การแก้ไขไวยากรณ์มีส่วนช่วยพัฒนางานเขียนในวิชาการเขียนของนักศึกษาที่เรียนภาษาอังกฤษเป็นภาษาที่สองหรือไม่

รัชศักดิ์ จิรวัฒน์[1][*]

บทคัดย่อ

อาจารย์และนักวิจัยหลายคนเชื่อว่าการแก้ไขไวยากรณ์ในงานเขียนของนักศึกษามีความสำคัญอย่างยิ่งในการพัฒนาทักษะการเขียน อย่างไรก็ตาม ยังมีอาจารย์และนักวิจัยจำนวนหนึ่งที่เชื่อว่าการแก้ไขไวยากรณ์นั้นไร้ประสิทธิภาพและยังเป็นภัยต่อการพัฒนาทักษะการเขียนในภาพรวม บทความนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์ที่จะนำเสนอแนวความคิดเรื่องการแก้ไขไวยากรณ์ในงานเขียนทั้งสองแนวทางนี้และกลยุทธ์รูปแบบต่าง ๆ ของการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับเพื่อแก้ไข นอกจากนี้ยังนำเสนอการให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับเพื่อแก้ไขในบริบทของการสอนการเขียนในประเทศไทยด้วย เนื่องจากนักศึกษาหลายคนยังมีความรู้ที่จำกัดเรื่องโครงสร้างภาษาอังกฤษและองค์ประกอบการเขียนเรียงความ ทำให้ต้องพึ่งพาคำแนะนำจากผู้สอนเป็นอย่างมาก อย่างไรก็ตาม ผู้สอนควรคำนึงถึงระดับความสามารถทางภาษาของผู้เรียนเมื่อต้องเลือกใช้กลยุทธ์การให้ข้อมูลย้อนกลับเพื่อแก้ไขรูปแบบต่าง ๆ และกลวิธีการสอนรูปแบบอื่น ๆ เช่น การสอนไวยากรณ์เพิ่มเติม ก็ควรนำมาใช้ร่วมด้วยเพื่อช่วยให้ผู้เรียนใช้ภาษาได้อย่างถูกต้องแม่นยำและเพื่อช่วยพัฒนาทักษะการเขียนอีกด้วย

คำสำคัญ: ข้อมูลย้อนกลับเพื่อแก้ไข การแก้ไขไวยากรณ์ การเขียนภาษาที่สอง

---

[1] คณะมนุษยศาสตร์และการจัดการการท่องเที่ยว มหาวิทยาลัยกรุงเทพ เลขที่ 9/1 หมู่ 5 ถนนพหลโยธิน ตำบลคลองหนึ่ง อำเภอคลองหลวง จังหวัดปทุมธานี 12120

[*] Corresponding author email: rachasak.j@bu.ac.th

CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK: DOES IT HELP IMPROVE STUDENTS' WRITING IN L2 WRITING CLASSES?

Rachasak Jirawat[1*]

Abstract

Correcting grammatical errors in students' writings is commonly believed to be indispensable for improving students' writing skills. On the contrary, some teachers/researchers believe that providing grammar correction is ineffective and harmful to the overall development of writing skills. This article mainly focuses on these two contradictory notions of corrective feedback approaches and examines various types of corrective feedback strategies. Moreover, the provision of corrective feedback in a Thai context is also examined since it is widely considered that many Thai students heavily rely on their teachers' suggestions due to their limited knowledge of English structures and essay components. However, it should be noted that various types of corrective feedback should be employed based on students' English proficiency levels. Other approaches, such as additional grammar instruction, should be used to increase students' linguistic accuracy and overall improvement of writing skills.

Keywords: Corrective Feedback, Grammar Correction, L2 Writing

[1] School of Humanities and Tourism Management, Bangkok University, 9/1 Moo 5 Phaholyothin Road, Klong Nueng, Klong Luang, Pathumthani 12120

[*] Corresponding author email: rachasak.j@bu.ac.th

Introduction

If you are a teacher teaching writing to second language or EFL/ESL students, you might be pondering, at some moment, these questions: is correcting grammatical errors in students' writings effective?; does corrective feedback help improve the quality of their work?; or what kind of feedback strategies should we employ? These are some of the questions that have been constantly considered and mulled over by a number of EFL/ESL writing teachers. It is commonly believed that students can substantially improve their writing skills if teachers correct their grammatical errors. Consequently, students will learn from the mistakes, be able to avoid repeating them, and write more accurately in the future (Gray, 2004). Thus, providing grammar correction or corrective feedback in L2 writing classes seems to be the norm that every writing teacher must follow in order to help students make significant progress in writing essays.

Furthermore, writing teachers may also encounter a difficult decision-making task regarding the various grammar correction strategies they should use. Should teachers correct all grammatical mistakes in students' texts or just indicate the types of error and let students correct the texts themselves? Should teachers highlight or underline the mistakes without offering any explanation? Should teachers select and correct only the specific type of error without mentioning other errors unrelated to the focused type of error? It can be easily seen that writing teachers face an uphill task in providing students with the most effective grammar correction strategy so that students' essays can be significantly improved.

While error correction feedback given to students is widely considered essential to improve the quality and accuracy of their writing (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2004), some strongly believe that it is ineffective and detrimental to their overall development of writing skills, and that this form of feedback should be avoided (Gray, 2004; Truscott, 1996). It is still debatable whether providing error correction feedback can help students write grammatically correct sentences and enhance the overall quality of their essays. Therefore, this paper mainly examines these two grammar correction approaches and the arguments stemming from these contradictory views of giving grammar correction in L2 writing classes as well as looking into the use of grammar correction in a Thai context.

Corrective Feedback

When writing teachers read and evaluate their students' essays, they usually provide responses to students' writing on various aspects such as content, organization, ideas and

arguments, grammar and sentence structure, etc. Regarding grammatical errors, it is widely believed that teachers should 'correct' those errors and tell them what is right. Hence, students will not repeat their mistakes and will write more accurately. In students' view, making errors is a crucial part of language learning and they need teachers' feedback to lead them to the right path. Besides, several students are annoyed when there is no feedback on grammatical errors (Lee, 2004). Moreover, some students are likely to lose confidence and complain if error feedback is not provided (Ferris, 2004). Thus, it seems obligatory for teachers to offer corrective feedback which is believed to play a pivotal role in helping students correct their linguistic errors and enhance their development of writing skills.

Technically speaking, several ways to provide corrective feedback can involve one correction strategy or more. First, the strategy called explicit correction or direct feedback is used to point out the mistakes directly and these mistakes will be replaced by the correct form offered by the teacher. Second, indirect feedback is another way where the teacher indicates the errors without providing the proper form or explanation. Mistakes can be underlined or marked with a highlighter to show the specific location. Third, correction codes are used to indicate the kind of errors. They can be abbreviations or a short grammatical explanation. Next, the number of mistakes is given in the margin of each line and students have to find the mistakes and correct them. Furthermore, selective or focused corrective feedback occurs when the teacher focuses on specific types of errors, whereas comprehensive or unfocused corrective feedback is used when all errors are concentrated (Gray, 2004; Herlinawati, Saukah, Mukminatien, Isnawati, & Bastian, 2020).

Types of corrective feedback can be briefly summarized as follows:

Table 1 Types of Corrective Feedback (adapted from Gray, 2004; Herlinawati et al., 2020)

Type of corrective feedback	Description
Direct feedback	Indicating an error and the correct form is provided.
Indirect feedback	An error is highlighted or underlined, but the correct form is not provided.
Correction codes	Indicating an error with codes or abbreviations.
Indicating the number of errors	Providing the number of errors in the margin of each line.
Selective/focused feedback	Indicating particular types of errors without correcting other errors.
Comprehensive/unfocused feedback	All types of errors are corrected.

The problem has immediately arisen when selecting correction strategies to employ. Writing teachers might find it challenging to decide which strategy is most suitable for their students' writing. Ferris and Roberts (2001) point out that indirect feedback gives students a better opportunity to improve their writing performance than direct feedback does. This is because students must pay more attention to the form and problems implicitly indicated by the teacher. On the contrary, Lee (1997) argues that the most effective correction strategy is the direct feedback which explicitly provides students with the correct form of grammar and sentence structure. With the direct feedback given by the teacher, students can see their errors and learn how these errors should be corrected. Like Lee (1997), Chandler (2003) asserts that direct corrective feedback is the easiest way to achieve accuracy in correcting students' writing. Students also prefer this approach since they can quickly know the errors and correct them. Furthermore, according to Ferris et al.'s (2000 cited in Chandler, 2003) research, students who received direct feedback from the teacher had more correct revisions than those who received indirect corrective feedback.

It should be noted that students' English proficiency levels should be considered when choosing whether to use direct or indirect feedback. For students with a lower proficiency level, giving them direct feedback might be more suitable since their language skills might not be sufficient to cope with indirect feedback. Providing the correct form and explaining the type of error clearly should be the most effective way to help improve their writing skills while indirect feedback, such as underlining, indicating errors without explanations, etc., might be given to more advanced students who have a higher proficiency level (Moser, 2020). In short, teachers need to assess students' language levels before selecting feedback strategies.

Using codes is another type of corrective feedback that helps students correct their errors. There are many forms of codes; they can be abbreviations or symbols (such as VT = verb tense, Art = article, etc.) and colors indicating types of errors (Moser, 2020). However, many researchers still doubt the effectiveness of using codes. The main problem is that many students do not entirely understand the codes the teacher has been using. In Lee's (2005) study, a number of students said that they did not understand the codes and could not correct the errors in their work accordingly. Some complained that the teacher hadn't explained the codes clearly; therefore, they could not cope with the codes. Moreover, some admitted that the errors in their essays had not been accurately revised because they did not know the grammar rules although they understood the codes. Moser (2020), therefore, points

out that to lessen the difficulty of using codes, teachers should explain the codes clearly to their students and should not use too many codes because it will lead to confusion and misinterpretation.

In addition, among a wide variety of corrective approaches, Herlinawati et al. (2020) experimented with two corrective approaches: selective corrective feedback (or focused corrective feedback) and comprehensive corrective feedback (or unfocused corrective feedback). Selective corrective feedback refers to the approach that mainly focuses on specific linguistic aspects without correcting other errors found in students' texts. In contrast, comprehensive corrective feedback concentrates on all types of errors. Their study reveals no significant difference between both strategies in helping students improve their accuracy in their written texts. Unlike Herlinawati et al. (2020), Sheen's (2007) study points out that employing selective corrective feedback has remarkably improved the accuracy of students' essays. Her study comprised the group that received corrective feedback and correct forms and the control group that received no corrective feedback. Pretests and posttests consisting of a writing test, a dictation, and an error correction test were used to measure the efficacy of these grammar correction approaches. Her focused corrective strategy was primarily concerned with correcting two types of articles: definite and indefinite articles. As a result, the control group performed worse than the group with direct selective corrective feedback. The plausible explanation is that students could quickly identify the particular aspect of error that should be focused on explicitly without worrying too much about other linguistic aspects. She states that the processing capacity of EFL/ESL students is fairly restricted and can be detrimental to the accuracy of their writing if they are asked to pay attention to many different areas of grammatical errors simultaneously. To do so will possibly weaken students' capacity to process the corrective feedback given by the teacher (Sheen, 2007; Sheen, Wright, & Moldawa, 2009).

Several writing teachers, however, may question the effectiveness of Sheen's study. Should corrective feedback pinpoint various aspects of writing rather than one particular aspect? Should corrective feedback focus on a wide range of grammatical errors? According to Lee's (2005) research, 82.9% of the students chose comprehensive or unfocused corrective feedback as their preferential strategy because if all errors were specified and corrected, the students would know what they did wrong and be able to avoid these errors in the future. Similarly, according to Amrhein and Nassaji's (2010 cited in Moser, 2020) study, 93.9% of the students also preferred the unfocused error approach since they wanted to know all their

mistakes. Thus, from students' point of view, comprehensive or unfocused corrective feedback seems to be necessary for language learners who aspire to improve their overall writing performance.

Does Grammar Correction Really Help Students Improve Their Essays Effectively?

Without grammar correction or corrective feedback given by the teacher, many students who learn English as a second language would be at a loss to assess their essays and increase their writing efficiency. Besides, providing no feedback might upset or frustrate students who eagerly want to learn from their mistakes so that they can write more accurately next time (Lee, 2004). In addition, students' revision after receiving feedback from the teacher plays an integral role in gaining grammatical accuracy and improving the subsequent drafts of their essays (Chandler, 2003). There are several studies supporting the effectiveness of corrective feedback (Lee, 1997; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Chandler, 2003). However, the notion of corrective feedback has been strongly criticized by many researchers and there are many studies pointing out that grammar correction is useless (Truscott, 1996; Gray, 2004).

Why Is Grammar Correction Ineffective?

Even though several researchers have ample evidence to support the effectiveness of giving grammar correction or corrective feedback, a number of teachers/researchers still have some doubts and consider it unnecessary or ineffective.

Truscott (1996), one of the significant researchers who oppose the use of grammar correction strategies, points out that grammar correction is ineffective in helping students improve their writing and should even be scrapped. He shows that a number of studies found that students who received no error feedback performed better in writing tasks than those who received grammar correction. The main reason is that students will perform well with confidence when they are in a pleasant and relaxing condition. Conversely, giving grammar corrections will put pressure on them because nobody wants to be told repeatedly that they are making mistakes. As a result, students will write with anxiety and perform badly at the end. However, it does not mean that students who received no feedback were better writers. They wrote under better conditions with a positive attitude and their writing would improve tremendously in the long run (Truscott, 1996).

Besides, it is still debatable whether teachers should focus on form or content when giving feedback. Can we completely separate form from content? According to Kepner's (1991

cited in Truscott, 1996) experiment, two forms of feedback were used to assess the effectiveness of grammar correction strategies. The first group of participants received error feedback on sentence-level errors while the other group received content-related feedback. After having checked all the written assignments, Kepner finally found no differences in grammatical accuracy. Instead, the participants who were given the content-related comments seemed to perform better. Thus, Truscott (1996) concludes that grammar correction does not affect the quality of students' writing and is unhelpful. Likewise, Sheppard's (1992 cited in Truscott, 1996) experiment also confirms Truscott's argument against grammar correction. Sheppard employed two forms of feedback in a writing class. One group of participants got error feedback containing correction codes while the other group was offered content-oriented feedback. The results showed that the participants who received error feedback had no advantage over the content group regarding grammatical accuracy. However, regarding the complexity of their writing (the frequency of the use of subordinate clauses), the group with error feedback performed worse than the content group. This may have resulted from their uncertainty about writing complex sentences because they feared making grammatical errors. Therefore, Truscott (1996; 1999) asserts that providing grammar correction is ineffective and harmful to the students' learning process.

Gray (2004) claims that when evaluating students' essays, many writing teachers tend to focus excessively on form over content. To be precise, teachers spend most of their time commenting on grammatical errors, but overlook the content of students' work. Gray's (2004) standpoint also seems to correspond to Truscott's. He strongly suggests that teachers should place more emphasis on content and give feedback on the overall texts rather than just grammar. The aspects that should be specifically emphasized are ideas and arguments, thesis statement, use of facts and experience, etc. Besides, students should be encouraged to read authentic reading materials such as novels, comics, etc. This method will enhance their grammar proficiency and improve their overall writing skills.

Personally, the researcher does not think we can completely separate form and content; both of them are supposed to support each other so as to make logically organized essays with grammatically correct sentences. According to Moser (2020), form and content support each other and should not be considered separately. He believes that the focus on form or content depends on the purpose of that writing task. For instance, the form should be emphasized if the purpose is to improve students' linguistic competence. However, if writing well-organized essays is the main aim, it is reasonable to focus on content. He also

states that when providing feedback on students' writing, teachers should decide whether to focus on form or content depending on different writing tasks.

The Effectiveness of Grammar Correction

A number of teachers/researchers strongly believe in the importance of providing grammar correction or corrective feedback and its significance in improving accuracy in student writing.

Lee (1997) conducted an experiment with two groups of EFL college students. One group received error feedback from the teacher, whereas another received no error correction. The results revealed that the group receiving error feedback could correct their errors effectively and outperformed the other group in terms of accuracy. Likewise, Ferris and Roberts' (2001) study shows a similar result. They also conducted their study with EFL students divided into two groups. They found that the group which received no error feedback performed worse in terms of improving the linguistic accuracy in their writing. Fathman and Whalley's (1990 cited in Ferris and Roberts, 2001) study reveals that the students who received grammar correction from the teacher made fewer grammatical mistakes on their subsequent drafts than those who received no error feedback.

Similar to Lee's (1997) and Ferris and Roberts' (2001), Chandler's (2003) study points out that the students progress remarkably when they are given error feedback and try to correct their errors to make a better subsequent draft. She experimented with her EFL/ESL students, divided them into two groups (the control group and the experimental group) and gave them five homework writing assignments. After submitting the first draft of the assignment, the teacher would offer error feedback on both content and grammar of students' writing. The different requirement of these two groups was that the experimental group was assigned to correct all the errors in the first draft of their first homework and, after that, they were allowed to submit the next homework assignment. In contrast, the control group was assigned to write the first drafts of all homework assignments and then correct the errors specified by the teacher at the end of the semester.

Having completed the experiment, Chandler (2003) revealed that the students in the experimental group improved more significantly than those in the control group in terms of grammatical accuracy. The results suggest that if the students revised and corrected the errors according to the teacher's feedback, their subsequent assignments would improve with a decrease in grammatical errors. On the other hand, if the students did not revise their writing,

they would not be able to produce the new writing more accurately. This contradicts Truscott's (1996) claim that error feedback is useless and should be removed from writing courses. It is interesting to note that giving error feedback without requiring revisions from students is no different from providing no feedback at all since the students do not learn from their mistakes and try to revise to write a new draft that is more accurate. All in all, grammar correction should go hand in hand with students' revisions, leading to a significant increase in grammatical accuracy.

Ekanayaka and Ellis's (2020) study also confirms Chandler's (2003) findings that indicate the efficacy of students' revisions after receiving feedback. They experimented with 91 Sri Lankan students which were divided into 3 groups. The first group received feedback from the teachers and had the opportunity to revise their texts. The second group also received corrective feedback without having a chance to revise, whereas the third group did not receive feedback and had no chance to revise. The results showed that the group that was given a chance to revise made more significant progress in a subsequent draft in terms of linguistic accuracy than the other groups that did not revise (Ekanayaka and Ellis, 2020). It can be seen that students' revisions should be a part of grammar correction process and can lead to an increase in grammatical accuracy.

Another study that helps strengthen the belief in the effectiveness of grammar correction is Bitchener's (2008). He conducted his study with EFL students in two private language schools in New Zealand. The study aimed to focus on the use of the referential indefinite article "a" and the referential definite article "the" since, according to Bitchener (2008), many EFL students found it challenging to excel in the use of the English article system. Most of the students were from Asia such as Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam and some were from other parts of the world such as Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Chile, etc. Their level of English proficiency was a low intermediate level. The students were asked to do three tests by describing what was happening in the pictures. The students were randomly divided into four groups. The first three groups were given various types of corrective feedback on their writing, whereas the fourth group, the control group, received no corrective feedback. After the tests and teacher feedback, the results showed that the groups who received corrective feedback performed better in terms of accuracy than the control group with no corrective feedback. Besides, Bitchener (2008) states that many students personally informed him after having done the last piece of writing that they found this focused approach of corrective feedback more helpful than the unfocused one most teachers frequently used. This

information seems to correspond to Sheen's (2007) claim that focused or selective corrective feedback is more effective and should be adopted in writing classes. However, in Bitchener's (2008) point of view, further study is also needed to guarantee the efficacy of certain approaches to corrective feedback.

In addition, Qosayere's (2015) qualitative research also shows the opposite of Truscott's (1996) belief in the ineffectiveness of grammar correction. The research instruments he chose were the interview and focus group. The research population consisted of teachers who taught writing and students majoring in English. The research aimed to determine the teachers' and students' opinions and attitudes towards the use of corrective feedback or grammar correction. The findings showed that both teachers and students had a favorable view of corrective feedback and found it significant for students' writing development. The students mainly considered teachers' feedback a vital part of improving their essays (Qosayere, 2015).

Corrective Feedback in a Thai Context

Writing essays in English seems to be a worrisome burden for many Thai students who learn English as a second language. According to Khumphee and Yodkamlue's (2017) study, one of the critical problems of Thai students' writing is grammatical errors, whether parts of speech, tenses, fragments, punctuation, etc. Apart from grammatical competence, the lack of organization in their essays is another problem among Thai students (Un-udom, 2019). Students do not excel in English grammatical structures and essay components, so they most heavily rely on their teacher's feedback and suggestions (Nguyen, 2019). Thus, providing corrective feedback has become an indispensable duty the teacher cannot avoid.

Tangkiengsirisin and Kalra (2016) claim that providing corrective feedback is essential to improving students' writing skills, especially direct feedback that most students positively perceive. In their study, 63 fourth-year students taking Business Communication in English II courses at an international university in Thailand were divided into two groups. Students in both groups were assigned to write four types of business letters (informative, persuasive, positive, and negative letter writings). One group received direct feedback while the other group received indirect feedback. Then, students needed to revise their writings according to the feedback given by the teachers. For the works with direct feedback, the teachers corrected the errors by providing the correct forms above the incorrect sentences. In contrast, for the group receiving indirect feedback, the teachers only underlined or circled the incorrect words

or sentences without giving them the correct forms. After that, the questionnaire and interview were conducted to evaluate the students' perception of the effectiveness of the corrective feedback. The results revealed that the students who received direct feedback progressed significantly in terms of accuracy in grammar and sentence structures whereas those with indirect feedback slightly improved. Their study seems to contradict Truscott's (1996; 1999) claim that grammar correction is harmful to students' writing.

Furthermore, in terms of the students' perception of the corrective feedback, Tangkiengsirisin and Kalra's (2016) study shows that the students who received direct corrective feedback had a positive attitude towards this grammar correction strategy, and they thought that they had improved tremendously because of the feedback given by the teachers. On the contrary, the students who got indirect feedback were frustrated and did not know what they had to do to improve their papers. Besides, many students seemed to think that the teachers did not put enough effort into marking students' assignments which led to the students having a negative attitude towards the corrective feedback. This study seems to confirm the belief that Thai students rely on their teacher's feedback and need the teacher to tell them directly what they have to do to correct errors (Black & Nanni, 2016; Nguyen, 2019).

In Nguyen's (2019) research on the expectations of the students about teacher corrective feedback strategies, she conducted her study with 65 fourth-year Thai students majoring in English in her essay writing class. These students had taken the paragraph writing and short compositions courses before this essay writing course and the teacher also taught them three courses in a row. Consequently, the teacher thoroughly knew the strengths and weaknesses of her students' writing. Throughout the semester, the students were assigned to write four types of essays (explanation, problem-solution, comparison-contrast, and persuasion). Before submitting each draft to the teacher, the students were required to peer review by asking their classmates to comment on their essays. Then, the teacher would later provide feedback on the students' essays. Furthermore, the students were also asked to survey their expectations and preferences for the teacher's corrective feedback strategies. The results showed that 97% of these students expected their teacher to give comprehensive feedback. That means they preferred the teacher to comment and correct all types of errors found in their essays. In terms of improving their writing skills, this research found that the students progressed in various aspects of writing, such as grammar, organization, and content. Additionally, Nguyen (2019) suggests that, apart from the types of corrective feedback the

teacher chooses, the success of corrective feedback also depends on students' English proficiency levels, classroom environments, and learning experiences. She, moreover, also contributes the students' active response to correcting errors to the deep-rooted culture in Thailand in which students need to be "compliant, obedient and deferring to their teachers." As a result, many students try their best to correct the errors indicated by their teachers since they consider the teacher's feedback as a command and feel they need to obey the teacher's orders.

Regarding teachers' perception of corrective feedback approaches, Black and Nanni's (2016) study points out that many teachers prefer indirect corrective feedback while their students select direct corrective feedback as the most appropriate strategy for grammar correction. Black and Nanni (2016) conducted the research with 21 teachers and 361 students at a Thai university. The students are Thai and their English proficiency was between intermediate and upper-intermediate. They were asked to complete a questionnaire on their preferences and perceptions of corrective feedback strategies. The results revealed that the teachers' point of view differed significantly from that of students. For the teachers, indirect feedback was considered positively the best way to improve students' writing skills since this approach encouraged students to think more and be more engaged in learning activities. On the contrary, the students were more concerned about accuracy. That was why they preferred direct corrective feedback since they could know all the errors and correct them quickly.

According to the researcher's experience as a teacher teaching writing courses to Thai university students, the researcher finds it unsurprising that many Thai students opt for directive corrective feedback when correcting errors in their essays. Many of them want to be told straightforwardly which words or sentences need to be corrected because they are overly concerned about accuracy and final grades while showing no determination to pinpoint the errors and correct them when the teacher has employed an indirect feedback approach. Personally, the combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback strategies seems to be the suitable solution if writing teachers use them appropriately based on students' levels of English proficiency.

Conclusion

It seems impossible for teachers of L2 writing classes to avoid giving feedback or suggestions to improve students' essays. Moreover, teachers may encounter difficulty in choosing the right type of grammar correction strategies to best suit their students' needs.

Ferris (2004) offers valuable advice on what we should do to provide effective corrective feedback in L2 writing classes. First, she suggests that teachers should equip themselves with the skills necessary for improving students' writing, such as teaching techniques, grammar, etc. Moreover, different approaches to corrective feedback should be employed based on students' levels of English proficiency. For instance, indirect corrective feedback may suit students with a higher level of English proficiency because they can correct errors by themselves without the correct form entirely given by the teacher. After receiving feedback from the teacher, students should revise their essays; feedback without revisions is not different from having no feedback at all. Furthermore, corrective feedback is not the only way to improve students' writing. Other approaches, such as additional grammar instruction, self-editing practice, etc., may help increase linguistic accuracy and overall development of writing skills.

Moreover, when it comes to teaching writing courses in Thai educational institutions, providing corrective feedback seems indispensable because as second language learners, many Thai students do not excel in grammar and English sentence structures. As a result, they expect to receive feedback from teachers in order to improve their essays (Black & Nanni, 2016; Nguyen, 2019). Students' English proficiency levels also play a vital role in the success of corrective feedback. Therefore, writing teachers should choose the appropriate corrective feedback strategies according to their students' levels of English proficiency.

References

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. **Journal of Second Language Writing, 17**, 102-118.

Black, D., & Nanni, A. (2016). Written corrective feedback: Preferences and justifications of teachers and students in a Thai context. **Journal of Language Studies, 16**(3), 99-114.

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.

Ekanayaka, W. I., & Ellis, R. (2020). Does asking learners to revise add to the effect of written corrective feedback on L2 acquisition?. **System, 94**, 1-12.

Ferris, D. (2004). The "Grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). **Journal of Second Language Writing, 13**, 49-62.

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.

Gray, R. (2004). **Grammar correction in ESL/EFL writing classes may not be effective.** Retrieved from http://iteslj.org/Technique/Gray-WritingCorrection.html.

Herlinawati, Saukah, A., Mukminatien, N., Isnawati, U., & Bastian, A. (2020). Do comprehensive and selective corrective feedback really work for L2 writing accuracy? An overview from Indonesian context. **Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 8**(1), 69-77.

Khumphee, S., & Yodkamlue, B. (2017). Grammatical errors in English essays written by Thai EFL undergraduate students. **Journal of Education Mahasarakham University. 11**(4), 139-154.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing. **System, 25**, 465-477.

Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. **Journal of Second Language Writing, 13**, 285-312.

Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? **TESL Canada Journal, 22**(2), 1-16.

Moser, A. (2020). **Written corrective feedback: The role of learner engagement.** Cham: Springer.

Nguyen, T. T. L. (2019). A case study of teacher feedback on Thai university students' essay writing. **Journal of Language Studies, 19**(2), 121-138.

Qosayere, I. (2015). The effect of grammar correction on students' writing. **International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education, 4**(1), 257-261.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. **TESOL Quarterly, 41**(2)*,* 255-283.

Sheen, Y., Wright, D. & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. **System, 37**, 556-569.

Tangkiengsirisin, S. & Kalra, R. (2016). Thai students' perceptions on the direct vs. indirect written corrective feedback: A Thai university context. **Arab World English Journal, 7**(3), 161-176.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. **Language Learning, 46**, 327-369.

Truscott, J. (1999). The case for "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes": A response to Ferris. **Journal of Second Language Writing, 8**(2), 111-122.

Un-udom, S. (2019). The effectiveness of different written corrective feedback on Thai EFL learners' writing. **Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Mahasarakham University, 38**(1), 76-85.