Education Journal《教育學報》, *Vol. 31, No. 1, Summer 2003*
© The Chinese University of Hong Kong 2004

How Do Hong Kong English Teachers Correct Errors in Writing?

ICY LEE
Department of Education Studies, Hong Kong Baptist University

While error correction research has focused on whether teachers should correct errors in student writing and what techniques they should use in correcting errors, much less attention has been given to how teachers actually go about error correction. This study investigated the way teachers of ESL (English as a second language) writing corrected student errors by asking them to complete an error correction task. At the end of the task, the teachers were asked to indicate whether they had marked errors comprehensively or selectively, and what criteria they had used in error selection. The teacher corrections were analyzed to find out: (1) what errors they had chosen to mark; (2) what error feedback strategies they used; and (3) the accuracy of the teacher error feedback. The findings of the study indicated that the majority of teachers marked errors comprehensively. The teachers favored direct feedback more than indirect feedback, and all of their indirect feedback was coded. Slightly over half of the error feedback was accurate, and there was a rather large proportion of unnecessary feedback. The article ends with a discussion of the pedagogical implications that arise from the study.

The recent literature on error correction has witnessed a lively debate between Ferris (1999, 2002) and Truscott (1996, 1999) on whether teachers should correct errors in student writing. However animated and attention-grabbing the debate is, the indecisive results in error correction research have left writing teachers with little choice. Life goes on in the classroom, students want to have their errors corrected, teachers think it is their responsibility to correct errors, and so error correction continues. While writing researchers are investigating the most effective techniques to use in correcting errors, little is done to find out how teachers of L2 writing give error feedback. If the crux of the issue is how teachers should go about error correction so as to reap maximum benefits for students, first we have to obtain information about how teachers

correct errors and what problems they may face. This provides the impetus for the present study.

"Error feedback" refers to the feedback teachers give on students' errors, which could be either direct or indirect. Direct feedback refers to overt correction of student errors, that is, teachers locating and correcting errors for students. Indirect feedback refers to teachers indicating errors without correcting them for students. Some teachers, when giving indirect feedback, locate errors directly by underlining or circling the errors, while others may locate errors indirectly, for instance, by putting a mark in the margin to indicate an error on a certain line. Whether teachers locate errors directly or indirectly, they can further decide if they want to identify the error types — by using symbols, codes, or verbal comments. For direct location of errors, teachers normally put the symbols, codes or comments right above or next to the errors underlined or circled. For indirect location of errors, teachers may put a code or symbol in the margin to identify the error type on a certain line. Table 1 summarizes the major error feedback techniques, with examples to illustrate each type of feedback.

Error correction research is fraught with controversy regarding the benefits of different error correction strategies. Is direct feedback more beneficial than indirect feedback, for instance? There is research evidence showing that direct and indirect feedback has no different effects on student accuracy in writing

Table 1 Types of Error Feedback

Type of error feedback	Explanation	Example
Direct feedback	• Locate and correct errors	• Has went ^{gone}
Indirect feedback (Direct location of errors)	• Locate errors • Locate errors and identify error types	• Has went • Has went $^{verb\ form}$
Indirect feedback (Indirect location of errors)	• Indirectly locate errors	• e.g., putting a mark in the margin to indicate an error on a specific line
	• Indirectly locate errors and identify error types	• e.g., by writing "verb form" (or "v") in the margin to indicate a verb form error on a specific line

(e.g., Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986; Semke, 1984). However, there are studies which suggest that indirect feedback brings more benefits to students' long-term writing development than direct feedback (see Ferris, 2003; Frantzen, 1995; Lalande, 1982) through "increased student engagement and attention to forms and problems" (Ferris, 2003, p. 52). The danger of direct feedback, according to Ferris (2002), is that teachers may misinterpret students' meaning and put words into their mouths. Direct feedback, however, may be appropriate for beginner students and when the errors are "untreatable," that is, when students are not able to self-correct, such as syntax and vocabulary errors (see Ferris, 2002, 2003).

How about the use of error codes (e.g., "T" for "Tense," "N" for "Noun") in giving error feedback, that is, coded feedback? Is it more beneficial than uncoded feedback? Coded feedback rests on the premise that students are better able to correct errors when alerted to the error types. One advantage of coded feedback is that the error codes provide a common ground for teachers and students to discuss errors (Raimes, 1991). Error identification, however, can be "cumbersome for the teacher and confusing for the student" (Ferris, 2002, p. 67). Also, the use of error codes is based on the assumption that students have a good understanding of grammar, and that when they see the codes they are able to correct errors right away. Lee (1997) has, however, cautioned that teachers may be overestimating students' ability in using marking codes, and that teachers may be "using a wider range of metalinguistic terms than students could understand" (p. 471). The usefulness of marking symbols/codes has been further questioned by Ferris and Helt (2000) and Ferris and Roberts (2001), who found that students did not correct more errors when they were provided with error codes. Research has yet to find out how useful and meaningful it is for teachers to mark student writing all over the place with codes, especially with codes that are unfamiliar to or not yet mastered by students.

Apart from coded versus uncoded feedback, another important consideration is the salience of error location. Should teachers make explicit the location of errors, or should teachers just hint at it? When teachers locate errors directly for students, they are assuming that students are unable to do so. Robb et al. (1986) have found that students' performance in error correction was not affected by the salience of error feedback, including whether error location was made explicit for students. Contrary results were obtained in Lee's (1997) study, which has shown that direct prompting of error location was more helpful than indirect prompting, since students were able to correct more errors when errors were directly located for them. It is, however, suggested that students of higher language proficiency may benefit more from indirect

prompting, that is, location of errors being hinted but not indicated. The different research findings perhaps suggest that teachers should be flexible enough and locate errors directly or indirectly where appropriate. For instance, when the errors are obvious, when the error types have been covered in grammar instruction, or when the students concerned have a high level of language proficiency, indirect location of errors may be more helpful.

Irrespective of the error feedback techniques that teachers use, one fundamental question teachers are faced with is whether to mark *all* student errors. Research on error correction has repeatedly pointed out the disadvantages of comprehensive error feedback, that is, marking *all* student errors. Two decades ago, Zamel (1982, 1985) has pointed out that excessive attention to student errors has turned writing teachers into grammar teachers, deflecting them from other more important concerns in writing instruction. Also, comprehensive error feedback is questionable since it is based on the mistaken premise that error-free writing is a desirable goal, while second language research has indicated that "it is unrealistic to expect that L2 writers' production will be error free" (Ferris, 2002, p. 5). In fact, "comprehensive" error feedback is almost an impossible goal because in reality, despite the very best efforts of writing teachers, they are often unable to capture every single error that students make in their writing (see Ferris & Helt, 2000). Even if teachers claim to provide feedback on errors thoroughly, there are bound to be disagreements about what counts as an error and what does not. Another problem associated with comprehensive error feedback is that when teachers adopt this approach, they may end up spending time and effort improving students' writing style, apart from marking grammatical errors. The point is that it is sometimes difficult to draw the line between grammatical inaccuracy and stylistic infelicity. To date there is no research evidence to show that more error feedback would lead to better or faster development of grammatical accuracy in writing. It is possible that error feedback is most effective when it "focuses on patterns of error, allowing teachers and students to attend to, say, two or three major error types at a time, rather than dozens of disparate errors" (Ferris, 2002, p. 50), that is, when teachers choose to give error feedback selectively.

The Study

In Hong Kong, error correction in writing is largely an unexplored area. In order to come up with a sound error feedback pedagogy, it is essential that we understand how teachers deal with error correction. The general question that prompted the current study is therefore: How do teachers provide feedback on students' errors in writing? To answer the research question, a survey, consisting

of a questionnaire and follow-up interview, was conducted with 206 secondary English teachers in Hong Kong, and 58 of the respondents were invited to mark a student essay to find out the strategies they adopted in error correction. This article reports the findings gathered from the error correction task. The specific research questions that the error correction task aimed to answer are:

1. Did the teachers mark errors comprehensively or selectively? What errors did they choose to mark?
2. Which error feedback strategies did the teachers use?
3. How accurate was the teachers' feedback on students' errors in writing?

In order to answer the research questions, an error correction task was designed. Since the error correction task was linked to a survey (not reported in this article; see Lee, 2003), the participating teachers were asked to mark the same essay written by a student unknown to them. The task required teachers to read and mark a student essay in the way they normally do in their own teaching situation. At the end of the task, they were asked to indicate how they had approached the error correction task, for example, whether they had marked errors comprehensively or selectively, the percentage of errors they had selected to mark, and the criteria of error selection.

The essay used in the error correction task (see Appendix) was written by a secondary two student in a Band 1 school in Hong Kong (secondary students in Hong Kong are streamed into schools of 3 bands, with band 1 being the top academically). The topic of the essay is: "Try to find out the environmental problems (e.g., rubbish on the beach) in Shek O on the picnic day. Then write a letter of complaint about these problems to the Director of the Environmental Protection Department." The essay is rather short (with only 181 words) and contains mainly local/surface errors, which are relatively easy to correct.

All together, 58 teachers participated in the study, of whom 54 teachers were studying on the part-time Postgraduate Diploma of Education program and 4 on the Master of Education program at The Chinese University of Hong Kong. While 75% of them had less than five years' teaching experience, 16% had 5–10 years teaching' experience and 5% had over 10 years' teaching experience (4% of the teachers did not give a response). Only 9% (5 teachers) were English panel chairs, and 75% of them had a degree in English.

Before the teachers' corrections were subjected for detailed analysis, the same student essay was read and marked by four teacher educators, including the researcher. The errors identified and corrected were compiled, and in the end 19 errors were identified in the student essay (see Table 2). The error types are summarized in Table 3.

Table 2 Errors and Error Types in the Student Essay

Error no.	Line	Student error (underlined)	Correction	Error category
1	4	on the breach, on the breach,	beach	Spelling
2	4	on the breach. on the breach,	. On	Punctuation
3	5	glasses	glass	Noun ending (plural)
4	5	some an other things	~~an~~	Word choice (unnecessary article)
5	6	weather pollution	water	Spelling
6	6, 7, 8	on the sea	in	Word choice (preposition)
7	6	on the sea. in Shek O,	. In	Punctuation
8	6	I had seen	saw / have seen	Verb tense
9	7	Ex:	For example, / For instance,	Spelling
10	7	The sea had	There were … in the sea	Sentence structure
11	7	And there have	were	Word choice (verb)
12	9	The third problem was about the toilet, because in Shek O the toilet were very dirty	toilets	Noun ending (plural)
13	10	I had gone	went	Verb tense
14	10–11	I saw the floor had some water and had many dirty things	I saw some water and many dirty things on the floor	Sentence structure
15	11	go to toilet	go to the toilet	Article (missing)
16	11	had not go	did not go	Word choice (verb)
17	13	must use	think of	Word choice (verb)
18	13	some idea	ideas	Noun ending (plural)
19	13	to take	make / help	Word choice (verb)

Table 3 Summary of Error Types in the Student Essay

Error type	Total
Word choice	6
Noun ending	3
Spelling	3
Punctuation	2
Verb tense	2
Sentence structure	2
Article	1
Total	*19*

Results

This section attempts to answer the research questions by addressing the following three aspects:

1. Comprehensive versus selective error feedback;
2. Direct versus indirect feedback;
3. Accuracy of teacher error feedback.

Comprehensive Versus Selective Error Feedback

At the end of the error correction task, 19 teachers (33%) indicated that they marked the errors selectively, whereas 39 teachers (67%) marked the errors comprehensively. Thus, the majority of the teachers seemed to favor comprehensive marking. In total, 843 errors were corrected by the comprehensive feedback group (39 teachers), and 310 by the selective feedback group (19 teachers). An average of 22 errors and 16 errors were thus marked by the comprehensive and selective groups respectively. Compared with a total of 19 errors (identified by the researcher and teacher educators) in the student essay, the findings from the comprehensive feedback group suggest that there may be a tendency of overmarking among teachers. In the selective feedback group, 10 teachers indicated that they had marked more than two-thirds of student errors, 8 teachers said they had marked two-thirds of student errors, and only 1 teacher said one-third of student errors had been marked. Thus, in giving selective error feedback, teachers marked a large proportion of student errors. The errors they chose to mark, citing from the teachers, were (the numbers in parentheses indicate the number of teachers who mentioned the criteria):

- Basic or obvious errors — e.g., tenses, prepositions, agreement (8);
- Errors that impede understanding or serious errors (3);
- Grammatical errors (rather than semantic errors) (2);
- Errors that are within students' understanding (2).

Thus, the criteria for error selection were mainly based on teacher perception of the nature of the errors.

To answer the first research question ("Did the teachers mark errors comprehensively or selectively? What errors did they choose to mark?"), the following conclusions can be made:

- The majority of teachers marked errors comprehensively;
- In comprehensive error feedback, there seemed to be a tendency to overmark;
- In selective error feedback, teachers tended to correct a large proportion of errors;
- Teachers' major concern in error selection was whether the errors are "basic" or "obvious." What they meant by "basic" or "obvious" errors, however, would need to be clarified.

Direct Versus Indirect Feedback

The analysis shows that direct error feedback (i.e., underlining/circling and correction) was given to 55% of the errors in the comprehensive feedback group and 65% of the errors in the selective feedback group. On average, more than half of the errors were overtly corrected by the teachers. Thus, teachers tended to give more direct feedback than indirect feedback on students' written errors. In both the comprehensive and selective feedback groups, the teachers used only one indirect feedback strategy, namely direct location of errors (by underlining or circling) plus the use of error codes (including symbols such as question marks and arrows) — that is, coded feedback. Table 4 summarizes the error codes used by the teachers in the study, which covered a rather wide range of error types, including "tense," "article," "spelling," "preposition," "pronoun," and so on. A total of 14 error types were used by the teachers in the error correction task. Six teachers voluntarily returned the error correction task with the marking codes they used in school. An initial analysis of the 6 marking codes provided by the six teachers has found that the number of error types range from 15 to 26, which suggests that schools tend to adopt fine categories in their marking codes. For instance, one marking code breaks the large category "verb errors" down into smaller categories like "tense," "infinitive," "gerund," "verb form," "agreement of subject and verb" and "voice."

Table 4 Error Codes Used by Teachers

Error type	Error code used by teachers
Tense / verb	T / v / v.t. / T (present) / T (past) / past simple / Tn / tv / vb / past par / vF v1v2, e.g., I had (v1) not go (v2)
Article	Ar / art / A
Auxiliary verb	Aux
Spelling	Sp
Number	Num / no / N / si / sing / plural / plu / pl
Agreement	agr / ag
Preposition	Prep / P / Pr / p.p. / Pre
Pronoun	Pr
Punctuation / Case	P / Punct / P / Ca / C
Wrong word	w.w. / ww / w / W
Wrong word order	Wo
Expression	Exp
Rewrite sentence	<rewrite>
Chinglish	<Chi-English>
Unclassified	(RS)(FS)

To answer the second research question ("Which error feedback strategies did the teachers use?"), the following conclusions can be made:

- The teachers tended to give more direct than indirect feedback;
- Indirect feedback strategy was limited to coded feedback;
- The error codes used in teachers' indirect feedback covered a wide range of error types.

Accuracy of Teacher Feedback

In analyzing the accuracy of teachers' error feedback, four types of teachers' error correction were identified (see Table 5).

1. Accurate feedback — accurate location/correction/coding of errors;
2. Inaccurate feedback — accurate location of errors but inaccurate correction/coding of errors;
3. Unnecessary feedback — feedback that (1) changes/improves style; (2) changes original meaning; (3) creates an error (i.e., correct but marked as an error) (see Ferris, 2002);
4. Omission — errors that are not marked (i.e., treated as correct) (applicable only to the comprehensive feedback group).

Table 5 Analysis of Teachers' Error Feedback in the Study

Type of error feedback	Explanation	Example
Accurate feedback	1. Errors accurately located and fixed 2. Errors accurately located 3. Errors accurately located and coded	1. On the breach → beach 2. On the breach 3. On the breach [sp]
Inaccurate feedback	1. Errors accurately located but inaccurately corrected 2. Errors accurately located but inaccurately coded	1. Some an other things → some many other things 2. In Shek O the toilet were[T] very dirty
Unnecessary marking	1. Marking that leads to stylistic difference or improvement 2. Marking that changes original meaning 3. No error is involved — teacher correction leads students to make an error	1. I am writing to inform you about … → complain 2. So next time … → From then onwards … 3. … the three problems that are causing damage → damages
Omission (only applicable to teachers who marked errors comprehensively)	An error that is treated as correct	some rubbish on the sea (treated as correct)

The teachers' performance in error correction is summarized in Table 6. In the comprehensive feedback group, 57% of feedback is accurate, 40% unnecessary, and 3% inaccurate. In the selective feedback group, the results are very similar — 57% of the feedback is accurate, 39% unnecessary, and 4% inaccurate. In the main, slightly over half of the student errors were accurately marked by teachers. On the other hand, there are totally 172 omissions of errors (identified only in the comprehensive feedback group). On average, there are 4 omissions in each teacher's error feedback.

Table 6 Teachers' Performance in Error Correction

Feedback type	Comprehensive marking group	Selective marking group
Accurate	57%	57%
Inaccurate	3%	4%
Unnecessary	40%	39%

To illustrate teachers' inaccurate and unnecessary feedback (see Table 5 for other examples), 10 teachers gave inaccurate feedback in the following sentence: "… there have many dirty things." The teachers corrected the sentence to "there are many dirty things" when the simple past tense should be used instead of the simple present tense. Eight teachers gave unnecessary feedback on "causing damage," changing "damage" to "damages." Six teachers coded the following "error" (see underlined: "we could see some glasses") as "tense" or "verb tense," when in fact the sentence itself is entirely correct.

To answer the third research question ("How accurate was the teachers' feedback on students' errors in writing?"), the following conclusions can be made:

- Only slightly over half of the teacher feedback was accurate;
- A large proportion of the teacher feedback was unnecessary;
- Some errors were omitted.

Discussion and Implications

The study has yielded some interesting findings that shed light on how English teachers in Hong Kong corrected student errors in writing. However, two limitations must be noted before we discuss the implications arising from the study. First of all, the sample is small and is therefore not representative of all Hong Kong English teachers. Second, instead of collecting data from the teachers' own writing classrooms and examining their error correction practices in the normal course of events, the error correction task in this study attempted to examine how they corrected errors based on an artificial marking exercise. The way the teachers marked errors in the error correction task may deviate from their normal practice. Nonetheless, the findings of the study provide some useful preliminary information about how English teachers correct errors in student writing, upon which further error correction research could be based.

The Elusiveness and Danger of Comprehensive Error Feedback

Many error correction advocates have advised against comprehensive feedback because of the risk of "exhausting teachers and overwhelming students" (Ferris,

2002, p. 50). In the local English syllabus for secondary English teachers, it is recommended that "teachers need not correct all the mistakes in learners' work" (Curriculum Development Council, 1999, p. 95). However, in the study the majority of teachers marked errors comprehensively (see also Lee, 2003). One problem is that once teachers decide to go for comprehensive error feedback, there is inevitably a tendency to mark more errors than necessary, as shown in the study. This study has also demonstrated that however "comprehensively" a teacher marks errors, there is bound to be omission. In reality, it is difficult to define an error (e.g., to distinguish between an error and a difference or improvement in style) and thus to decide whether to give feedback or not. Thus, "comprehensive feedback" may be an elusive concept. Further research could investigate the error correction practices adopted by English teachers in their day-to-day teaching to ascertain the rationale behind their preference for comprehensive marking.

The Nature and Criteria of Selective Marking

In the study, the teachers who claimed to adopt selective marking were actually not particularly selective in their approach, since there was still a tendency to mark a large proportion of student errors. Their major selection criterion was whether the errors are "basic" or "obvious." However, it is not certain how the teachers defined "basic" errors. In selective error feedback, there are several fundamental issues to consider. For example: How can teachers define the gravity of errors? Which errors should teachers mark, and which errors should they leave alone? These are important questions to explore. One limitation of the study is that the teachers did not mark their own students' essay, so it was impossible for them to select errors according to their own student needs. Given the heavy marking load faced by Hong Kong English teachers, however, it is possible that in the end the process of error correction would resemble the one examined in the error correction task in the study, that is, teachers may compromise their error correction practices, due to the time constraint, by treating their student essays as if they were written by some unknown students.

The Range of Error Feedback Strategies

The study has shown that the teachers mainly relied on two error feedback strategies, namely direct error feedback (underlining/circling and correcting errors) and indirect coded feedback (underlining/circling and coding errors). No single teacher used uncoded feedback (i.e., underlining/circling errors without coding them), and none of them located errors indirectly (e.g., by

indicating the occurrence of errors in the margin). The results suggest that teachers may need to experiment with a wider range or error feedback strategies. Lee (1997) believes that teachers should vary the degree of salience of error feedback (e.g., regarding error location or error types) according to learner needs — less salient information could be provided for advanced learners, whereas more salient information for less advanced learners. For example, more proficient students could be given uncoded feedback or error feedback that prompts them about error location, thus requiring them to locate and correct errors. Further research could investigate the error correction strategies teachers use in their own writing classroom to ascertain the range of strategies teachers adopt and the beliefs that underlie those strategies.

Efficacy of Coded Feedback

Interestingly, in the study all the direct feedback was coded. The assumption seems to be that learners are able to correct errors only when codes are provided, or that they are better able to correct errors with coded than uncoded feedback. Error correction research has yet to find out whether coded feedback is more useful than uncoded feedback. In fact, it is possible that with some errors (and/ or for some students), uncoded feedback is equally effective and useful compared with coded feedback. The study has also indicated that teachers tend to use a large number of error codes in error correction. Assuming that the error types have been covered in grammar lessons, the error codes can help students reinforce their learning. However, when teachers mark errors comprehensively, when an essay is full of errors, and when a large amount of the error feedback is coded, a student essay can be filled with error codes of different kinds. In that case, it is questionable if students are able to correct their errors. Also, it could be very time-consuming for teachers to use codes to categorize a wide range of errors, and it could be overwhelming and frustrating for students to correct their errors based on the codes. Future research could perhaps explore what an "optimal" number of error codes may be so as to find out whether students would benefit from larger or smaller categories of error codes.

Teacher Competence in Error Feedback

The study has shown that only slightly over half of the teachers' error feedback was accurate. Other feedback was either inaccurate or unnecessary (but mainly unnecessary). Inaccuracy in error feedback is understandable, given that "to err is human." What should raise our concern, instead, is teachers' unnecessary

feedback, which took up quite a large proportion of the total error feedback. Some of the unnecessary teacher corrections were found to be misleading because they created errors as a result. The teachers who claimed to mark errors comprehensively also failed to detect some student errors. To some extent, therefore, the study casts doubt on teachers' competence in error correction, though more local research has to be conducted to corroborate the findings of the study. In Hong Kong, English teachers are required by the government to pass a language proficiency assessment so as to be benchmarked for English language teaching. The first benchmark tests were conducted in 2000. Interestingly, the benchmark test results have shown that teachers perform worst in correcting student errors in the writing paper. Coupled with the findings of this study, it could be concluded that teachers may need more training and practice in error correction. In order that teacher error feedback be made more effective and beneficial for our learners, teacher education courses have to put more focus on helping pre-service and in-service teachers cope with this time-consuming and painstaking task of error correction.

Conclusion

The study has found that the Hong Kong English teachers' error correction practice may leave much to be desired. Although selective error feedback is recommended in the local English syllabus, the majority of teachers mark errors comprehensively. Their range of feedback strategies is limited, and their competence in giving error feedback is also questionable. It must be noted, however, that these findings cannot be generalized based on such a small-scale study. Also, in the study the teachers corrected errors in an essay not written by their own students. The results might have been different if essays written by the teachers' own students had been used. Nevertheless, the study has demonstrated that ESL teachers may be faced with different problems in error correction. In order to help them come up with better alternatives in error correction, the findings of error correction research have to be disseminated to frontline ESL teachers. Indeed, ways have to be sought to bridge the gap between research and classroom practice. Teachers have to be encouraged and provided with opportunities to conduct classroom-based research so that they can experiment with a wider range of error feedback strategies to find out what works best in their own context. Apart from error correction in the English classroom, it would be interesting to find out how Chinese teachers in Hong Kong correct errors in the L1 classroom and whether they face similar problems, and how content subject teachers in English-medium schools treat errors in

student writing. Together these studies would throw light on how students could be supported in their acquisition of both L1 and L2 through teachers' error feedback.

Acknowledgments

Funding for the investigation reported in this article was provided by the Direct Grant of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

References

Curriculum Development Council. (1999). *Syllabuses for secondary schools: English language (Secondary 1–5)*. Hong Kong: Printing Department, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government.

Ferris, D. R. (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. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ferris, D. R., & Helt, M. (2000, March). *Was Truscott right? New evidence on the effects of error correction in L2 writing classes?* Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

Ferris, D. R., & 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.

Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *Modern Language Journal*, *79*(3), 329–344.

Lalande, J. F., II. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, *66*(2), 140–149.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System*, *25*(4), 465–477.

Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, *8*(3), 216–237.

Raimes, A. (1991). Errors: Windows into the mind. *College ESL*, *1*(2), 55–64.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, *20*(1), 83–95.

Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, *17*(3), 195–202.

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.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, *16*(2), 195–209.

Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*(1), 79–97.

Appendix: Student Essay Used in Error Correction Task

Composition topic

Try to find out the environmental problems in Shek O on the picnic day. Then write a letter of complaint about these problems to the Director of the Environmental Protection Department.

Dear Sir,

I am writing to inform you about the three problems that are causing damage to the environment in Shek O.

The first problem was rubbish problem on the breach, on the breach, we could see some glasses, some cans and some an other things.

The second problem was weather pollution on the sea, in Shek O, I had seen some rubbish on the sea. Ex: The sea had some cans and bottles. And there have many dirty things on the sea too.

The third problem was about the toilet, because in Shek O the toilet were very dirty. On that day, when I had gone into a toilet, I saw the floor had some water and had many dirty things. So next time, although I wanted to go to toilet, I had not go.

I should be grateful if you would let me know what you can do about these problems. Shek O is a good place for swimming and playing, so we must use some idea to take Shek O become clean.

Thank you very much!

Yours faithfully,
XXX