

## The impact of computer assisted implicit corrective feedback on narrative writing ability of Intermediate EFL learners

<sup>1</sup>Elham Pourmorad, <sup>2</sup>Fereshte Sadeghi

<sup>1</sup>Islamic Azad University, Masal branch, Gilan, Iran.

<sup>2</sup>Payam Noor University, Gilan, Iran

### Abstract

The present study investigated the possible impact of Computer assisted feedback on writing accuracy of Iranian intermediate EFL learners, majoring English literature in Guilan and Chabahar University. Oxford proficiency test and descriptive writing pre-test were used to check the homogeneity and comparability of the participants. The most frequently occurred errors EFL learners' writing pre-test were selected to be targeted in the study. Two groups were formed: Computer assisted implicit corrective feedback group (N=20), and control group (N=20). The treatment (implicit corrective feedback) in experimental group was conducted via email. Control group received no corrective feedback of any kind intentionally, but they were also given some routine help to improve their writing. After the treatment, a post-test was administrated, and a series of statistics were used to analyse the data. Comparisons indicated that the p-value was 0.002 that was less than 0.05; thus it could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the control and experimental group at the end of the treatment.

**Keyword:** computer-assisted language learning (call); error; implicit corrective feedback; accuracy; implicit learning; descriptive writing

### 1. Introduction

It is believed that writing is the most difficult skill for language learners, because they need to have a certain amount of L2 background. Writing allows students to develop and express ideas for imaginative, informative, and persuasive purposes in organized, fluent and clear ways. This skill is a thinking process; a writer produces a final written product after he/she goes through the thinking process (Brown, 2001; cited in Onozowa, 2010). A noticeable increase in textbook writing, conference presentation, published research and commentary project about L2 writing has been a sign of the recognition of the importance of L2 writing (Reid, 1993; cited in Onozowa, 2010). Jack C. Richards and Willy A. Renandya (2002) <sup>[26]</sup> claimed There is no doubt that writing is the most difficult for second language learners to master. The difficulty lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating these ideas into reliable text (p.303).

Writing need is becoming necessary not only in L2, but also in our daily life, particularly owing to the prevalence of information technology, such as writing e-mail, or business letters overseas. To become effective writers, students need to understand the language choices writers make; this involves students developing an understanding of the text type, or genre, required of a task and its social purpose. There are main genres with different purposes, such as procedure, personal recount, narrative, report etc. In the last two and half decades, various disciplinary and organizational studies across the world have demonstrated a growing interest in narrative as a main form of human expression through which individuals are able to write stories that come from their experiences, their lives, and events that assists in meaning-making (Afful, 2008).

According to Hyland (2000) <sup>[17]</sup>, expressivism is an important approach as it encourages writers to explore their beliefs,

engage with the ideas of others, and connect with readers. It simply assumes that all writers have a similar innate creative potential and can learn to express themselves through writing. In other words, writers can write in different types, as (Reppen, 1995; cited in Hyland, 2000) <sup>[17]</sup> put it, writing research has shown that students need to be exposed to and have practice with various genres. A genre is a staged, purposeful, socially-constructed communicative event (Martin, 1985) <sup>[21]</sup>.

The teacher's role is to guide students through the writing process, avoiding an emphasis on form to help them develop strategies for generating, drafting and refining ideas. This is achieved through setting pre-writing activities to generate ideas about content and structure, encouraging brainstorming and outlining, requiring multiple drafts, giving extensive feedback, searching text level revisions, facilitating peer responses, and delaying surface corrections until the final editing (Raimes 1992, cited in Hyland, 2000) <sup>[17]</sup>. Process approaches overemphasize "the cognitive relationship between the writer and the writer's internal world" (Swales, 1990, p. 220; cited in Hyland, 2000) <sup>[17]</sup> and as a result they fail to offer any clear perspective on the nature in effective written communication.

Over so many years writing has been taught in the foreign language classes; thus, one would expect to find the highly effective methods for successful teaching and learning this skill. Two different approaches were introduced for teaching which its focus is on the final product, the coherent, error free text. The second one is process approach. It is on the basis of the belief that there will never be the perfect text, but it would seem that producing, reflecting on, discussing, and reworking successive drafts of a text help one to get perfection in writing (Nunan, 2001). Badger and White (2000) presents an overview of the approaches to teaching writing over the past 20 years. In product approaches, learning to write has four stages, the first

stage is familiarization; this stage intends to make learners answer certain features of a particular text. Next two stages are controlled and guided writing; here, learners practice the skills with increasing freedom until they are ready for the free writing section, the fourth stage.

A product approach is “a traditional approach in which students are encouraged to mimic a model text, usually is presented and analyzed at an early stage” (Gabrielatos, 2002, p.5). For example, in a typical product approach-oriented classroom, students are supplied with a standard sample of text and they are expected to follow the standard to construct a new piece of writing. On the other hand, Kroll (2001; cited in Hasan & Akhand, 2010) defines process approach as follows:

“The “process approach” serves today as an umbrella term for many types of writing courses... what the term captures is the fact that student writers, engage in their writing tasks through a cyclical approach rather than a single-shot approach. They are not expected to produce and submit complete and polished response to their writing assignments without going through stages of drafting and receiving feedback on their drafts, be it from peers and/or from the teacher, followed by revision of their evolving texts” (pp. 220-221).

There is no doubt that every teacher for every level of EFL course has his/her own routes of providing corrective feedback as they encounter the students’ errors in their writing. There are different views about supplying feedback. Some claimed that giving feedback is not of use for acquisition (Krashen, 1982; Truscott, 1996 <sup>[12]</sup> [, 1999; cited in Ellis, 2009). According to Krashen (1982), when language learners understand the meaning of the input, acquisition happens not when they concentrate on the form. On the contrary, Schmidt (2001; cited in R.Ellis, 2003) argued that learners’ awareness of an error in the relation between the input and their interlanguage is vital for their process of acquisition.

### 1.2 Corrective Feedback and Computer Assisted

In the light of information revolution and the scientific challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, there is a general trend to use computers in all aspects of life and education. With the increase in availability of computers in schools and universities, computer assisted instruction has got an important role in computer classes. Introduction of word processors has facilitated the editing and revising writing processes. Writing softwares and electronic mails teach the writing processes in ways that are fun and motivating for student.

On the other hand, as Ravichandran (2000, pp.82-89) put it, it is often necessary in a language learning classroom, to provide repeated practice to meet important objectives. Because this can be boring, painful, and frustrating, many students lose interests and motivation to learn foreign languages. CALL programs present the learner with a novelty. They teach the language in different and more interesting ways, even though tedious activity becomes more interesting. Another problem for teaching writing is dependent to time. Many students need additional time and individualized practice to meet learning objectives. The computer offers students self-instructional tasks. Moreover, learners receive maximum benefit from feedback only when it is supplied immediately. Their interest and willing declined when the information on their performance is delayed.

Corrective feedback is different in terms of how implicit or explicit it is. Zamel (1985; cited in Aghazo & Abdelrahman

& Qbeitah,2009) has criticized the responding behaviors of ESL/EFL teachers on the ground that ESL/EFL writing teachers, make arbitrary corrections, write contradictory comments, provide vague prescriptions, impose abstract rules and standards, respond to text as fixed and final products, and rarely make content-specific comments or offer specific strategies for revising the text.

## 2. Literature Review

People need to learn to write in English for occupational or academic purposes. Chastain (1998) clarifies the place of writing in the syllabus by characterizing two aspects of writing in typical language classroom. The first one is being the basic communication skill and the second one is a contribution to the process of the second language learning. At elementary or lower level, students experience writing as it is one of the four language skills. At this level, writing is considered as a basic process to help students learn the language. In advanced or higher level or composition courses the first aspect (i.e. communication skill) becomes more widespread and the emphasis would be primarily on writing as a way of communication.

According to Nunan (1999) <sup>[23]</sup>, genre theorists argue that the existence of language can fulfill certain functions. There are different types of writing such as descriptive, functional, expository, research report, persuasive, informative, and narrative writing. In descriptive writing, writers use lots of adjectives and paint a picture in their minds. Functional writing relates to daily life like filling out forms, writing a note or grocery list. Expository writing means to inform the reader about something, such as, telling what happened or when happened. Research report is about research information and a specific topic. When we use informative writing that we are telling facts to someone who doesn’t know. The goal of persuasive writing is to try and convince people to agree with writes. In narrative writing, writers tell a story.

At first, it is the quantity rather than quality that receives attention. Writers should put their ideas on the paper without being too much worry about formal correctness in the initial stages. Process writing in the classroom may be construed as programme of instruction with a series of planned learning experiences to help students understand the nature of writing at every point. Richards and Renandya (2002) <sup>[26]</sup> created four basic writing stages: planning, drafting (writing), revising (redrafting), editing, and three other stages which are externally imposed on students by teacher, namely, responding (sharing), evaluating, and post-writing. As showed in Figure 1, these stages are not sequential, but they are recursive. Krashen (cited in Richards & Renandya, 2002)<sup>[26]</sup> said that in writing a draft there is a great deal of recycling to earlier stages.

### 2.1 Corrective feedback

Providing feedback in a second language plays an important role to a student’s writing development. While making errors is natural in all aspects of language learning, second language writers face unique difficulties in developing writing skills (Evans, Hartshorn, McCollum, & Wolfersberger 2000; cited in Herrera, 2011). Written corrective feedback gives learners noticeable information. Ferris (2002) suggests that students “need distinct and additional intervention from their writing teachers to make up their errors and develop strategies for finding, correcting, and avoiding errors” (p.4). It is a

controversial debate that which kind of feedback is effective, explicit or implicit feedback. Whereas explicit corrective feedback can persuade learners to notice the gap by directly and overtly drawing their attention to the incorrect form they have made, implicit corrective feedback aims at inducing learners to detect the difference of the forms.

To gain the best result for giving corrective feedback, internet and email has an important role in this study. The domain of Computer-Assisted Language Learning in Iran needs more research. It is anticipated that this study will shed light on the benefits of using email in language learning in general, and in writing in particular. Brown (1997; cited in Brown, 2000) <sup>[4]</sup> listed the advantages of CALL as giving immediate feedback, allowing students to work at their own pace, and causing less frustration. In this environment learners are given an opportunity to study and review the materials as many times they want without limited time. As Stokes (1997; cited in Gunduz, 2005) <sup>[15]</sup> put it, students can get detailed feedback and hints which led them to think more.

Ferris (1999) <sup>[12]</sup> emphasized on providing corrective feedback on learners' written texts and believed that Truscott's claim is elementary and requires for further research. Truscott has not accepted Ferris' criticisms. Truscott (1999) <sup>[12]</sup> said these criticisms are unfounded and highly selective:

Teachers must constantly make decisions about what to do-and what not to do in their classes, these decisions are necessarily made under conditions of uncertainty; research never puts an end to doubt. But the choices still must be made, and made constantly (p.121).

According to Sheen (2010) "oral or CF research has been grounded in SLA theories and hypothesis, whereas written CF research has drawn on L1 and L2 writing compositions theories" (p.171). Writing researchers have examined feedback in regards to how writing can improve overall writing performance. This distinction is best emphasized by Ferris (2010), who states that "the studies of written CF designed by SLA researchers examine whether written CF facilitates long-term acquisition of particular linguistic features, and if so, how" (p.188). In contrast, L2 writing researchers view CF as an approach to improve learners' overall writing and consider that a limited focus of corrective feedback only on linguistic features is not effective (Ferris, 2010) <sup>[13]</sup>.

Liang (2008) found that indirect correction helped students make fewer morphological errors with greater accuracy in a new piece of writing. The study examined error feedback and L2 university ESL students' ability to self-edit by providing either direct feedback or indirect feedback on three error categories; morphological errors, semantic errors, and syntactic errors to two randomly assigned groups.

The danger of direct feedback is that teachers may misinterpret students' is appropriate (Ferris, 2002), however, (1) for beginner students; (2) when errors are 'untreatable', i.e., errors not amenable to self-correction such sentence structure and word choice and (3) when teachers want to draw students' attention to other patterns which require student correction (Lee, 2003). Leki (1991) and Roberts (1999) (cited in Falhasiri & Tavakoli & Mohammadzade & Hasiri, 2011) <sup>[10]</sup> have also pointed out that students sometimes feel that indirect feedback does not provide them with sufficient information to resolve more complex errors such as idiosyncratic and syntactic errors. Chandler (2003) <sup>[5]</sup> explained that a greater cognitive effort is expended when students are required to use indirect feedback

to make their own corrections is offset by the additional delay in knowing whether their own hypothesized correction is in fact correct.

## 2.2 Corrective Feedback and Computer Assisted Language Learning

The important role of corrective feedback in learning is clear to us. To do it easier and more effective, computer as a tool helps learners to learn better. In this modern life that computer has an essential role; it can play its vital role in learning. Two reports at a recent conference at Tamakan University on L2 writing reminded us that the CF reliability problem is also shared by Computer Assisted Language Learning programs (Chen, 2006; Masumi, 2006). According to Francis (2007) <sup>[11]</sup> if learners are to receive feedback, it is important to be consistent, this consistency is perhaps even more important in the CALL environment. Levy (1997) defines computer assisted language learning (CALL) as "the search for and study of use of the computer in language teaching and learning" (p.1).

It is important to mention here that, the computer is a human made tool which is incapable of action. It will perform with remarkable speed, the instructions exactly given to it by a human user. Thus, as Gunduz (2005) <sup>[15]</sup> stated that, the computer is "the servant of the user" and it is only a teaching aid. As a result, the computer is dependent on the teacher in many ways: for example, it is unable to make educational materials without the teacher. It is the teacher who decides what degree of control the computer will have in her/his classes.

## 2.3 Internet and Email

The Internet is revolutionizing education. This development is exciting for instructors of English as second/foreign language in that it offers greatly expanded opportunities for authentic communication beyond the walls of the traditional classroom. And authentic communications is crucial in language acquisition. As Hughes (1999; cited in Braunstein & Meloni & Zolotareva, 2000) states that, "Language use and language learning are social activities; they occur best in situations which encourage negotiation of meaning and learner collaboration with other learners, instructors, and community members" (p.1).

According to Gunduz (2005) <sup>[15]</sup>, by the mid-1990, experts estimated that more than fifty million computers were linked to the information superhighway by way of a network called the Internet (Net). The internet is a computer-based worldwide information network. It is composed of a large number of smaller interconnected networks called internets. These internets may connect tens, hundreds or thousands of computers, enabling them to share information through a series of cables (phone-lines) (Encarta, 2000).

A study by Kern (1996; cited in Brown & Kawaguchi, 2011) further supports the idea that e-mail exchanges can bring broad benefits of cultural and historical knowledge as well as enhanced student motivation. Kern organized and investigated a French-English exchange between students in the United States and France based on e-mail communication and an exchange of essays on topics related to the immigrant experience.

Written interaction, such as that gave by text-chat, may help to increase the visual saliency of linguistic forms (Chapelle, 2001) <sup>[6]</sup>, including, for instance, English articles, third person singular-s, and the past tense-ed morpheme. Thus, the visual

saliency of linguistic forms during text-chat may help learners to confirm currently held hypotheses about the target language.

**3. Methodology**

**3.1 Participants**

The study was carried out in Guilan University and Chabahar Maritime University. The subjects of the study were 40 Iranian students both male and female; their age range was between 20 to 25 years old. The mean age was 22.5. Regarding the gender, 25 of the subjects were female and 15 were male. Twenty male and female students were in experimental group and twenty male and female students in control group. The subjects were not selected randomly; rather participants remained as intact groups. They were assigned two different groups: explicit group and control group. Subjects were majoring in English literature who took essay writing course. The language proficiency of subjects was evaluated using an Oxford proficiency test.

**3.2 Instrumentation**

By considering the purpose of the study, a number of instruments for collecting the relevant data were used. The applied instruments are presented and described as follows:

**3.2.1 Oxford Proficiency test**

In order to homogenize the participants and to see whether they are in the same level of proficiency or not, the researcher used Oxford proficiency test; it included three sections of Vocabulary and grammar; Reading, and Writing. Since answering to the writing section was not necessary at this stage, they received a writing task separately, the participants only answered to the first two sections, vocabulary and grammar, and reading. The participants were asked to answer the questions in 60 minutes. The researcher herself corrected the

papers and finally it was found that all the participants were in the same level of proficiency, intermediate level.

As Table 3.1 indicates, the estimated mean and standard deviation values of Oxford proficiency test of all subjects of the study amounted to be 48.62 and 6.72.

**Table 1:** Oxford proficiency Pre-test Mean Score of All Subjects

Number	Mean	Std. Deviation
40	48.6271	6.72847

Table 3.2 shows that the Oxford proficiency pre-test mean scores of the control and Implicit groups amounted to be 50 and 47.28, respectively. The analysis reveals that there were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of their language proficiency, and all subjects were intermediate EFL learners.

**Table 2:** Descriptive Statistics on Oxford proficiency Pre-test Scores

Group	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control	50.0000	5.89380
Implicit	47.2857	7.38338

The independent t test result shown in Table 3.3 and 3.4 also indicates that with an alpha level of 0.05, the two groups were not statistically different in terms of their overall language proficiency,  $p = 0.197 > 0.05$ .

**Table 3:** Group Statistics of Experimental And Control Group

	VAR00002	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
VAR00001	1	20	12.6500	2.13431	.47725
	2	20	13.5000	1.96013	.43830

**Table 4:** Independent Samples Test of experimental & control group

		Levene's test for equality of variances		T-Test For Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	DF	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval Of The Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal Variances Assumed	.140	.710	-1.312	38	.197	-.85000	.64797	-2.16175	.46175
	Equal Variances Not Assumed			-1.312	37.728	.198	-.85000	.64797	-2.16206	.46206

**3.3 Narrative Writing Pre-test**

A writing-oriented pre-test was used as the other required instrument in this study. A narrative writing pre-test adapted from 'Paragraph Development' (Arnaudet & Barrett, 1990) was used to determine whether subjects were homogeneous in their narrative writing skill.

**3.4 Narrative Writing Post-test**

A narrative writing test was used as a post-test to check the potential differences in writing performance of the subjects over time in two different groups at the end of the treatment.

**3.5 Materials**

A variety of topics from IELTS test were assigned to students; the students totally wrote seven tasks.

**3.6 Procedure**

The study was conducted in the winter and spring of 2012 in two universities. The students of Chabahar maritime university (20 students in computer assisted implicit feedback) were the experimental group that were taught through virtual system by a university professor. The participants in the control group were students in the Guilan University who were taught at class by a university professor. The semester lasted 12 sessions and classes were hold once a week of two hours. For collecting appropriate data, the entire study was spread over a period of 12 weeks; 5 sessions were devoted to teaching basic principles of writing and only 7 sessions were devoted to writing.

**3.7 Pre-test**

One week later, when it was confirmed that the subjects were at the intermediate English language proficiency level, all of the

subjects took part in narrative writing pre-test. Writing pre-test included a topic for learners to write a narration of that topic. In order to increase the reliability, two raters scored the students' written texts. First, they scored by considering both fluency and accuracy of subjects' written texts. Then, by determining the targeted linguistic structures, raters scored the accuracy of the papers once again but this time based on the percentage of the correct use of the three target linguistic structures. The average mean scores of the three target structures was considered as total writing accuracy score. In the following session, subjects' written texts were returned with corrective feedback for the experimental group.

**3.7.1 Target Structures**

Three linguistic errors chosen by the researcher to be targeted in the research were those which occurred most frequently during the writing pre-test. It was decided that the three most recurrent error categories would be focused on in this study. The greatest difficulty occurred with the correct use of the verb tense (19.66% of all errors), correct word order (14.65% of the total errors), and correct use of the prepositions (12.46% of the total errors).

**3.8 Treatment**

After conducting pre-tests, researcher randomly chose the Chabhar University group as explicit ones and one class of Guilan University as a control group. Both groups were passing essay writing course and they participated writing course once a week for two hours. For five weeks English teachers taught students of all groups different skills of essay writing: format, coherence, cohesion punctuation, linguistic structures. After that the experimental and the control groups were assigned similar tasks to write every session. The only difference between the experimental group and the control group was that in experimental group the subjects were provided with the professor's corrective feedback in the form of explicit feedback through email correspondence. Control group received no corrective feedback of any kind intentionally, but they were also given some routine help to improve their writing. Subjects of

the experimental group received seven writing tasks during the treatment via email and for every task they had 45 minutes to write and 15 minutes extra time to send back their tasks done.

First the tasks were given to both groups as mentioned earlier, the experimental group had 45 minutes time to write the narration and 15 minutes more to connect and send the tasks back. Then, raters corrected the narrative tasks focusing on target structures. The experimental group received explicit corrective feedback. In explicit corrective feedback, the errors, their location, and description of violated rules were provided. In control group, students were informed that there were some errors in their description, but they were not told where the errors were or what rules had been violated. The teacher returned the original written texts of subjects to them with their marks on their sheet with corrective feedback for the experimental group. Afterwards, they received the next writing topic, and the same procedure was adopted for the next writing task.

**3.9 Post-tests**

The last writing was considered as a post test for the two groups. On the post-tests, subjects in experimental group and control group did not receive any corrective feedback.

**4. Results**

**4.1 Narrative Writing Pre-test**

All the participants in the two groups participated in the writing pre-test to determine whether they were homogeneous EFL writers or not. At first, both fluency and accuracy of subjects' written texts were considered in scoring. All scores of writing pre-test were out of 20 for each subject. In order to increase the reliability of the test, the researcher asked two experienced university professors to correct the papers. The result of the reliability of the two scorers is presented in table 4.1 below.

**4.2 Inter-Rater Reliability**

Table 4.1 displays that both raters were very close in their grading the papers. The 95% agreement rate was calculated for scoring by two raters at p-value of  $0.36 > 0.05$ .

**Table 4.1:** Inter-Rater Reliability

Inter-Rater Reliability	T-Test For Equality Of Means				
	95% Confidence Interval Of The Difference				
	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Equal Variances Assumed	38	.369	.35055	-.38925	1.02562
Equal Variances Not Assumed	37.865	.369	.35055	-.38932	1.02569

According to the p value ( $p = .36 \geq .05$ ) estimated by the independent t. test it is claimed that the two groups were not significantly different in their narrative writing ability test.

**4.3 Narrative Writing Post-test**

As it was mentioned in procedure section the last writing task given to control and experimental groups was considered as the

post test for the project. The test once again was evaluated by the two professional instructor who showed at pre test that their scoring was reliable according to the interreliability test conducted. In order to test the research hypothesis an independent t. test was conducted using the score of the subjects of the two groups in post test narrative writing. The result of this analysis is presented in tables 4.2 and 4.3 below:

**Table 4.2:** Group Statistics of control and experimental groups

	VAR00002	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
VAR00001	1	20	12.5000	1.98680	.44426
	2	20	13.7500	1.83174	.40959

**Table 4.3:** Independent Samples Test of control and experimental groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	DF	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR 00001	Equal variances assumed	.218	.644	-2.069	38	.045	-1.25000	.60426	-2.47326	-.02674
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.069	37.752	.045	-1.25000	.60426	-2.47353	-.02647

As table 4.2 indicates that the mean scores of control and experimental groups are 12.500 and 13.750 respectively. Furthermore statistics estimated by independent t test shown in table 4.3.  $p = .00 \leq .05$ . Indicates that the p value is less than probability level of .05; as a result it can be concluded that the experimental group was significantly different and outperformed the control group at the post test.

**5. Conclusion**

In this study, according to the procedure of the research explained in last two sections, first the researcher compared the performances of two groups of experimental and control via an independent t test in narrative writing; according to the result of the statistics gained in the study, the p-value was 0.45 that was more than the critical value 0.05; in addition, the result of the descriptive statistics showed that the mean difference between the groups was not significant; as a result there was not a significant difference between the groups and they were almost the same in their narrative writing ability.

Later, the subject’s performance in post-test was calculated via an independent t test; the p-value was 0.003 that was less than 0.05; thus it could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the two groups in their writing ability; the differences between control and experimental groups was due first to the contact between the teacher and the participants; the control group treatment was done at class; the experimental group was taught via email.

The findings of this study are in line with Ellis (2009), Bitchener & Knoch (2010), Schmidt’s Noticing Hypothesis (2001), and Carroll & Swain (1993), that the provision of more indirect and implicit corrective feedback is more beneficial for language learners. Based on noticing hypothesis theory, to learn something, it has to be noticed first. Learners have to consciously notice or pay attention to input (corrected written texts) to improve it to intake for L2 learning.

**References**

1. Badger R, White G. A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing. *ELT Journal*. 2000; 54(5):153-160.
2. Bitchener J, Young S, Cameron D. The Effect of Different Types of Corrective. Feedback on ESL Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2005; 3(2):191-205.
3. Braunstein B, Meloni CH, Zolotareva L. The U. S.-Siber Link Internet Project. *TESL-EJ*. 2000; 4(3):15-36.
4. Brown HD. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Longman, 2000.
5. Chandler J. The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 2003; 12(4): 267-296.

6. Chapelle C. *Computer Approaches in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
7. Chastain K. *Developing Second Language Skills: Theory and Practice (3<sup>rd</sup>)*. New York. Harcourt Brace, 1998.
8. Ellis R. *Tasked-based Language and Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
9. Ellis R. A typology of Written Corrective Feedback. *ELT Journal*. 2009; 2(3):97-98.
10. Falhasiri M, Tavakoli M, Hasiri F, Mohammadzadeh A. The Effectiveness of Explicit and Implicit Corrective Feedback on Interlingua and Error Analysis of Students’ Compositions. *English Language Teaching*, 2011; 4(3):3-24.
11. Francis N. Corrective Feedback in L2 Assessment: Negative Evidence and Interactive Practice. *International Symposium on English Teaching*. Taipei English Teachers Association, Y.-N. Leung. 2007; 2(3):376-386.
12. Ferris D. The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 1999; 5(4):1-11.
13. Ferris D. Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2010; 32(4):181-210.
14. Gabrielates C. EFL Writing: Product and Process. *ERIC*, 2002.
15. Gunduz N. Computer Assisted Language Learning. *Journal of language and Linguistic Studies*. 2005; 1(2):5-32.
16. Hasan M. Akhand M. Approaches to writing in EFL/EFL context: Balancing product and process writing class at tertiary level. *Journal of NELTA*, 2010; 15(2):77-88.
17. Hyland K. *Disciplinary discourse: Social interactions in academic writing*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.
18. Kern R. Perspectives on Technology in Learning and Teaching Languages. *TESOL Quarterly*, 2006; 40(1):183-210.
19. Krashen SD. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. California: Pergamon Press Inc, 1982.
20. Liang Y. The effects of error feedback in Second Language Writing. *Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*. 2008; 15(4):65-79.
21. Martin JR. “Process and text: two aspects of semiotic”, in Benson, J. and Greaves, W. (Eds), *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse. International Systemic Workshop Alex, Norwood, NJ*, 1985.
22. National Commission on Writing. *Writing: A ticket to work...or a ticket out*. New York: The College Entrance Examination Board, 2004.

23. Nunan D. *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle, 1999.
24. Onozawa C. A study of the process writing approach. *EL-T Journal*. 2012; 3(10):153-163,
25. Ravichandran T. Computer-Assisted Language Learning in the Perspective of Interactive Approach. *Advantage and Apprehensions. Proceedings of National Seminar on CALL*. Anna University, Chennai, 2000.
26. Richards JC, Renandya WA. *Methodology in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
27. Sheen Y. The role of oral and written corrective feedback in SLA. *Students in Second Language Acquisition*. 2010; 32(2):169-179.