SHARDA UNIVERSITY

DREAMLIGHT WORLD MEDIA

ICETA 7 | *7th* International Conference on Educational Technology of Adi Buana

FUTURE EDUCATION: Education Empowerment beyond Boundaries

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

Graduate Program

University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya

SURABAYA, 13 MARCH 2016

EDITORS

7th International Conference on Educational Technology of Adi Buana

"Future Education: Education Empowerment beyond Boundaries"

Editors:

Prof. Dr. Abdul Jalil Othman	(University of Malaya, Malaysia)
Prof. Dr. I Nyoman Sudana Degeng, M.Pd.	(State University of Malang)
Prof. Dr. Iskandar Wiryokusumo, M.Sc.	(University oF PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya)
Prof. Dr. Achmadi Susilo, M.S.	(University of Wijaya Kusuma Surabaya)
Prof. Dr. Mustaji, M.Pd.	(State University of Surabaya)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Kiyomi Banda	(Sanno University of Tokyo, Japan)

CONTENT

Improving Global and Local Issues of Students' Essay through Written Corrective Feedback

Endah Yulia Rahayu
University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya
Indahr_99@yahoo.com

Abstract

writing is an arduous job for English teachers because appropriate teaching methods, and assessment need careful planning. Teachers spend alot of time and energy to their students' writing as they believe corrective feedback can improve the global and of students' writing. This study of 40 freshmen of English Department in University of Adibuana explored feedback related to types of errors in students' writing and types of corrective feedback the researcher provided when she responded to students' writing. more; this study investigated teachers' concerns associated with providing corrective She responded to a questionnaire. The results was that she tended to respond to all types and spent a great deal of time responding to students' writing focusing on meaning. She different kinds of barriers such as time required to provide feedback, students' of symbols, classroom management, etc. Mostly she concerned about the time to respond to students' writing as providing feedback is boring. She used different types corrective feedback such as writing positive comments, displaying students' best work, based on students' needs. The researcher recommended that providing feedback on writing based on their needs might be better than responding to all types of errors.

Introduction

ago, teaching English as a second language, both teachers and students were concerned producing accurate language. This idea was from Audiolingual Method where errors should Therefore, teachers spent a great deal of time correcting students' writing errors. New trends appeared in the 1970s that focused on the elements and process of writing. Zamel stated that The process approach focuses on the ideas which enable writers to explore and discoveries about themselves, experiences and the world. On the other hand, the product does not focus on the writing itself but on the outcome writers intend to achieve.

second language has always been difficult for learners of English and today \ is a hot for SLA researchers. Ken and Eri (2006) mentioned that responding to students' errors is one most enduring and problematic tasks for teachers of writing. Teachers have to provide to students' writing which is a social practice influenced by teachers' views of good and teaching (Shelley & Jill, 2010). They vary in their concerns regarding reasons for corrective feedback on writing. Although providing feedback has been seen as a task, teachers expressed their reasons for responding to their student's writing errors. indicated that providing comments on writing errors can improve global and local issues of writing. However, some teachers used writing comments as justification for the grades. Other teachers thought that L2 learners appreciate teachers' comments on their writing students strongly agree with their teachers that their errors needed to be corrected (Alan & 2007).

and Global Issue of Students Essay

teacher gives feedback, students are often confused by what their teacher want them to on in their writing and in their revisions. (Hughes) They may think, for example, that semicolon mistakes is as important as anticipating and addressing counterarguments or or strengthening the main point of their paper. The teachers' comments on their writing

often lead students to make only superficial revisions to words and sentences, overlooking larger conceptual, rhetorical, and structural revisions that would most improve a paper.

As a resul to when teachers design writing assignments,they have to talk with their students about their writing, develop evaluation criteria, offer advice about revisions, and comment on and evaluationfinal papers. Both teacher and students need to find ways to ommunicate clearly about different levels of revision and about priorities for their writing and revising.

Teachers can help signal priorities to differentiate between global and local writing oncerns. Through the assignments, comments and evaluation criteria can help students by focusing first on conceptual and structural level planning and revisions before grammatical and lexical level revisions by focusing on global writing concerns particular to that assignment so that teachers can help their students to strengthen their ideas, their analyses, and their arguments; and so the students have papers worth editing and polishing.

Next, teachers can turn their attention and our students to improving sentences, words, and punctuation. Global Writing Concerns in the writing assignment, in comments, in discussions with students, and in evaluation criteria, focus first on whole text issues such as ideas or content, focus, genre, argument, thesis, development, organization, clarity of purpose, awareness of audience.

e The Concept of Written Corrective Feedback

The researcher used different concepts to define "corrective feedback". Many terms are used to introduce correct feedback which are "negative evidence", "negative feedback", "error correction" and "corrective feedback" (Eva, 2012). Each term is defined to avoid possible confusion. Negative evidence originally comes from two types of input language learners exposed to when learning a second language which are negative and positive evidence. Positive evidence provides learners of the language with a model that reflects correct use of grammar in the target language. On the other hand, negative evidence informs learners about what is unacceptable in the second language (Long, 1996). Negative evidence involves two types which are direct and indirect evidence. The direct negative feedback refers to teachers' responses to errors for the purpose of attracting learners' attention to them. However, indirect negative feedback supplies the learners with signals that indicate unacceptable construction because of missing input (Chomsky, 1981).

Hence, negative corrective feedback can be explicit or implicit. Chaudron (1977) differentiated between error correction and corrective feedback. He pointed out that these two concepts should not be used interchangeably. He indicated that error correction can be seen as corrective moves aim to correct the non-target like forms. On the other hand, corrective feedback reflects the presence of an error to be repaired.

Types of feedback

There are many types of feedback. Researchers examined and compared between them and showed different results. Ferris (1997), identifies different feedback techniques including peer response, teacher-student conferences, audio taped commentary, email comments and comments written on students' drafts (Shelly & Jill, 2010).

Direct Versus Indirect Feedback

John, Stuart & Denise (2005), distinguished between direct and indirect feedback. They defined direct or explicit feedback as feedback that occurs when teachers identify errors and provide correct form. However, indirect feedback is a situation in which teachers indicate that errors have been made but do not provide corrections. So, diagnosing and correcting errors are students' responsibilities.

PRESENTER'S PAPERS

e. Discussion of Research Findings

The purpose of this research was to explore the students' perceptions about corrective feedback on students' writing of 40 freshmen of English Department of Adibuana Surabaya which focus on the traditional approach process of the correct form. The process approach focuses on how people write rather than what they write. So, responding to meaning and content errors on the students essay. Furthermore, the idea of focusing on content and meaning is supported and emphasized in the nativism or innatist approach. It was mentioned in the literature review that Nativists believe that learners are active writers who generate thoughts and ideas. They also argue that teacher's is to foster students' creativity and guide them in the writing process. To correct content and meaning errors, Lyster and Ranya (1997) suggests that teachers can use a strategy called "clarification requests". This means that when English teachers read students' writing and find ambiguous sentences, they can indicate to their students that their sentences are not understandable and they should rewrite them to clarify their meanings.

This study found that a large number of students' essay respond to sentence structure errors (M=4.36, SD=.808). This could be related to language interference which means that teachers may worry that students may confuse between Indonesian and English structure when writing. It happens since there are many differences in Indonesian Structure and English structure. Many students misunderstand frequently written English form. For examples: The problem for Indonesian students lie on understanding the meaning of English Progressive in the first place, and interpreting Indonesian Progressive sentences into English. Other English constructions such as Simple Present, Simple Past, Present or Past Perfect Simple have no problem in translating into Indonesian. That is why it is important to solve the problem to avoid misunderstanding. Explaining aspectuality of English progressive, teaching culture differences between English and Indonesian, and investigating English progressive correspondences in Indonesian is important to be comprehend by Indonesian students. (Rahayu, 2015)

Furthermore, this study revealed that subject-verb agreement, pronouns, and articles are other types of errors English teachers provide feedback on. Additionally, this study showed that the students made spelling errors (M 3.77,SD 1.00). A qualitative study by Barbara (2011) on spelling errors showed that error quality increases with higher level spelling errors. Therefore, he suggested that students with low spelling score should be assessed based on their basic skills. Finally, although this study maintained that teachers provide written corrective feedback on all types of errors with high means, connectors errors had the lowest mean (M 3.57, SD=.974).

f. Conclusion and Finding

This study primarily aimed to explore how the students Global and local issues of the student essays regarding the written corrective feedback on writing including writing errors teachers provide feedback on, difficulties English teacher (researcher) faced when responding to student writing, and types and ways of feedbacks. The findings of this study revealed that the students responded to all types of errors with high means. While lecturer/researcher focused on meaning and content errors, connectors had the lowest mean. The results showed that writing positive comments give the most positive results to the students essay.

g. Recommendations for English teachers

Recommendations for English teachers and schools are suggested. First, the researcher recommends that providing feedback based on students' writing based on their needs might be better than responding to all types of errors. This can help teachers observe students' progress and support low achievers in writing gradually. Additionally, giving the same feedback to all students might make writing class boring for students who have already reached the required level in writing. Another suggestion is that researcher believes that the focus on meaning and content should be more than that on form and accuracy. This is because the researcher agrees that focusing a lot on form and accuracy may slow students' writing fluency. Some students might feel frustrated

PRESENTER'S PAPERS

teachers find lots of grammatical errors which might lead them to either stop writing or text to avoid committing errors. A further recommendation suggested by the that students should be encouraged more to use self-assessment and peer assessment. Using these types of assessment can allow learners recognize the importance of fluency and accuracy.

References

(n.d.). *Emphasizing the Right Thing at the Right Time: Differentiating Between Global and Local Concerns*. Dipetik 3 3, 2016, dari writing.wisc.edu/PDFs/uwmadison_wac_glocs_locs.pdf

. (2015). Differences on Language Structure between English and Indonesian. *International Journal of Languages*, 257.

& Diane, B. (2007). *Writing scholars as teacher educators: Exploring writing teacher education.* Journal of Second Language Writing, 16(3), 125-218.

, C. (1977). *A descriptive modal of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors.* Language Learning, 27 (1), 29-46.

(2002). *Noticeability of corrective feedback, L2 development and learner beliefs.*

A.K., Whalley, E. (1990). *Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form*

& Robert, B. (2001). *Error feedback: How explicit does it need to be?* Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(3), 84-161.

. 2003. *Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process.* Journal of Second Language Writing, 12: 17-29.

(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, 261-296.

, Y. & Denise (2005). *The effect of different types of corrective feedback*

& Eri, A. (2006). *Teachers' perceptions of error: The effects of first Language and Experience.* System, 34 (2006), 509-519.

, K. (2010). *Perceptions of KFL/ESL Teachers in North America Regarding Feedback on College Student Writing.*

(1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition.*

Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook Of Language Acquisition: Vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition (pp. 413-468).* New York: Academic Press.

& Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classroom.* Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19(1), 37-61.

, S. & Jill, M. (2010). *Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms.* Assessing Writing, 15 (2010), 86-99.

, V. (1982). *Writing: The process of discovering meaning.* TESOL Quartery, 16, 195-209.

Author's Biodata

Indah Yulia Rahayu is a lecturer of English Education Department, University of PGRI Adi Buana Surabaya. Indahr_99@yahoo.com

IMPROVING GLOBAL AND LOCAL ISSUES OF STUDENTS' ESSAY THROUGH WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

Endah Yulia Rahayu

Indahr_99@yahoo.com

Teaching writing is an arduous job for English teachers because appropriate teaching methods, observation, and assessment need careful planning. Teachers spend alot of time and energy to correct their students' writing as they believe corrective feedback can improve the global and local issues of students' writing. This study of 40 freshmen of English Department in University of PGRI Adibuana explored feedback related to types of errors in students' writing and types of written corrective feedback the researcher provided when she responded to students' writing. Furthermore, this study investigated teachers' concerns associated with providing corrective feedback. She responded to a questionnaire. The results was that she tended to respond to all types of errors and spent a great deal of time responding to students' writing, focusing on meaning. She reported different kinds of barriers such as time required to provide feedback, students' understanding of symbols, classroom management, etc. Mostly she concerned about the time required to respond to students' writing as providing feedback is boring. She used different types of written corrective feedback such as writing positive comments, displaying students' best work, feedback based on students' needs. The researcher recommended that providing feedback on students' writing based on their needs might be better than responding to all types of errors.

a. Introduction

A centry ago, teaching English as a second language, both teachers and students were concerned about producing accurate language. This idea was from Audiolingual Method where errors should be avoided. Therefore, teachers spent a great deal of time correcting students' writing errors. New writing trends appeared in the1970s that focused on the elements and process of writing. Zamel (1982), stated that The process approach focuses on the ideas which enable writers to explore and make discoveries about themselves, experiences and the world. On the other hand, the product approach does not focus on the writing itself but on the outcome writers intend to achieve.

Writing in second language has always been difficult for learners of English and today \ is a hot topic for SLA researchers. Ken and Eri (2006) mentioned that responding to students' errors is one of the most enduring and problematic tasks for teachers of writing. Teachers have to provide feedback to students' writing which is a social practice influenced by teachers' views of good writing and teaching (Shelley & Jill, 2010). They vary in their concerns regarding reasons for providing corrective feedback on writing. Although providing feedback has been seen as a demanding task, teachers expressed their reasons for responding to their student's writing errors. They indicated that providing comments on writing errors can improve global and local issues of students' writing. However, some teachers used writing comments as justification for the grades they assign. Other teachers thought that L2 learners appreciate teachers' comments on their writing and students

strongly agree with their teachers that their errors needed to be corrected (Alan & Diane, 2007).

b. Local and Global Issue of Students Essay
Once the teacher gives feedback, students are often confused by what their teacher want them to concentrate on in their writing and in their revisions. (Hughes) They may think, for example, that correcting semicolon mistakes is as important as anticipating and addressing counterarguments or clarifying or strengthening the main point of their paper. The teachers' comments on their writing often lead students to make only superficial revisions to words and sentences, overlooking larger conceptual, rhetorical, and structural revisions that would most improve a paper.

As a resul to when teachers design writing assignments,they have to talk with their students about their writing, develop evaluation criteria, offer advice about revisions, and comment on and evaluationfinal papers. Both teacher and students need to find ways to ommunicate clearly about different levels of revision and about priorities for their writing and revising.

Teachers can help signal priorities to differentiate between global and local writing oncerns. Thus, the assignments, comments and evaluation criteria can help students by focusing first on conceptual and structural level planning and revisions before grammatical and lexical level revisions by focusing on global writing concerns particular to that assignment so that teachers can help their students to strengthen their ideas, their analyses, and their arguments; and so that students have papers worth editing and polishing.

Next, teachers can turn their attention and our students to improving sentences, words, and punctuation. Global Writing Concerns in the writing assignment, in comments, in discussions with students, and in evaluation criteria, focus first on whole text issues such as ideas or content, focus, genre, argument, thesis, development, organization, clarity of purpose, awareness of audience.

c.The Concept of Written Corrective Feedback

The researcher used different concepts to define "corrective feedback". Many terms are used to introduce correct feedback which are "negative evidence", "negative feedback", "error correction" and "corrective feedback" (Eva, 2012). Each term is defined to avoid possible confusion. Negative evidence originally comes from two types of input language learners exposed to when learning a second language which are negative and positive evidence. Positive evidence provides learners of the language with a model that reflects correct use of grammar in the target language. On the other hand, negative evidence informs learners about what is unacceptable in the second language (Long, 1996). Negative evidence involves two types which are direct and indirect evidence. The direct negative feedback refers to teachers' responses to errors for the purpose of attracting learners' attention to them. However, indirect negative feedback supplies the learners with signals that indicate unacceptable construction because of missing input (Chomsky, 1981).

Hence, negative corrective feedback can be explicit or implicit. Chaudron (1977) differentiated between error correction and corrective feedback. He pointed out that these two concepts should not be used interchangeably. He indicated that error correction can be seen as corrective moves aim to correct the non-target like forms. On the other hand, corrective feedback reflects the presence of an error to be repaired.

Types of feedback

There are many types of feedback. Researchers examined and compared between them and showed different results. Ferris (1997), identifies different feedback techniques including peer response, teacher-student conferences, audio taped commentary, email comments and comments written on students' drafts (Shelly & Jill, 2010).

Direct Versus Indirect Feedback

John, Stuart & Denise (2005), distinguished between direct and indirect feedback. They defined direct or explicit feedback as feedback that occurs when teachers identify errors and provide correct form. However, indirect feedback is a situation in which teachers indicate that errors have been made but do not provide corrections. So, diagnosing and correcting errors are students' responsibilities.

Coded versus Un Coded Feedback

In additions to direct and indirect feedback, the researchers compared between coded and un coded feedback. They pointed out that coded feedback is locating the exact location of an error and the type of error is indicated with a code. However, uncoded feedback refers to underlining, circling and placing errors. Students diagnose and correct errors in both coded and un coded feedback (John, Stuart & Denise, 2005).

Positive Versus Negative Feedback

Ferris and Robert (2001) explained one type of feedback which is commentary. In this type of feedback, teachers write their comments on their students' writing in the margin or at the end of the students' writing. This kind of feedback provides detailed information about meaningfulness of ideas and ways to improve writing. Hyland (2003) distinguished between two types of commentary feedback which are positive and negative feedback. He pointed that positive feedback is used to reward writers for their writing efforts. On the other hand, negative feedback is provided to criticize writing.

Electronic Feedback David (2009) explained computer mediated feedback. He indicated that interest in the use of software in which learners are exposed to different and many examples of the target form. The researcher indicated that this type of feedback has a limitation which is the availability of computer labs and the willingness of teachers to use them to develop writing skills.

d. Research Method

Researcher found different results when examining the effectiveness of providing corrective feedback on writing. Many studies proved that providing corrective feedback is significant. Fathman and Whalley (1990) examined the effect of feedback on grammatical accuracy. They found out that corrective feedback improved students' grammatical accuracy in writing.

The researcher divided students into four groups. Two groups received direct corrections on their errors in their essays. While the two other groups were given error codes. The results indicated that the groups who received error codes produced more accurate writing than groups who were given direct corrections. Furthermore, Jean (2003) pointed out that direct correction, underlining and coding led to more grammatical correct writing. Although many studies showed that providing corrective feedback is effective, few studies proved that error feedback is ineffective.

Most studies were conducted to find out students' perspectives regarding perceived feedback on their writing or on the strategies teachers use to correct students' errors. Kyounrok (2010) regarded that many contextual factors can affect the approaches of responding to students' writing errors and one of the factors is teachers. Teachers are concerned about correcting students' writing and they believe that corrective feedback will improve writing. Since teachers spend time and effort correcting and providing feedback on students' writing, it is worthwhile exploring these teachers' views on written feedback.

In Indonesia, teaching writing in universities, particularly in English department applys different systems in giving feedback. Amongst the writing lecturers in English Department of Adibuana also happens the same thing. Today It focuses on a specific student-centered model, a particular pedagogy and new teacher standards that specify particular expectations of teacher practice. The aim is to improve student performance to welcome global learning sistem in this MEA era. Finally teachers are required to use different ways to provide students with feedback like self assessment, peer assessment and teacher's assessment. Teachers spend a good deal time correcting students' writing. Furthermore, they should teach students skills needed to improve writing. Therefore, this study was designed to investigate English language teachers' perspectives and attitudes regarding writing corrective feedback to 40 freshmen of English Department of University of PGRI Adibuana.

e. Discussion of Research Findings

The purpose of this research was to explore the students' perceptions about corrective feedback on students' writing of 40 freshmen of English Department of Adibuana Surabaya which focus on the traditional approach process of the correct form. The process approach focuses on how people write rather than what they write. So, responding to meaning and content errors on the students' essay. Furthermore, the idea of focusing on content and meaning is supported and emphasized in the nativism or innatist approach. It was mentioned in the literature review that Nativists believe that learners are active writers who generate thoughts and ideas. They also argue that teacher role is to foster students' creativity and guide them in the writing process. To correct content and meaning errors, Lyster and Ranya (1997) suggests that teachers can use a strategy called "clarification requests". This means that when English teachers read students' writing and find ambiguous sentences, they can indicate to their students that their sentences are not understandable and they should rewrite them to clarify their meanings.

This study found that a large number of students' essay respond to sentence structure errors (M=4.36, SD=.808). This could be related to language interference which means that teachers may worry that students may confuse between Indonesian and English structure when writing. It happens since there are many differences in Indonesian Structure and English structure. Most students misunderstand frequently written English form. For examples: The problems for Indonesian students lie on understanding the meaning of English Progressive in the first place, and interpreting Indonesian Progressive sentences into English. Other English constructions such as Simple Present, Simple Past, Present or Past Perfect Simple have no problem in translating into Indonesian. That is why it is important to solve the problem to avoid misunderstanding. Explaining aspectuality of English progressive, teaching culture differences between English and Indonesian, and investigating English progressive correspondences in Indonesian is important to be comprehend by Indonesian students. (Rahayu, 2015)

Furthermore, this study revealed that subject-verb agreement, pronouns, and articles are other types of errors English teachers provide feedback on. Additionally, this study showed that the students made spelling errors (M=3.77,SD=1.00). A qualitative study by Barbara (2011) on spelling errors showed that error quality increases with higher level spelling errors. Therefore, she suggested that students with low spelling score should be assessed based on their basic skills. Finally, although this study maintained that teachers provide written corrective feedback on all types of errors with high means, connectors errors had the lowest mean (M=3.57, SD=.974).

f. Conclusion and Finding

This study primarily aimed to explore how the students Global and local issues of the students essays regarding the written corrective feedback on writing including writing errors

teachers provide feedback on, difficulties English teacher (reseacher) faced when responding to students' writing, and types and ways of feedbacks. The findings of this study revealed that the students responded to all types of errors with high means. While lecturer/researcher focused on meaning and content errors, connectors had the lowest mean. The results showed that writing positive comments give the most positive results to the students essay.

g. Recommendations for English teachers

Recommendations for English teachers and schools are suggested. First, the researcher recommends that providing feedback based on students' writing based on their needs might be better than responding to all types of errors. This can help teachers observe students' progress and support low achievers in writing gradually. Additionally, giving the same feedback to all students might make writing class boring for students who have already reached the required level in writing. Another suggestion is that researcher believes that the focus on meaning and content should be more than that on form and accuracy. This is because the researcher agrees that focusing a lot on form and accuracy may slow students' writing fluency. Some students might feel frustrated when their teachers find lots of grammatical errors which might lead them to either stop writing or write short texts to avoid committing errors. A further recommendation suggested by the researcher is that students should be encouraged more to use self-assessment and peer assessment after writing. Using these types of assessment can allow learners recognize the importance of writing fluency and accuracy.

References

Hughes, B. (t.thn.). *Emphasizing the Right Thing at the Right Time:Differentiating Between Global and Local Concerns*. Dipetik 3 3, 2016, dari http://writing.wisc.edu/PDFs/uwmadison_wac_glocs_locs.pdf

Rahayu, A. U. (2015). Differences on Language Structure between English and Indonesian. *International Journal of Languages* , 257.

Alan, H. & Diane, B. (2007). *Writing scholars as teacher educators: Exploring writing teacher education. Journal of Second Language Writing*. 16(3), 125-218.

Chaudron, C. (1977). *A descriptive modal of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. Language Learning*, 27 (1), 29-46.

Eva, K. (2012). *Noticeability of corrective feedback, L2 development and learner beliefs.*

Fathman, A.K., Whalley, E. (1990). *Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form*

Ferris, D. & Robert, B. (2001). *Error feedback: How explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second Language Writing,* 10(3), 84-161.

Hyland, K. 2003. *Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. Journal ofSecond Language Writing*, 12: 17-29.

Jean, C. (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, 261-296.

John, B. ,Staurt, Y. & Denise (2005). *The effect of different types of corrective feedback*

Ken, H. & Eri, A. (2006). *Teachers' perceptions of error: The effects of first Language and Experience.* System, 34 (2006), 509-519.

Kyoungrok, K. (2010). *Perceptions of KFL/ESL Teachers in North America Regarding Feedback on College Student Writing.*

Long, M. (1996). *The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition*.

W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook Of Language Acquisition: Vol. 2. Second Language Acquisition (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press.*

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classroom. Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-61.

Shelley, S. & Jill, M. (2010). *Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms. Assessing Writing,* 15 (2010), 86-99.

Zamel, V. (1982). *Writing: The process of discovering meaning. TESOL Quartery*, 16, 195-209.