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Introducción: Tesis de grado en Educación perteneciente a la línea de investigación sobre la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera.

Metodología: El tipo de esta investigación es cuantitativa y tiene un nivel descriptivo con un diseño cuasi-experimental.

Resultados: El autor presenta el resultado de la investigación sobre el uso de la retroalimentación indirecta para mejorar las habilidades de escritura de los estudiantes en San Ignacio de Loyola, en el primer semestre de 2014.

Conclusiones: Primero, al usar y recolectar información de entrevistas con maestros, cuestionarios de estudiantes, observaciones en el aula y al comparar y contrastar los resultados de la escritura con las rúbricas utilizadas en la universidad, la hipótesis general presentada en esta investigación, el uso de la retroalimentación indirecta mejora las habilidades de escritura de ensayos en la Universidad San Ignacio Loyola en Lima, pudieron ser probados. No obstante, la retroalimentación indirecta simplemente superó la retroalimentación directa en un porcentaje mínimo. En segundo lugar, el estudio encontró que la hipótesis general, "La retroalimentación indirecta contribuye mejor que la retroalimentación directa para mejorar las habilidades de escritura en ensayos de estudiantes de inglés III en la Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola", se demostró de acuerdo con las figuras 9 y 10, en las cuales hay una diferencia entre los puntajes obtenidos en el ensayo de salida de los grupos control y experimental. Por lo tanto, se concluye que la retroalimentación indirecta contribuye mejor que la retroalimentación directa para mejorar las habilidades de escritura en ensayos de estudiantes de inglés III en la Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola. Tercero, con respecto al examen de ingreso del grupo de control, se observa que este grupo está centrado en el 88.2% en la categoría regular. Por otro lado, los resultados para el mismo examen del grupo experimental también localizan el 88.2% en la categoría regular. Esto demostró que los dos grupos comparten la misma característica, ya que ambos son grupales en el nivel regular. El primer grupo no es mejor que el segundo, todo esto se indica en las tablas 6 y 7, así como en la figura 12. Cuarto, según la tabla 10, con respecto al criterio de finalización de la tarea, se puede observar que el 76.5% de los estudiantes del grupo experimental y el 94.1% en el grupo control estaban en el nivel regular. Por otro lado, hubo una mejora notable en los niveles de bueno y muy bueno en el grupo experimental con 26.6% y 2.9% en comparación con 5.0% en el nivel de bueno en el grupo control (tabla 10). Quinto, con respecto a la categoría de lenguaje y vocabulario,
hubo mejoras interesantes en el grupo experimental. Se ubicó en los niveles regular y bueno con 82.4% y 17.6% respectivamente. Mientras que en el grupo de control se observó que 2.9%, 94.1% y 2.9% se ubicaron en los niveles bajo, regular y bueno (tabla 10). Sexto, con respecto a la categoría de evaluación del diseño también mostró mejoras significativas, observando una mejora en la categoría baja que tenía 5.9% en comparación con el grupo de control que ubicó al 20.6% de los estudiantes en este nivel. En el grupo experimental, se observó que 76.5% y 17.6% están en el nivel regular y bueno. En contraste, el grupo de control colocó 64.7% y 14.7% en los niveles regular y bueno (tabla 10).
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Introduction: Degree thesis in Education pertaining to the line of research on teaching English as a foreign language.

Methodology: The type of this investigation is quantitative, and has a descriptive level with a quasi-experimental design

Results: The author presents the result of the investigation about the use of indirect feedback to improve students’ writing skills at San Ignacio de Loyola University, in the first semester in 2014.

Conclusions: First, by using and collecting information from classroom observations, teacher interviews, student questionnaires, and by comparing and contrasting results of writing with the rubrics used at the university, the general hypothesis presented in this research, the use of indirect feedback improves the writing skills of essays at San Ignacio Loyola University in Lima, could be proved. Nonetheless, indirect feedback just overpassed the direct feedback by a minimum percentage.

Second, the study found that the general hypothesis, “Indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University,” was proved according to figures 9 and 10, in which the scores obtained in the exit essay of the control group differ from the experimental one. So, we can affirm that indirect feedback contributes better than direct one to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

Third, with respect to the entry exam of the control group, it is noticed that this group is centered in 88.2% in the regular category. On the other hand, the results for the same exam of the experimental group also localize 88.2% in the regular category. This showed that the two groups share the same characteristic since they both are group in the regular level. The first group is not better than the second one, all of this is stated in the table 6 & 7 as well as figure 12.

Fourth, according to the table 10, regarding the task completion criterion, it can be observed that 76.5% of students of the experimental group and 94.1% in the control group were in the regular level. On the other hand, there was a noticeable improvement in the levels of good and very good in the experimental group with 26.6% and 2.9% compared with 5.0% in the level of good in the control group (table 10).

Fifth, regarding the language and vocabulary category, there were interesting improvements in the experimental group. It was located in the regular and good levels with
82.4% and 17.6% respectively. While in the control group it was observed that 2.9%, 94.1% and 2.9% were located in the low, regular and good levels (table 10).

Sixth, with respect to the layout evaluation category also showed significant improvements, observing an improvement in the low category that had 5.9% compared to the control group that placed 20.6% of students in this level. In the experimental group, it was observed that 76.5% and 17.6% are in the regular and good level. In contrast, the control group placed 64.7% and 14.7% in the regular and good levels (table 10).

Summary date: December 10\textsuperscript{th}, 2019
Table of contents

Introduction ......................................................................................................................... 1

Chapter 1 Investigation outline .......................................................................................... 5
1. Formulation of the problem ......................................................................................... 5
2. Hypothesis..................................................................................................................... 6
   2.1. General hypothesis.............................................................................................. 6
   2.2. Specific hypothesis ............................................................................................. 6
3. Delimitation of the objectives ...................................................................................... 6
   3.1. General objective ............................................................................................... 6
   3.2. Specific objective............................................................................................... 6
4. Justification of the investigation .................................................................................. 6
5. Limitations of the investigation ................................................................................... 7
6. Antecedents of the investigation (Previous research) .................................................. 8

Chapter 2 Theoretical framework ................................................................................... 15
1. English language teaching .......................................................................................... 15
   1.1. Importance of the English language ................................................................. 15
   1.2. Competences for the English language ............................................................. 15
2. Writing purposes ........................................................................................................ 16
   2.1. Productive skills ............................................................................................... 17
      2.1.1. Following the rules ..................................................................................... 18
      2.1.2. Dealing with difficulty .............................................................................. 18
   2.2. Productive skills in the classroom ..................................................................... 18
3. Reception and production .......................................................................................... 19
   3.1. Problems and solutions ..................................................................................... 20
   3.2. Language .......................................................................................................... 21
   3.3. Topic .................................................................................................................. 21
4. The writing skill ......................................................................................................... 22
   4.1. The writing process ......................................................................................... 22
   4.2. Process and product ......................................................................................... 24
5. Assessment ................................................................................................................ 24
   5.1. Assessment and testing ..................................................................................... 24
   5.2. Assessment and learning ................................................................................... 26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Definition of corrective feedback</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.</td>
<td>Types of teacher’s feedback</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.1.</td>
<td>Indirect Feedback</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.2.</td>
<td>Direct feedback</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.3.</td>
<td>Unfocused feedback/correction</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.4.</td>
<td>Focused feedback/correction</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.5.</td>
<td>Metalinguistic feedback</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Importance of Error Feedback</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.1.</td>
<td>Feedback helps students revise and edit their texts</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.2.</td>
<td>Feedback leads to accuracy gains over time</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.3.</td>
<td>Students and Teachers Value Error Feedback</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Written accuracy is important in the real world</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>The role of the instructor providing indirect feedback on students’ writing</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 3 Methodology of the investigation** .......................................................... 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Type of the investigation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Design of the investigation</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Population and study sample</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.</td>
<td>Universe</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.</td>
<td>Operationalization of variables</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Techniques and instruments for gathering of data</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.</td>
<td>Instruments for gathering of data</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1.</td>
<td>Participants’ written program</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2.</td>
<td>Entry and Exit written essays</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1.</td>
<td>Procedure for giving indirect feedback</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.</td>
<td>Sessions and activities for Indirect Feedback and Direct Feedback</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4 Results

1. Results related to indirect feedback
   1.1. Perception of students
   1.2. Perception of teachers

2. Results of the score record

3. Test of hypotheses
   3.1. Test of data normality
   3.2. Test of hypothesis
   3.3. Statistical testing of the general hypothesis
   3.4. Statistical testing of the specific hypothesis

4. Descriptive results of the Entry essay results
   4.1. Entry essay for the control group
   4.2. Entry essay for the experimental group
   4.3. Descriptive results of the exit essay results
   4.4. Descriptive results of the exit essay results by evaluation criteria

Conclusions

Recommendations

Bibliographical references

Appendices 

Appendix 1. Entry test
Appendix 2. Exit test
Appendix 3. Sample of sequence of drafts of the experimental group
Appendix 4. Checklist to monitor drafts using indirect feedback
Appendix 5. Survey for teachers- Written Feedback
Appendix 6. Survey for students given indirect feedback
List of tables

Table 1. Ranges and levels for grading essays ........................................................... 45
Table 2. Suitability when using indirect feedback ..................................................... 47
Table 3. Importance of giving feedback to students’ pieces of writing ................. 48
Table 4. Fluctuation of scores – Indirect feedback ................................................... 49
Table 5. Evaluation of the statistical significance of the exit test evaluation categories of the control and experimental groups (n = 68) ........................ 57
Table 6. Results of entry essay for the control group .............................................. 58
Table 7. Results of entry essay for the experimental group .................................... 58
Table 8. Results of exit essay for the control group ............................................... 59
Table 9. Results of exit essay for the experimental group ..................................... 60
Table 10. Results of exit essay for the experimental group by evaluation criteria ...... 62
List of figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Indirect feedback codes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Relationship between input and output</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation model Tests, measurement, assessment, teaching and evaluation</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rubric for writing used at San Ignacio de Loyola University</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Suitability of indirect feedback</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Importance of giving feedback to students’ revisions</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fluctuation of drafts in the experimental group</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Histogram for control exit test scores</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Acceptance and rejection regions of $H_0$</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U test for the value $Z$ and $p$</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acceptance and rejection regions of $H_0$</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Results of entry essay for the control group</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Results of entry essay for the experimental group</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Results of exit essay for the control group</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Results of exit essay for the experimental group</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

For a number of years, assessing our students enhance their writing skills in English as a Second Language has been acknowledged as being important because of the necessity to be proficient in the language to graduate from a career, study abroad or earn international certificates, which permits different kind of people to study or live abroad, especially in English-speaking countries. Thus, in the attempt to help students to improve their writing skills, feedback is needed, which has to be chosen carefully by thinking what can be the best one, and here precisely rises a disagreement among many teachers on the role of corrective feedback in English Foreign Language.

Teachers do not agree on a way to assist students to internalize linguistic knowledge through writing. What was also noticed is that most teachers give direct feedback to check their students’ pieces of writing, which consists on giving the answers to students’ mistakes and what students do is just rewrite their drafts and spend less time to improve them. Nonetheless, few others use indirect feedback, which uses symbols that help students improve their drafts and, of course, it takes more time to rewrite them because they need to figure out what each symbol refers to. Therefore, this kind of occurrence in classrooms demands practice.

From the different approaches used to assess students’ pieces of writing, indirect feedback was selected because it advantageously influences on students’ writing skills and helps them stimulate their minds better than just using the direct feedback on the side of teachers. This approach makes students reflect on their writing and then internalize some language in English. It would be useful to determine to what extent they improve from the first to the last draft.

Based on some research, indirect feedback is more helpful on students’ long-lasting writing development than direct feedback (Ferris, 2002 op cit.). Students become more accurate in some way after using the indirect feedback since they have the opportunity to self-edit, which can guide their learning and help them solve problems by themselves.

To make indirect feedback more efficacious, it can be reflected by a code pointing out a specific type of mistake (T = verb tense, Sp = spelling) and to avoid students’ doubt or confusion, instructors might regularly use a regular set of symbols or markings to indicate where and what needs to be corrected. They may also train students to identify and remedy
errors based on each code or symbol. Additionally, teachers ought to make students be familiar with the system through some constant practice.

Consequently, for the students to be aware of these symbols some correction codes were utilized provided by Hasyim (2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WO</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Wrong Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WF</td>
<td>Word Form (noun or adjective? Adjective or adverb? etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Grammar (Tense Aspect [simple, continuous, perfect?] etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>unclear meaning (try and re-phrase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>missing punctuation (,.“; etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Indirect feedback codes

In this document, it is desirable to confirm if the indirect feedback strategy could have long-lasting effects on students’ knowledge and language acquisition, including the improvement of task completion, grammar and vocabulary, layout, and mechanics. In this way, students can be encouraged to become autonomous writers. This is where self-correction, supervised by the teacher, can be useful. If these strategies are appropriately applied since the very beginning, it would represent a valuable tool for the better development of written documents among students and will let them perform adequately in international exams.

The present document is divided into four chapters. In Chapter 1, the inquiries which arise based on previous experience, are stated as general and specific problems. Following, a general hypothesis, indirect feedback positively contributes to improving the writing skills in essays of low intermediate English students, and two sub-hypotheses are proposed as possible skills of the research. Finally, to guide the actions of the present investigation, a general objective and two sub-objectives are stated.
The present document is divided into four chapters. In Chapter 1, the inquiries which arise based on previous experience are stated as general and specific problems. Following, a general hypothesis, indirect feedback positively contributes to improving the writing skills in essays of low intermediate English students, and two sub-hypotheses are proposed as possible skills of the research. Finally, to guide the actions of the present investigation, a general objective and two sub-objectives are stated.
Chapter 1
Investigation outline

1. Formulation of the problem

We know that acquiring an L2 language takes a considerable time and even more when learners endeavor to use it for academic purposes. All of this depends on learners’ age of first exposure to the L2; consequently, some acquirers may never accomplish several aspects of the target language as native speakers do. Second Language Acquisition happens through various stages: vocabulary, morphology, phonology and syntax and as this acquisition happens, learners do make errors caused by several aspects such as unsuitable transference of L1 forms or inadequate knowledge of L2 (Ferris, 2011, p. 9-10).

All of what is described above is related to the productive skills that are necessary to master to perform well in real situations. Writing is the one that will be focused in this study in order to assist learners in improving their writing skills.

Before conducting the present study, it was observed that students were not so skillful or felt reluctant to perform writing activities in class. Likewise, some teachers, who seemed not to care about these facts, were easy to be convinced to assign these writing practice as homework and sometimes due to time constraints they did not perform any previous lectures about the writing process. If teachers’ aim is to help students to be good writers in the target language, they had better teach them how to write effectively in class. After this practice, there must be some follow-up to monitor students’ progress and one way to do is giving feedback. And here a question arises, whether this approach makes students improve in accuracy after getting feedback. And a conclusive response might be: student writers have succeeded in producing better revisions in response to error feedback without taking into consideration the variety of errors that could exist, student individualism, and teacher feedback mechanisms (Ferris, 2011, p. 8).

Considering this fact, two kinds of feedback were compared: Direct Feedback and Indirect Feedback. There are some positive insights regarding indirect feedback. For instance, Lalande, (1982, p. 140-149) declared that students who got indirect feedback reduced errors gradually while students who received direct one did not, and he also said that it pushes students to guide their learning and solve problems. Moreover, it helps them enhance to self-edit by themselves.
The general objective of this project is to demonstrate that indirect feedback contributes to improving writing skills in essays of low intermediate English learners.

To summarize, the statement of the problem is:

Does indirect feedback contribute better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University?

2. Hypothesis

2.1. General hypothesis. Indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

2.2. Specific hypothesis. Indirect feedback positively contributes to improving the writing skills in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, layout and mechanics in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

3. Delimitation of the objectives

3.1. General objective. Show how indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

3.2. Specific objective. Determine how positively indirect feedback contributes to improving writing skills in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, layout and mechanics in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

4. Justification of the investigation

The study arose since writing accuracy has become very important in the real world in the last decades, but according to some anecdotal and research evidence, it is suggested that university professors and employers find language errors in writing distracting. So in order for teachers at the university to assess drafts/revisions adequately, a rubric is used to evaluate this kind of practice. Nonetheless, it was observed that some teachers and students
seemed to find writing activities difficult to handle due to boredom or time constraints. Because of this and with the desire to enhance the writing process and its assessment in a better way, a research was performed. The study was focused on the comparison of two approaches: indirect and direct feedback.

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate that indirect feedback contributed to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University regarding four items: task completion, grammar and vocabulary, layout, and mechanics as well as the effect that indirect feedback can cause on them.

The result of this study, in the educational sphere, would permit students use self-editing strategies and engage in guided learning and solving problem, which lead to long-term aim of fostering student autonomy in monitoring their own writing. In the social sphere, it would also contribute to making students perform in real situations like presenting reports or writing formal emails. And in the cultural sphere, students were able to distinguish the different registers related to writing. This research then had an important impact on the social, educational and cultural spheres not only in the classroom itself, but also at the university.

5. Limitations of the investigation

This investigation has been interesting and challenging at the same time for me and other teachers who deal with written tests. Nevertheless, some situations interfered along the process. One of them is related to time since it had to be included in the normal advancement of the regular classes. There was a fixed program for the institution, which students and teachers had to follow.

Another issue faced was students’ attendance; they had to be present for the writing of essays, taking surveys or receiving feedback.

The last one has to do with L1 interference since most of them have Spanish as mother tongue so there were occasions in which students translated word for word what they wanted to say in English. We all know that English and Spanish are different languages semantically.
6. Antecedents of the investigation (Previous research)

Martha Lira-Gonzales (2013), The Language Portfolio as a Strategy to Improve ESL Writing in Students of First Grade of Secondary at “Sagrados Corazones” School, Master in Education in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

The objective of the study was to enhance the students’ writing skills from first grade of secondary with the usage of a Language Portfolio. To achieve this goal, three specific objectives were consigned: the usage of a Language Portfolio in the syllabus, train teachers as to how to use it, and assess writing skills in them.

It was concluded that exactly 12.9% of students were classified into the good standard related to writing skills in accordance with a quantitative research methodology and through an empiric-analytical quantitative investigation. The percentage was obtained from students’ scores via some important methods used for the study; some of them were deductive, inductive, analysis, synthesis, and others. The data was gathered along the application of the remedy. Results showed that the implementation of the language portfolio aid learners in improving their pieces of writing after all the data from the different tools was collected and analyzed.

The sample was divided in two groups: Control group (learners who did not have as additional material language portfolio) and sample group (participant who utilized the language portfolio). The results of the analysis demonstrated that the students from the sample group did better when working with their drafts than the ones from the control group. Additionally, after analyzing the data, it was found that 39.1% of learners from the sample group performed better than the students being part of the control group, whose percentage was just 13.6. It can be concluded from the present study that making learners have the language portfolio as an additional material in class promotes the enhancement of writing skills.

Therefore, this research showed that the use of feedback in order to aid learners in improving students’ writing skills with the help of a method or tool proved to be useful. At the same time, it seemed appropriate that researches should be handled by using an experimental and a control group so that they can be valid.

Martha Marie Bless (2017), Impact of Audio Feedback Technology on Writing Instruction - Walden University, doctor’s Philosophy degree in Educational Technology, USA.
The purpose of this study was to investigate how Kaizena impacted on teachers’ writing instructions, particularly in relation to teacher self-efficacy. Kaizena (2016) is a software application that facilitates the provision of teacher generated digital audio feedback. To accomplish that purpose, the author interviewed high school teachers to gather and analyze their perceptions about their experiences with Kaizena. The impact of Kaizena on their beliefs regarding their capabilities as writing instructors were also collected and analyzed. In addition, she also gathered artifacts related to writing assignments of the participants to elucidate how teachers used Kaizena in their writing instruction.

She claims that the ability to communicate thoughts and ideas in writing is critical for life and work in the present century, and because of the accelerated pace of revolution in the global knowledge economy, it is critical to acquire proficient writing skills (National Governors Association & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010). However, student achievement scores on nationally administered standardized assessments are not good enough especially in writing skills, and evidence from the research literature indicates that teachers struggle to keep up with the workload of providing feedback on student papers (Achieve, Inc., 2014; Graham, & Perin, 2007b; Graham, Harris, & Hebert, 2011; Graham, Hebert, & Harris, 2015; National Commission on Writing for America’s Families, Schools, and Colleges, 2003, 2004, 2005; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000).

It is claimed that audio feedback positively influences on students, and its feedback in high school writing instruction is promising; although teachers in both user groups recommended Kaizena to their colleagues, they showed resistance because the complexity of the technology was unpleasant to some instructors. Although, some research on audio feedback and the results of that study indicated that audio feedback should be applied more because it is a beneficial tool for giving detailed, personal, dialogic feedback to students, and it might reduce teachers’ grading workloads and improve their self-efficacy as writing instructors, which in turn could improve student writing.

Before concluding, it is important to define what Kaizena is. This is a tool that teachers utilize to give feedback to students’ work, which was digitally submitted. This can be written or audio feedback. At the same time, teachers can post comments on students’ submissions. The use of technology, nowadays, can help teachers with the grading workloads as stated before, which may be time-consuming and tiring.
This study sounds good and promising because both teachers and students may benefit from it. However, as the researcher stated, some teachers felt reluctant to apply this tool to their daily performance because they are not so familiar with technological breakthroughs or they are not used to it.

Maruzzela Ysabel Beltrán Centurión (2017), Applying the 6+1 Trait Writing Model as an effective strategy to improve English as a Foreign Language students’ writing skills at the Language Department of Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Peru.

This piece of research is aimed to demonstrate that the 6 + 1 Trait Writing Model, a method created in the USA to plan, deliver instruction and assess primary school student writing in the mother tongue, is also an effective tool to improve the writing skills of English students as a Foreign Language at the Language Department of Universidad Nacional de Trujillo, Peru.

The study involved 48 EFL students who were enrolled in the Intermediate English Language course; half of them were intervened by means of a 20-hour workshop based on this analytic model and the seven traits that characterize quality writing to finally produce the data. After the instruction, analysis of results and interpretation of findings, it has been found that all participants reached some improvement which was gradual but steady.

At the beginning of the intervention, this upgrade was quite slow and not very significant but it tended to be higher as the participants continued to produce written material. On the other hand, analyzing particular writing traits has been especially helpful to determine the components that participants internalized better and therefore had more chance to upgrade.

It was finally concluded that by means of the application of the 6+1 Trait Writing Model EFL students were able to show a better writing performance and therefore improve their writing skills.

Something important to be highlighted here is that the improvement was gradual but steady, which is our goal as teachers; we need to assist our students in improving some skills or knowledge gradually. It is best for students to acquire some know-how when learning and acquiring a foreign language to perform later on their own.

Roberto Alvira (2016), The impact of oral and written Feedback on EFL writers with the use of Screencasts, Universidad de La Sabana, Chía, Colombia.
This study focuses on what impact coded, oral, and written feedback has with the use of screencasts in relation to the improvement of paragraph writing of EFL students at B1 level. The participants of the study came from different academic programs at a private Colombian university.

At university level, it is important for teachers to develop strategies to give feedback appropriately to students; this feedback should make students to develop higher thinking skills for them to improve their writing skills since this is necessary for language development. Some valid research has stated that the poorer writing skills students have, the more dropouts exist in Colombia. Olave-Arias, Rojas-García, and Cisneros- Estupiñán (2013) talk about this issue, which is related to the level of development in reading and writing, and emphasize on reading and writing practices that caused learning difficulties. Nevertheless, Córdoba, Grinstajn, and Suárez (2009) refer it to the lack of student literacy as the origin of student dropout.

The aspect described above is really worrying since the result of good pieces of writing such as paragraphs or essays comes from the knowledge students have acquired when learning to write in the first language.

Giving feedback on writing plays an important role in the teaching of writing skills as it does in all educational fields. To support this position, Phil Race claims that feedback is fundamental in all kind of learning situations (Race, 2001). Through the web 2.0 tool used in this study, the instructor gave students feedback by using a video of the students' writings and to make a voice recording to help in the provision of feedback. The usage of this strategy contributed significantly to this study since it offers promising possibilities for instructors in EFL and ESL contexts for improving the quality of their teaching practice in terms of providing feedback on writing.

The question that served as a guide to this study was: What is the impact of coded written feedback, within the context of process writing and with researcher-student short oral feedback using screencasts, on the improvement of writing narrative?

As the author mentions students improved their writing skills through the creation of screencast so that in the attempt to do this task almost perfectly, they acquired lexis that was beyond their level, revised different tenses and fostered their creativity eagerly and freely due to the teacher’s given flexibility.
Giving students pace and freedom for the creation of their drafts with the addition of feedback seems to always work; thus they may work on their own. The use of coded feedback to review their pieces of writing made students autonomous and self-editors after some practice. It can be agreed that students, who write well in their L1, can do it in L2 since they transfer their writing skills in any other language.

Víctor Del Águila-Pinto (2016), Improving Learners’ Fluency through the Implementation of Creative Writing in the EFL Classroom, Master’s in education in Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Piura - Peru.

The purpose of the research was to provide some understanding related to the application of creative writing activities in the EFL classroom in order for students to enhance their fluency in English. All of the content is about a wide range of data, encompassing the explanation of the action research, the identification of the problem and the proposal of the hypothesis, as well as an assortment of sample activities and conclusions.

It involves a qualitative investigation type because it is mainly based on the depiction and the observation of the problem and remedy; the inductive outline was also used.

According to the methodology being used, it involves an interpretive qualitative investigation. Besides, it is an action investigation since it has as an aim to improve the educational practice.

His sample was divided in two groups the experimental and the control one. They came from four classes he was assigned; each group had 25 students. Two groups were chosen for the control group, and the other two groups served for the implementation of the proposal. That is, fifty students helped him to prove that creative writing activities led to language fluency.

Through his study, he could confirm that the advantages of promoting creative writing overrides its disadvantages. For instance, students were able to acquire a large copious. This was verified through the comparison between the written essays from the participants of the control group and the ones who belong to the experimental one.

Additionally, as a result, his students learned how to write creative stories using lexis that went far from their level, which made them use the dictionary to see words that were not part from lexicon so they took risks due to their freedom and flexibility of their imagination when writing; they also were able to master the four basic skills (speaking,
listening, reading and writing) along with vocabulary, spelling, pronunciation, language awareness, critical thinking and literary appreciation. His learners was able to work with grammar aspects such as grammar forms and verb tenses including syntax and phrases, which permit them to communicate thoughts in a coherent way.

The aspect described above has a lot in common with the present study since through indirect feedback my students also improved their task completion, language and grammar, layout and mechanics.

Finally, the author claims that writing does not have to be serious. On the contrary, it promotes a lot of fun especially when students use their imagination to create situations as well as amusement when performing situations in front of the class.

After reading the five passages described above coming from national and international contexts, it is intended to prove that there is evidence to propose that the use of some kind of feedback in class always brings improvements on students’ writing skills at different levels of education. Students felt in some way motivated that they could learn from their mistakes and enhance their pieces of writings to some extent.
Chapter 2
Theoretical framework

1. English language teaching

In the past years, the term “English as a lingua franca” (ELF) has evolved as a way to refer to communication in English among speakers with different L1s taking notice that one out of every four users of the target language around the world is a native speaker of it (Crystal, 2003, p. 1-11), most non-native speakers use English as a means of communication. Something peculiar in ELF contexts is that, in the majority of cases, English is ‘a contact language’ among people who share neither a common mother tongue nor a national culture, and have the necessity to choose English as a means of communication since it is one of the most spoken language around the world (Firth, 1996, p. 237-259).

1.1. Importance of the English language. Nowadays, people’s perception of our has changed due to new era of information, technology and globalization since they see it as a smaller place, in which a person who is able to communicate in more than one language since companies need its staff to be qualified to do so (Naves and Muñoz, 2000, p.10-11).

So, we can say that it is crucial for a person to master the target language and if this person is not prepared to use English properly is considered illiterate. It is then alleged that English has become the key which opens many locks all over the world because it is the tool for interacting with different people from other countries.

Therefore, many people around the world might be able to perform simple dialogues by using English as a means of communication, especially in hotels, restaurants, airlines and transportation fields. Almost without exception no language had been so popular before. According to Steeter, (2011), English is considered the language of international communication. This fact can be corroborated by the use of English in most books and by people from different backgrounds speaking English in international academic conferences or congresses.

1.2. Competences for the English language. The four capabilities that a learner needs to master are speaking, listening, reading and writing, which ought to be promoted.
Nowadays, companies look for and expect employees or applicants to communicate in the target language through different mechanisms such as technological tools. Students who can reach good command of the target language are qualified to understand and have access to the most recent technological and scientific advances or information whether printed or digital. If students belong to this group, they are definitely more eligible to excel from the rest.

Writing, one of these capabilities was the subject of this study, which is writing. According to Penny Ur, writing is used to convey thoughts in words and exchange information by the use of signs or figures, which you need to identify. To develop this skill (writing), it is necessary for students to acquire the essential abilities to make sentences, paragraphs or essays using mental skills. Likewise, cultured people can produce in their own language.

2. Writing purposes

Jeremy Harmer (Harmer, 2004, p. 7-9) mentions three main categories of learning, which have to do with this study:

**English as a Second Language (ESL)** - this phrase described students who live in the target language context and need English to interact in their everyday lives. For instance, new immigrants and refugees would have the necessity to be involved in some specific and simple tasks such as the ability to fill in forms, or write different types of letters or short notes. Therefore, they need to be aware of the different kind of register depending on specific circumstances.

**English for Specific Purposes (ESP)** - currently most students study English for particular aims. For instance, people who are going to work as doctors or nurses, in the USA, might study medical English. Depending on the field, others who are going to study at an English-medium university need to concentrate on English Academic Purposes (EAP). Students studying business management might focus on commerce and management, and so forth.

When choosing task and topics, they should not only develop students’ general language competence, but also be relevant to their reason for study. For instance, writing assignments for business students can have a high validity if they can discriminate among the different kinds of letters and documents that they will write along their professional
life. Besides, if nurses in training are asked to write up a simulated patient record in their English class, they will appreciate the value of such a task.

**English as a Foreign Language (EFL)** – this aspect applies to students who learn English at schools and institutes in their own places or country or people who are transitory visitors in the English-speaking country. Sometimes those needs are not as specific as the ones mentioned above.

Most of the time, it is feasible to figure out what students’ needs are or will be. Nonetheless, it is almost impossible to make a list of them, so making a list of general aims is easier. Regarding adult students, it is difficult to choose writing assignment that are pertinent to a group whose occupations, backgrounds and expectation are varied and different. Nonetheless, it can be provided different kinds of tasks that might meet the students’ expectations in an individual way.

These purposes depict some of our students’ purposes to study English after they graduate from the university. Some really would like to live in English speaking countries and others would love to study a career. And the people, who remain in our country and have the chance to work in the multinational companies, need to master the target language by using not only the productive skills but also the receptive skills. Employees communicate and interact business strategies with other foreign employees where the company has branches.

2.1. **Productive skills.** According to Harmer (1998) “The productive skills of writing and speaking are different in many ways. However, there are several language production processes which should be gone through whichever medium we are working in” (p. 246).

In terms of writing, it should comply both coherence and cohesiveness. Coherence writing happens when the sequence of ideas and points are easy to follow. A piece of writing is coherent if it makes sense. Regarding the structuring discourse, “we try to structure our discourse in such a way that it could be understood by our listeners or readers” (Harmer, 1998, p. 247).

In these cases, ‘chains of reference’ are used. For instance, we can use some language features such as pronouns, lexical repetition, and synonym to replace or refer to ideas that have already been said or expressed. We can also use various linkers such as connectors that will be assessed in this research.
2.1.1. Following the rules. It is easy to speak and convey meaning for people who share similar or the same cultural and linguistic backgrounds since they are aware of the rules of conventional conversations in their own language and culture. (Harmer, 1998, p. 247).

Now when they communicate in written form they follow certain rules, which are not recorded anywhere, and they aren’t easy to define either. But with the help of our shared schemata, people can communicate with one another well. Turow (2014) said that we have to be familiar with the current agreements and we can express something in our own ways respecting the language’s covenants.

Writing has conventions that need to be identified, followed or purposefully broken. When production of writing arises, we need to be skillful enough to negotiate those rules in a good way.

2.1.2. Dealing with difficulty. When writers or speakers struggle trying to understand the meaning of words or do not remember them, they might use some strategies to solve those difficulties by improvising (try phrases or words that hopefully can be right), discarding (words that are not attainable to express what someone wants to say); foreignising (when words are used in other languages people know well); paraphrasing (using different words to say something said before). (Harmer, 1998, p. 249).

Of course, some of those strategies are more relevant than others. Our role as instructors is to encourage their learners to paraphrase and improvise more often than using the other techniques.

2.2. Productive skills in the classroom. When written production occurs, students have an opportunity to use different kind of language in a variety of genre that they might use on some real life experiences, not precisely inside their classrooms (Gower, Phillips & Walters, 1995, p. 113).

As students produce some oral language, they should communicate until they convey some meaning. So language drills are not so effective to develop productive skills. In a similar way, when students are asked to write sentences to practice grammar and put in
practice specific grammar rules or some other valid reasons, but those exercises do not help students develop writing skills.

Moreover, skill training is not always communicative since it may involve a lot of teaching intervention. This kind of activity is often controlled so there is correction of punctuation, or any other type of feedback. Production of written tasks are advantageous practices since teachers and students evidently can see how well things are being done. It is crucial for teachers to assign freer tasks, so that it can be evaluated to what extent the language learning program is being successful. (Harmer, 2001, p. 10-11).

3. **Reception and production**

   According to Jeremy Harmer, the teaching of productive skills is closely related to receptive skills since they are involved harmoniously to each other.

   **Output and input:** the process of acquisition occurs when a student is able to produce some language and see how it develops so the output becomes input.

   So, that input of feedback can come from different sources such as ourselves, whether we can be language learners or not. We can also obtain feedback from people we are talking to. We might even modify what we jot down as we acquire effective writing skills.

   Of course, teachers may also provide feedback, not only when pieces of work are finished, but also feedback is given along the writing process since they (as resource teachers or prompters) offer support continuously.

![Figure 2. Relationship between input and output](image)

The circle of input and output (Harmer, 2011, p. 251)
This relationship between input and output is consigned in Figure 1, which depicts how students’ production can be influenced by many sources. The output becomes input, which is modified and improved, and is shown in students’ pieces of writing, through which students acquire and internalize language, so their drafts become better and better.

- **Texts and models:** specifically at schools and institutes in which students are exposed to different genres, it is crucial to provide models for them as a guide. If they are to write descriptions of a chapter, scene they like, they need to be shown models for them to follow and analyze their style and structure.

  Imitation of some productive work is not a good idea. On the contrary, students are effectively assessed if they are given some examples since they can see and analyze certain conventions and based on that they can produce language appropriately.

- **Texts as stimuli:** most of the language production work comes from the content or text students see or hear. A piece of narrative can be based on a controversial reading description.

- **Reception as a part of production:** in most of the circumstances, production can develop from the practice of receptive skills. In writing production, most of what we often write is dependable on what we read. Letters often need to be replied after they are written, and e-mail talks look like spoken dialogues.

  Reception and production are strongly linked to each other so teachers should not get students to practice skills separately, even if that thing could happen.

- **Production enables reception:** making students do productive skill work promotes students to improve their receptive skills. For instance, students can put into practice their understanding from reading activities into their writing work.

### 3.1. Problems and solutions

It is true students struggle to communicate in written form because they find it difficult, whose reasons are varied. Nonetheless, teachers can help them be successful regarding this task. First of all, the tasks we give them must be at the same level of their knowledge of the language. That is, teachers should be aware that students might be not capable enough to succeed in doing well.

Next, it is vital for the learners to know where they are going (the aim of the lesson or task). They need to be guided to cultivate writing habits since they are not accustomed to write unconsciously. It is a good idea for teachers to enhance confidence in students by
giving controlled task first before giving them freer tasks. Finally, teachers need to find solutions to the problems that may arise by the language learners need, and the difficulties which the topic or the genre might cause.

3.2. **Language.** Learners who are involved in a productive task might become very disappointed whenever they just do not have enough words or grammar structures they need to convey meaning in writing. At times, they can feel the necessity to look up language they would like to use, which may make the writing process difficult to deal with.

It is necessary to follow some steps for making students achieve this goal successfully:

- **Supply key language:** before students get involved in a written task, we might check their understanding of novel vocabulary and assist them with phrases or questions that might be helpful for the task – e.g. the writing of a short note. It is necessary that students go on their own pace before asking them to use some new language in communicative activities so soon.

- **Plan activities in advance:** planning is really crucial because students acquire the language at their own pace before they use it fluently. This plan also help them to absorb the language as they could do it at an early age.

  Production activities whose aim to be communicative are not just practice tasks. Speakers and writers need to develop a strategy in which they get involved in kind of language problems in communication. So that, they can find ways of saying things even though they do not have the language they need at hand.

3.3. **Topic.** The topics we propose must be in accordance of the taste of students. On the other hand, they might not be able to spend their time on some kind of language production. These topics should be meaningful enough. If they are not familiar with the genre we ask them to write, they might find it difficult to be involved or interested in the task.

  If they know what they are to write about, they will succeed in complying the task easily. Unfortunately, most of the time they feel forced to write about themes they are not familiar with.
Production activities are not successful when students have language limitations because themes or genres are not interesting enough to learners or sometimes they do not have the sufficient information. Nonetheless, we can avoid that situation by:

- **Choose interesting topics:** it is important to find out the kind of tasks that interest the members of the class. Through questionnaires, we might know students’ favorite topics.

- **Create interest in the topic:** teachers can arise creativity by speaking about the topic and communicating it with enthusiasm. Before any activity begins, students can be asked to think what they may say or write about the topic; learners might also be given the chance to come up with opinions about the topic.

- **Activate schemata:** it is important to give learners enough time to activate their previous knowledge, or show them examples of typical notes, letters or excerpts, before instructors ask them to write one by themselves.

- **Vary topics:** it is also crucial to use a variety of topics for learners so that they get involved and interested in the class.

- **Provide necessary information:** when instructors plan a writing task they need to figure out which information is relevant for the task and give it to our students before they begin any writing task. It is not appropriate to ask them to write a report if they do not get the necessary facts at their disposal.

4. **The writing skill**

4.1. **The writing process.** Garner and Johnson (1997) describe the steps of the writing procedure:

Writing is a natural process created by writers as they work. For successful writers, it is easy to move back and forth between the steps of the writing process in a conscious and unconscious way. Young ones, on the other hand, rely on the security and structure of the writing process (p. 70).

Ron White (1993) claims that the writing process consists of three basic pros: planning, drafting and revising. Planning is a set of strategies designed to produce and find information. In writing, we plan in an organized process, whose aim is a desire product. At this point, the author builds basic level of a topic that ought to rely on the writer’s experience, knowledge, and ideas.
Drafting refers to the use of a series of strategies to develop and organize a continuous piece of writing. Here, the author might improve and explore his/her idea. It also focus on spelling, punctuation, and grammar.

Revising is a series of strategies arranged to re-evaluate and re-examine the choices that have created a piece of writing. The revising ideally occurs after some getting feedback, which is important to tell which phrases, words or sentences should need correction. Revising writing can start when the author make decisions about how to improve his/her piece of writing, be able to look at his/her writing from a different perspective, and picking places where his/her writing might be clearer, more interesting, more informative and more convincing to the reader.

The description of each stage is shown as follows:

**Pre-writing.** In this stage, students can be involved in some activities such as reading, brainstorming, mind mapping, discussing, fast writing, questioning, and interviewing. It is important to encourage them before they write sentences in their first draft. Brainstorming is a typical pre-writing activity in the process approach according to the topic being provided. So, students would get motivated to write since they might feel that they have something to say that matters.

**Drafting.** In this stage, students have the opportunity to pick among ideas during pre-writing and structure. The result of brainstorming session provides a plan of description of the topic. Authors can jot down the content without considering the grammatical aspect first so the content is more important than the language form.

**Revising.** In this stage, the students have the chance to review a draft to revise organization and content depending on the feedback from him or herself, from the instructor, or from peers. In this step, authors might polish their style and develop their ideas. In this stage, the instructor helps students, through the revision, to shape and reshape the text into final form. It is also focused more on mood, audience, length, consciousness, voice, clarity, and completeness.

**Editing.** In this step, writers apply instructors’ feedback and students revise their final texts to improve some mistakes related to spelling, punctuation, grammar, and all
presentation. Editing for grammar might be classified: editing at discourse level, sentence level and word level.

4.2. Process and product. According to Jeremy Harmer in Chapter 18 of his book The Practice of English Language Teaching, Third Edition, the writers that concentrate on the process approach are involved in the objective of the task and the final product. However, others like to follow the process approach which helps students go through some different stages such as pre-writing phases, editing, re-drafting and finally publishing their work, which makes learners use different skills.

When working with the process approach, we can talk about the concept of first and final drafts with learners and the same time we can also ask them whether the following activities can take place, in the first or final steps:

a. Check language use (grammar, vocabulary, linkers).
b. Check punctuation (and layout).
c. Check spelling.
d. Check writing for unnecessary repetition.
e. Decide on the information for each paragraph, and the order of the paragraphs.
f. Note down various ideas.
g. Select the best ideas for inclusion.
h. Write a clean copy of the corrected version.

As everybody knows, the writing procedure is not so easy, and the steps of drafting, reviewing, redrafting and writing, etc. are performed in a recursive way; we can go back and forwards among the steps mentioned before.

5. Assessment

5.1. Assessment and testing. The term assessment can sometimes be misunderstood in a normal educational practice. You may think that ‘assessing’ and ‘testing’ can be synonyms, but actually, they are not.

Assessment is said to be “appraising or estimating the level or magnitude of some attribute of a person”. In terms of educational practice, assessment is a continuous procedure that involves a vast range of methodological approaches or techniques. Any
written work, such as a simple phrase or word, is judged by the author, instructor or by other peers.

Tests, on the other hand, belong to assessment, a genre of assessments techniques. They are administrative procedures that happen at specific times in a syllabus or curriculum. It happens when learners put together all their faculties and knowledge to perform in the best way, knowing that their answers are being scored and evaluated.

In scientific terms, a test is way to measure a person’s ability, knowledge, or performance in each section. The definition has some components. A test is a method. It’s also an instrument—a set of procedures, items or techniques—that requires good performance on the part of the person who takes the test. For a test to be valid, the method must be structure and explicit: a writing prompt with a scoring rubric.

Some tests measure general ability, whereas others focus on very specific competences or objectives. Grading products in class might vary from instructors. Tests like writing notes, responding to e-mails, or simply writing paragraphs related to some topics are depicted with a grade and some comments, which sometimes are not so nice. Other grades are some individual grades to get the average grade, score or mark. The instrument has to be well-designed to be valid and measurable.

Next, a test normally calculates with a number a participant’s knowledge, ability, or performance. Instructors need to know who the test-takers are. They also need to know their previous experiences and background. They need to wonder if the exam appropriately matches to test-takers’ abilities and decipher the scores or marks,

Test-takers perform to demonstrate their abilities regarding linguistics, ability that can be demonstrated according to their knowledge and competence of the target language.

Finally, an exam depicts to what extent an individual master something. For instance, if a proficiency test is taken, the individual demonstrate just a sampling of a skill. Nonetheless, when the topic is domain this is taken in a general way since this test-taker demonstrate all skills of a language. Other exams might include more specific criteria. A vocabulary test might consider only the set of words covered in a single unit.

To construct or design a test well, it had better measure an individual’s ability that involves a domain. This task is not so easy since it requires science and art
5.2. **Assessment and learning.** The difference depends on your perspective. For optimal learning, learners must be free to experience, to assume how they learn the target language by themselves without feeling disappointed if some judgment arises regarding the emergence of errors or mistakes. Teaching should provide different kinds of input in class such as listening activities, or others related to critical thinking, and situations to recycle the language or skills in such a way as to being able to master the language little by little.

Likewise, during these practice activities, instructors must be good observers to see learners’ performance to get good, give qualitative feedback and suggest some strategic resources. Ideally, instructions should be provided based on the instructor’s deeply observation to learners.

Our discussion of all these overlapping concepts is represented in the following diagram showing the interrelationships among testing, measurement, assessment, teaching and evaluation.

![Evaluation model Tests, measurement, assessment, teaching and evaluation](image)

*Figure 3. Evaluation model Tests, measurement, assessment, teaching and evaluation
Source: (Brown, H & Abeywickrama., P., 2010, p. 6)*

6. **Error**

Both Second Language Acquisition and composition scholars have examined and even challenged the notion of “error” at various points in time. For example, in a classic SLA piece, Corder (1967) stated that making mistakes or errors is part of the process of learning a language, which can be compared to the stage children their mother’s tongue. Almost all children live this experience until they become adults so it has to be considered as a natural process (p. 161-170).
In a different line of argument, (Williams, 1981, p. 152-168) writing in a mainstream composition journal asserted that errors are primarily in the eye of the beholder and especially in the mind of writing teachers wielding red pens –in other words, instructors identify errors in student writing because they are looking for them. On the contrary, they have to focus on the context and what they want to communicate since learners eventually improve those mistakes.

Though these lines of argument problematize the notion of error in learners’ writing production and how to study it, most writing instructors, especially those focused on L2 students, would counter them with the following assertions:

a. Though many L2 writing errors may indeed be developmental and may resolve themselves over time and with more exposure to the L2, not all of them will. There is considerable evidence that adult L2 learners may fossilize –get stuck and fail to make progress –without sufficient motivation and opportunity (including feedback and instruction) to do so.

b. While many writing teachers do obsess over relatively minor points such as correct comma placement, to the extent scholars claim that all written error is just in the instructor’s imagination, the argument goes far beyond. L2 student writers do produce non-target constructions that many, if not all, proficient users of the language would not only notice but identify as correct. Further, some of these are global errors, meaning that they interfere with overall text comprehensibility.

Aside from the scholarly viewpoints discussed another issue in defining “error” as it pertains to student writing is a practical one: Teachers themselves may have poorly described even idiosyncratic notions of what constitutes an error in a given text. For example, take the following sentence excerpt in a student paper: “…students try and make their essays sound fancy but end up making them confusing.” It could be argued that “…try to make…” would be correct. However, even though this version sounds more idiomatic and appropriate than the student’s, it is observed that the original construction is not, in fact, grammatically incorrect.

Errors are morphological, syntactic, and lexical forms that deviate from rules of the target language, violating the expectations of literate adult native speakers.
7. **Definition of corrective feedback**

If teachers or instructions want their students to write well and develop creative skills in writing, they had better provide constructive feedback.

Feedback refers to the practice of providing information about students’ writing performance. Penny Ur says that “in the context of teaching, general feedback is information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of the learning task, usually with the objective of improving their performance” (Ur, 1996, p. 50).

Thereby, it can be said that feedback is very a useful tool in the teaching and learning process, besides students will learn how to evaluate themselves. It also helps students to become self-confident about their own learning so that they can improve their performance in writing tasks. When giving feedback, instructors should stimulate continuous writing among students, in order for them to feel satisfied with their writing products and conduct the task until it is finished. Thus, along the writing process, instructors had better motivate learners to re-draft their pieces of writing until they are acceptable to be read.

7.1. **Types of teacher’s feedback.** As stated before, feedback plays a crucial role in the teaching process of a foreign language. Regarding this aspect, instructors realize that their giving feedback to learners is a vital practice in class (Anderson, 1982, p. 369-406). It is stated that without the instructor’s feedback students will not perform well in terms of language usage, organization of ideas and writing improvement.

7.1.1. **Indirect Feedback.** As stated previously, teachers use this strategy to help students figure out their mistakes by pointing out errors but without correcting (e.g. underlining, circling an error or providing codes).

- Lalande (1982) claimed that indirect feedback is more efficacious because it instills reflection and problem-solving, instilling more long-term in writing/self-monitoring ability in learners.
- It is said that for weak proficiency writers in language learning classes, indirect feedback seems to be not so popular since they do not possess they sufficient linguistic elements to employ (Bitchener and Knoch, 2010, p. 405-414).

I agree with these experts since students need to recognize the parts of the speech in a statement in order for them to be able to enhance mistakes or errors circled or underlined.
So this type of feedback has to be chosen for pre-intermediate students, who precisely belonged to the study group.

7.1.2. **Direct feedback.** Direct feedback is defined as an approach to correct learners’ mistakes in an explicit way. This act occurs when the instructor highlights students’ mistakes via comments in a general way, so learners have the chance to remedy what is wrong in their pieces of writing (Ferris and Helt, 2000, p. 11-14).

Direct Feedback is simply the provision of the correct form that is written directly on the learner’s paper, while Indirect Feedback is given in a different way; the instructor points out the mistake or error in an indirect way on the paper. The instructor might underline, highlight or circle it, or may indicate in the margins that an error exists on that line, but without giving the correct form.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) defined it as an assignment that “contains either comments, information or questions related to the well-formedness of the student’s utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form”. Its purpose is to highlight “the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student” (ibid: 47). Lyster and Ranta discovered in their study of French learners taking some immersion courses that this type of feedback was accepted by 86% of the cases studied and learners could improve their writing skills through elicitation and clarification (p. 19-37).

7.1.3. **Unfocused feedback/correction.** Correction that is directed at a wide range of errors that learners make in their writing. It involves correction of all error in a learner’s test, irrespective of their error category.

7.1.4. **Focused feedback/correction.** Correction that is directed at specific, predetermined errors that learners make in their writing. It is focused on a number of specific linguistic features only (i.e. errors in the use of English articles). Errors that are not considered in the assessment are ignored.

7.1.5. **Metalinguistic feedback.** It is an approach that teachers use when giving feedback to students’ writing by using comments, information, or questions related to the
correctness of student’s utterance without providing the correction—also some terms used as in the examples below.

S: I am here since January.

T: Nice to hear that, but remember it is an activity that started in the past and continues up to the present, so we use the present perfect.

S: We see a movie yesterday.

T: This is an activity that occurred in the past. What is the past tense of see? It is an irregular verb.

7.2. Importance of Error Feedback

7.2.1. Feedback helps students revise and edit their texts: Some studies were performed to observe the error feedback on some writing drafts and with the help of them it is found that this practice assist learners in improving their accuracy. Nonetheless, some judgment on this issue came up since accuracy could happen during some periods but not for long periods.

7.2.2. Feedback leads to accuracy gains over time: In recent years, many researchers have taken up Truscott’s challenge to study the effects of corrective feedback on written accuracy over time (i.e. on new texts rather than only revised ones). If a controlled quasi-experimental approach with an entry exam and exit exams design and it is only framed to various discrete categories (e.g., definite and indefinite articles), learners getting error feedback did better than those who got no feedback on both entry exams and exit exams.

7.2.3. Students and Teachers Value Error Feedback: As noted by several researchers, students value teacher feedback on their errors and think that it helps them to improve their writing. Truscott anticipated this argument and responded that “students believe in correction but that does not mean that teachers should give it to them” and that teachers should, rather than giving in to this student desire, help them adjust to the absence of grammar correction.

However, given the unquestioned (even by Truscott) strength of student demand for error correction, the possible harm to student motivation and confidence in their instructors
may far outweigh any possible damage that could come to them from providing error feedback.

Most teachers of L2 writer instructors know that were they to refuse to give any error feedback or grammar instruction, it would cause a rift between them and their students. This potential negative skills is not one that may be dismissed lightly nor overcome easily.

In addition to the strongly held views of student writers, the fact is that most instructors in the usefulness of error feedback and provide it consistently to their students. This is true even though researchers and theorists in both SLA and composition studies have been questioning the practice for decades. According to Santa (2006), he noted with some lack of understanding teachers’ “obstinate response to error in students’ pieces of writing” in his monograph hints the history of error treatment in composition,

Santa’s observation is supported by a range of recent studies of teachers’ feedback practices, all of which clearly demonstrate that today’s classroom instructors remain committed to providing error feedback (among other things) to their student writers. If teachers are providing feedback to their student writers, perhaps it is most important for researchers to turn their primary attention to discovering the most effective ways for them to do so (Hartshorn, 2010, p. 44, 84-109).

8. **Written accuracy is important in the real world**

Instructors must work at looking for best ways to help their students become “independent self-editors” on a personal basis (Bates et al., 1993). Instructors are not going to be present when learners face the real world. Learners’ accuracy is crucial when conveying some messages; there is no place for misunderstanding or inadequacy of the language usage or meaning.

It is responsibility of instructors to aid learners in intake of knowledge, strategies, and resources to be able to perform well and be accurate outside the class (Gray-Rosendale, 1998, p. 43-75). Although it is necessary to continue doing some research to achieve the goals described lines above, it may be clear that if instructor feel like not continuing with this practice, learners would not be able to self-edit or be accurate in the foreign language.
9. The role of the instructor providing indirect feedback on students’ writing

It is not possible for students to write by themselves since it is not just a step, but is a procedure, in which they need to be guided and assessed to improve their pieces of writing. So, someone needs to check their mistakes. This correction could come from the teacher or from a peer because writing usually involves two people. We need to keep in mind that somebody needs to read another student’s piece of writing to see if this somebody can make his ideas across.

Before students are able to do some peers’ feedback, which is more advantageous, the instructor’s feedback should be done as a whole class. Students first need to be involved in some individual writing practice. At this stage, the instructor can be a describer when giving assessment. But before that, the instructor had better be reader and advisor for them.

For instructors to give feedback effectively, they need to understand students’ errors and act as facilitators rather than impose critical judgment on learners’ writing production (Ferris, 2002).

Instructors can provide self-correction opportunities for their students providing indirect feedback on students’ grammatical errors (Chandler, 2003, p. 12, 267-296). The feedback given by the teacher should not be focused on just taking this practice as a test, the last stage of the writing process. The marking or score of final products should always open more opportunities for students to be able to redraft their work. If this chance is not given, authors might not have the opportunity to correct the wrong behavior and re-practicing the correct behavior.

Additionally, through the practice described above, students may be able to convey their ideas more clearly and to have a clear idea about any comments that teachers have provide in their pieces of writing, because the teacher, acting as advisor, might help them improve their drafts.

Glossary

Kaizena: is an online tool that permits the instructor to facilitate different types of feedback, which includes voice recording, text comments, rating students’ skills, and attaching files. Through this platform, students might respond directly to the teacher’s feedback, which becomes a conversation rather than just a one-sided learning experience.
Language and vocabulary: refers to the correct use of structures and a good range of vocabulary according to the level.

Layout: refers that the writer complies with all the requirements for the type of text. The numbers of words are appropriate.

Mechanics: refers to the correct use of spelling and punctuation as well as connectors.

Task completion: Refers to how well the writer keeps the information in a logical sequence and a clear, well-focused topic.
Chapter 3
Methodology of the investigation

1. Type of the investigation

The type of this investigation is quantitative, and has a descriptive level with a quasi-experimental design.

A descriptive research was chosen because it describes how the study was done, at the same time it quantifies the relation between the variables, in this case the use of indirect feedback in essays with the development of the production of pieces of writing from English language students in English III at San Ignacio de Loyola university.

Regarding the approach, the quantitative one was utilized since as mentioned by Gomez (2009); it practices the collection and examination of data, which replies to research questions and test hypotheses formerly established.

2. Design of the investigation

The design of this investigation is quasi-experimental because it intends to observe the resulting effects of the manipulation of the independent variable over the dependent one. For this purpose, both an Entry Written Test and an Exit Written Test are administered. For this design, two groups were used, a Control Group and an Experimental Group. These designs are used for already established groups, such as groups that make up the sample of this research (Bernal, C. 2006). The level of this research is descriptive-correlational.

There are three reasons why this technique was applied: a) to find out if students had improved their writing skills and organization; and, b) to perceive if they were able to correct their own work in the consecutive drafts task completion, grammar and vocabulary, layout and mechanics and c) to find out which approach (direct or indirect feedback) is likely more suitable to correct students’ pieces of writing.

The Entry Test (Appendix 1) and the Exit Test (Appendix 2) were used to compare to what extent students had improved their task completion, grammar and vocabulary, layout and mechanics. Samples for Entry Test are found in Appendices a) & b) and for the Exit Test are stated in the Appendices a) & b). In the appendices 3a), b), c) and d), samples of sequence of drafts of the experimental group are consigned.

The type of this investigation is quantitative, and has a descriptive level with a quasi-experimental design.
Where:

$O_1$: Entry test

$X$: Treatment (Indirect feedback).

$O_2$: Exit test

$-$: No treatment

### 3. Population and study sample

#### 3.1. Universe.

The investigation is held at San Ignacio de Loyola University in Lima-Peru, which is a private university that is part of a group of educational institutions founded in 1995 by Raúl Diez Canseco, former Peruvian Vice President, along with an institute and two schools.

Its Undergraduate Program is made up by four schools and twenty-six majors, though it does have a Graduate Program. USIL is strongly focused on entrepreneurship and hospitality management, consistent with its mission statement, which is "to shape competent entrepreneurial professionals who are socially responsible and capable of performing successfully, both domestically and internationally".

There are different schedules for undergraduate students, whose ages range from 16 to 23 years old. Each class consists of 18 to 20 students. There were 980 students that belonged to the course, English III when this study was performed.

#### 3.2. Population.

In this study, there are two main populations: Teachers and students.

By students, it is referred to those who enrolled in English III of Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola, located in La Molina, Lima. They came from different programs and were gathered in groups of 20 people according to their level of English. They take the English course as part of the curriculum of each career. The total amount of the students was 82.
On the part of teachers, it is included those who are in charge of the English courses from English I to English VI. They have a curriculum to teach the course and have to follow a semester curricula, which contains a specific content and use specific strategies and techniques to attain the class objectives. The techniques and strategies used are mainly to develop communicative competence. The selected sample was divided into two groups:

Experimental Group: 2 classes 3K2M and 3Q2T, which received the writing process program (34 students).

Control Group: 2 classes 3D1M and 3D2M, which did not receive the writing process program (34 students).

The students belonged to a medium and high socio-economic level and their ages range from 17 to 22 years old. There also students who belonged to an academic scholarship program supported by the Peruvian government: “Beca 18 students”. All students studied English in different levels from English I to English VI. They must reach B2 English proficiency by the time they finish English VI.

Evaluation is based on quizzes and exams for the four skills. Normally there are 4 written quizzes, one mid-term exam, and a final exam every semester. Continuous assessment is the second big component based on class participation, classwork and homework. Bilingual courses (career courses taught in English), start from English IV on. There are several courses now ranging from electives to mandatory major courses.

Classes were heterogeneous. In relation to language proficiency and knowledge, for example, the control group seemed to be a little stronger than the experimental group. Additionally, there could be students who were not at the same level as their peers. Individual and levels of proficiency was varied since not all of them learned at the same pace, so some students could be able to repeat the semester.

The book has a component called My Total English Lab that helps students get additional practice, progress tests and automatic gradebook.

4. Research questions

• How to verify if students are improving their writing skills through the four categories considered in the study?

• How to gather information regarding the kind of feedback my colleagues use for correcting students’ pieces of writing?
• How can be known if students feel indirect feedback is suitable for them when correcting their drafts?

5. Variables

A variable is "every phenomenon considered in function of one of its characteristics that can take different values in accordance with a defined system of classification: age, sex, intellectual coefficient, social stratum, method of teaching, level of instruction, and so on". (Saville-Troike, M., 2006, p. 113).

They are organized according to the dimension of educational development, compelling as a reference the inclusion of ICT in education, particularly in English by considering two variables:

• Independent Variable: Corrective feedback- Direct & Indirect
• Dependent Variable: Improvement of the writing skills

Indirect feedback was given to the Experimental Group and direct feedback to the Control one. To know to what extent students improved their writing skills in essays, it was necessary to administer an exit test with an appealing topic for them. Additionally, students from both groups wrote three drafts between the entrance and exit exams to be familiar with the technique. Scores from this practice were gathered in a score record.

5.1. Operationalization of variables

A. Operationalization of the variable Corrective Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Conceptual definition</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback is information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of the learning task.</td>
<td>Teacher’s specific comments on students mistakes on an essay.</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Specific comments based on scores given on corrected mistakes made by the student.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
usually with the objective of improving their performance” (Ur, 1996, p. 50).

| Source: own elaboration |

| B. Operationalization of the variable Improvement of Writing Skills. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Conceptual definition</th>
<th>Operational definition</th>
<th>Dimension (Level)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Escale of measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of writing skills</td>
<td>Writing improvement is a process in which a student has to improve his/her spelling, grammar, word choice spelling and fluency in order to get a good organization of ideas to transmit a message in written form Cercia (2019).</td>
<td>Progress made by students when writing an essay in terms of the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, layout, and mechanics.</td>
<td>Very low Low Regular Good Very good</td>
<td>Final score obtained after evaluating task completion, language and vocabulary, layout, and mechanics</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own elaboration

6. Techniques and instruments for gathering of data

6.1. Techniques. As the research model is a quasi-experimental design, it considers the field technique which consists of direct observation of the research study. The following techniques were considered to gather data in order to measure the learners’ achievement in following the writing process properly.

The following techniques were used: a survey for teachers (see Appendix 5) and a survey for students given indirect feedback (see Appendix 6).
Data for this analysis was collected through the EFL Writing Class taught at San Ignacio de Loyola University in Lima during the first term in 2014. Students were evaluated using the criteria for the Preliminary English Test (PET), a Cambridge Exam. Once they passed the exam, they needed to master the basics of English and had practical language skills for everyday use. Therefore, they were assessed to write letters and emails on everyday subjects, activities that are provided by the book. Nonetheless, during the semester and for this study, students were encouraged to improve their writing skills by rewriting their drafts twice.

6.2. **Instruments for gathering of data.** A quantitative method was used to obtain the necessary information. In this case, 2 essays were used as part of the Entry and Exit test. The following sections describe the setting, participants’ written program and the Entry and Exit written essays.

Entry written test: To diagnose students’ knowledge regarding writing skills.

Score record: To monitor students’ drafts (2 pieces) along the study of the Experimental, whose samples are stated on the Appendix 3a), b), c) and d).

Exit written test: To verify to what extent students improve their writing skills regarding word order, vocabulary, spelling, use of punctuation and connectors.

Observation: Checklists to monitor the process of indirect feedback regarding the writing of drafts (Appendices 6, a) were first designed and then used by the instructor to observe learners’ progress in the experimental group.

In assessing students’ writing quality, five components are suggested: task completion, language and vocabulary, layout and mechanics according to the rubrics given by the university.

The content of writing tasks must be in accordance to assigned topic. Organization of writing has to be clearly supported, and logical sequencing. Vocabulary of writing must be effective regarding word choice, and usage. Regarding language use (grammar) in writing activities, students will create sentences based on ideas, and the words in the sentences must be arranged grammatically appropriate, dealing with the tenses and verb agreement. The last aspect is related to the use of mechanics, which consists of spelling and punctuation as well as the use of connectors, which help students to link ideas.
In this study, some aspects were focused in the content of students’ writing production as mentioned above. Nonetheless, students were encouraged to organize their ideas, be careful with the layout and be logical when writing; students were advised that they should write for others and these others need to understand what they wanted to communicate.

All the instruments were validated by the Dr. Mary Vásquez, professor at the Universidad Mayor de San Marcos.

6.2.1. Participants’ written program. The study took place during one semester (2014). Both the Experimental and Control group had English lessons twice a week, two (2) hours each lesson, a total of four (4) hours of English instruction per week. I used the last 8 weeks to perform the study.

The fourth week, both groups took the Entry written test, and were given their results.

After that, the Experimental Group (EG) was prompted to use the writing codes on their different pieces of writing. They needed to know what each symbol meant for them to improve their drafts for the next class. Students had to reflect on their written mistakes based on the indirect written feedback.

Regarding Control Group (CG); during the next 8 weeks, they just needed to improve their writing drafts with the appropriate words given by the teacher, so that learners were able to correct their mistakes according to the direct written feedback given by their educator.

That feedback sometimes had to be done in Spanish most of the time for students to understand better how to improve what they wanted to convey. I also want to point out that there were some comments below their pieces of work, sometimes to add information or clarify some ideas.

6.2.2. Entry and Exit written essays. To know the students’ background and see how they would progress at the end of the study, an entry and an exit tests were administered respectively. The students were graded according to the Standard evaluation for writing at San Ignacio de Loyola University, Rubric for writing (Figure 4). The final scores were obtained from the add-up of the indicators, 20-17 means 5 marks, 16-13 means 4 marks, 12-9 means regular, 8-4 means low and 3-0 means very low.
At San Ignacio de Loyola, it is used different rubrics depending on the course that is taught. In this respect, the indicators stated are task completion, grammar and vocabulary, layout and mechanics.

In the meantime, their drafts were revised twice in order to help students from the experimental group practice improving their drafts using the indirect feedback. Nonetheless, assessment was performed all the time in class for both groups.

7. Procedure

7.1. Procedure for giving indirect feedback. The procedure for the application of indirect feedback is as follows:

a. Teacher explains the descriptive text in general and gives the correction codes to be used in their pieces of writing regarding word order, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and connectors.

b. Teacher provides various samples on how to use codes so that students could be able to work on their own.

c. Teacher provides students a model for them to have an idea on how to organize paragraphs on their texts (taking into consideration: introduction, body and conclusion). Besides, pointing out and working on the five indicators mentioned before.

d. Students draft and the teacher monitors their texts.

e. Students write their drafts.

f. Teacher uses indirect feedback to correct students’ pieces of writing to be more objective.

g. Students rewrite their compositions and correct their own mistakes.

h. Teacher provides grades and praise students’ drafts according to their improvement.

7.2. Sessions and activities for Indirect Feedback and Direct Feedback. The sequence of events listed above was done in order for students to be familiar with the correction codes. First, students took an entry exam to diagnose aspects of the language they needed to develop. The most common mistakes were related to word order, grammar, vocabulary, spelling, punctuation and connectors. Then students were persuaded to rewrite
two drafts. To improve the content of their pieces of writing, they had to recognize the codes and started rewriting a new draft. And finally, they took an exit exam to be compared with the entry exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Experimental Group Indirect Feedback</th>
<th>Control Group Direct Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From March 24th to 28th</td>
<td>Students took the Entry Test and were informed that they would be involved in a research regarding writing</td>
<td>Students took the Entry Test and were informed that they would be involved in a research regarding writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From March 31st to April 4th</td>
<td>Students were explained how they will enhance their writing skills through the use of codes or symbols</td>
<td>Students were told that they needed to improve their drafts just by rewriting their drafts based on the corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From April 21st to 25th</td>
<td>Students rewrote their first draft by using the feedback explained in the previous class</td>
<td>Students rewrote their first draft by using the feedback explained in the previous class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From May 12th to 16th</td>
<td>Students wrote a short paragraph by adding a reason</td>
<td>Students wrote a short paragraph by adding a reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From May 26th to 30th</td>
<td>Students got their drafts and improve them by using the method they were using and following suggestions on completion and organization</td>
<td>Students got their drafts and improve them by using the method they were using and following suggestions on completion and organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From June 9th to 13th</td>
<td>Students are encouraged to write a paragraph about their holidays</td>
<td>Students are encouraged to write a paragraph about their holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From June 30th to July 4th</td>
<td>Students improved their paragraphs by using the feedback they were used to and the teacher’s comments</td>
<td>Students improved their paragraphs by using the feedback they were used to and the teacher’s comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From July 14th to 18th</td>
<td>Students took the Exit Exam</td>
<td>Students took the Exit Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own elaboration
### RUBRICS FOR ASSESSING WRITING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>5 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>0 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK COMPLETION</strong></td>
<td>All requested information is kept in a logical sequence.</td>
<td>One section is missing.</td>
<td>Two sections are missing.</td>
<td>Three sections are missing.</td>
<td>Four sections are missing.</td>
<td>Four or more sections are missing. Student did not do the task as requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE AND VOCABULARY</strong></td>
<td>Correct use of structures and a good range of vocabulary according to the level.</td>
<td>One to three grammar problems. Although they do not impede communication.</td>
<td>Three to five grammar problems. Some of them break down communication.</td>
<td>More than five grammar problems that have negative effect on communication.</td>
<td>Sentences are incomplete. Little use of vocabulary for the task.</td>
<td>Severe grammar problems interfere greatly with the message; reader can't understand what the writer is trying to say. Almost no use of vocabulary for the level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAYOUT</strong></td>
<td>Complies with all the requirements for the type of text. Appropriate number of words.</td>
<td>Satisfactorily complies with almost all the requirements for the type of text. Appropriate number of words.</td>
<td>Complies with almost all the requirements for the type of text. Some information is not in the required format. Appropriate number of words.</td>
<td>Complies with some of the requirements for the type of text. Some information is not in the required format. Too many or too few words</td>
<td>Complies with few of the requirements for the type of text. Information is not in the required format. Too many or too few words</td>
<td>Doesn't comply with less than 75% of the requirements for the type of text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MECHANICS</strong></td>
<td>No spelling or punctuation errors. Good use of connectors.</td>
<td>One spelling or punctuation error. Good use of connectors.</td>
<td>Two spelling or punctuation errors. Some connectors are used.</td>
<td>Three to four spelling or punctuation errors. A few connectors are used.</td>
<td>Four to five spelling or punctuation errors. Limited use of connectors.</td>
<td>More than five spelling or punctuation errors. No use of connectors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20-17 = very good 16-13 = good 12-9 = regular 8-4 = low 3-0 = very low

By using these rubrics, teachers give students grades, which go from 0 (zero) to 20 (twenty), according to the criteria presented above.
From this rubric, we can obtain the following levels for grading essays as shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 – 20</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 13</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 09</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 – 04</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 – 00</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Results

Once data was gathered, it was set up in tables and graphs according to the results of the entry tests and exit tests. For descriptive data analysis, the percentage was used. The procedure was manual and I used the statistical program SPSS version 25.

In this chapter, the results of the entry test are presented (Appendix 1), a score record through the assessment of two (2) drafts of the experimental group, whose samples can be seen in Appendix 3a), b), c), d) and an exit test (see Appendix 2, a) and b) to see some samples) were performed to assess the influence of indirect feedback in academic performance in the acquisition and internalization of students’ language at low intermediate level at San Ignacio Loyola University.

The data obtained from these tests reflect the process along the study: at the beginning, in between and at the end of the control and experimental groups.

1. Results related to indirect feedback

1.1. Perception of students. Table 2 shows the results regarding how useful the use of indirect feedback was to improve their writing skills, in which it is stated that 64.3% of students always recognized the codes, liked using them when rewriting their drafts, instructions and time given to perform the activities were adequate (Appendix 6, a) a sample to see).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totality</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Frequency of the survey (questions 1-5)
1.2. Perception of teachers. When the teachers were asked to what extent it is important to give feedback to their students’ pieces of writing, 57.14% of them give always feedback to students and 42.85% often give feedback to students’ pieces of writing, which is really good since it is a good habit to assist students with the improvement of the command of the target language in order to prevent fossilization and has to be monitored along the learning process (Appendix 5).

### Table 3. Importance of giving feedback to students’ pieces of writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix 5
2. Results of the score record

In order to see the improvement of the use of indirect feedback between the entry and exit exams, there was a score record to have evidence of the practice of the experimental group to enhance their writing skills via the recognition of codes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental group</th>
<th>Draft 1</th>
<th>Draft 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and vocabulary</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows the average of grades on the five different types that students got on the subsequent three drafts between the entry and the exit exams. All of those grades are passing and the improvement was consistent, except the vocabulary indicator.

As mentioned before, word order and vocabulary belong to language and vocabulary section in the rubric used at the university. Language is related to grammar instruction, which is barely described in certain studies. Nonetheless, as noted by Frodesen and Holten (2003), “Even when grammatical features have been covered and practiced, students may not use it accurately in their own writing” (p. 142). (Ferris, D., 2011, p. 40)
As it is observed, the grades go from lower to higher. In the first drafts grades were lower because it was the first time they encountered this kind of feedback; they needed to get accustomed to the use of the codes to correct their mistakes. This fact might be evident in some way because according to longitudinal studies by Lalande (1982), Frantzen (1995) and Ferris (2006) they said that learners who got indirect feedback did better than those who received direct one.

3. Test of hypotheses

In order to know the kind of statistics analysis to be used to test the hypothesis, it is necessary to know if the data comes from a normal distribution or not.

3.1. Test of data normality

Formulating hypotheses:

H₀: The data comes from a normal distribution.

H₁: The data does not come from a normal distribution.

Significance level: 0.05
3.2. Test of hypothesis

Statistical Test:

Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay Control exit</td>
<td>Statistic = 0.235, Df = 34, Sig. = 0.000</td>
<td>Statistic = 0.843, df = 34, Sig. = 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental exit</td>
<td>Statistic = 0.242, Df = 34, Sig. = 0.000</td>
<td>Statistic = 0.886, df = 34, Sig. = 0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Histogram for control exit test scores


**Statement of decision:**

Accept $H_0$: if, $\text{sig (asint)} > \text{sig (0,05)}$

Accept $H_a$: if, $\text{sig (asint)} \leq \text{sig (0,05)}$

**Statistical decision:** The value sig is less than 0,05 then the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The curve tendency is also shown in figures 1 and 2.

**Statistical conclusion:** The data does not come from a normal distribution. Then inferential analysis is done using non-parametric statistics.

### 3.3. Statistical testing of the general hypothesis

**Hypothesis.** “Indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University”.

The statistical test of the hypothesis is made with the Mann-Whitney U test because it works with non-parametric data, two independent samples and the samples are larger than 20. The procedure for the respective contrast of the hypothesis is developed below.

**a) Statistical hypotheses**

$H_0$: Null Hypothesis: The scores obtained in the exit essay of the control and experimental groups are the same.

The score of the exit exam control group = the score of the exit exam experimental group ($H_0: Z \leq Z_{\alpha}$)

$H_a$: Alternate Hypothesis: The scores obtained in the exit essay of the control and experimental groups are different.

The scores obtained in the exit essay of the control group $\neq$ the scores obtained in the exit essay of the experimental group ($H_a: Z > Z_{\alpha}$)

**b) Test statistic.**

Flores, E., Miranda, M., & Villasís, M. (2017) indicate that the statistical test of Mann-Whitney U is a non-parametric test applied to two independent samples. This test is the non-parametric version of Student's usual "t" test. Our study has two
independent samples that make this test the most appropriate when testing the hypotheses.

It is important to note that the Mann-Whitney U test has versions for small samples and large samples that are greater than 30, in our case having two independent samples of 32 subjects.

Nachar, N. (2008) says that to test the difference between U and μU, the reader can refer to the z-table. If the absolute value of the calculated z is larger or equal to the tabulated z value, the null hypothesis is rejected. We will use the large test version through this formula to find the Z value.

\[ Z = \frac{U - \mu_U}{\sigma_U} \]

Where \( \mu_U \) and \( \sigma_U \) are the mean and standard deviation of U if the null hypothesis is true, and are given by the following formulas

\[ \mu_U = \frac{n_1n_2}{2} \]
\[ \sigma_U = \sqrt{\frac{n_1n_2(n_1 + n_2 + 1)}{12}} \]

Where \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) correspond to the sample size in each group, control and experimental. U is the calculated value.

c) **Statement of decision and level of significance**

With the theoretical value of \( Z_{\alpha} = 1.96 \) with a 95% confidence level we can define that to reject the null hypothesis (\( H_0 \)), Z must be greater than the theoretical \( Z_{\alpha} \), that is, if the absolute value of the calculated z is larger or equal to the tabulated z value, the null hypothesis is rejected. See Figure 9 for more detail.

Reject \( H_0 \) if |calculated z| ≥ |z tabulated|.

In terms of the P value, the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) will be rejected if the p-value is less than the usual level of significance of 0.05; otherwise, \( H_0 \) will be accepted.
d) Computed values

Figure 10 shows that the statistical software SPSS v.25 reports a Z value of -4.264 with a P value of 0.000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics</th>
<th>Essay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>242,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>837,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-4.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Mann-Whitney U test for the value Z and p.

e) Statistical decision

Upon completion that the value of p-values less than 0.005 and the value of z calculated $|\geq| \ z$ tabulated. The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted.

f) Conclusion.

At 95% level of statistical confidence, the results of the statistical analysis show that there is a difference between the scores obtained in the exit essay of the control and experimental groups, leaving the null hypothesis without effect. Therefore, it is concluded that indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.
3.4. Statistical testing of the specific hypothesis

**Hypothesis:** “Indirect feedback positively contributes to improving the writing skills in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, layout and Mechanics in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.”

The statistical test of the hypothesis is made with the Mann-Whitney U test because it works with non-parametric data, two independent samples and the samples are larger than 20. The procedure for the respective contrast of the hypothesis is developed below.

a) **Statistical hypotheses**

   \( H_0 \): Null hypothesis: The scores obtained in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, layout and mechanics in the exit essay of the control and experimental groups are equal.

   \( H_a \): Alternate Hypothesis: The scores obtained in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, layout and mechanics in the exit essay of the control and experimental groups are different.

b) **Test statistic**

   Flores, E., Miranda, M., & Villasís, M. (2017) indicate that the statistical test of Mann-Whitney U is a non-parametric test applied to two independent samples. This test is the non-parametric version of Student's usual "t" test. Our study has two independent samples that make this test the most appropriate when testing the hypotheses.

   It is important to note that the Mann-Whitney U test has versions for small samples and large samples that are greater than 30, in our case having two independent samples of 32 subjects.

   (Nachar, 2008) says that to test the difference between \( U \) and \( \mu_U \), the reader can refer to the \( z \) - table. If the absolute value of the calculated \( z \) is larger or equal to the tabulated \( z \) value, the null hypothesis is rejected. We will use the large test version through this formula to find the \( Z \) value.

\[
Z = \frac{U - \mu_U}{\sigma_U}
\]
Where \( \mu_U \) and \( \sigma_U \) are the mean and standard deviation of \( U \) if the null hypothesis is true, and are given by the following formulas:

\[
\mu_U = \frac{n_1 n_2}{2} \quad \sigma_U = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_2 (n_1 + n_2 + 1)}{12}}
\]

Where \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) correspond to the sample size in each group, control and experimental. \( U \) is the calculated value.

c) **Statement of decision and level of significance**

With the theoretical value of \( Z_{\alpha} = 1.96 \) with a 95% confidence level we can define that to reject the null hypothesis (\( H_0 \)), \( Z \) must be greater than the theoretical \( Z_{\alpha} \), that is, if the absolute value of the calculated \( z \) is larger or equal to the tabulated \( z \) value, the null hypothesis is rejected. See Figure 11 for more detail.

Reject \( H_0 \) if \(|\text{calculated } z| \geq |z \text{ tabulated}|\).

In terms of the \( P \) value, the null hypothesis \( H_0 \) will be rejected if the \( p \)-value is less than the usual level of significance of 0.05; otherwise, \( H_0 \) will be accepted.

![Figure 11. Acceptance and rejection regions of \( H_0 \)](image)

d) **Computed values**

Table 5 shows the data obtained by the statistical software SPSS v.25 with reports for each of the categories analysed.
Table 5. Evaluation of the statistical significance of the exit test evaluation categories of the control and experimental groups (n = 68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>P Value</th>
<th>Z value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-2.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and vocabulary</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-2.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>-1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>-3.896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Investigator database. SPSS v 25

e) **Statistical decisión**

Upon completion that the p-value is less than 0.005 and the value of z calculated \(|z| \geq |z| \) tabulated. The null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, and mechanics.

In the case of the layout category, the null hypothesis is accepted as no statistically significant differences are found.

f) **Conclusion**

At 95% level of statistical confidence, the results of the statistical analysis show that there is a difference between the scores obtained in the exit essay and the control and experimental groups, leaving the null hypothesis without effect. Therefore, it is concluded that the Indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in the categories of task completion, language and vocabulary, and mechanics not including the layout category in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

4. **Descriptive results of the Entry essay results**

4.1. **Entry essay for the control group.** Table 6 and Figure 12 show the results obtained by the learners of English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University in the Entry essay. The results showed that 88.2% of the students had a regular performance on writing and an 11.8% presented a good writing performance.
Table 6. Results of entry essay for the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frecuency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Acumulated percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88,2</td>
<td>88,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>11,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Investigator database. SPSS-V25

Figure 12. Results of entry essay for the control group
Source: Investigator database. SPSS-V25

4.2. Entry essay for the experimental group. Table 7 and Figure 13 shows the results obtained in the Entry essay by the experiential group. It can be observed that 88.2% obtained a regular level while 4% obtained a good level performance.

Table 7. Results of entry essay for the experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frecuency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Acumulated percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Investigator database. SPSS-V25
4.3. Descriptive results of the exit essay results

a) Exit essay for the control group. Table 8 shows the results of Exit essay for the experimental group. The results show that 85.3% of the students were in the regular level for writing performance while a 14.7% were in the good level.

Table 8. Results of exit essay for the control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Accumulated percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Exit essay for the experimental group. Table 9 presents the results of the experimental group exit essay. Figure 15 is attached for a better visualization of the results. In these results, it can be observed that 47.1% of the students were in the regular level, 50% in good and 2.9% in very good.

Table 9. Results of exit essay for the experimental group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Valid percentage</th>
<th>Accumulated percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47,1</td>
<td>47,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50,0</td>
<td>97,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. **Descriptive results of the exit essay results by evaluation criteria.** In Table 10, you can see a summary of the percentages of students for each evaluation criteria. In the task completion criterion, it can be observed that 76.5% of students of the experimental group and 94.1% in the control group were in the regular level. On the other hand, there was a noticeable improvement in the levels of good and very good in the experimental group with 26.6% and 2.9% compared with 5.0% in the level of good in the control group.

Regarding the language and vocabulary category, there were interesting improvements in the experimental group. It was located in the regular and good levels with 82.4% and 17.6% respectively. While in the control group it was observed that 2.9%, 94.1% and 2.9% were located in the low, regular and good levels.

The layout evaluation category also showed significant improvements, observing an improvement in the low category that had 5.9% compared to the control group that placed 20.6% of students in this level. In the experimental group, it was observed that 76.5% and 17.6% are in the regular and good level. In contrast, the control group placed 64.7% and 14.7% in the regular and good levels.
Finally, the experimental group looks better in the mechanics category. It can be seen that 97.1% of the students were in the good and regular levels. With respect to the control group we had 79.4% of the students at the same levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Experimental Group %</th>
<th>Control group %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>76,5</td>
<td>94,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language &amp; vocabulary</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>82,4</td>
<td>94,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17,6</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layout</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>20,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>76,5</td>
<td>64,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>17,6</td>
<td>14,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>52,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>76,5</td>
<td>26,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>14,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>Language &amp; Vocabulary</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Task completion</td>
<td>Language &amp; Vocabulary</td>
<td>Averag Lang &amp; Voc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

First, by using and collecting information from students’ questionnaires, teacher interviews, classroom observations, and by comparing and contrasting results of writing with the rubrics used at the university, the general hypothesis stated in this research, *the use of indirect feedback improves the writing skills of essays at San Ignacio Loyola University in Lima*, could be proved. Nonetheless, indirect feedback just overpassed the direct feedback by a minimum percentage.

Second, the study found that the general hypothesis, “Indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University,” was proved according to Figure 9 and Figure 10, in which there is a difference between the scores obtained in the exit essay of the control and experimental groups. Therefore, it is concluded that indirect feedback contributes better than direct feedback to improving writing skills in essays of students in English III at San Ignacio of Loyola University.

Third, with respect to the entry exam of the control group, it is noticed that this group is centered in 88.2% in the regular category. On the other hand, the results for the same exam of the experimental group also localize 88.2% in the regular category. This showed that the two groups share the same characteristic since they both are group in the regular level. The first group is not better than the second one, all of this is stated in the table 6 & 7 as well as Figure 12.

Fourth, according to the table 10, regarding the task completion criterion, it can be observed that 76.5% of students of the experimental group and 94.1% in the control group were in the regular level. On the other hand, there was a noticeable improvement in the levels of good and very good in the experimental group with 26.6% and 2.9% compared with 5.0% in the level of good in the control group (Table 10).

Fifth, regarding the language and vocabulary category, there were interesting improvements in the experimental group. It was located in the regular and good levels with 82.4% and 17.6% respectively. While in the control group it was observed that 2.9%, 94.1% and 2.9% were located in the low, regular and good levels (Table 10).

Sixth, with respect to the layout evaluation category also showed significant improvements, observing an improvement in the low category that had 5.9% compared to the control group that placed 20.6% of students in this level. In the experimental group, it
was observed that 76.5% and 17.6% are in the regular and good level. In contrast, the control group placed 64.7% and 14.7% in the regular and good levels (Table 10).
Recommendations

From the study, the following recommendations might be useful.

1. The use of the indirect feedback is recommended (Appendix 10) in order to improve writing skills in students from lower intermediate level at San Ignacio Loyola University. Indirect feedback surpassed the direct one just by a little. Nonetheless, any kind of feedback chosen according to the students’ necessity will definitely benefit and encourage them to write better and better because writing is a skill that needs to be taught, taking into consideration that learning a foreign language is a process.

2. Future research and studies are necessary to continue exploring how writing development is facilitated and the best possible pedagogical considerations that help lead to such development. In order for the study to take place more adequately, it would be a good idea to persuade students to participate actively in the research by highlighting the importance of it since activities or occurrences like this help teachers to apply better strategies assisting students to write better in and outside their classrooms.

3. It is not one of the aims of this study, but it would be interesting to explore the impact of the agreement and disagreement of teachers’ perceptions regarding the use of indirect feedback to assess students writing skills.

4. Additionally, special attention should be given to investigate how much this teaching methodology can influence or be applied on how well students (participants) write in their own language for the researcher to see how much this can affect students’ acquisition of the target language (English).

5. The results obtained in the test of contrast between hypothesis and obtained results have been presented with a difference that although minimal can be corrected or adjusted as for example in the experimental and control groups, especially in the group conformation depending on the abilities that can be detected before its conformation to give greater credibility of the result.

6. It is advisable that teachers of L2 writers learn to treat students’ errors effectively. Teachers need to be well-prepared and be able to diagnose and respond to students’ errors and explain grammatical concepts in English. The healthy habit of attending workshops or conference presentations on grammar teaching may contribute to the preparation of excellent facilitators for the benefit of EFL learners.
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Appendices
Appendix 1. Entry test

Name: _________________________________________________
Schedule: _________________________________________________

Write a text in three paragraphs:

1. Do you think sports are important in life? Why? Do you like sports? Which ones?
2. Do you do sports or watch them on TV? How frequently? Explain.
3. Did you do / play sports in high school? Have you ever been in a school team? Explain.

Use connectors (however, so, also, because, when) and appropriate tenses (present, simple, present perfect, past simple) and vocabulary related to the topic. Use 80-100 words.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
a) Sample of an entry test

**Writing Test**

Name: Carlos Allison Drawery  
Schedule: 1:00 - 3:00

Write a text in three paragraphs:

1. Do you think sports are important in life? Why? Do you like sports? Which ones?
2. Do you do sports or watch them on TV? How frequently? Explain.
3. Did you do / play sports in high school? Have you ever been in a school team? Explain.

Use connectors (however, so, also, because, when) and appropriate tenses (present simple, present perfect, past simple) and vocabulary related to the topic. Use 80 - 100 words.

I think sports are important because it is healthy for me. I like sports. I practice soccer every day in the university when I have free time.

I love watching sport programmes. I always watch ESPN in channel 41 and ESPN+ in channel 42 because it is very interesting and relax for me because I love soccer!

I always played soccer in high school with my friends in the break. When I was a child I always played with my friends too.

I had been playing in a school team in the athletics school.

---

**Task completion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language and vocabulary</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Required Type of task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Order</td>
<td>Missing Word</td>
<td>Wrong Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Scoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TC</th>
<th>LW</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Sample of an entry test

**WRITING TEST**

Name: Oscar Palencia Ramirez  
Schedule: 

Write a text in three paragraphs:

1. Do you think sports are important in life? Why? Do you like sports? Which ones?
2. Do you do sports or watch them on TV? How frequently? Explain.
3. Did you do / play sports in high school? Have you ever been in a school team? Explain.

Use connectors (however, so, also, because, when) and appropriate tenses (present simple, present perfect, past simple) and vocabulary related to the topic. Use 80 – 100 words.

**I love practicing sports in my life.** I think that every body should practice any sport to have a healthy life. In my case, I practice softball (sport) as similar to baseball but the main difference is the ball in the softball. The ball is bigger than the baseball ball. My position is second baseman. I try to catch all the balls that the pitcher can't.

My schedule to practice this sport is twice a week. Sometimes I practice on the weekend. When I joined this club, I practiced every day but now it's impossible for me because I have to work and I study with my university. Suddenly I don't have free time. I have practiced this sport for five years and I enjoy it.

In my school, I didn't play any sports. My school didn't have sports activities. Now, I haven't been in a school team. But I belonged to drama club like drama and doing dub.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task completion</th>
<th>Language and vocabulary</th>
<th>Layout</th>
<th>Mechanics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task type</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>Required Type of task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing word</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong word</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of errors</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Appendix 2. Exit test

Name: __________________________________________________________________

Schedule: __________________________________________________________________

Write an essay:

Talk about your childhood, high school and life style. Use past tense, simple present and present perfect. Use capitalization, punctuation, connectors, adjectives and vocabulary related to the topic. Use 80-100 words.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
a) Sample of an exit test

My childhood was amazing because when I was growing up I lived in a farm with my grandparents. My father used to take me to school everyday. I woke up at 7 o'clock, and I took a shower at 8 o'clock and I had breakfast very fast.

In high school I was 12 years old and I lived with my uncle, because my parents were in another city.

Nowadays my lifestyle is very fast because I study at university and I live in Vienna.

This city is very crowded, but there a lot of people, but I feel happy because I'm able to study the career that I love.

Nice!

Gabriela: This is a better job!
b) Sample of an exit test

My autobiography

In my childhood, I didn't like the school, and I went with my friends to the city. We played outside and had fun. I usually played football, but I had time to study, too. The other year was similar.

In high school, I had to change my school. The new school was very different. I had to study more, but I enjoyed it.

In my free time, I liked to go for a walk and read books. I like to learn new things.

In university, I have to take many tests. It is a lot of work.

(Diagram of a test with numbers and letters written on it.)
Appendix 3. Sample of sequence of drafts of the experimental group

My autobiography

When I was childhood I used to stay at home all day and ate chocolate and a lot of candies. Then I was in high school, I didn’t like study because I liked play tennis. I used to study some time because I needed to prove, but the high school is the best time of my life, but now my lifestyle is different because I like play futsal and eats vegetables because the times change and I loves my present lifestyle.
a) Sample of sequence of drafts of the experimental group

When I was childhood, I used to stay at home all day and ate chocolate and a lot of candy. Then when I was in high school, I didn't like studying because I liked playing tennis. I used to study sometimes because I liked playing tennis. I used to study sometimes because I needed a pass, but the high school is the best time of my life. But now my lifestyle is different because I like playing futsal and eat vegetables because times have changed and I love my present life.
b) Sample of sequence of drafts of the experimental group

Talk about your childhood, high school and present life style

Well in this opportunity I'd like to talk about how I went to the zoo with my father. When I was 5 years old my father decided to go to the zoo because he saw a television show. I wanted to see animals and one more thing I like playing football. My mother took me away to the stadium. For playing soccer with some friends. After that I was accepted in the high school. I've been in there since I studied.

In this paragraph, I'm talking about my high school. I was studied in this city since I was 15. It's related to my education with school hours. Every morning I woke up to shower and dress. And I was ready to go to school. An old friend took me to the school. I've met a lot of friends in the school. Then we kept in touch.

And now I'm in the university. It's an other lifestyle that I have. I take every morning the bus to my classes and it's so much interesting to study here, because I have a lot things to do. I can learn something every day. Some matter for my life.

Test Completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language and vocabulary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handout</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Sample of sequence of drafts of the experimental group
Appendix 4. Checklist to monitor drafts using indirect feedback

General data
Date: ..............................
Level: ............................  Number of students: ...................

Below it is described the features of observation to be held during the development of classes and the monitoring result of drafts of the experimental group using indirect feedback.

**Instruction:**

Put an X if it meets or not these skills. Use the column Quantity of students indicating an approximate of students who meet the skill and the Observation column to provide some explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production of texts</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity of students</strong></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students use the vocabulary and the grammar learned to write their drafts properly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students write statements according to the English syntax (syntax).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*3. Students use punctuation appropriately on their essays.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students improve their spelling skills from one draft to another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They rewrite their pieces of writing considering the codes provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) Sample of checklist to monitor drafts using indirect feedback

General data
Date: 16-06-14
Level: B2.1
Number of students: 34

Below it is described the features of observation to be held during the development of classes and exit test results of students in the experimental group using indirect feedback for the development of the capacities of production of texts in essays.

Instruction:

Put an X if it meets or not these skills. Use the column Quantity of students indicating an approximate number of students who meet the skill and the Observation column to provide some explanation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production of texts</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Quantity of students</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>6-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students use the vocabulary and the grammar learned to write their drafts properly.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students write statements according to the English word order (syntax).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students use punctuation appropriately on their essays.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students improve their spelling skills from one draft to another.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They rewrite their pieces of writing considering the codes provided.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5. Survey for teachers- Written Feedback

SECTION I. Below you will find a set of questions regarding the way you assess your students’ writing skills (sentences, paragraphs, essays). Check the alternative you agree with.

1. To what extent is it important for you to give feedback to your students’ pieces of writing? Please, circle the alternative that describes your interest best.
   1. I always give feedback to my students’ pieces of writing.
   2. I often give feedback to my students’ pieces of writing.
   3. I sometimes give feedback to my students’ pieces of writing.
   4. I seldom give feedback to my students’ pieces of writing.
   5. I never give feedback to my students’ pieces of writing.

2. There are some approaches to give students’ feedback on their pieces of writing. Below I have depicted two of them. I’d like you to circle and support the alternative you prefer.
   a. Direct Feedback- the teacher overwrites the mistakes so that students rewrite their pieces of writing adding or changing information.

I use the Direct Feedback because ____________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
b. Indirect Feedback- teacher uses symbols to give students hints about their mistakes so students try to figure out how to improve their pieces of writing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Punctuation</td>
<td>I live work, and go to school in Lon&lt;&gt;ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Close space</td>
<td>Every one works hard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>The manager is a woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Apple are the most nutritious fruit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Unnecessary word</td>
<td>The students Ø studies all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Missing word</td>
<td>Please don’t use that question anymore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I use the Indirect feedback because _________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you usually discuss your students’ mistakes in person, especially when there are global errors (mistakes that are too difficult to understand)? If so, how do you think this habit can benefit students from acquiring knowledge and improving their writing skills?
Yes/No, __________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

SECTION II: IDENTIFICATION
Please, answer the questions, which will serve to classify follow-up replies. Circle the best alternative that reflects your own situation.

Gender
Male
Female

Level of education
Licentiate / bachelor
Magister
Doctor

Age:
20 – 29
30 – 39
40 – 49
50 – 59
60 – 69

Thanks a lot for your cooperation.
a) **Teacher’s opinions on indirect feedback**

Seven teachers took part in the interview. For the purpose of this study, I will only state teachers’ insights regarding indirect feedback when correcting their students’ drafts.

The interview was divided into three sections: This first part was devoted to find out the importance of giving students’ feedback on their pieces of writing, the second one was to know if the indirect feedback or the direct one is preferred by the teacher, in which they were able to give reasons and the third one dealt with teachers’ general information.

**Importance of giving students’ feedback**

96% percent of the teachers always give feedback to students’ pieces of writing, which I think it is healthy since this practice avoids fossilization.

**Indirect feedback vs. direct feedback**

85.7% of teachers preferred to use indirect feedback and 71.4% of them use both of these approaches. Most of them claim that direct feedback is preferable with students at low levels while the indirect feedback might be used with upper level students.

Something that I completely agree with is the fact that it is best to give students’ feedback especially at low levels to prevent fossilization.

**Teachers’ opinions regarding indirect feedback and direct feedback when correcting their students’ pieces of writing**

I use the indirect feedback because I consider suitable for students that are in a higher level and I have to deal with longer pieces of writings.

I use the Direct Feedback because _it’s a way to save time for me as a teacher (I don’t have enough time to talk to them individually), but on the other hand it’s a way to help my students realize their mistakes. Especially with the grammar I’m working with them._

R. Pinedo

I use the Direct Feedback because I find it more practical to highlight students’ mistakes directly and show the grammar or lexical points they need to improve. However,
as a teacher, you need to make your students take into account your feedback by reading carefully their piece of writing, otherwise they won’t have the chance to reflect and improve their written mistakes.

W. Fernandez

I use the indirect feedback because somehow students are involved in their own learning and self-assessment. For example, by using these symbols students start analyzing and thinking about what elements they need to adjust, change, correct and improve. Besides reflecting on their own progress, they become familiar with this procedure. All in all, applying this indirect feedback helps learners to improve their own language proficiency and encourage them while writing.

L. Arangurí

I prefer the indirect feedback because this kind of feedback make students analyze the kind of mistakes they make and students are able to correct themselves with constant practice.

M. Román

I use the indirect feedback because it helps students be aware of the kind of mistake they have made and make the necessary changes before handing in the last version. I use it for paragraph or essay writing.

I use the Direct Feedback because Students need to know what mistakes they still make. I will use it for the final version of their writing.

Y. Tovar

I use the indirect feedback most of the time because I introduce the symbols since the first writing task and students become used to my corrections using them. On the other hand, they are able to recognize the type of mistakes they make and eventually understand how to do self-correction and sometimes peer correction. I consider this a method that works.
I use the Direct Feedback only for exams, because it’s very difficult to give one-to-one feedback when they receive their tests. I normally give a general feedback on the board where I highlight the most common mistakes, including grammar, spelling and punctuation.

E. Martínez

I use direct feedback to elementary students because they recently start learning the language and indirect feedback to intermediate students because they manage more the language and we pre-teach the abbreviations so they know what to do.

K. Huapaya
Appendix 6. Survey for students given indirect feedback

Dear students, this questionnaire aims to obtain your views on the use of indirect feedback when rewriting your pieces of writing. Mark a cross (X) in the alternative you agree with.

GENERAL DATA
1. Age: ________________
2. Gender: Male (   ) Female (  )
3. Date: ___ / ____ / ______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect feedback to improve writing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It was easy to recognize the codes/symbols to rewrite your pieces of writing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. You liked working with the indirect feedback when rewriting your drafts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rewriting your drafts using symbols or codes contributed to improving your writing skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Activities like &quot;syntax &amp; punctuation&quot; helped you improve to formulate statements and use punctuation correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The “Spelling and vocabulary” activity helped you distinguish similar words and increase your vocabulary related to different topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Activities like &quot;vocabulary&quot; helped you write ideas or events properly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities &quot;connectors&quot; helped you to connect two ideas easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The instructions to perform activities were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The time you were given for each exercise/activity was adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and/or suggestions:

..........................................................................................................................
..........................................................................................................................

Thank you for your cooperation
a) Sample of survey for students given indirect feedback

Estimados alumnos/as, esta encuesta tiene por objeto obtener sus puntos de vista sobre el uso del indirect feedback para corregir sus párrafos y ejercicios de escritura. Marca con una x (X) en la alternativa que estés de acuerdo.

**DATOS PERSONALES**

1. Edad: 
2. Sexo: Masculino ( ) Femenino ( )
3. Fecha: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Siempre</th>
<th>Frecuentemente</th>
<th>Algunas veces</th>
<th>Nunca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect feedback para mejorar las habilidades de escritura</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Fue fácil reconocer los símbolos o códigos al reescribir tus prácticas de escritura (oraciones, párrafos y ejercicios).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Me gustó trabajar con los símbolos para corregir tus prácticas de escritura.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Al reescribir mis párrafos y ejercicios usando los símbolos contribuyó a que mejorara mis habilidades de escritura.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Producción de textos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Los ejercicios de “word order &amp; punctuation” me ayudaron de manera correcta al formular oraciones y usar puntuación.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Las prácticas de “Spelling and vocabulary appropriateness” me sirvieron a distinguir palabras similares e incrementar mi vocabulario relacionado a diferentes temas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Los ejercicios como “vocabulary appropriateness” contribuyó a escribir ideas y eventos apropiadamente.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Las actividades relacionadas a “connectors” me ayudó a que interrelacionara fácilmente mis ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Las instrucciones fueron claras para que realizara las diferentes actividades de escritura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. El tiempo brindado por la profesora para la realización de las actividades de escritura fue adecuado.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comentarios:

________________________
________________________

Muchas gracias por tu apoyo