

The data gathered from the pre- and post-tests revealed that the overall accuracy scores were statistically significantly different from those in the pre-test as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

The Accuracy Scores of the Pre- and Post-Tests (n=30)

Aspects	Pre-test		Post-test		t	Sig.
	M	**S.D.**	**M**	**S.D.**		**(2-tailed)**
Art	62.39	33.01	78.55	29.32	-1.99	.056
GI	74.36	34.22	66.24	42.03	.88	.386
PS	46.82	16.68	44.63	21.42	.47	.645
SVA	74.13	20.12	88.81	12.16	-3.05	**.005**∗∗
VT	71.12	20.03	86.08	13.30	-4.27	**.000**∗∗
WO	57.89	24.48	63.29	25.73	-1.045	.305
Overall	**60.65**	**10.67**	**66.48**	**9.35**	**-2.505**	**.018**∗

∗$p<.05$; ∗∗$p<.01$

Table 2 indicates that students' overall scores were statistically different when the pre-test (M = 60.65, SD = 10.67) and the post-test (M = 66.48, SD = 9.35) were compared. In terms of each grammatical aspect, the difference in the aspect of subject-verb agreement (SVA) between the pre-test (M = 74.13, SD = 20.12) and the post-test (M = 88.81, SD = 12.16) was found

to be statistically significant ($t = -3.05$, $p < .01$). Additionally, the aspect of verb tense (VT) showing the difference of the accuracy scores between the pre-test (M = 71.12, SD = 20.03) and the post-test (M = 86.08, SD = 13.30) was found to be significantly different (t = -4.27, $p < .01$). However, the four other aspects of grammar, word order, articles, gerund and infinitive, and parts of speech did not show any significant differences.

2. Students' Opinions Toward the Use of Grammar Logs

The data gathered from the questionnaire which revealed the students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs were grouped into three aspects: grammar log with corrective feedback, writing, and promoting learning.

When considering each aspect of the opinions toward the use of grammar logs, the findings were varied. Table 3 presented students' opinion towards the use of grammar logs with corrective feedback.

Table 3

The Students' Opinions Toward the Use of Grammar Logs with Corrective Feedback

Aspects	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I feel that explicit written corrective feedback of the teacher via grammar logs helped me understand	23.3	**53.3**	23.3	0.0	0.0

Aspects	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
grammatical concepts better.					
2. I understand six grammatical aspects better.	16.7	**50**	33.3	0.0	0.0
3. I learn how to correct the grammatical mistakes from my grammar logs.	33.3	**40**	23.3	3.3	0.0

In terms of grammar logs with corrective feedback, Table 3 indicates that 53. 3% of the students agreed that the grammar log and the explicit written corrective feedback helped them to better understand the grammatical concepts in their writing. With regard to the grammatical mistakes in their grammar logs, the students understood six grammatical aspects better. Fifty percent and forty percent of the students said that they learned how to correct the grammatical mistakes from their grammar logs.

With respect to writing, the students' opinion was presented in Table 4 below.

Table 4
The Students' Opinions Toward the Use of Grammar Logs with Writing

Aspects	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Use of grammar logs improve my writing skill of English.	13.3	**70**	16.7	0.0	0.0
2. I think it is a good idea to use grammar logs to improve writing skills in English.	23.3	**66.7**	10	0.0	0.0
3. Dealing with the grammar logs was convenient with regard to keeping track of my learning.	13.3	**50.0**	33.3	3.3	0.0
4. I would use grammar logs for my studies in the future.	26.7	**50**	23.3	0.0	0.0
5. I enjoyed recording grammatical mistakes using grammar logs.	6.7	**46.7**	46.7	0.0	0.0

Aspects	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
6. Grammar logs encourage me to write more in English.	20	**43.3**	36.7	0.0	0.0
7. I would like to do more grammar logs.	43.3	**43.3**	13.3	0.0	0.0
8. I learn to write better in English by using grammar logs.	20	**40**	40	0.0	0.0
9. I believe that my English writing will improve quickly if I use grammar logs.	16.7	**40**	40	3.3	0.0
10. After using grammar logs, I feel confident in writing.	3.3	40	**56.7**	0.0	0.0

When asked about the writing, the majority of the students agreed that they had improved their writing skill by using grammar logs (70%). Interestingly, the majority of the students agreed that using grammar logs would be a good idea to develop their English writing skill (66.7%).

Additionally, a large number of the students agreed that dealing with grammar logs was useful for keeping track of their learning (50%). And they thought that it was a necessary tool for their future to improve writing ability (50%). Almost half of the students enjoyed recording their grammatical mistakes in the grammar logs (46.7%).

Interestingly, it can be seen that 43.3% of the students strongly agreed that they would like to do more grammar logs which also encouraged them to write more in English. Forty percent of the students wrote better by using grammar logs. They also believed that their English would improve quickly if they used grammar logs (40%). However, 56.7% of the respondents expressed their neutral ideas to their confidence of using grammar logs.

In terms of learning, the students' opinions toward the use of grammar logs to promote learning were presented below.

Table 5
The Students' Opinions Toward the Use of Grammar Logs to Promote Learning

Aspects	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I feel comfortable recording the grammatical mistakes using grammar logs.	13.3	**50**	33.3	3.3	0.0

2. Grammar logs influence my writing and understanding of grammar.	20.7	**50**	30	0.0	0.0

In terms of using grammar logs to promote learning, 50% of the students felt comfortable and believed grammar logs influenced their writing and they had better understanding of grammar (50%).

It is very interesting to learn that all respondents did not show any disagreement toward the use of grammar logs.

3. The Results Gathered From Open-Ended Questions

The data gathered from the open-ended questions were analyzed and categorized into three themes: benefits, obstacles and suggestions.

Table 6
Benefits, Obstacles and Suggestions of the Use of Grammar Logs From Students' Perspective

No.	Categories	Aspects	Statements
1	Benefits	- Increasing grammatical knowledge	- I learned grammar from my own writing tasks.
		- Having more critical thinking	- I think using grammar logs helped me think more critically.

2	Obstacles	- Time allocated	- I need more time to work on my grammar logs and writing tasks.
		- English proficiency	- Because I'm still not fluent in English, I found it was hard to finish my grammar logs and writing tasks.
3	Suggestions	- Time extension for writing tasks and grammar logs	- I need more time to write and record the grammatical mistakes and grammar logs.

According to the open-ended questions, the results revealed that the students viewed the grammar logs as a valuable source for improving their grammatical ability in writing skill. Additionally, they reported that after experimenting the use of grammar logs, they learned and gained grammatical knowledge, and also developed more critical thoughts that they applied the knowledge to their next writing. It was found that time allocated and the English proficiency of the students were the obstacles in this study. Particularly, some students reported that they wanted more time to write and record the grammatical mistakes in their grammar logs.

Discussion

After analysing the data and obtaining the results, the researcher arrives at the discussion section to answer the research questions and compare and contrast them with the

previous studies. The discussion of the present research is presented below.

Research Question 1: Was There a Difference Before and After Participants Used Grammar Logs, and to What Extent Did Their Use Have on Their Accuracy Scores and Their Writing Ability?

This study focused on the effectiveness of using grammar logs on students' writing ability. The students' pre- and post-tests scores on writing were analysed to find if there was a statistically significant difference in terms of writing improvement. The results of the descriptive statistics of the participants indicated that students' overall scores improved significantly when comparing the pre-test and the post-test.

Interestingly, the aspect which had the least effect was the parts of speech. Even though the training on the aspect of parts of speech was provided, the students did not appear to improve in their ability to use parts of speech. One explanation could be their low proficiency of English. Similarly, Kamimura (2006) found that even though the overall scores of writing in the post-test of students were improved, some low proficiency students still could not apply the knowledge they had obtained through the training before starting to write due to their limited English ability.

Research Question 2: What Did Grade 9 Students Think of the Use of Grammar Logs?

The findings of this study revealed that the students had strong positive opinions toward of the use of grammar logs in improving the grammatical ability for writing. This finding is

similar to that of the study by Weinburgh (2000). He stated that opinions toward learning influence student behaviors: choosing books, speaking and also learning language. The opinions toward language are viewed as components of inspiration in language. Thus, the students' opinions toward English seem to be one of the factors for students to achieve in language learning. Most of the students perceived the grammar log as a useful tool to improve writing proficiency. The grammar log can help the students to perform the writing tasks.

Based on the data obtained from the open-ended questions, there were some interesting points related to the benefits of using the grammar log, which were a) the students wanted to do more on grammar logs , b) the use of grammar logs helped students improve their English writing skills, c) the students thought that it was a good idea to use grammar logs to practice writing skills in English, d) the students felt that explicit written corrective feedback of the teacher together with the grammar logs helped them to understand grammatical concepts better, and e) dealing with the grammar logs was convenient in terms of keeping track of learning.

From the above findings, the grammar log can assist students in both promoting writing habits and increasing the students' capability in writing, especially in six grammatical aspects. This finding is supported by the previous study by Hirschel (2011) who investigated the quality of grammar logs. From this current study, it can be concluded that after using grammar logs, students were much more aware of their grammatical errors. Moreover, the grammar logs are helpful in language learning and teaching.

Despite its benefits, there are some issues related to the use of grammar logs from students' perspectives. The students with low English proficiency found that the grammar log was one of the factors obstructing their limited improvement. They believed that their grammatical ability was so poor that they had a hard time finishing writing on their grammar logs and writing tasks.

Even though the students in this study were trained how to write a paragraph, and how to use grammar logs and they received the explanation and practice of six grammatical aspects, their proficiency seemed to be a barrier in improving their English writing ability and they did not have enough time to review and practice most frequent grammatical errors in the written works. Low proficiency students might be unable to work on their tasks. Additionally, the students reported that they needed more time to write and record the grammatical mistakes and grammar logs.

Conclusion

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that the use of grammar logs did affect the students' grammatical ability on writing. Similar to Hirschel's (2011) study, it was certain to say that after using grammar logs, students would gain more benefits for improving their English writing skills. They would better understand their grammatical errors. Using the grammar log can be considered as an essential tool which encourages students to become more accurate and fluent in learning to write. The grammar log can be seen to be beneficial by all the English teachers and can be included as part of the writing instruction in the English course curriculum. Additionally, the explicit written

feedback clearly assists students in organizing their writing and understanding of the grammatical aspects. Moreover, the students are able to move beyond the sentences and understand the grammatical knowledge better.

Limitations and Recommendations for Further Research

There were some limitations of this study. Firstly, teaching low proficiency students to write a paragraph needed more time than the researcher had expected.

Secondly, students with low English proficiency had difficulty in writing and finishing their writing tasks and they had a hard time recording their mistakes in the grammar log. They could not complete their tasks within the time provided by the researcher. Therefore, more time should be provided to the low proficiency students.

Thirdly, with small sample size in this study, generalization of the findings may be problematic. Therefore, the effects of explicit corrective feedback and other grammatical aspects are needed to be further investigated using a larger sample size.

Due to the length of time and the small number of subjects in this study, the result of this study may not be generalized to other groups of students. Therefore, the effect of the use of grammar logs with the six grammatical aspects requires further investigation. Moreover, the four aspects of grammar, word order, article, gerund and infinitive, and part of speech should be emphasized and studied. In addition, the comparison between the use of grammar logs with explicit corrective feedback and those with implicit feedback should be studied, which

might yield interesting results. The study of grammar logs with other grammatical aspects and different types of feedback is also recommended.

References

Al-Sobhi, B. M. S., Rashid, S. M., Abdullah, A. N., & Darmi, R. (2017). Arab ESL secondary school students' spelling errors. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, *5*(3), 16-23.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The relative effectiveness of different types of direct written corrective feedback. *System, 37*, 322-329.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics, 31*, 193-214.

Nonkukhetkhong, K. (2013). *Grammar error analysis of the first year English major students, Udon Thani Rajabhat University* [Official conference proceedings]. The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013, Japan. http://papers.iafor.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/acll2013/ACLL2013_0068.pdf

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hirsche, R. (2011). A qualitative study in grammar logs. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 6*(2), 126-139. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Rob_Hirschel/publication/271152961_A_qualitative_study_in_grammar_logs/links/

Kamimura, T. (2006). Effects of peer feedback on EFL student writers at different levels of English proficiency: A Japanese context. *TESL Canada Journal, 23,* 12-39.

Kaweera, C. & Usaha, S. (2008). The impact of different types of teacher written feedback on EFL university students' writing. *KKU Research Journal, 8*(2), 83-94.

Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. *Arizona Working Papers in SLA & Teaching, 15*(1), 65-79. http://www.w3.coh.arizona/edu/awp/

Lush, B. (2002). Writing errors: A case study of Thai students' writing errors. *Thai TESOL BULLEIN, 15*(1). 75-82.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L.(1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37-66.

Pica, T. (1984). Methods of morpheme quantification: Their effect on interpretation of second language data. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 6,* 69-78.

Richard, C.J., & Renandya, A.W. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Strijbos, J.W., & Sluijsmans, D. (2010). Unravelling peer assessment: Methodological, functional and conceptual developments. *Learning and Instruction, 20*, 265-269.

Weinburgh, M. H. (2000). Gender, ethnicity, and grade level as predictors of middle school students' attitudes toward science. *ERIC.* https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED442662.pdf

Wiriyachitra, A. (2001). A Thai university English scenario in the coming decade. *ThaiTESOL, 14* (1), 4-7.