The Error Correction Skills of EFL Novice and

Experienced Teachers

In a Dutch Secondary School Context

Kristel Wessels – 3495922

MA Thesis Engelse Taal en Cultuur: Educatie en Communicatie,
Utrecht University.

Supervisor: Merel Keijzer
Second reader: Rick de Graaff

July 2013

Acknowledgements

This thesis would have never been possible without the help of the students and teachers that participated in this study. I am very grateful that they voluntarily corrected writing products in their own spare time, without any compensation. I would, therefore, like to thank them for their participation.

Additionally, I would like to thank my supervisor. She has helped me reach my full potential and her guidance has kept me calm and focused throughout the writing process. This thesis would not have been what it is now without her.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The past half century has seen an increasing interest in second language (L2) writing. Research on the workings and possible benefits of L2 writing for L2 learners in their acquisition process has grown explosively (Leki, Cumming & Silva, 2009) and just over 20 years ago a journal was founded with a focus solely on L2 writing, the *Journal of Second Language Writing* (Leki & Silva, 1992). Studies have proven the added value of L2 writing in the language learning classroom (Williams, 2012), additionally to oral communication, which before was the main focus area.

One of the most current discussions in L2 writing has been the if and how of error correction as a response to students' L2 writing (Ferris, 2004). Error correction (or corrective feedback) has long been the response of teachers on the writing products of their students and "teachers and researchers hold a widespread, deeply entrenched belief that grammar correction should, even must, be part of writing courses" (Truscott, 1996, p. 327). The error correction debate which has occupied the L2 writing research community revolves around the question whether error correction is an effective tool to improve students' writing and, if so, what sort of error correction works best. However, to date there has been little agreement on what intervention method is to be preferred.

An area that has also received little attention is related to the individuals that do the error correction. The research to date has tended to focus on the merits of error correction itself rather than the abilities of the teachers. It is implicitly assumed that teachers are capable of spotting and correcting errors in pupils' L2 writing products, but this assumption may not be warranted, especially taking a foreign language (FL) context into account where most teachers are in fact non-native speakers of the language they are instructing. In fact, one study has shown that teacher trainees' ability to spot and correct written errors is at chance level (Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, 2012). This is a far from ideal situation, for either pupils or the

teachers concerned, and more research into this field is needed to see, for example, if experienced language teachers are better at spotting and correcting and how exactly they differ from novice teachers; not only in the number of errors they mark but also the nature of the corrections they made. A related question then becomes whether and how error correction could be trained during teacher training.

As a consequence, this paper will focus on the error correction abilities of novice and experienced teachers. The main aim of this paper is to determine whether differences are attested between novice and experienced FL teachers; English foreign language teachers in this case. Both types of teachers were asked to correct authentic writing products of different grades of Dutch *vmbo-t*[1]. On the basis of the results, this study seeks to determine if and what improvements can be made in teaching error corrections skills during teacher training.

---

[1] For a further explanation of this Dutch secondary school level see Method section.

2. Theoretical Framework

In order to investigate the error correction abilities of novice and experienced teachers, it is essential to introduce second language (L2) writing in general first, before the focus can be shifted to error correction. Therefore, this section will start with a general overview of L2 writing as a process. Next, error correction in general will be discussed, followed by an illustration of the error correction debate. Last, error correction and teachers' strategies and knowledge will be considered.

2.1 Second Language Writing

During the past half century much more information has become available on the processes underlying L2 writing (Leki, Cumming & Silva, 2009; Matsuda, 2003; Matsuda & De Pew, 2002; Silva, 1990). Compared to other L2 activities such as speaking, listening and reading, L2 writing tended to be overlooked in second language acquisition (SLA) for many years. This could possibly be due to, Matsuda (2003) argues, the more oral focused methods (audio-lingual) and the importance of spoken language in the years before L2 writing became more important. However, L2 writing did receive more attention in the 1950s, at least in the United States, following the increase in numbers of international students enrolled in higher education in the U.S., who also needed to master writing skills in their L2 (Matsuda, 2003). Since then, a large and growing body of literature on L2 writing has accumulated.

The main question guiding L2 composition research is how L2 students should 'learn-to-write'. Theories on how to 'learn-to-write' have shifted over the decades. Initially (1960s), it was believed that controlled composition was best for L2 students. This involved treating writing on a sentence-level structure, which means writing as "a collection of sentence patterns and vocabulary items" that were exercised as "habit formation" (Silva, 1990, p. 13). Writing was practiced by learning to write predetermined blocks of sentences which could

later be used in any way to create new sets of sentences.

The discourse-level approach that followed controlled composition was seen as an answer to the 'learn-to-write' question. This meant writing on a paragraph-level and writing as "a matter of arrangement, of fitting sentences and paragraphs into prescribed patterns" (Silva, 1990, p. 14). Not only sentence-blocks were practiced, but students were also taught how paragraphs were to be composed following set examples.

Then, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, 'writing as process' became more important. Matsuda (2003) describes that the workings behind L2 writing became more important in L2 writing research. He mentions how "invention strategies, multiple drafts, and formative feedback – both by the teacher and by peers – also became important parts of writing instruction in many L2 writing classrooms" (Matsuda, 2003, p. 21). Not only development of organisation was encouraged, the development of meaning in one's text were also deemed important in L2 writing research and classrooms. Simultaneously, 'writing as language use in context' appeared in L2 research and classrooms, mainly within the context English for Academic Purposes. This last approach aims at writing instruction specifically aimed at aspects of academic writing (Matsuda, 2003).

Regardless of the extensive historical overviews that exist on L2 writing, a concern has risen from the field that the focus of L2 writing is too much on second language (SL) writing instead of foreign language (FL) writing (Manchón, 2009; Manchón & DeHaan, 2008). FL writing is essentially different from SL writing, since most of the FL learners do not encounter the FL outside of the classroom (as opposed to SL learners who typically reside in the SL most of the time) and their use of the FL is mostly different (more integrative) from SL learners' use of the SL. Manchón (2009) suggests another distinction between SL and FL writing. She argues that L2 writing in a FL learning context involves 'writing-to-learn' as well as 'learning-to-write', as opposed to a SL learning context where the main focus is on

'learning-to-write'. This paper focuses on a FL learner context.

However, whether one focuses on FL writing or SL writing, the main question of L2 writing, similar to other L2 activities, is the value thereof in the L2 classroom. In the Netherlands, as in many other FL countries, writing is one of the four L2 skills in the classroom (speaking, listening and reading being the other three). As such, it is part of the aims stipulated in the Dutch *Europees Referentie Kader (ERK)* (in Great-Britain known as the CEF(R)). The *ERK* has set core goals for each of the 4 skills for the different levels of secondary school. According to the *ERK*, *vmbo-t* pupils[2] (the lower end of Dutch secondary education), for instance, are expected to achieve A2/B1 level of writing skills at the end of their school career (Nationaal Bureau Moderne Vreemde Talen [NaB-MVT], 2004). Furthermore, the central exam of the *vmbo-t* pupils consists partly of a writing exercise. These stipulations are partly why L2 writing is part of the L2 learning classroom.

Moreover, many researchers believe that L2 writing can be beneficial to the overall L2 learning experience (Harklau, 2002; Manchón, 2009; Saville-Troike, 2006; van Beuningen, 2011; Williams, 2012), even though it is one of the most difficult and demanding skills. L2 writing is seen as demanding, because of its context and of the fact that it is a cognitively demanding task. Saville-Troike (2006) argues that L2 writing can be more difficult than speaking, since writers cannot assess from other aspects, such as non-verbal signs or direct help from their interlocutor, if their writing is heading in the right direction, aspects that speakers successfully use. This limitation makes writing, according to Saville-Troike, a skill that can drive pupils to the limits of their language skills, more so than speaking. Van Beuningen (2011) offers another explanation for the level of difficulty of L2 writing. She argues that writing in the L1 is already a cognitively demanding task because of the many aspects (the content, structure, formulation etc.) a writer has to master. L2 writing is even

---

[2] For a further explanation of this Dutch secondary school level see Method section.

more demanding because the language part of writing will take up most of learners' cognitive resources, leaving writers with little for the other aspects of writing. Nevertheless, both Saville-Troike and van Beuningen are convinced of the L2 writing benefits. Saville-Troike states: "it seems likely that pushing the limits of linguistic knowledge in written production contributes to second language acquisition (SLA) by stimulating syntactic development" (2006, p. 164). Van Beuningen considers L2 writing as "a means to learn a language", "because output production forces learners to process language more deeply and with more mental effort than is necessary during listening and reading" (2011, p. 3).

Other views on the importance of writing in the L2 classroom involve the usefulness of writing as an activity which helps learners to "notice gaps" or "notice the holes" in their production (Williams, 2012, p. 323), by themselves or after feedback by the teacher. In combination with unavoidable features of (L2) writing, such as fewer time constraints than encountered in oral production, the permanent record it leaves and the expectation of a well-written and accurate piece (because one can spend more time on it), noticing can lead to acquiring L2 linguistic knowledge (Williams, 2012). Harklau (2002) highlights the practicality of L2 writing in the secondary school classroom. Her account as an experienced researcher at secondary schools is clear in conveying that while most research might be on L2 speaking skills, the reality in the classrooms is that L2 writing seems to be the most practised, since there is little oral interaction during most lessons. Moreover, in classroom interaction there is little opportunity for feedback as part of oral communication, as opposed to written feedback which is employed often as a device. As such, L2 writing can be important in the L2 classroom.

However important L2 writing can be, the exact outcome of L2 writing and L2 writing instructions in the L2 classroom is difficult to pinpoint. If there is one conclusion that can be drawn from FL writing research, it is that FL writing is characterised by individual differences

(Casanave, 1994; Kormos, 2012; Sasaki, 2004; Sasaki, 2009). It is difficult to state which developmental milestones pupils go through throughout their school career, so it is not clear what sort of errors the participants will encounter in the writing products of the pupils. Casanave (1994), for one, found "great individual diversity" in her quantitative study of language development in the L2 writing of university students. Casanave's conclusion that development in L2 writing mainly follows "individual patterns" (p. 193) is valuable for tailored education, but, at the same time, it complicates research into L2 development in general. Furthermore, Sasaki (2004; 2009) highlights the importance of motivation in L2 writing development. Perhaps unsurprisingly, but relevant to most FL contexts, it was found that more motivation (for example, in the form of contacts with native speakers) leads to more improvement throughout students' school careers. Moreover, Kormos (2012) studied the impact of individual differences on L2 writing. In her paper she discusses how motivation, aptitude and working memory capacity influence the writing processes of L2 learners. Kormos also suggests that individual differences might also influence the way students react to and process feedback.

2.2   Error correction

One of the aims of L2 writing is the improvement of pupils' writing. L2 writing instruction is not only meant to improve the pupils' L2 knowledge (writing-to-learn), but it is also expected that the pupils' writing will develop (learning-to-write). This expectation is also reflected in the *CEFR,* which stipulates that while *vmbo*-t 2nd graders should achieve the A1/A2 level, the 4th graders (i.e. pupils at the end of their school career) should have developed their skills towards the A2/B1 level. One way of achieving this, which is also reflected in most current language learning classroom practices, is providing error correction (or corrective feedback) to the pupils' writing products. Written error correction can be defined as "any explicit

attempts to draw a learner's attention to a morphosyntactic or lexical error" (Polio, 2012). Different sorts of error correction will be discussed later in this section. First, an elaboration on why error correction should have a place in the language learning classroom is provided.

In the past half a century, the language learning classroom has seen three main approaches to optimal L2 learning (Long & Robinson, 1998). Initially, educators and researchers alike believed that a foreign language could best by learned by dividing the language into different linguistic components (i.e. a block present simple, a block present continuous etc.) and then to provide the learner with the pieces of the language separately and sequentially. Learners are taught the language from grammar block to grammar block without much focus on the language as a whole; this approach is often labeled focus on formS (Long & Robinson, 1998). A countermovement, based on processes in first language acquisition, emerged with the growing discontent regarding the traditional approach which did not seem to do its work. This 'focus on meaning' approach builds on the premise that "people of all ages learn languages best, inside or outside a classroom, not by treating the languages as an object of study, but by experiencing them as a medium of communication" (Long & Robinson, 1998: p. 18). The basic tenet in this approach is the believe that language is learned implicitly on the basis of sufficient input. Language is not taught by providing forms in a meaningless way, but is instead taught by providing meaningful, communicative situations. However, the third approach, focus on form, finds flaws in the theories of focus on meaning approaches. Advocates of the focus on form approach do believe that language is learned best in a meaningful, communicative environment, but they argue that sheer input alone is not enough for the full potential of language learning and, therefore, occasional focus on language form is necessary (Long, 1991; Long & Robinson, 1998). Occasional focus on form is seen as necessary because some language forms cannot be learned without so-called 'negative feedback' (feedback pointing out the mistake). Long & Robinson (1998, p. 21) mention the

example of the constraint of adverb placement in between the verb and direct object in English. French learners of English, for instance, may encounter difficulties learning this constraint, since placement between the verb and direct object is acceptable in French. It is argued that without negative feedback (feedback pointing out the mistake) French learners of English will use incorrect adverb placement, because (i) from the input alone learners cannot discern that certain adverbs cannot be placed in set positions, even if they never hear it and (ii) if the French learners use the incorrect form in a communicative setting, they will probably not be corrected by natives since communication is not affected. Therefore, the focus on form approach believes in corrective feedback in a communicative setting to improve L2 knowledge or, as Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt (2012) put it in the written error correction context, "non-target-like levels of accuracy often observed among non-native speakers can be attributed partially to the lack of sufficient input. Negative feedback in the form of error correction can act as a remedy and provide ample opportunity for learners to attend to structures, rules of use, etc. of the target language." (p. 139). This view corresponds with the earlier mentioned view that L2 writing can be used to notice gaps in one's knowledge (Williams, 2012) and is also mentioned by van Beuningen (2011) as a positive aspect of error correction in L2 writing.

Moreover, apart from the effects error correction may have on language learning, error correction is seen as a useful tool by both students and teachers to improve L2 writing and L2 grammar (Ferris & Robberts, 2001; Lee, 2008; Leki, 1990; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). Students can even be so involved that they show preferences for certain types of feedback. However, Truscott (1996; 1999), who is not an advocate of error correction, warns against using students' needs as argument for error correction. He finds the argument "circular" (1999: p. 116) in that the students may expect and need the feedback, since it has always been given to them throughout their language learning careers. The students may not know better

and, therefore, find feedback necessary for L2 improvement.

Nevertheless, error correction is found in the majority of language learning classrooms. Still, one cannot speak of a, as Guénette (2007: p. 51) fittingly calls it, "corrective feedback recipe". The many options of error correction a teacher can choose from are described in van Beuningen (2011). First, a teacher has an option of choosing between direct and indirect feedback. The difference between those two lies in whether the teacher provides the correct form when pointing out the error or not. Direct feedback means that the teacher not only identifies the error, but also corrects the error by presenting the L2 writer with the correct form. A teacher using indirect feedback will only identify the error and leaves the task of correcting to the L2 writer. Both of the options entail other suboptions. Direct feedback can consist of just the correct form, the correct form plus a written explanation of the error or the correct form plus a written and oral explanation of the error. Indirect feedback, in turn, can consist of underlining/circling plus coding the error (coding as in providing the writer with information what sort of error he/she has made), only underlining/circling the error, or simply mentioning that errors have been made in a certain sentence. Next, the teacher has to choose whether he/she will only target one or a few specific error categories or whether he/she will target every error encountered in a writing product; focused versus unfocused feedback. The advantages and disadvantages of either option will be discussed in the next section, for this distinction in feedback is abundantly found in the research on error correction.

In addition, error correction research is concerned with the effect of feedback on certain types of errors. According to Ferris (Ferris, 1999) a distinction can be made between treatable and untreatable errors. The definition by Bitchener, Young & Cameron (2005, p. 194) is clear on what constitutes treatable and untreatable errors: "the former (…) occur in a rule-governed way, and so learners can be pointed to a grammar book or set of rules to resolve the error, while the latter (…) are idiosyncratic and so require learners to utilize

acquired knowledge of the language to correct the error".

Teachers differ in that they sometimes consistently use the many options in error correction and sometimes mix the various options. Whether error correction strategies are used consciously or not, the role of feedback on written products and its effect in L2 proficiency features increasingly more prominently in second language acquisition research.

2.3   The error correction debate

With the multiple options for error correction, it is unsurprising that no agreement has been reached in error correction research regarding which option is most optimal. Moreover, it is sometimes even contested whether error correction is beneficial at all (Truscott, 1996; 1999; 2004; 2007). Truscott's first article (1996) on the ineffectiveness and even harmful effects of error correction appears to have touched a nerve in the field of applied linguistics and second language research. Since then, research interest in error correction has grown almost explosively and many researchers have tried to prove Truscott wrong. With Truscott holding on to his views, a true error correction debate (as Ferris herself calls it in the title of her 2004 article) on the advantages and disadvantages of correction followed in the last decade. This paragraph will try to outline the debate by examining numerous studies which, directly or indirectly, influenced the debate throughout the years.

2.3.1   Arguments against error correction

As stated above, Truscott's 1996 article with his view on error correction started it all. In this article, Truscott argues for the abandonment of grammar correction, because of three reasons: (i) former research has not proven the effectiveness of grammar correction; (ii) theoretical and practical insights contradict the possible effectiveness of grammar correction; and (iii) he suggests that grammar correction can be harmful (for Truscott's reasons see below).

Truscott's trigger to offer his view on grammar correction was that "authors often assume the practice is effective, without offering any argument or citing any evidence" (p. 328) and he claims that it was necessary to add an opposing view to the research.

Truscott begins by discussing previous research on the topic. First, it is important to note that Truscott is only interested in the effectiveness of grammar correction in particular. He suggests that pupils may respond differently to error correction outside of the syntax. Furthermore, Truscott is only interested in studies that contain a control group with no correction or as little correction as possible, since Truscott claims that one can show no effect of grammar correction if the improvement of students' L2 writing with error correction is not compared to the improvement of students' L2 writing without any correction. Truscott first reviews several studies which support his view that grammar correction has no or even harmful effects. These studies showed that no differences were found among control and experimental groups concerning their accuracy in writing. This result speaks in favour of no error correction, since students' without error correction seemingly performed as well as students' who did receive it. Error correction, then, has no added effect, Truscott claims. Sometimes, the control group performed better in fluency and experimental groups with correction showed decrements in complexity. Truscott suggests that this may be due to the avoidance of possible errors by the experimental group. The experiment group will have received corrected work and Truscott argues that they may try to avoid the errors they initially made by simplifying their writing for less chance of errors later.

Truscott also discusses research that is normally cited as evidence in favour of error correction, which he then tries to disprove. According to Truscott, most of the 'positive' studies contain a methodological flaw, for they examine the accuracy improvement of students' revisions instead of students' new writings. Truscott points out that students' revisions (or self-edits) cannot accurately show students' improvement in writing since it does

not show accuracy in the long run. Therefore, he considers studies which prove accuracy improvement with revisions useless for proving accuracy improvement in the long run. The same holds for improvement in grammar exercises.

In addition, Truscott also mentions theoretical and practical problems in relying on the effectiveness of error correction. He considers the gradual and natural process of language learning as a process which is undermined by the practice of error correction. According to Truscott, it is proven that language is acquired through sequences and (parts of) the language is not acquired at once, but it needs time. Therefore, he considers grammar correction to be useless, since it is possible that errors are corrected which learners will not notice, since they are not that far in their language process to acquire that type of error. Moreover, Truscott mentions the difference between learning and acquiring a language, a view which follows from Krashen (1981), who argues that language learners acquire a language subconsciously and that consciously learning a language by its rules only helps when an L2 learner can consciously apply those rules. Consciously learning a language will, according to Krashen (1981), never reach the same results as acquiring a language and the language rules that are internalised by learning a language are only useful for monitoring language production, which is produced by the knowledge one has subconsciously acquired. Error correction falls under conscious language learning and is thus not optimal. Since Truscott agrees with Krashen, he is far from convinced that error correction could work in principle.

Additionally, Truscott claims that there are practical problems to consider. He argues that teachers need to be able to spot an error and adequately explain it, an ability he claims they do not always possess. Furthermore, students may not understand corrections or have little motivation to actively use the corrections as an aid to learn the language. Even if error correction were to be helpful in theory, these practical problems would discourage it.

Moreover, according to Truscott, error correction is not only ineffective, but it can

even be harmful. He argues that error correction brings stress into L2 writing, which will lead to simplified writing (students will try their hardest to avoid constructions they find difficult) and unmotivated students, which is the opposite of what teachers would like to achieve.

These earlier findings were corroborated by subsequent follow-up studies done by Truscott (2007; Truscott & Hsu, 2008). In his meta-analysis (2007) he found harmful effects of correction on students' writing and the Truscott & Hsu (2008) study found that revisions cannot be used as a method to study the accuracy improvement of students' L2 writing, since revisions do not account for future writing.

Notably, his theoretical and practical problems can be considered weaker. The practical problems Truscott discusses can be improved by stimulating the students' motivation and training the teachers in adequately correcting errors. Furthermore, sources that substantiate the practical problems mentioned by Truscott are lacking and such sources would make his case more convincing. Moreover, the theoretical problems are difficult to link to practical examples. The views expressed by Truscott seem sound, however, as is the case for the practical problems, they are not linked to previous research to support his views.

2.3.2   Arguments supporting error correction

As part of a movement against Truscott's views, more research using control groups without error correction treatments was carried out to point out the benefit of error correction. These studies on the benefit of error correction can be divided into three categories, one of which focuses on direct error correction, one of which favours indirect error correction and the last one of which points out benefits for both sorts of error correction.

Several studies have found a benefit of direct grammar correction on the subsequent writing products of students (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener and Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; van Beuningen, 2011). Bitchener, Young & Cameron

(2005), Bitchener, (2008) and Bitchener and Knock (2010) all examined groups who received either direct written correction, both with or without added oral and written feedback. All studies focused on selective errors and looked at new pieces of writing (instead of rewrites). Bitchener et al. (2005) conclude that direct written error correction alongside oral conference feedback showed more effect on accuracy than only direct written error correction. Furthermore, they suggest that some error types are more treatable than others, as seen in the improvement for some errors compared to others. Bitchener (2008) later consolidated the results in a different article, where it was found that direct written error correction significantly helps in improving the accuracy of students' L2 writing (but only for the error type targeted in the study), especially if the correction is combined with oral and written metalinguistic information. Bitchener and Knoch (2010) confirmed the advantages of direct correction, this time for advanced learners. Bitchener and Koch found that only the direct correction groups performed significantly better in accuracy in the long run, not the indirect group. In contrast to earlier research done by Bitchener, the oral metalinguistic explanation proved no different than only written metalinguistic explanation. They suggest that this may be because of the students' level: maybe advanced students only need extra written explanation to facilitate learning.

Other studies (Chandler, 2003; van Beuningen, 2011) also found advantages for direct error correction over no feedback and indirect feedback. Chandler (2003), who compared a direct correction group and a control group, found a significant advantage in accuracy improvement in new writings for the group who received direct error correction. A second study by Chandler focused on the effectiveness of different sorts of correction. Chandler offers direct correction as the best option compared to indirect correction, since the group receiving direct feedback performed better, not significantly, than the underlining group. To show that the advantages of error correction were not gained by simplifying their writing,

Chandler also measured fluency of the writers' products. It showed that fluency did not decline in subsequent writing in either of the studies.

Van Beuningen recorded similar advantages of the benefit of direct above indirect correction (2011). This study was clearly set up with the comments of Truscott in mind. The secondary school pupils in the experiment were divided into 4 groups: a direct correction group, an indirect correction group (underlining with code) and two control groups, one of which received extra practice in writing and one of which had to perform self-correction without any feedback. These control groups were incorporated to ensure that accuracy improvement did not follow from extra practice or from self-correction alone. The results showed that, while the direct correction group showed significant differences in improvement with the control groups in the revision text and new writing, the indirect correction group only showed significant differences in improvement in relation to the control groups in the revision text. The direct correction group did not perform significantly better than the indirect correction group in the new piece of writing, which clouds the conclusions drawn. Nevertheless, the analysis did show a trend and since the indirect group declined in their accuracy in later writing, while the direct group improved throughout writings, the direct group is still seen as performing best. Consequently, van Beuningen tentatively concludes that direct correction seems the best correction option when the aim is long-term improvement in accuracy.

Other studies are more favourable of indirect error correction instead of direct correction (Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). One comparatively old study favouring indirect correction proves an interesting case. The study by Fathman & Whalley (1990) is used by both sides of the debate as one of the main studies to convince the others of their right. Fathman & Whalley found that the grammatical accuracy of the students significantly improved following grammar feedback, as opposed to the students who had

received no or only content-related feedback. These results seem to point in favour of error correction, which is why numerous years later researchers use Fathman & Whalley's study as evidence pro error correction, especially, because it contains a control group. However, since the students' task consisted of self-editing/rewriting their products, Truscott does not consider the study as evidence.

In the 2001 Ferris & Roberts study, the need for explicit error correction was studied in detail by comparing coded indirect feedback and uncoded indirect feedback (alongside with a control group). No significant differences between the groups with coded and uncoded were found. Therefore, Ferris & Roberts (2001) conclude that the explicitness of error correction does not matter. Furthermore, they observed that some errors were indeed more treatable than others, since significant differences were found between ''treatable'' errors (verbs, noun endings, and articles) and ''untreatable'' errors (word choice and sentence structure)" (p. 17).

The previously discussed studies all seem to favour one sort of error correction over the other. However, a recent study by van Beuningen (2011) shows that there may not be a simple choice between either direct or indirect error correction. In this study, van Beuningen kept most if the factors of her, earlier discussed, small-scale study intact, only now the writing products of over 250 secondary school Dutch pupils were analysed in a "tightly controlled classroom-based quasi-experiment" (p. 57) . This time, the writing products were also analysed on avoidance effects, to test Truscott's (1996) statements relating to simplifying writing as an avoidance technique. In contrast to the small scale study which found that only direct feedback showed significant improvement in the long run, this large scale study found that both the direct and indirect error correction groups had significantly improved the accuracy in their revisions and their new writings. Closer analysis brought on the conclusion that indirect correction led to long-term improvement in non-grammatical errors, while direct correction led to long-term improvement grammatical errors. As a response to Truscott, it was

also mentioned that the experimental groups did not improve due to avoidance techniques and that extra practice alone did not lead to accuracy improvement (which is something which Truscott claims does lead to improvement (1996)). This study shows that instead of just one sort of correction, direct and indirect correction can both have positive effects on students' writing.

2.4   Error correction strategies

Even though it is still unclear whether or not, and if so what sort of, error correction is effective and useful in L2 improvement, the fact remains that error correction is a widely used tool in the language learning classroom. Furthermore, as Ferris (2004) mentions, if teachers do it, they "must do it competently" (p. 59). Therefore, apart from the question which error correction is best, questions on proper error correction raise another focus point in the error correction theory, namely the competence of teachers' error correction abilities. However, before the teachers' ability can be discussed, it is useful to understand what detecting and correcting an error entails.

Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt (2012), a direct precedent of the current study, use a theory from the field of psychology, signal-detection theory, to closely examine which factors are involved in detecting an error. "Signal-detection theory provides a general framework to describe and study decisions that are made in uncertain or ambiguous situations" (Wickens, 2002, p. 3). Detecting an error is one of those decisions in which a teacher can be uncertain whether or not there is need for correction. There are four possible alternatives for teachers when they are trying to detect errors in the writing products of their pupils:

- the teacher can correctly spot an error; this is called a *hit* in the signal-detection framework.

- the teacher can correctly evaluate that there is no error; this is called a *correct rejection*.

- the teacher can judge a construction or word as an error which actually is correct, this is called a *false alarm*.

- the teacher can misjudge an error by judging it as correct, this is called a *miss*.

Out of these four, the first two are the preferred outcomes, since the teacher has correctly judged the situation. However, a teacher can also misjudge the situation and this is what happens in the last two options. The teacher either overcorrects by correcting constructions and words which are not errors to begin with or he/she simply misses errors. Apparently, error correction is not quite a simple undertaking.

The last option of missing errors was, among other things, frequently attested in the 1990 study by Cohen & Cavalcanti. They studied the feedback on writing products given by three different types of (experienced) teachers in Portuguese (a secondary school EFL teacher, a university EFL teacher and a university L1 Portuguese teacher) and investigated how their feedback was received and appreciated by the students. For all teachers, Cohen & Cavalcanti (1990) showed that there were "numerous instances where the teacher not only failed to comment on an incorrect form but did not acknowledge any awareness of it" (p. 173). While Cohen & Cavalcanti are aware that teachers may choose not to correct an error (the error could have been deemed too difficult for the student to understand, for example), they still believe that it is important to point out that the missed errors may have also been a case of lack of knowledge.

Moreover, Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt (2012) describe error correction as a difficult task for non-native speakers, seen as the non-natives do not only need to be proficient in the foreign language, but they also need extra metalinguistic knowledge or language awareness to decide whether a certain construction or word is an error. Andrews (2004, 2007) describes

language awareness as an "explicit knowledge about language" (2007, p. 13). Teacher language awareness (TLA) consists of this language awareness, the metalinguistic knowledge of the FL one teaches, and the ability of teachers to convey that knowledge to the students. The TLA of a teacher is of importance for not only spotting errors, but also correctly correcting them.

Experience

Seemingly, there is more involved in correcting errors than one might think at first sight. Therefore, it is interesting to see how a novice teacher with little experience fares in the correction of errors, especially in relation to experienced teachers.

Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt (2012) only investigated the error detection skills of novice teachers. They examined a completed error judgment task of German undergraduate students. The error judgment task consisted of 36 sentences (of which 12 contained no error and 24 contained errors) in context of student interactions. An example of such a sentence as given by Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt (2012, p. 144):

> "*Peter borrowed a book from his friend, George. George needs it back, but Peter has forgotten to return it.*
> *George: Peter, do you have the book that I gave you last week?*
> ***Peter: I'm really sorry but I was in a rush this morning and I didn't brought it today.***"

The students had to not only judge whether the sentence was correct or not, but they also had to point out and correct the error if they felt there was one. Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt found that "the performance of the participants resembles random guessing on average" (p. 145).

This means that if an error was present there was a 50% chance of it being uncorrected or a *miss* and if no error was present there was still 50% chance of it being corrected or a *false alarm*. The results proved rather shocking, since error detection skills are important in the L2 or FL language classroom. If novice teachers are not equipped to adequately correct errors, this may have implications for the pupils they teach. Therefore, the current study was designed to further investigate novice teachers and their ability to correct errors.

It is difficult to find studies examining the difference in error detection skills between novice and experienced teachers. However, there are some studies (Cumming, 1990; Schoonen, Vergeer & Eiting, 1997), which studied the effect of difference in expertise in rating L2 writing. The rating of L2 writing is a quite different from detecting and correcting errors; however, teachers do have to rate the products on the basis of language use (which can be seen as assessing the overall accuracy of the product) and content (and other possible aspects).

Cumming (1990) studied whether the scores given by novice and experienced teachers distinguished between the students' writing skills and the students' L2 abilities. Moreover, he set out to describe the thinking behaviours of both groups of teachers. Interesting to the current study is mainly the differences described between the two groups of teachers. Cumming found that the ratings for 'content' and 'rhetorical organization' significantly differed between the novice and expert teachers (the novice teachers rated these aspects higher than the experienced teachers). However, the rating of 'language use' showed no significant difference between the groups. This means that the novice teachers were more positive than the experienced teachers on the 'content' and 'rhetorical organization' aspects of the writing products, while both groups of teachers rated the 'language use' aspect similarly. Moreover, the study showed that the novice teachers seemed to focus more on the accuracy of the writing products than the experienced teachers. The experienced teachers were also

interested in accuracy, but they had more balance with a focus on other aspects, such as content.

Schoonen et al. (1997) did not specifically study novice and experienced teacher, but instead focused on the differences between and the reliability of experienced and lay readers in rating writing assignments. They found that most of the differences between the lay and experienced readers could be found in rating 'language use'. Mostly, the lay readers were stricter in their evaluations than the experienced readers. Regarding 'content', the ratings seemed quite similar.

Andrews (2007) describes the difference in novice and experienced teachers on the basis of teacher language awareness (TLA). He argues that experienced teachers show more metalinguistic knowledge and better abilities to explain errors than novice teachers. In other words, they have more TLA than their novice counterparts. Moreover, he discusses how novice teachers tend to focus less on language content issues in the classroom and more on aspects as classroom management, especially compared to experienced teachers. Nevertheless, there are some instances in which novice teachers outperform the experienced teachers. Andrews describes how the novice teachers were better than experienced teachers at predicting what lexical constructions would provide the most difficulties for their pupils. Andrews argues that this effect was probably found because the novice teachers had only recently completed secondary school themselves and could, therefore, imagine what would prove difficult.

2.5   Research questions & hypotheses

This study aims at answering the following subquestions:

1) How do L1 Dutch novice teachers correct the EFL writing products of pupils enrolled in one particular kind of Dutch education, namely *vmbo-t*?

2) How do L1 Dutch experienced teachers correct the EFL writing products of pupils enrolled in one particular kind of Dutch education, namely *vmbo-t*?

This leads to the following main research question that guides this study:

- How do the error corrections of novice and experienced teachers differ?

With the little theoretical background on this particular subject, it is difficult to formulate precise predictions. However, based on the research discussed before, it is hypothesised that:

- the novice teachers will correct fewer errors than the experienced teachers (Andrews, 2007; Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, 2012)

- the novice teachers will leave more errors uncorrected than the experienced teachers, although the experienced teachers will also miss errors (Andrews, 2007; Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, 2012)

- the novice teacher will overcorrect considerably more than the experienced ones (Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, 2012)

- The novice teachers are more likely to erroneously correct more errors than the experienced teachers (Andrews, 2007)

- The novice teachers will either give a higher mean grade than or will show similar grades as the experienced teachers (Cumming, 1990; Schoonen et al., 1997)

- The novice teachers will focus more on the accuracy of the writing products than on the meaning, while the experienced teachers will also focus on other aspects (Cumming, 1990; Schoonen et al., 1997)

3. Method

3.1 Participants

In order to meet this paper's objectives, 23 English students training to be teachers at Utrecht University were recruited and multiple experienced English teachers at Dutch secondary school were approached by e-mail. This resulted in a final subject pool of 16 novice teachers participating in this study and 5 experienced teachers.

The students were all enrolled in the first year of the two-year Educational Master at Utrecht University (2012/2013). They were thus studying to become future English teachers at secondary school level. The students consisted of 11 females and 5 males with an age range between 22 and 27 (Mean: 23.69 (SD 1.53)). Some of the teacher trainees had some experience in teaching English at secondary schools, since they successfully completed an educational minor earning them 2nd degree qualification for teaching English[3]. In those cases, their experience consisted of a one year part-time internship. Others had never stood in front of a classroom.

The experienced teachers were recruited randomly and, therefore, did not work at the same school. 10 teachers responded to the request and only 5 of them ultimately completed the assignment. The request was sent to acquaintances of the researcher who send the request to English teachers they were in contact with. The experienced teacher group consisted of four females and one male and their experience ranged from 7 up to 34 years of English teaching experience, with a mean of 21,2 years (SD 10.11). All of the teachers had experience with *vmbo-t* pupils or *mbo*, which is the tertiary school which is the follow-up for most *vmbo-t* pupils. The writing products used for this study were indeed written by *vmbo-t* pupils. "The Dutch secondary school system consists of 3 levels: VWO / HAVO / VMBO, with VWO as

---

[3] There are multiple teacher degrees in the Netherlands. The 2nd degree means one is qualified to teach all the years of Dutch *vmbo* and only the first three years of *havo* and *vwo*. The 1st degree, for which the trainees are studying, means one is qualified to teach all the years of all the Dutch secondary school levels.

the highest and VMBO as the lowest level. VMBO itself is subdivided into a (higher) theoretical level, VMBO-t and three more practical sublevels, VMBO-gemend, VMBO-kader and VMBO-beroeps. The VMBO-t trajectory (…) spans 4 years." (Wessels, 2012)

All the participants participated in this study on a voluntary basis and were not reimbursed for their involvement in the study.

3.2 Materials and Procedure

To determine whether teachers in training and experienced teacher differed in error correction, it was decided that the best method to adopt for this study was to let both groups of participants correct 16 authentic writing products of Dutch *vmbo-t* pupils. Authentic writing products were chosen, contrary to an earlier study which used grammaticality judgment tasks (Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, 2012), to let the design resemble actual classroom practice as closely as possible. The writing products were taken from an earlier BA study (Wessels, 2012) , which looked at the development of pupils' lexical and syntactic FL (English) writing. The study obtained several writing products of 86 pupils divided into four classes of all four years of *vmbo-t*. The pupils' task consisted of writing a piece on a personal topic, for which they were set a time-limit of six minutes. The task that was assigned to the pupils can be found back in the Appendix.

It was decided to use writing products of all years of *vmbo-t* to study if differences occurred in correcting different years. Furthermore, four writing products per year were selected for the purpose of this study to limit the workload for the participants. Of the four writing products, two were considered to be of a low proficiency level and the other two of a high proficiency level. The choices concerning proficiency were made on the basis of the results of error correction conducted by the researcher and a second, trained linguist. The writing products were put in a random order to obscure the difference in proficiency. The

different years were added to the writing products to alert the participants to the difference of the products.

Once the writing products were selected and were put into a Word file, participants were digitally approached to participate. To decrease the possibility of influencing the participants, it was decided not to fully inform the participants of the goal of the study. Participants who agreed to participate were sent a letter of explanation alongside the file with writing products. They were asked to read the letter before starting the assignment. First in the letter, the participants were asked to correct the writing products in the same way they would correct the work of their own pupils. Then, the context of the writing products was explained and the original task that resulted in the writing products was also included. Next, it was made possible to correct the products in one's own time by using the correction function in Word. This means that the participants were able to independently correct the writing products without the researcher being present and in the absence of time constraints. Subsequently, to ensure that the participants correctly identified the errors, they were specifically asked to not only identify the mistake, but also specify the nature of the error (by coding for example) or to provide the direct correction of the error. They were very much left the choice as to which option they preferred. Instead, they were instructed to correct the way they would normally do. Following this, the participants were asked to award a mark of 1-10 to the writing products and to substantiate the mark with a short justification. Upon completion of the correction task, a small questionnaire was administered to determine the participants' level of experience and their thoughts on written error correction.

Since the majority of the student participants students did not answer the digital request, the task was performed by 13 students in a classroom setting. To control for little difference between the participants, the students were provided with the same letter of

instruction as the other participants and no additional instruction was provided. The only difference was that the students performed the corrections on paper instead of digitally.

3.3   Data analysis

On basis of previous work and the current study's research questions it was decided to analyse the pupils' writing products on a total of 7 different dimensions. These measures were decided by the researcher in view of possible difference with Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt (2012) and the Signal Detection theory in mind. The chosen measures were as follows:

- Total number of errors

- Number of errors left uncorrected

- Number of errors which were not errors to begin with

- Number of errors which were corrected erroneously

- Type of errors (corrected errors & uncorrected errors)

- Mean grade awarded to the writing products

- Teachers' error correction strategies

It was decided to analyse these measures per year and per proficiency level, to reveal possible differences between years or proficiency level. The first 3 measures were chosen to analyse the number of hits, misses and false alarms. The 4th measure was chosen to determine if the teachers were not only capable of spotting errors but also if they could correct them. To establish if the teachers would differ in generally grading the writing products, the grades (6th measure) awarded were also analysed.

The 5th measure was selected to find out if there was a difference in certain types of errors which may have been easier to correct. The corrections were analysed on the basis of three type of errors: lexical (word choice), stylistic (spelling / pragmatic / style) and

grammatical. Errors were considered to be lexical if the pupils used incorrect vocabulary. Like '**learn** for a test' instead of **study** (2.2) or 'We have a good **relation**' instead of **relationship** (3.1) (the actual written products from which these examples were taken can be found in the Appendix. At the end of the sentence the year and the product number is given (1.4 for year 1, product 4, for instance). As mentioned, stylistic errors consisted of spelling, pragmatic and style errors, although most of the stylistic errors found by the researcher and the trained linguist were spelling and style errors. Plain spelling errors can be found in 1.1, in which words such as '**hucks**' (hugs), '**said**' (side) and '**gif**' (give) were marked as stylistic errors. Sentences which missed a necessary comma or semicolon were seen as style errors. Sentences which missed half of the sentence and, therefore, complicated the exact meaning of the sentence were also considered stylistic errors, for example 'all us members of the family' (1.3), which the pupil wrote without context in the middle of his text, which leaves the reader guessing as to what his intended meaning could be. Errors of syntactic nature (such as wrong tense use, incorrect prepositions or incorrect word order and of course more common errors) were regarded as grammatical errors, like '**fighted**' instead of fought (1.1), 'he **don't** have much hair' (1.4) instead of doesn't, 'I see her almost every day **on** school' (2.4) instead of at and '**Hes** name is Ad' (4.1) instead of his.

Last, it was decided to qualitatively study the answers given in response to the questionnaire concerning the teachers' error correction strategies. Moreover, the corrections made were also examined qualitatively.

4. Results

As was stated in the method section, it was decided to analyse the teachers' corrections and their questionnaire on seven different dimensions. Moreover, some of these dimensions will be compared to the corrections the researcher and a second trained linguist made. For further ease, Table 1 first of all lists the number of errors filtered out by the trained linguist and the researcher. It is important to note that the pre-correction done by the trained linguists were made on the basis of whether a construction or word could be considered acceptable, since not all errors made were considered constructions that pupils of this level were able to have acquired. The numbers of errors filtered out in this pre-correction may not reflect what actual teachers do. For pedagogical reasons, teacher may mark more or fewer errors. It is, therefore, plausible that some teachers will spot more errors than the total number indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Number of errors corrected by the researcher and the second linguist; in total and subsequently spelled out per year and on the basis of good versus poor writing products

	Pre-correction
Total number of errors	180
Number of errors for good year 1 pupils	27
Number of errors for poor year 1 pupils	30
Number of errors for good year 2 pupils	10
Number of errors for poor year 2 pupils	33
Number of errors for good year 3 pupils	10
Number of errors for poor year 3 pupils	31
Number of errors for good year 4 pupils	10
Number of errors for poor year 4 pupils	29

4.1   Total number of corrected errors

Table 2 below first of all lists the mean number of errors that both the novice and experienced

teachers corrected (i.e.: how many hits were counted per participant?), both in total and

subsequently spelled out per year and on the basis of good versus poor writing products:

Table 2: Mean number and standard deviations of total errors corrected by the novice and experienced teachers.

	Novice Teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Total number of errors N=180)[4]	134.00 (30.25)	129.80 (35.84)
Number of errors for good year 1 pupils (n=27)	22.81 (4.05)	21.40 (6.50)
Number of errors for poor year 1 pupils (n=30)	20.94 (4.78)	20.40 (5.60)
Number of errors for good year 2 pupils (n=10)	7.31 (3.63)	5.20 (1.48)
Number of errors for poor year 2 pupils (n=33)	22.88 (6.01)	22.40 (7.57)
Number of errors for good year 3 pupils (n=10)	9.13 (2.63)	7.60 (3.65)
Number of errors for poor year 3 pupils (n=31)	19.06 (5.54)	20.00 (5.75)
Number of errors for good year 4 pupils (n=10)	8.50 (2.50)	9.40 (3.98)
Number of errors for poor year 4 pupils (n=29)	23.38 (6.27)	23.40 (4.83)

Although Table 2 shows that the novice teachers corrected slightly more errors than

the experienced teachers in total, it is difficult to find a clear tendency in the corrected errors

between both groups of teachers, since the experienced teachers found more errors in the

---

[4] The numbers mentioned in the first column are the numbers in Table 1. These numbers are the number of errors found in the pre-correction.

writing products of some years. Unsurprisingly, independent samples t-tests were unable to detect statistically significant differences.

Moreover, as is evident from Table 1, both the novice and the experienced teachers were able to make a clear distinction between the writing products of the good and the poor pupils. However, compared to the pre-correction neither of the two groups of teachers spotted all the errors filtered out by the trained linguists. This is true across years and for both good and poorer writing products.

4.2   Number of errors left uncorrected

Table 3 below specifies the number of errors that were not marked by the two groups of

teachers. In other words, it contains the number of *misses* the groups displayed by glossing

over errors. Whether this was a deliberate act or not will be discussed later in the discussion

section.

Table 3: Mean number and standard deviations of uncorrected errors by the novice and experienced teachers; in total and subsequently spelled out per year and on the basis of good versus poor writing products

	Novice Teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Total number of errors left uncorrected	49.06 (19.60)	44.80 (19.24)
Number of errors left uncorrected for good year 1 pupils	5.13 (2.75)	4.20 (2.68)
Number of errors left uncorrected for poor year 1 pupils	8.13 (3.74)	6.20 (4.66)
Number of errors left uncorrected for good year 2 pupils	4.56 (1.26)	5.20 (1.79)
Number of errors left uncorrected for poor year 2 pupils	8.38 (4.26)	7.80 (3.90)
Number of errors left uncorrected for good year 3 pupils	3.19 (1.68)	4.20 (1.64)
Number of errors left uncorrected for poor year 3 pupils	10.13 (4.75)	8.80 (4.15)
Number of errors left uncorrected for good year 4 pupils	2.88 (1.71)	2.40 (1.67)
Number of errors left uncorrected for poor year 4 pupils	6.69 (4.38)	6.00 (3.40)

Necessarily perhaps, similar patterns as for the number of errors that were corrected

emerged here: although the novice teachers overall left fewer errors uncorrected than the

experienced teachers, this pattern was not found throughout all the years and the differences did not reach significance levels anywhere (as assessed on the basis of independent samples t-tests).

Furthermore, the table illustrates that, across proficiency levels, both experienced and novice teachers seem to overlook more errors in the writing products of the poor pupils' writing products than the good pupils' writing products, which is consistent which what is found in Table 2.

Across years, it is more difficult to discern a pattern. The only noticeable difference can be found for the uncorrected errors for the year 4 products, which show a marked decrease compared to previous years.

Examples

It is interesting to look at examples of errors which were frequently left uncorrected. The actual written products from which these example were taken can be found in the Appendix. At the end of the sentence the year and the product number is given (1.4 for year 1, product 4, for instance). An error which was, perhaps surprisingly, left uncorrected quite frequently by the experienced, but was mostly filtered out by the novice teachers concerned a stylistic error:

> (1) (…) * since she died I don't sey here anymore only in my memories or dreams. 1.1

A comma should be inserted after "anymore". This error was mostly not corrected by the experienced teachers, while the majority of the novice teachers did correct it. The other errors that can be seen in the sentence are spelling errors and were corrected most of the time.

Other errors which were often left uncorrected related to grammatical errors, such as the one in (2):

(2) *(…) and I fell **from** the chair. 3.2

The teachers failed to notice the Dutch construction and did not correct it to 'off'.

Moreover, sometimes both groups of teachers did not correct entirely incorrect sentences, such as the one in (3):

(3) *All ready making for my dad's fifteeth birthday. 1.3

While some teachers did mark such sentences with a question mark, many simply did not do anything with examples like (3).

4.3   Number of errors which were not actually errors

Table 4 presents the mean scores and standard deviation for another measure that was

included in the present study, namely the number of corrections that were found in the writing

products but on the basis of words and constructions that were not uniformly wrong to start

with (i.e. how many false alarms were found in the corrections of the teachers ?):

Table 4: Mean number and standard deviation of false alarms by the novice and experienced
teachers; in total and subsequently spelled out per year and on the basis of good versus poor
writing products

	Novice Teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Total number of non-errors	4.38 (3.98)	3.20 (3.11)
Number of non-errors for good year 1 pupils	.56 (1.03)	1.40 (2.61)
Number of non-errors for poor year 1 pupils	.3125 (.70)	.00 (.00)
Number of non-errors for good year 2 pupils	.75 (1.13)	.00 (.00)
Number of non-errors for poor year 2 pupils	.44 (.89)	.00 (.00)
Number of non-errors for good year 3 pupils	.56 (.81)	.20 (0.45)
Number of non-errors for poor year 3 pupils	.50 (.73)	.00 (.00)
Number of non-errors for good year 4 pupils	.44 (.73)	1.00 (1.00)
Number of non-errors for poor year 4 pupils	.81 (.91)	0.60 (0.55)

As can be seen from Table 4, a variable picture appears to emerge here: the novice and

experienced teacher seemingly take turns in the number of corrections they make on the basis

of grammatical/lexically accurate constructions. Most importantly, at no point were the

differences between the novice and experienced teachers statistically significant.

Interestingly, the good writing products (except for year 4) seem to receive more

corrections that are not strictly necessarily than the poor writing products. In the writing

products of the first three years both groups of teachers corrected (although slightly) more than necessary.

Examples

Most of the *false alarms* consisted of lexical constructions; a good example is given in (4):

(4) She often gives me kisses **on the front of my head** (…) 3.4

In which some of the teachers corrected 'on the front of my head' to 'on my forehead', while it is logical to correct it to 'forehead' it is unnecessary, since the pupil did not phrase anything wrong.

4.4   Number of errors which were corrected incorrectly

Table 5 provides the mean number and standard deviation of errors which were corrected by the participants, but which they corrected wrongly. One of the aims of the current study was to see if the teachers were able to not only spot an error, but also correct it correctly. The participants which are missing from the data are the teachers who used 'underlining only' as a correction method, which already implies that they never corrected something erroneously. Therefore, they were omitted from this particular analyses.

Table 5: Mean number and standard deviation of incorrect corrections by the novice and experienced teachers; in total and subsequently spelled out per year and on the basis of good versus poor writing products

	Novice Teachers (n=14)	Experienced teachers (n=3)
Total number of incorrectly corrected errors	6.73 (5.78)	5.67 (1.53)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for good year 1 pupils	0.87 (0.83)	1.33 (0.58)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for poor year 1 pupils	1.27 (2.31)	0.00 (0.00)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for good year 2 pupils	0.47 (0.83)	0.67 (0.58)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for poor year 2 pupils	1.33 (0.98)	1.33 (0.58)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for good year 3 pupils	0.87 (1.36)	0.33 (0.58)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for poor year 3 pupils	0.53 (1.30)	0.33 (0.58)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for good year 4 pupils	0.33 (1.05)	0.00 (0.00)
Number of incorrectly corrected errors for poor year 4 pupils	1.07 (0.80)	1.67 (0.58)

It can be seen from Table 5 that the novice and experienced teacher differ very little in their mean number of incorrectly corrected errors. None of the differences proved significant. Moreover, no pattern was found - for either the novice or experienced teachers - between years or between proficiency levels.

Examples

Even though the mean number of wrongly corrected errors is not high for either group, the mistakes the teachers make when they correct an error can be crucial for a pupils' accuracy improvement. The most salient error made by the teachers (experienced and novice alike) relates a construction which is a difficult grammatical error for L2 learners to grasp:

(5) *She lived in my **parent house.** 2.1 // *She lived in my **parent's house.**

This error should have been corrected to 'parents' house' to indicate possession. The teachers who corrected it using such an incorrect construction did notice that the error lies in possession. However, they failed to provide the right correction, evidenced by the second sentence.

4.5   Type of errors

Table 6 provides some insight into the type of errors that were corrected per group. More specifically, it specifies whether the novice and experienced teachers differed in the number of lexical, stylistic (including spelling) and grammatical errors they corrected.

Table 6: Mean number and standard deviation of the total number of lexical/stylistic/grammatical errors corrected by the novice and experienced teachers

	Novice Teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Total number of lexical errors corrected (n=17)[5]	14.25 (4.85)	10.67 (3.5)
Total number of stylistic errors corrected (n=80)	56.94 (16.40)	68.67 (30.80)
Total number of grammatical errors corrected (n=83)	61.69 (13.67)	61.67 (13.08)

As can be seen, there were clear differences (and some similarities) in the types of errors corrected. The novice and experienced teachers were very much similar in the number of grammatical errors they marked. However, the novice teachers recorded more lexical errors than the experienced teachers and the experienced teachers, in turn, were better as spotting stylistic errors, the large majority of which was made up of spelling errors. None of these differences, however, reached statistical significance.

It can be seen from the data in Table 6 that compared to the trained linguists' correction, both of the teacher groups did relatively well overall in correcting all types of errors. Not one sort of error appears too difficult to correct, since a balance can be found between the error types.

---

[5] The numbers mentioned in the first column are the total number of lexical/stylistic/grammatical errors found by the researcher and the second linguist.

Table 7 below shows the data of the type of errors the teachers did not correct. As above, it specifies whether the novice and experienced teachers differed in the number of lexical, stylistic (including spelling) and grammatical errors they failed to correct.

Table 7: Mean number and standard deviation of the total number of lexical/stylistic/grammatical errors which were not corrected by the novice and experienced teachers

	Novice teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Total number of lexical errors uncorrected	5.25 (4.17)	4.17 (3.13)
Total number of stylistic errors uncorrected	20.56 (8.51)	15.67 (6.71)
Total number of grammatical errors uncorrected	23.25 (10.04)	21.00 (10.95)

As shown in Table 7, the novice and experienced teachers did not differ greatly in the type of errors that were left uncorrected. Unsurprisingly, none of these differences reached statistical significance. The figures in Table 7 do indicate that grammatical and stylistic errors seemed hardest to detect.

4.6   **Mean grade awarded to the pupils' writing products**

Table 8 below presents an overview of the marks (from 1 to 10) that all teachers were asked to award to each student. The numbers not only present the means per year but also the means per proficiency level:

Table 8: Mean number and standard deviation of the grade awarded to the writing products per year and on the basis of proficiency

	Novice Teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Mean grade awarded to good year 1 pupils	7.65 (.67)	7.48 (1.56)
Mean grade awarded to poor year 1 pupils	5.49 (.66)	5.56 (1.12)
Mean grade awarded to good year 2 pupils	8.76 (.63)	9.16 (0.50)
Mean grade awarded to poor year 2 pupils	5.89 (.78)	5.92 (1.47)
Mean grade awarded to good year 3 pupils	8.21 (.62)	7.98 (1.44)
Mean grade awarded to poor year 3 pupils	6.06 (.73)	6.30 (1.75)
Mean grade awarded to good year 4 pupils	8.59 (.47)	8.82 (0.21)
Mean grade awarded to poor year 4 pupils	5.11 (1.29)	5.36 (0.97)

Not surprisingly perhaps, looking at these results, is that the novice and experienced teachers did not differ at all in the grades awarded. By contrast, they were remarkably on one page where grading the writing products was concerned.

4.7 Teachers' error correction strategies

Type of correctors

Table 9 lists the type of correctors rather than corrections being made. In order to interpret these results, it needs to be pointed out what the numbers that were entered into the data file meant:

1 = uses mainly underlining only

2 = uses mainly underlining and coding

3 = uses mainly direct correction

4 = uses mostly underlining but sometimes direct correction

5 = uses mostly direct correction but sometimes underlining only

It should be noted that Table 10 presents frequency scores rather than means. In other words, the table lists the number of correctors who opted for a certain method of correction.

Table 9: Number of correctors who opted for a certain method of correction

	Novice teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Underlines only	2	3
Underlines and uses codes	2	0
Uses direct corrections	10	2
Underlines mostly but sometimes directly corrects	1	0
Direct correction mostly but sometimes only underlines	1	0

Although it is hard to distill trends on the basis of this table (due to the small number of experienced teachers), it can be seen that for the experienced teachers both underlining and direct correction are popular methods. No other form of correction is used in this group. The novice teachers predominantly went for the direct correction method and, in terms of percentages, used the underlining only method markedly less than the experienced teachers. Not surprising given the numbers under investigation, however, none of the differences were significant.

Strategies mentioned

One of the questions asked in the questionnaire was whether the teacher followed a certain

strategy. Table 10 shows the strategies that were mentioned by the teachers.

Table 10: Number of teachers who mentioned a certain strategy.

	Novice teachers (n=16)	Experienced teachers (n=5)
Correct all mistakes	7	3
Only correct the most important mistakes	6	1
Meaning	1	1
Accuracy & Meaning	2	0

As can be seen from Table 10, the most popular strategy is a focus on the accuracy of

a writing product. Only 3 novice and 1 experienced teacher mentioned meaning as an

important part of correcting. The experienced teachers differ from the novice teachers, since

they seem to favour correcting all errors, while the novice teachers are balanced between

correcting all errors, or correcting the most important ones.

4.8   Summary

No significant differences were found for either of the 7 dimensions. However, there did seem

to be a minor difference or trends in favour of the novice teachers for 'total number of

corrected errors' and 'number of uncorrected errors'. The novice teachers corrected more and

missed fewer errors in total than the experienced teachers. In terms of 'number of errors

which were not errors to begin with' and 'errors which were corrected incorrectly', both

groups of teachers showed similar patterns of only a small number of errors. Moreover, they

showed similar grading patterns and both groups of teachers seemed to favour accuracy over

meaning in writing products.

5. Discussion

This study set out with the aim of assessing the difference in error corrections by teachers in training and experienced teachers. Very little was found in the literature on the actual error correction skills of novice and experienced FL teachers and the current study set out to fill this niche. This study's results can be divided into three categories: (i) error correction skills and, related to that, error types, (ii) grading patterns and (iii) correction strategies. Since no clear differences between years and proficiency levels were found during the analysis, the results below are discussed wholistically.

First of all, the results of this study did not show any significant differences between the error correction skills of novice and experienced teachers. However, minor differences were found for total number of errors and number of uncorrected errors. The novice teachers corrected more errors than the experienced teachers and, subsequently, also left fewer errors uncorrected, which seems to indicate that the novice teachers are slightly more skilled or as skilled as experienced teachers in discovering errors. Moreover, the results of experienced and novice teachers' error correction skills showed that both groups hardly ever corrected errors which were not errors to begin with. This strategy may well be preferable in the classroom, as this means that the teachers do not overcorrect, which is most effective for their pupils. Also, it seemed most difficult for both groups to spot grammatical and stylistic errors as opposed to lexical errors which appeared easier to spot.

There are several explanations for the results of the current study. A possible explanation for the non-significant but slight difference between the novice and experienced teachers might be the design of the study itself. The small sample size of the experienced teachers made it hard to generalize. There are, however, other possible explanations. It seems possible that these results are due to a stricter focus on the language use by the novice teachers, which would be consistent with the findings of both Cumming (1990) and Schoonen

et al. (1997). Cumming (1990) found that novice teachers focused more on the accuracy of the writing products and Schoonen et al. (1997) reported that inexperienced readers rated stricter on language use. The higher total number of errors found by the novice teachers can, therefore, be a case of stricter error correction by the novice teachers; they may have focused on finding the errors more than the experienced teachers. Even though the experienced teachers expressed that they typically corrected all errors in their everyday classroom practice, and not only the most important ones, it is possible that they did not mark more errors due to a less strict focus.

Nevertheless, the observed differences are only small. It may be that the error correction skills of both novice and experienced teachers are due to individual differences among the teachers and a limited capacity of non-natives' error correction abilities in a second language (Hahne, 2001). In other words, some individuals may simply be better at the multitask that writing correction essentially is; not only do they need to employ their own L2 proficiency to spot the errors, but they also have to use pedagogically sound feedback options. All of this typically has to be done under time constraints given the considerable pressure that secondary school teachers often experience (Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999, 2004). In the future, it may be interesting to look more closely at individual differences by including measures such as working memory and domain-general cognitive control to see what individual characteristics good versus poor correctors possess.

The results that teachers did not mark numerous errors are consistent with Cohen & Cavalcanti's (1990) study. The revisions that were still suggested by the investigators in that study after the teachers' revisions showed that many errors were not corrected. Cohen & Calvanti claimed this could have been done to bias towards and knowledge of the students. The teacher may have left out mistakes of which they knew the students could not learn (since they were not ready, for example).

A possible explanation for the uncorrected errors in the current study might be that the teachers did not consider them to be errors. However, since most errors were of a low proficiency level, other explanations are also possible and in fact more likely. First, the workload of 16 writing products, which they corrected voluntarily and they probably did not want to spend too much time on them, may have resulted in correcting too quickly and, therefore, not correcting errors they would have corrected if there had been fewer products. For example, numerous spelling errors were left uncorrected, probably because of concentration issues. Second, the uncorrected errors might have been left uncorrected because teacher did not find the errors important enough. Third, the task type may also have a part in the number of uncorrected errors. The task given to the pupils was a fairly open task (elements what needed to be in the task were listed, but not much) and personal and, therefore, the input differed greatly from pupil to pupil. Such a task is not regularly given in L2 classrooms, especially in the first year, in which pupils mostly write closed task with little room for creativity and the last year, in which there is more focus on formal letters, since formal letters are tested in the final exams. If open and personal tasks are not regularly given, the teachers may not be used to the creative output and the errors that are commonly made in such tasks. The number of uncorrected errors might be different if the teachers were asked to correct writing products in the form of formal letters, or other tasks which teachers are used to. A final possibility is that some teachers may not have bothered with correcting fragmented sentences (some of the teachers wrote this as comment next to very low proficiency products) or obvious mistakes. Others may have chosen not to correct repetition errors. Repetition errors are errors of the same type (or exactly the same errors) that are made repeatedly by the same pupil in the same writing product. Some teachers choose to correct the error when it occurs the first time and then ignore later similar errors. These numerous possibilities concerning the uncorrected errors indicate that it is difficult to state if uncorrected errors are due to the

proficiency level of the teachers or because of other (previously stated) reasons. This is mainly because of the design of the study, since it analysed the teachers in an authentic context, which has its advantages, but complicates the conclusion.

However, some of the error correction skills findings of the current study do not support results of previous research. In particular, the finding that novice teachers corrected almost no errors which were in fact not errors at all / correct constructions differs from Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt's 2012 study, who found that the error detection skills of novice teacher resembled guessing at best. They showed that "in the case of an error, for most participants there is a 50% chance of successful detection. In the case of a correct utterance, for most participants there is a 50% chance of a mistaken classification as an error" (Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, 2012, 145). This was not the case in the current study; the novice teachers spotted an average of 134 errors and only spotted 4.38 errors which were actually errors. The novice teachers did not correct numerous errors, which was the same for the novice teachers in Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt's study. Nevertheless, these results are difficult to compare to each other, since exact numbers from their study are missing. Moreover, the number of errors that were left uncorrected by the novice teachers was not radically different from the picture that emerged for the experienced teachers.

The contradictory results with the Pfingshorn & Engelhardt (2012) study may be due to design differences in task type and design differences in level of task difficulty. The task type of the current study and Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt's study differed greatly, since in the first the teachers were asked to correct as they did normally, with the intention of keeping the correction task as close to a real teacher task as possible, while in the second the teachers were asked to correct an error if they spotted one, purely to test the ability of novice teachers to correct possible errors. This may have resulted in different outcomes. Furthermore, the novice teachers in Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt's study had to correct single sentences devoid of

context, while the teachers in the current study corrected authentic writing products as they would in the FL classroom. The decontextualized sentences in the Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt study may have invited the novice teachers to overcorrect, because of pressure to not miss any errors. Every single sentence may have raised doubt, while in the current study the teachers might have looked more generally at mistakes. Moreover, the level of difficulty also may have differed in the studies. While there is no clear picture of the level of difficulty of the sentences used by Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt, the writing products of the current study did not contain any majorly difficult constructions or ambiguous mistakes, as they were authentic products, produced by vmbo-t pupils in various years. The level of writing may have caused a different focus for the teachers, since they did not need to look hard to find mistakes. Therefore, they may have corrected fewer non-mistakes, for there were fewer opportunities to find them. Furthermore, the differences between the Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt and the current study could have been due to different populations. The current study solely examined Dutch novice teachers, while the Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt study examined German novice teachers. Although it is difficult to draw conclusions without hard evidence on the proficiency levels of all students, it is possible that the Dutch novice teachers, since they performed better than the German teachers, have a higher proficiency which made it easier to detect errors. This may be why they managed to have better detection skills than their German counterparts. Moreover, the students' educational background also differed. Pfingsthorn & Engelhardt's study consisted of undergraduate students of English and American studies without, presumably, any formal pedagogical training, while the current study consisted of graduate students which were enrolled in an Educational MA. This means two slight disadvantages for the undergraduate students, as they would have had less education than the graduate students, and the graduate students may have been more alert to the importance of feedback overall, since they are enrolled in a study which focuses on education as compared to the undergraduates.

Another important finding was that both groups of teachers graded the writing products almost the same. Although it is difficult to compare the findings of the current study to other earlier studies, since the studies differ in so many ways, there are some similarities. The similar grading patterns are consistent with those of Schoonen et al. (1997), who found that lay (comparable to the novice teachers in this study) and expert readers proved similar in rating content in writing products. The rating in that study might have been done differently (with a scale rating and purely a rating on content for Schoonen et al.'s study), they do point out a similar thing; that novice and expert readers prove similar in grading writing products.

Schoonen et al. (1997) imply that it may have been the type of task which triggered the same grades. They argue that for simple tasks, even lay readers (or novice teachers) can simply see what should be in the writing product and, consequently, can assess whether the task was done correctly. They also argue that if the writing task is well defined it is easier to check if the students confirmed to the task. These explanations also seem to hold for the current study. The assignment (see Appendix), to which the teachers had access, was rather simple and well defined, as it listed all elements that were supposed to be in the writing product. This may have led to similar grading patterns.

Moreover, it seemed that the novice teachers preferred direct correction as correction method and the majority of teachers expressed that they focused on the (most important) errors in writing products and only a few teachers mentioned the importance of content. This focus on the errors of writing products instead of the meaning corroborates the tendencies found by Hughes & Lascaratou (1982), who, although the study was carried out more than 30 years ago, suggested that FL teachers are still focusing on grammar mistakes instead of the communicative aspect of students' writing products, even with the switch to a more communicative approach in most FL classrooms. The view of a FL teacher as mostly concerned with errors is also found in the Cohen & Cavalcanti (1990) study. They pictured

the FL secondary school teacher as a teacher mainly concerned with the accuracy of her pupils, since later in their education the pupils would be evaluated in terms of accuracy. The same seems to hold in the current study. Whether or not the teachers either looked at the most important or all errors, there was little mention of content or meaning as a measure which teachers found important. Nevertheless, lexical errors that were corrected, especially the ones that perhaps really weren't errors to start with (such as example (4)), may in fact have been attempts by the teachers to say something about the meaning of the written piece.

This does not mean, however, that the teachers do not find meaning an important aspect of writing. A possible explanation for the focus on errors could be due to the instruction. The teachers were specifically asked to correct the writing products, which may have led the focus away from the meaning. Therefore, they may not have mentioned meaning at all, since they were solely concerned with the accuracy. Moreover, since the teachers did not assign the task themselves they may have found it difficult to assess the meaning factor, since they were not present when the pupils were instructed what to do. Another possible explanation is that results of the pupils' assignment in particular proved difficult, since the content which the pupils wrote differed greatly student from student. It may have been difficult to assess meaning in such personal products, as opposed to assessing meaning in formal letters.

However, with a small sample size, caution must be applied. Moreover, it is important to bear in mind the possible bias in the results as a result of the experienced teacher sample; there were no first degree teachers in the sample and they all had mostly experience with *vmbo-t* or *mbo* and not other levels of pupils. These specifications could have had influence on the results. First-degree teachers may have a higher order language knowledge, which could emphasize the differences between novice and experienced teachers. However, the analysed teachers all had experience with the level of the pupils who wrote the writing

products, and this could have given them an advantage since they might know what sort of errors to expect. Furthermore, the novice teacher sample can also appear biased, seen as they all follow the same education and were not from different universities across the country. A different education may lead to differences in scores, since it can be possible that given products from pupils enrolled in a different education may lead to different attention levels on the part of the teachers to the difficulties of error correction. Moreover, there are novice teachers who study to become second-degree teachers, instead of first-degree teachers. The novice second degree teachers could correct differently.

Pedagogical Implications

Despite the absence of statistically significant findings (partly due to the small-scale nature of this study), there are some general implications which can be useful for both novice and experienced teachers to consider for themselves.

The results do not show teachers who are severely lacking in error detection skills. However, there are some concerns. First, the teachers must ask themselves the question whether they want to test their students' writing products on communicative aspects or purely on accuracy. While the study may have painted a misguided picture of the focus on errors, it is important for teachers to keep asking themselves whether they are more interested in communicative aspects of language than in accuracy, especially given the current communicative approach of language learning. Second, they must be aware that if they use direct correction, it can be the case that the errors that they correct erroneously may negatively influence the pupils' (future) writing. Some of the wrongly corrected errors found in the current study (for example, correcting 'parent house' with 'parent's house') are difficult grammatical aspects for all pupils, which is made only more complicated if the teacher does not know the correct form.

Moreover, error detection skills in general may be improved by training. A study by Shohamy et al. (1992) showed that, also for experienced teachers, training might help in more reliable rating results. This may also extend to error correction. Furthermore, training teachers on error correction skills and providing them with more grammatical knowledge is one of the aspects which Ferris (2004) deems important for better error correction in the L2 classroom.

More generally in terms of error correction and feedback in the classroom, the discussion in the theoretical framework has demonstrated that there is no such thing as simply correcting errors. It is imperative for teachers to be aware of the choices they make when they adopt a certain feedback strategy. The choice, for example, for either direct or indirect correction, or marking all mistakes or only the most important, can make a difference in the effectiveness on the progress of the pupils. Teachers should bear this in mind and teacher training programmes should prepare the novice teachers for the upcoming choice they must make. Since several novice teachers expressed that they did not really have a strategy, this may not be done (at least at the university which the students were from) at the moment.

6. Conclusion

The present study was designed to determine whether teachers in training and experienced teacher differ in their error correction skills. Furthermore, this study set out to assess the differences between the novice and experienced teachers concerning their grading and error correction strategies.

This study found that, although a minor difference can be found in the novice teachers correcting more errors, the novice and experienced teacher do not significantly differ in their error correction skills. It was also shown that the grading patterns of both groups appeared similar and the error correction strategies were mainly based on the mistakes, either all mistakes or the most important mistakes.

However, several limitations of this study need to be examined. First, the sample size of the experienced teachers was too small to properly generalize the results. Also, the current research was not specifically designed to evaluate the exact error detection skills of the teachers, which may have influenced the results. Last, the current study was limited by the teachers' degree, since the novice teachers were learning for 1st degree teachers while the experienced teachers were 2nd degree teachers. This also may have influenced the results.

Further investigation and experimentation into the error correction skills of both novice and experienced teachers is strongly recommended. The current study is too limited to draw definitive conclusions, but it does show potential to further investigate the tendencies found. Further research might, therefore, investigate the same issues only with a larger sample size. And at the same time, it may be helpful to look more closely at individual differences (see earlier comment in the discussion).

Furthermore, more research is needed to assess the exact error detection skills of teachers in actual writing products. Further research should therefore consist of a difference in instruction and design compared to the current study.

Moreover, it would be interesting to compare the teachers' error correction skills on different secondary school levels to see if error correction proves more difficult for higher proficiency writing products. Additionally, it would be interesting to compare teachers with a different degree (1st degree teachers versus 2nd degree teachers) who hold the same level of experience.

References

Andrews, S. (2001). The Language Awareness of the L2 Teacher: Its Impact Upon Pedagogical Practice. *Language Awareness, 10*(2-3), 75-90.

Andrews, S. (2007). *Teacher Language Awareness*. Cambridge Books Online: Cambridge University Press.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(2), 102-118.

Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 19*(4), 207-217.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14*(3), 191-205.

Casanave, C. P. (1994). Language development in students' journals. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 3*(3), 179-201.

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*(3), 267-296.

Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cumming, A. (1990). Expertise in evaluating second language compositions. *Language Testing, 7*(1), 31-51.

Fathman, A.K., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. (1999). The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D.R. (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*(1), 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*(3), 161-184.

Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct?: Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(1), 40-53.

Hahne, A. (2001). What's different in second-language processing? Evidence from event-related brain potentials. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 30*(3), 251-266.

Harklau, L. (2002). The role of writing in classroom second language acquisition. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 329-350.

Hughes, A., & Lascaratou, C. (1982). Competing criteria for error gravity. *English Language Teaching Journal, 36*(3), 175-182.

Kormos, J. (2012). The role of individual differences in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 390-403.

Krashen, S. D. (1981) *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. University of Southern California: Pergamon Press Inck.

Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(3), 144-164.

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (57-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leki, I., Cumming, A., & Silva, T. (2009). *A Synthesis of Research on Second Language Writing in English.* New York: Routledge.

Leki, I., & Silva, T. (1992). From the editors. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*(1), iii-iv.

Long, M.H. (1991). Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In K. de Bot, R.B. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M.H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition* (15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Manchón, R. M. (2009). Introduction: Broadening the Perspective of L2 Writing Scholarship: The Contribution of Research on Foreign Language Writing. In R.M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in Foreign Language Contexts: Learning, Teaching, and Research* (1-19). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Manchón, R. M., & de Haan, P. (2008). Writing in foreign language contexts: An introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(1), 1-6.

Matsuda, P.K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing* (15-34). Cambridge Books Online: Cambridge University Press.

Matsuda, P. K., & De Pew, K. E. (2002). Early second language writing: An introduction. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(4), 261-268.

Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(2), 82-99.

Nationaal Bureau Moderne Vreemde Talen. (2004). *Taalprofielen.* Enschede: Author.

Pfingsthorn, J., & Engelhardt, M. (2012). Errors in judgment of errors: Detection skills among EFL teacher trainees. In N. de Jong, K. Juffermans, M. Keijzer, & L. Rasier (Eds.), *Papers of the Anéla 2012 Applied Linguistics Conference* (139-148). Delft: Eburon.

Polio, C. (2012). The relevance of second language acquisition theory to the written error correction debate. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 375-389.

Sasaki, M. (2004). A Multiple-Data Analysis of the 3.5-Year Development of EFL Student Writers. *Language Learning, 54*(3), 525-582.

Sasaki, M. (2009). Changes in English as a Foreign Language Students' Writing Over 3.5 years: A Sociocognitive Account. In R.M. Manchón (Ed.), *Writing in Foreign Language Contexts: Learning, Teaching, and Research* (49-76). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schoonen, R., Vergeer, M., & Eiting, M. (1997). The assessment of writing ability: expert readers versus lay readers. *Language Testing, 14*(2), 157-184.

Shohamy, E., Gordon, C. M., & Kraemer, R. (1992). The Effect of Raters' Background and Training on the Reliability of Direct Writing Tests. *The Modern Language Journal, 76*(1), 27-33.

Silva, T. (1990) Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions in ESL. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing: Research insights for the classroom* (11-23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 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.

Truscott, J. (2004). Evidence and conjecture on the effects of correction: A response to Chandler. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 13*(4), 337-343.

Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*(4), 255-272.

Truscott, J., & Hsu, A.-p. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*(4), 292-305.

van Beuningen, C. (2011). *The effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback in second language writing.* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Wessels, K. (2012). *Second Language Writing: The Progress of Secondary School Pupils.* (Unpublished BA Thesis). Utrecht University, the Netherlands.

Wickens, T. D. (2002). The signal-detection model. In T. D. Wickens (Ed.), *Elementary signal detection theory* (3-16). Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 21*(4), 321-331.

Appendix

WRITING EXERCISE

Describe:

>Someone in your family that you really admire.

>What relation this person is to you

>What are your first/favourite memories of this person

>How often you see this person

>And say why you really admire this member of your family

JAAR 1

#1

I admire my grandmother. Here name is Miepi. She was seventy-nine years old. She didn't workt anymore. She livd in Geldrop. My best memorys is are here soft hands end here big hucks. I like the memory of Preston Palles to. First I saw here every weekend, but since she died I don't sey here anymore only in my memories or dreams. I admire this person because she was always by my said en always sweet. She didn't gif up she fighted for us. I love here so much. Sometimes I need to cry because I miss here.

Mark:
Motivation:

#2

My dad and mum. I have a good relation with thim. My mum's name is Jeannine. She is 47 years old. Her work is hendiegecapte verzorgen. Her familie live in BoZ. My dad's name is Tim. He is 51 years old. He's work is in Bruinzeel (kitchen). He's familie live in London. With my mother going shopping and with my father going on holiday with sister brother and parents. I see my dad and mum every day. I tell thim every think.

Mark:
Motivation:

#3

My mother. My dad. My mother and dad stand all time for my ready. My dad's fiftheeth birthday. All ready making for my dad's fifteeth birthday. Of course the best parents of the world. All us members of the family. My cousin. It's my cousin everyone in the family we love them. I for the first time in my hands had. Of course my cousin one of the best. He is very happy. Everyone to him going.

Mark:
Motivation:

#4

I admire my grandfather the most of the family. I admire him because I think he's strong. My grandmother died and he is still normal and he has a girlfriend with he's married. He is 67. His name is Piet and I don't know if he has a job. He lives in KadIJ. Sometimes he go to a funpark with me and my older brother. I'm very close with him. He's very nice. He don't have much hair. I see him once at two weeks.

Mark:
Motivation:

JAAR 2

#1

She is Dewi. She is 8 years old. She lived in my parent house. Her hobbys are street-dance and. I see her every day. I admer my sister. I don't why her. My memories with her. The vacance 2011 in Turkey. That was great. And all the vacanaces in spain. All the Efteling. With her and my parent to Disneyland paris for 2 days. All her birthdays that was great.

Mark:
Motivation:

#2

I admire my mom. Her name is MvW. She is 42 years old. She has no job but she is a part-time cleaner and she gets money every Tuesday and Saturday. She lives in Huijbergen in our own house. I have lots of memories of my mom. We always go shopping and she helps me learn for a test. She never gets angry when I have a bad note. She always says: "it doesn't matter, you did your best". Her hobbies are making art with programs on the computer. She surfs on the internet for Marilyn Monroe every day. She likes sharing her art pictures on her fanpage on Facebook.

Mark:
Motivation:

#3

My dady. I have very lovely dad. He lived in Stavenisse. He is 41 years old. Hes name is Lyon. Hes job is mink farmer. We are very close to. We do every thing. Use hobbys are judo, akido, quad racing. I see my dad every day. I love my dad because he everything for me. My mom. She is everything for me. They name is Nelleke. She is 42 years old. Her job is mink farmer. She lived in Stavenisse

Mark:
Motivation:

#4

The person I admire is my cousin. She is 13 years old. Her name is Kelly. She lives in BoZ and is in class H2F. She doesn't have a job. Her hobbys are horse riding and painting. I have a lots of memories, because always when we are together, we have so much fun. And we have to laugh all the time. We always go horse riding and watch very scare movies and have sleepovers. I see her almost every day on school and also in the weekends when we meet or when we go to the city or cinema or at family birthdays. I admire her because she always helps me and we like the same things. We always laugh and we always help eatchother.

Mark:
Motivation:

JAAR 3

#1

I admire my cousin Martijn. We have a good relation. We can good hurry up. I don't know? Maybe that we good hurry up? 4 or 5x per week. Because we have a good relation and we go oft with. We go to RBC a few years ago and we go oft football. And every Sunday the familie goes eachwitter and that 's nice. And we oft play fifa on the playstation3. The hobby from Martijn is playing football.

> Mark:
> Motivation:

#2

I admire my mother because she's my mother. I have lot of memories of my mother like when we laughing in the livingroom and I fell from the chare. Or when whe talking with each other by diner. I see my mother every day and every day she become more special to me. I admire my mother because she's doing everything for me and when we shopping together we have lot of fun.

> Mark:
> Motivation:

#3

The person I admire is my mother. The reason why I admire her is because she is always be there for me no matter what. I know that we argue sometimes, but we can't stay more than one day without eachother. She supports me for the things I believe in. She is there when I need her. She is the person who gave me my life. Without her I wouldn't breathing. She is the person who holds my hand when I'm afraid. She will be mad when I do something wrong. Not because she likes yelling only so I can learn from my mistakes. She tells me what's right and what's wrong.

> Mark:
> Motivation:

#4

There is someone I really admire. She is sweet and I like her so much. I really admire my lovely mother. She is the one who made me and raised me. Ofcourse, I know her my whole life. She is the best thing in my life and I'm proud to be her daughter. I see her every day and I like it when we cook together. She gives me often kisses on the front of my head or on my cheak. I really admire her because she can raise 4 children. I love her. She can be mad but.

> Mark:
> Motivation:

JAAR 4

#1

It is my father. Hes name is Ad. He is fifty-one years old. He have a own business. He live in a Noordhoek. I do mountainbiking every zonday morning with him. First I do every zaterday to karting with him. He does mountenbiking. I see him every day by it eating. My father is sporty. He did moter cross. He was very good. He have very veel doorzettingsvermogen. It is my.

Mark:
Motivation:

#2

I really admire my oldest brother Bas. He is 19 years old and doesn't live at home anymore. He lives in a house with a few other people and people that take care of him. This is because he is mentally handicapt and can't live on his own. I don't have a favourite memorie with him, because there are to much. His likes to play computer games and he loves to read. We talk a lot about the games he plays, even when I don't really like them. I like being around him because he always makes me happy. That's why I admire him. I normally see him every weekend and if not I try to visit him at least once a week.

Mark:
Motivation:

#3

I really admire my grandfather. He's around sixtysix years old and lives in a big house. The reason I admire him is because he has been in every city and village in the Netherlands. He doesn't really has a hobby. He just sits there in his house day in and day out. I see him once a week. Like 5 years ago we made big and long walks in the forest for like 4 hours with his old dog. He has a nine-month old dog now, but that dog can't really walk that long. He called the dog casper, because the name had to start with a c. He listens to old music back from the 80s.

Mark:
Motivation:

#4

My father is my best friend. He is 49 years old and works at Philips. He help me with my homework. I have it busy. My father's hobbys are football and tennis. I play with him football on Saturday. I tennis with my father on Sunday and Friday. My father is very good, because he can football and tennis. That's amazing. I see my father of course everyday. That's funny. My father is often home. I watch tv with my father, football of course. We are supporters at Ajax. My mother admire I also. She is 46 years old and works at Teleteam at Roosendaal.

Mark:
Motivation: