Analysis of Error Type and Feedback Efficacy on Genre-Based Writing: Narrative Writing[*]

Mi-Haeng Cho

(Chungnam National University)

Cho, Mi-Haeng (2022). Analysis of error type and feedback efficacy on genre-based writing: Narrative writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *28*(4), 1-21.

The current study aims to analyze EFL learners' error types and teachers' feedback efficacy in English narrative writing. 60 participants divided into two proficiency groups by TOEIC scores were asked to write each of two narrative essays in class and correct each language-form error in their drafts based on two kinds of feedback (explicitly coded and uncoded). Errors in each group's drafts and revisions were statistically analyzed based on the error types and feedback methods. The findings of the study are as follows: 1) Overall learners' writing accuracy and fluency analyzed by tokens and error rate after revision show a significant improvement. 2) Detailed error analysis on narrative writing indicates that in the draft, the error types related to verbs (particularly past tense) are more frequent than others, but in the revisions, the correction activity using feedback shows a positive effect on error types relevant to verbs, one of treatable errors. 3) Students with better English proficiency, given more explicit "coded" feedback, can significantly reduce error rates in both drafts and revisions. This suggests teachers to consider troublesome error types as well as feedback methods when giving error feedback to EFL writers.

[feedback/error type/error correction/narrative writing]

I. INTRODUCTION

English writing has become an increasingly important skill for EFL learners due to the need to exchange knowledge and information in English quickly online. Compared to the

traditional written communication done over a longer time scale, writing instant messages show impromptu and intuitive characteristics, much like speaking (Cho, 2018). Many researchers have highlighted that English writing skill is more important than ever before and the interest has brought about theories and approaches to teach English writing (Hyland, 2003; Lee & Yoon, 2022). However, writing is still the most difficult skill for EFL learning and is also the most burdensome area for teachers (Byrne, 1988). Moreover, the evaluation system for Korean university admissions centered on listening and reading nudges both students and teachers away from improving productive skills (Park & Lee, 2012). Thus, it can be acknowledged that a specific and structural research showing a path for teaching English writing in light of such circumstances with immediate applications is in need.

As the importance of English rises and communicating through text instantaneously is highlighted, genre-based teaching emphasizes explicit teaching of grammar and text in writing education, and has shown its effects on improving students' writing skills. Teachers of EFL writing classes must first provide an appropriate and familiar genre to the students with limited experience writing in English. A number of researchers have asserted that narrative writing is a fundamental and pedagogical genre for ESL/EFL writing teaching (Huh & Lee, 2018; Knapp & Watkins, 2005; Kormos, 2011; Reppen, 2002; Weigle, 2002). Knapp and Watkins (2005) advise narrative writing as a genre suitable for EFL students lacking experience in English writing, but further research on narrative writing in Korea is rare (Cho & Lee, 2015).

As common errors are imperceptible to EFL students with limited experience, the feedback given by teachers plays a crucial role in improving the students' English writing skills. Especially, errors that inhibit communication or impose incorrect meaning should be the first to be corrected (Ferris, 2011). In many types of research related to feedback, it has been advised that giving indirect feedback is less time-consuming and more helpful for improving the accuracy and overall quality of learner's writing (Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2006; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2004; Lalande, 1982). Ferris (2002) noted that indirect feedback, whether explicit codes are used or not, forces learners to be reflective and analytical and affects long-term improvement in written accuracy.

Also, Ferris (2002) introduced the difference between "treatable" and "untreatable" errors as an error-correction pedagogical distinction. Many researchers have examined the "treatable/untreatable" dichotomy and have used the supplemented error types and systematic error classification criteria to improve learner's writing accuracy and quality (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Cho, 2018; Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

Due to the difficulties of collecting data and acquiring funds, there are few studies on the frequent and problematic errors of Korean EFL students. It is clear that studies on foreign language writing education require much time and effort and are inaccessible to

researchers due to the vast field of study. It is necessary to narrow the scope to study the genre needed for students and provide a practical and routine writing education approach. This study focusing on analyzing frequent errors and the feedback effect in narrative writing should serve as a practical and detailed guideline to improve writing classes.

The purpose of this study is to identify the learner's language error patterns by analyzing the error types and frequency of errors made by learners through narrative writing, and to examine the effect of feedback provided in the writing process based on learners' error correction by error type. The research questions to be answered are as follows:

1. In English narrative writing, what characteristics do the type and frequency of errors show between drafts and revised versions?
2. In English narrative writing, how does the error correction of each error type differ according to the feedback method?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Genre-Based Writing: Narratives

English writing is not easily mastered for L2/EFL learners and is also a complex, time-consuming activity which requires concentration, effort, and persistence for both ESL/EFL learners and teachers, so many researchers have highlighted the difficulty of learning to write in ESL/EFL language (Hadley, 1993; Han & Hiver, 2018; Hyland, 2003; Williams, 2005). Just simply being exposed to an English writing environment and allowing students to write a lot will not assure ESL/EFL learners of their writing improvement (Reppen, 2002). In this point, explicit instruction is needed particularly for novice writers learning English as a foreign or second language (Bae, 2012; Yang & Sohn, 2009). Genre-based L2 writing has been the center of attention in writing pedagogy (Hyland, 2004; Knapp & Watkins, 2005; Reppen, 2002). The characteristics of genre-based L2 writing pedagogy are that it is explicit, systematic, students' needs-based, and consciousness-raising, so these genre perspectives have all influenced second language genre-based writing, providing an elaborated pedagogical framework focusing on the teaching of communicative purposes, structures, and language features of particular genres (Hyland, 2016).

Based on the recent genre-based ESL/EFL writing teaching and research, this current study intends to present the merits and necessity of narrative writing education. First of all, Narrative writing is chosen as a fundamental and pedagogical genre for ESL/EFL writing teaching (Knapp & Watkins, 2005). Narrative writing is typically based around a real experience that learners have had, and it also allows students to develop their ideas more

creatively than other academic papers or journalistic articles. When presenting writing genres in order of familiarity to learners in the lesson plan for writing lesson, Reppen (2002) recommends narrative text first and recognizes it as the most familiar genre to writing learners. Among various writings, narrative writing is one of the most frequently taught writing texts usually starting from the beginner's level in a language class (Kormos, 2011). According to Huh and Lee (2018), narrative writing is one of the most commonly used writing tasks in EFL language course programs. Tompkins (2003) also suggests narrative writing as a suitable genre to be introduced into writing classes, and Knapp and Watkins (2005) recommended that teachers should plan to initiate narrative writing as a basic writing genre at the beginning of the writing lesson.

Furthermore, this study investigated narrative-related writing textbooks for EFL learners. In the English writing series (Alice & Masoud, 2007; Karen & Christine, 2017; Keith, April, & Elena, 2014) widely used among ESL/EFL writing textbooks for English writing learners, narrative writing is introduced and placed at the beginning level. It is acknowledged that narrative writing is appropriate and suitable for novice learners who have rare genre-based writing experience.

Last but not least, narrative writing ability is becoming more crucial skill for English learning with the advent of new types of quick written communication (Weigle, 2002). Many recent researchers at the ESL academic studies have coined literacy narratives for the new types of experiment using more written narrative interviews in favor of the English letter format of question and answer method than oral narratives. It can be seen that written narrative interview of English letter formats is thought that it has the advantage of producing more flexibility and freedom than verbal narrative interview to respondents (Guerin, Kerr, & Green, 2014; Langum & Sullivan, 2017).

Narrative writing is a genre suitable for EFL learners who lack writing experience, and in a situation where it is easily used as an academic question-and-answer method instead of an oral interview, various and specific studies on narrative writing to be used in writing classes are still lacking. In domestic studies related to English narrative writing education, it is reported that narrative writing contains literary elements such as characters, background, plot, etc., and is widely used in the field because it arouses the interest of learners because of its many dramatic elements (Kim & Kang, 2014). Cho and Lee (2015) also recounted that a narrative writing is the genre suitable for writing lessons early stage for EFL learners.

2. Error Types

It is unavoidable that errors occur in the writing of EFL students with limited experience. In this point, a number of researchers over decades have examined the effects of error

correction (Ferris, 2011; Polio, 2003). Recent research trends on error types are looking at the frequency of errors frequently made by learners, and are moving in the direction to identify the types of errors that learners-centered error correction are possible (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2004).

Ferris (2002) introduced the difference between "treatable" and "untreatable" errors as an error-correction pedagogical distinction: "treatable" error categories are related to a linguistic structure such as verb tense and form, subject-verb agreement; article usage, plural and possessive noun endings, sentence fragments, run-ons and mechanical errors, but "untreatable" error ones are relevant to the need of students' acquired knowledge of the language including word choice, idiom(preposition usage), and sentence structure. A number of studies to improve the accuracy and overall quality of learner's writing have examined the "treatable/untreatable" dichotomy discussed in Ferris (Bitchener et al., 2005; Cho, 2018; Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Ferris (2011) additionally reported lists of common ESL/EFL errors which have more detailed categories of error classification system as shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Error Type Classification System (Ferris, 2011)

Error type
Morphological errors
Verb part : tense, form, subject-verb agreement
Noun part : article / determiners, noun endings (plural / possessive)
Lexical errors
Word choice, word form, informal usage, idiom error, pronoun error
Syntactic errors
Sentence structures, run-ons, and fragments
Mechanical errors
Punctuation, spelling

In order to investigate error types of English writing for Korean EFL learners, Cho and Lee (2015) supplemented the error types and systematic error classification criteria including error codes based on the list of errors suggested by Ferris (2011), as shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Error Type Classification and Code (Cho & Lee, 2015)

Error type	Code	Range of errors
Verb tense	vt	All errors in verb tense
Verb form	vf	Including relevant auxiliary, verb omission (mainly verb *Be*), and verb be + regular verb (use double verbs) errors
Subject-verb agreement	sva	Third person singular and all subject-verb agreement in the present tense
Article	art	Including quantifiers errors
Number of noun	nn	Including pronouns
Possessive of noun	np	Including pronouns, inanimate possessives, double possessives

Word choice	wc	Excluding preposition
Word form	wf	Excluding verbs, nouns, and articles errors & including gerunds and infinitives used as objects of verbs
Idiom	id	Including preposition
Sentence structure	ss	Including word omissions, word order, sentence or clause errors
Conjunctions	con	Including run-ons and fragments
Mechanical	mec	Punctuation, spelling, or capitalization

3. Efficacy of Error Feedback

Writing errors are inevitable for college freshmen who lack the opportunity to write in English before entering college, and appropriate writing instruction and practice is highly needed in an EFL setting. In this case, it is an inevitable task for teachers to provide feedback on learner's errors. Teachers should preferentially provide effective feedback on the types of errors that learners make, which have high frequency of occurrence and may interfere with communication (Ferris, 2011). In much research related to feedback, although the efficacy of error feedback has been controversial, it has been discussed that giving feedback by indirectly specifying learner errors is less time-consuming and helpful for improving the accuracy and overall quality of learner's writing (Ellis, 2009; Ferris, 2006; Ferris & Hedgcock, 2004; Lalande, 1982). Among these previous studies, both the feedback types (direct/indirect) suggested by Ellis (2009) and the indirect feedback types (coded/uncoded) introduced by Ferris (2002) have mainly been used in writing feedback study. Ferris (2002) noted that indirect feedback forces learners to be more reflective and analytical about their errors than direct feedback and affects long-term improvement in written accuracy.

Ferris (2002) suggested that when writing teachers do choose to identify errors as part of indirect correction, they must choose whether to use codes (symbols) or not. In order to help students to self-edit their writing, it is the most important issue how explicit error feedback should be given. In this experimental classroom study, we plan to investigate the efficacy of two indirect feedback conditions (Ferris, 2006; Ferris & Roberts, 2001): (1) Coded: errors marked with codes from 12 different error categories including underline; (2) Uncoded: errors in the same 12 categories underlined but not otherwise coded or symbolized.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants in this study were comprised of 60 EFL students (31M, 29F) of university C in Daejeon. The subjects took a required 15-week English course for two hours twice a week for consisting mainly of TOEIC R/C strategies with additional writing tasks. In the current study, 60 students who performed both narrative writing tasks were selected as valid experimental subjects.

As a result of conducting a survey at the beginning of the semester to obtain basic information related to writing skill, the TOEIC scores of the students varied from 400 to 700 as shown in Table 3: 45 students scoring 600-700 on the TOEIC, 10 between 500 to 599 and 5 between 400 and 499. The feedback method was differentiated between two groups: coded and uncoded. The group with coded feedback consisted only of students with TOEIC scores between 600 and 700. Although higher TOEIC scores do not necessarily translate to higher writing skills, it is possible to assume that there is a significant difference in general English skill between the two groups.

TABLE 3
TOEIC Score Distribution of Participants

TOEIC Feedback	400-499	500-599	600-699	t	p
Uncoded ($n = 34$)	5	10	19	4. 614	.000 ***
Coded ($n = 26$)	0	0	26		

*** $p < .001$

In a preliminary questionnaire related to writing skills, 47% of participants responded that writing is the most difficult language function to learn. At the same time 98% of students admitted that they are in need of English writing skills. Also most students (98%) have no experience of getting a feedback response in previous English courses and a majority (87%) did not feel confident writing.

2. Data Collection

1) Narrative Writing Task

Students were required to perform two timed-impromptu narrative writing tasks in class. The first narrative topic used for the writing task was "Write about the most frightening (or difficult) experience you have ever had." The second narrative topic "Write about an event

that affected you greatly and would probably interest your classmates." was selected (Keith, et al., 2004). While performing two narrative writing tasks, 60 students submitted not only their first drafts (120 pieces) but also their self-revision drafts (120 pieces) which were submitted by getting feedback through the teachers' error correction in the following class.

2) Method of Feedback

As for the feedback on the learner's errors in the narrative writing tasks, two different types of indirect feedback were imposed: coded and uncoded. For the "coded" feedback, teachers underlined the errors and also indicated the type of error using the code in Table 2. On the other hand, "uncoded" feedback indicates the error position only by underlining the errors. Each feedback was given to the students for their first drafts for timed (30minutes) impromptu error correction to be performed by the students in class. Students were provided with sufficient explanation about the meaning of the error codes by Ingram and King (1988).

One American lecturer with experience teaching English in Korea for several years as well as this researcher negotiated the error types based on the error type classification and code in Table 2 modified by Cho and Lee (2015). And then we made two copy bundles of the first drafts written by the learners and checked each copy for errors. By applying the errors identified through consultation, feedback was given to the learners.

3) Data Analysis

In order to classify the errors in the learners' writing, the list of errors was adopted from Ferris's (2011) with a little modified error range including explanations and examples. The errors appearing in the first draft and the revised version of the learner's writing were classified based on this list. Next, to analyze the error rate of the learners' narrative writing in the present study, the number of tokens (words) was calculated (Polio, 2003), and then the error rate was computed as a percentage by dividing the total number of errors in the learner's writing into the total number of tokens. Finally, SPSS 24.0 was used to analyze the data investigating the error rate according to the error type, the results of the error pattern in the first draft and revision version, and the effect of each feedback type. All statistical analyses using *t*-tests were verified at the significance level $p < .05$.

4) Questionnaire

A questionnaire was conducted on the 60 students beforehand to collect basic information on their English proficiency and writing skills.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Error Analysis of Overall Writing Tasks

1) Overall Writing Fluency and Accuracy: Token Count and Error Rate

In order to investigate the overall improvement of learners' English writing fluency and accuracy across the error correction activities using feedback in narrative writing tasks, the number of tokens (words) and error rates of learners' writing tasks were examined as shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Overall Token Count and Error Rate ($N = 60$)

	Writing task	M	SD	t	p
Token count (Words)	Task 1- Draft	117.68	35.62	- 3.337	. 0001 **
	Task 1- Revision	121.12	36.00		
	Task 2- Draft	120.55	39.52	- 6.240	.000 ***
	Task 2- Revision	125.42	40.23		
Error rate	Task 1- Draft	13. 60	7.59	11.095	.000 ***
	Task 1- Revision	7.13	5.29		
	Task 2- Draft	12.24	5.69	13.454	.000 ***
	Task 2- Revision	5.58	4.37		

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The current study analyzed the number of tokens and the error rate of the narrative text draft (120 pieces) written by 60 people who took the course and the revised version (120 pieces) modified by the learner after receiving feedback from the teacher. It was found that the number of words increased significantly in both narrative texts, and the error rate was also significantly decreased in the process of going from the draft to the revised version through feedback. It can be interpreted that the correction activity using feedback to learners in narrative writing had a positive effect on the fluency and accuracy of English writing.

2) Overall Effects of Feedback: Error Ratio between Drafts and Revisions

The two groups participating in the experiment were provided with feedback in different ways by the teacher. At this time, in order to find out whether the overall correction results which were made in the process of correcting errors from the draft to the revised version by the learner had an effect on the learner's writing accuracy, it was verified based on the error rate. The results of analyzing the error rates of the two groups - "coded" feedback ($n = 26$) and "uncoded" feedback ($n = 34$) in the narrative first draft and the revised version

Cho Mi-Haeng

are shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5
Overall Effects of Feedback between Drafts and Revisions

Feedback	Writing task	*M*	*N*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Coded (Underline + symbol)	Task 1- Draft	10.76	26	3.56	7.480	.000 ***
	Task 1- Revision	5.25	26	2.11		
	Task 2- Draft	11.03	26	4.61	12.458	.000 ***
	Task 2- Revision	4.46	26	2.83		
Uncoded (Underline)	Task 1- Draft	15.78	34	9.06	8.492	.000 ***
	Task 1- Revision	8.56	34	6.47		
	Task 2- Draft	13.16	34	6.31	8.599	.000 ***
	Task 2- Revision	6.44	34	5.13		

*** $p < .001$

Table 5 shows that the two groups provided with each different feedback method do not reveal differences in the process of correcting errors from the draft to the revised version: the teacher divided the learners' drafts (60 drafts of 2 writing tasks: 120 pieces) into the "coded (underline+symbol)" group and the "uncoded (underline)" group to provide feedback, and then the two groups submitted the revisions (60 revisions of 2 writing tasks: 120 pieces) based on the teacher's feedback. The error rate was derived in the data. As a result, both the "coded" and "uncoded" methods provided to learners significantly reduced learners' writing errors ($p < .001$). This shows that in narrative writing, the teacher's feedback has the effect of reducing learners' errors statistically and significantly.

Therefore, when a learner performs a writing task with narrative writing, it is suggested that if feedback is given during the writing process, the fluency and accuracy of writing can be improved by increasing the number of words as well as reducing errors.

3) Overall Error Type: Error Ratio between Drafts and Revisions

In order to explore which error type can be corrected more treatable by the EFL learners using the teacher's feedback, the error-rate data collected by students' drafts and the revisions are analyzed by *t*-test. The result of analyzing the error rate in the first draft (120 pieces) of narrative text written by the learner and the error rate in the revised version (120 pieces) submitted after rewriting using the teacher's feedback was shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6
Overall Error Type: Error Ratio between Drafts and Revisions

Error type	Writing	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Verb tense	Draft	1.74	2.04	7.264	0.00 ***
(vt)	Revision	.67	.99		
Verb form	Draft	.82	1.17	6.004	0.00 ***
(vf)	Revision	.38	.80		
Subject-verb agreement	Draft	.16	.55	2.472	0.01 **
(sva)	Revision	.04	.21		
Articles	Draft	2.26	2.03	7.935	0.00 ***
(art)	Revision	1.15	1.37		
Noun-plural	Draft	.49	.78	4.632	0.00 ***
(nn)	Revision	.20	.48		
Noun possessive	Draft	.16	.46	1.281	0.20
(np)	Revision	.12	.38		
Word choice	Draft	1.62	1.65	6.925	0.00 ***
(wc)	Revision	.85	.98		
Word form	Draft	.75	.98	5.958	0.00 ***
(wf)	Revision	.29	.54		
Idiom	Draft	1.49	1.31	6.471	0.00 ***
(id)	Revision	.78	.90		
Sentence structure	Draft	1.06	1.09	7.101	0.00 ***
(ss)	Revision	.59	.89		
Conjunction	Draft	.54	.87	3.744	0.00 ***
(con)	Revision	.29	.56		
Mechanical	Draft	1.80	2.10	6.566	0.00 ***
(mec)	Revision	.95	1.56		

* *p* < .05 , *** *p* < .001

Teachers of ESL writing need to focus on the aspects of grammar that are particularly problematic for nonnative speakers of English (Ferris, 2011). Table 6 indicates that these problematic error types might be treatable for the EFL narrative-writing learners in the current study. The narrative-writing activity utilizing the feedback to the learner showed significantly reducing the error of overall each error type (p < .001) except for the error of subject verb agreement (p = .015) and the noun ending-possessive (p = .203). This suggests the possibility that teacher feedback in narrative writing can lead to improvement in learners' writing by reducing errors in almost all types of errors.

2. Analysis of Errors in Narrative Writing

1) Errors Frequency by Error Type in Drafts

In order to examine the errors that frequently appear in narrative texts, the error rate investigated in the learner's draft was subdivided by type based on the error classification table. To analyze the frequency of errors by type, error rate for each type was represented

as a percentage to the total number of errors.

TABLE 7
Frequency by Error Type in Drafts*

Error type	Error rate	(%)
Verb tense (vt)	1.74	13.50
Verb form (vf)	0.82	6.35
Subject-verb agreement (sva)	0.17	1.30
Article (art)	2.26	17.48
Noun -plural (nn)	0.49	3.82
Noun possessive (np)	0.17	1.30
Word choice (wc)	1.62	12.50
Word form (wf)	0.76	5.87
Idiom (id)	1.49	11.56
Sentence structure (ss)	1.06	8.23
Conjunction (con)	0.54	4.17
Mechanical (mec)	1.80	13.92

*Total token number in narrative drafts (14, 294) : theme 1 (7,06 1) + theme 2 (7,233)

In the first draft written by the learners, as shown in Table 7, the use of articles (art = 17.48%) and mechanical punctuation marks or spellings (mec = 13.92%) were the most frequent. This result is in line with the results of several previous studies indicating that these errors were the most frequent in the writing of EFL learners. (Han, 2014; Lim, 2018; Song, Pae, & Shin, 2013).

Then, errors related to the tense of the verb (vt = 13.5%) appear very frequently. This is because in narrative writing with the theme of the learner's experience, the tense of the verb is mainly used in the past tense, and it can be seen that learners are not familiar with the use of the past tense. This result is similar to previous studies showing that one of the most frequent errors inhibiting communication of Korean EFL students was verbs (Cha, 2004; Kim, 2010).

In this study, narrative writing learners frequently commit errors of the past tense, much more particularly with using irregular variations than regular ones which end in –ed, which causes frequent errors associated with the verb tenses. For the teachers who are going to plan narrative writing lessons, it can be considered that performing the task using irregular variations of past tense in the process of prewriting is effective. This shows that writing genre is directly connected with error types, and the error type should also be considered in parallel with the writing genre.

In the first draft, word choice was 12.5%, followed by idiom (11.56%), sentence structure (8.23%), verb form (6.35%), word form (5.87%), using the incorrect conjunction (4.17%), plural number of nouns (3.82%), subject-verb agreement (1.3%), and possessive forms of nouns (1.3%).

2) Errors Frequency by Error Type in Revisions

To discern the change in error rate after revision, the error frequency according to type was calculated for Table 8.

TABLE 8
Frequency by Error Type in Revisions*

Error type	Error rate	(%)
Verb tense (vt)	0.67	10.40
Verb form (vf)	0.39	6.20
Subject-verb agreement (sva)	0.04	0.90
Article (art)	1.16	18.80
Noun -plural (nn)	0.21	3.60
Noun possessive (np)	0.13	1.70
Word choice (wc)	0.85	13.30
Word form (wf)	0.29	4.40
Idiom (id)	0.78	12.70
Sentence structure (ss)	0.59	9.20
Conjunction (con)	0.29	4.80
Mechanical (mec)	0.95	14.00

*Total token number in narrative revisions (14, 792) : theme 1 (7,267) + theme 2 (7,525)

The results of examining the frequency of each error type in the revised version of narrative writing were almost similar to those of the first draft. Article usage (18.8%) and mechanical punctuation marks or spellings (14%) were the most common errors, as in the first draft. However, the verb tense (10.4%), which was the third most frequent in the draft, showed a much better correction than word choice (13.3%) and idioms (12.7%) through the error correction process. It shows that the proper word choice and phrase idioms errors are kinds of untreatable errors which are idiosyncratic and difficult to be self-corrected by the student, compared to verb tense is a treatable and modifiable error related to language structure, easily overcome by the student in a rule-governed way (Ferris, 2011). This suggests the possibility that when teaching narrative writing, explicit instruction in verb tense can lead to improvement in writing especially through feedback.

Other untreatable errors defined by Ferris (2011) showed similar error rates in the revision as well: sentence structure (9.2%) and word forms (4.4%). In the written narrative patterns, students with lack of writing experience tend to have difficulties with correcting sentence structure errors. It can be showed that narrative writing might have the complex process of sentence structure including subordinating. On the other hand, in this study focusing on the error types in narrative writing, the frequency of subject-verb agreement (draft: 1.3%, revision: 0.9%) and possessive noun endings (draft: 1.3%, revision: 1.7%) errors was the lowest among the ratios. This is also because learners usually use the personal pronoun *I* in narrative writing with the theme of the learner's experience, and also

past tense in the case of subject-verb agreement is not necessary.

In sum, verb tense error rates diminished in the revision, were showing that self-correction is effective. The result confirms that verb tense error frequent in narrative writing is also a language structure based error, capable for the students to correct via an indirect feedback. This shows promise that explicit lecturing of language structure on verb tense can improve writing skills.

3. Error Analysis According to Feedback Method

1) Token and Error Rate According to Feedback Method

The independent *t*-test conducted on the token (word) count and error rate according to feedback methods is shown in Table 9. In the basic questionnaire before executing the writing task for this research, the two groups showed different English skills based on TOEIC scores. Feedback methods were varied in the two groups based on this fact. The more explicit "coded (underline+symbol)" feedback was given to the class with higher TOEIC scores (*n* = 26), and "uncoded (underline)" feedback was provided for the class with lower TOEIC scores (*n* = 34).

TABLE 9
Token Count and Error Rate by Feedback Method

	Writing	Feedback (Proficiency)	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Tokens	Draft	Coded (Higher)	126.69	39.83	1.923	. 057
		Uncoded (Lower)	113.32	34.79		
	Revision	Coded (Higher)	132.87	39.97	2.423	. 017 *
		Uncoded (Lower)	115.93	35.11		
Error rate	Draft	Coded (Higher)	10.89	40.8	-3.22	. 002 * *
		Uncoded (Lower)	14.47	7.86		
	Revision	Coded (Higher)	4.86	2.51	-3.33	.001 **
		Uncoded (Lower)	7.50	5.90		

* *p* < .05, ** *p* < .01

In the draft, the number of words in the two groups was somewhat higher in the group with high English proficiency, so there was a slight difference in writing fluency, but it was not statistically significant. However, in the revised version using feedback, the group with high English proficiency used more words on average to a statistically significant extent (*p* = .017). Proficient groups were able to fluently use more tokens with more explicit "coded" feedback. In short, token count for the first drafts was higher for the more fluent group, but was not statistically significant. However, the difference can be said for the token count for the revised draft which was higher for the group with high English proficiency. This shows that feedback method for the more fluent group significantly

impact the token count of the tasks done in a limited time with the same topic for narrative writing.

On the other hand, the error rate showed a different pattern from the result of token count. First, in the learner's draft, the group with high English proficiency had a statistically significantly lower error rate than the group with relatively lower English proficiency (p = .002). This shows that students with English proficiency would make less errors and submit a more accurate task in narrative writing within a limited time during class, showing a statistically significant difference, which means that the writing accuracy is better.

In addition, revisions showed similar results. Proficient groups were able to effectively correct errors with coded feedback. As a result, if feedback is provided with coded type (underline + symbol), it can be clearly interpreted as a statistically significant difference (p = .001). This shows that more explicit feedback methods have a strong influence on improving error rates compared to baseline English proficiency of each individual.

In this study, the teacher provided different feedback methods based on English proficiency for the two groups, and the difference in English skills showed that the more skilled student with more explicit "coded" feedback was able to reduce error rates significantly for both the drafts and revisions. This coincides with the results of Ferris (2006) that students with more explicit coded feedback showed a statistically significant improvement in error correction compared to students with less explicit uncoded feedback. However, it does not agree with the results of Ferris and Roberts (2001) that students with coded feedback showed a statistically insignificant slight improvement in error correction compared to students with uncoded feedback.

Students and instructors feel that more explicit (i.e., coded) feedback is preferable and even necessary (Cho & Lee, 2015; Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts, & McKee, 2000; Ferris & Roberts, 2001), but additional research supporting this view is insufficient to provide a cohesive result, leaving the argument in an indecisive state (Ferris, 2011). The subtle contrary results from the research by Ferris and Roberts (2001) in a similar ESL environment imply that another factor should be considered. The difference in English skills can be an important factor in the ability to revise errors based on different feedback methods. This implies that English skills should be considered in research on error correction according to genre and feedback methods.

2) Frequent Error Type in Drafts According to Feedback

In order to find out whether there is a difference in the error rate by error type between the two groups in the learners' drafts, an independent t-test was performed. Among the results of testing the error rate according to each error type between the two groups in the

draft, the statistically significant error types are organized in Table 10.

TABLE 10
Frequent Error Type in Drafts by Feedback Method

Error type	Feedback (Proficiency)	M	SD	t	p
Noun possessive(np)	Coded (Higher)	.05	.24	-2.611	0.01 **
	Uncoded (Lower)	.25	.55		
Word choice (wc)	Coded (Higher)	.89	.91	-4.911	0.00 ***
	Uncoded (Lower)	2.16	1.86		
Conjunction (con)	Coded (Higher)	.34	.57	-2.420	0.01 *
	Uncoded (Lower)	.69	1.02		
Mechanical (mec)	Coded (Higher)	1.14	1.28	-3.357	0.001 **
	Uncoded (Lower)	2.30	2.44		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

In the learner's draft, there were significant differences between the two groups in errors related to the possessive case of nouns ($p = .01$), word choice ($p < .001$), conjunctions ($p = .01$), and mechanical punctuation marks or spellings ($p = .001$). In other words, the first drafts showed that the more proficient group made fewer errors related to possessive case of nouns, word choice, conjunctions, and mechanical punctuation marks or spellings than the group with low English proficiency, and the degree was statistically significant.

3) Frequent Error Type in Revisions According to Feedback

To analyze the error correction difference by the error type in the two groups after feedback, an independent *t*-test was done. Error types showing statistically significant and meaningful error rate differences were selected for further analysis in Table 11 for details.

TABLE 11
Frequent Error Type in Revisions by Feedback Method

Error type	Feedback (Proficiency)	M	SD	t	p
Verb tense (vt)	Coded (Higher)	.27	.45	-4.566	0.00 ***
	Uncoded (Lower)	.98	1.16		
Word choice (wc)	Coded (Higher)	.52	.64	-3.553	0.00 ***
	Uncoded (Lower)	1.10	1.12		
Conjunction (con)	Coded (Higher)	.14	.36	-2.888	0.005 **
	Uncoded (Lower)	.41	.66		
Mechanical (mec)	Coded (Higher)	.49	.72	-3.179	0.002 **
	Uncoded (Lower)	1.29	1.91		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Unlike in the drafts, in the revisions it was found that the learners who received the coded feedback made the error correction more accurately and significantly reduced the

number of errors for the verb tense ($p < .001$) after using the feedback. It can be confirmed that more explicit feedback has a positive effect on errors related to verb tense in narrative writing. Errors related to verb tense belong to the treatable and correctable errors categorized by Ferris (2011). Although it is an error frequently made by EFL learners, especially in narrative writing, the results in this analysis show that it can be corrected by providing feedback from the teacher.

On the other hand, as in the drafts, there were significant differences between the two groups in errors related to word choice ($p < .001$), conjunctions ($p = .005$), and mechanical punctuation marks or spellings ($p = .002$) in the learners' revised version. In particular, word choice is an untreatable error type according to Ferris (2011) which is difficult to improve in a short period of time. This implies that EFL students suffered difficulties in correcting such errors without sufficient proficiency in English.

V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The current study intends to research the effects of feedback and error analysis on college students' narrative writing in a Korean EFL environment. Two (higher and lower) writing groups were required to write each of two narrative essays in class and then correct each language form error in their drafts across two feedback conditions (coded and uncoded) based on the explicit levels. Errors of each group's drafts and revisions are statistically analyzed based on the common ESL/EFL error list. The results are summarized in the following several paragraphs.

First of all, in order to investigate the overall improvement of learners' English writing fluency and accuracy across the error correction activities using feedback in narrative writing tasks, the number of tokens and error rates of learners' writing tasks were analyzed. It was found that both the number of tokens and error rates improved significantly. It is pointed out it is clear that the correction activity using teacher's feedback to learners in narrative writing had a positive effect on the fluency and accuracy of English writing. Next, the overall effects of feedback and error type between drafts and revisions were examined using the error ratio. The result showed that the two groups provided with each different feedback method did not reveal differences in the process of correcting errors and showed significantly reducing the error of almost each error type. Therefore, when a learner performs a writing task with narrative writing, it is suggested that if feedback is given during the writing process, the overall fluency and accuracy of writing can be improved by increasing the number of words as well as reducing errors.

In relation to the first research question, the error rate was investigated in the learners' drafts to examine the errors that frequently appear in narrative texts. This result showed

that narrative writers frequently commit errors related to the past tense much more particularly with using irregular variations than regular ones that end in *–ed*. It was similar to the result of other studies that showed problematic and frequent errors associated with the verb tenses (Cha, 2004; Kim, 2010). However, the frequency of each error type in the revision indicated different results to those of the draft. The verb tense showed a much better correction than other error types. The result confirms that the error rates of verb tense after giving error feedback to EFL narrative writers can be decreased in the revision. In addition, explicit lecturing of language structure on verb tense can improve writing skills.

As for the second research question related to the efficacy of feedback methods, the teacher provided different feedback methods based on English proficiency and showed that the more skilled student with more explicit "coded" feedback was able to reduce error rates significantly for both the draft and revision. This result is in line with the results of Ferris (2006) that students with more explicit coded (underline + symbol) feedback showed a statistically significant improvement in error correction compared to students with less explicit "uncoded" feedback. However, it does not agree with the results of Ferris and Roberts (2001) that students with coded feedback showed a statistically insignificant slight improvement in error correction. This implies that narrative writers' proficiency should be considered in research on error correction according to feedback methods.

To be brief, it is important to recognize that teaching narrative writing using feedback may be more beneficial and effective to the EFL learners to reducing the error rate. The findings suggest that teachers carefully consider EFL learners' troublesome error types as well as explicit feedback when teaching narrative writing.

REFERENCES

Alice, S., & Masoud, S. (2007). *Effective academic writing1-3*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bae, H-J. (2012). The effectiveness of genre-based L2 writing instruction on Korean middle school students' writing ability. *English Teaching, 67*(3), 147-180

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

Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skills* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Cha, K-A. (2004). An error analysis of Korean university students′ writing. *Foreign Languages Education, 11*(2), 149-169.

Cho, M-H. (2018). An error analysis of EFL Korean college students in English descriptive writing. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 24*(4), 169-193.

Cho, M-H., & Lee, J-W. (2015). Effects of writing genres on EFL learners′ error correction in English writing. *Journal of the Korea English Education Society, 14*(2), 245-262.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97-107.

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

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing* (5th ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R., Chaney, S. J., Komura, K., Roberts, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000, March). Perspectives, problems, and practices in treating written error. In *Colloquium presented at International TESOL Convention* (pp.14-18), Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2004). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, and practice* (2nd ed.)*.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*(3), 161-184.

Guerin, C., Kerr, H., & Green, I. (2014). Supervision pedagogies: Narratives from the field. *Teaching in Higher Education, 20*, 107-118.

Hadley, A. O. (1993). *Teaching language in context* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Han, J., & Hiver, P. (2018). Genre-based L2 writing instruction and writing-specific psychological factors: The dynamics of change. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 40*, 44-59.

Han, Y. (2014). An error analysis of grammar in university students′ English compositions. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics, 14*(4), 525-548.

Huh, M-H., & Lee, J-B. (2018). Task complexity and writing prompts and performance in EFL high school students′ narrative writing. *English Teaching, 73*(4), 55-72.

Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217-230.

Hyland, K. (2004). *Genre and second language writing*. Ann Arbour, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, K. (2016). *Teaching and researching writing* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Ingram, B., & King, C. (1988). *From writing to composing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karen, B., & Christine, R. (2017). *Ready to write 1-3*. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson.

Keith, S. F., April, M. V., & Elena, V. S. (2004). *Great paragraphs: An introduction to writing paragraphs*. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Keith, S. F., April, M. V., & Elena, V. S. (2014). *Great writing 1-4.* Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Kim, H., & Kang, S. (2014). Teaching of primary English writing based on text structures using narrative and expository literary texts. *English Language Teaching, 26*(1), 149-170.

Kim, J.-H. (2010). Grammar error correction in L2 writing: Effects, types of errors, and types of feedback. *Foreign Languages Education, 17*(1), 1-30.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). *Genre, text, grammar: Technologies for teaching and assessing writing.* Sydney, Australia: UNSW Press.

Kormos, J. (2011). Task complexity and linguistic and discourse features in narrative writing performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*, 148-161.

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

Langum, V., & Sullivan, K. P. H. (2017). Writing academic English as a doctoral student in Sweden: Narrative perspectives. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 35*, 20-25.

Lee, J-W., & Yoon, K-O. (2022). Effects of planning and revising conditions on EFL learners′ writing quality. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *28*(2), 21-38.

Lim, S-B. (2018). A study of grammatical errors in college students′ English writings. *The Journal of Modern British & American Language & Literature*, *36*(1), 301-328.

Park, J-S., & Lee, M-B. (2012). A report on the teaching and learning of speaking and writing in high school English classrooms: Transiting to NEAT. *Modern English Education, 13*(2), 121-149.

Polio, C. (2003). Research on second language writing: An overview of what we investigate and how. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 35-65). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reppen, R. (2002). A genre-based approach to content writing instruction. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renanday (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp. 321-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Song, M-Y., Pae, J-K., & Shin, D-K. (2013). An analysis of errors in high school students' responses to the writing items of the National English Ability Test. *Foreign Languages Education, 20*(3), 269-296.

Tompkins, G. (2003). *Literacy for the 21st century: Teaching reading writing in pre-kindergarten through grade 4*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, J. (2005). *Teaching writing in second and foreign language classrooms*. Boston, MA: McGraw-HilI.

Yang, M. S., & Sohn, Y G. (2009). A study on the current English writing education in secondary schools. *The Journal of English Education, 38*, 106-135.

Mi-Haeng Cho (instructor)

Dept. of English Language and Literature

Chungnam National University

34134 Daehang-no 99, Yuseong-gu

Daejeon, Korea

Email: mhcho65@gmail.com