

令和 6 年 6 月 26 日現在

機関番号：27401

研究種目：基盤研究(C) (一般)

研究期間：2019～2023

課題番号：19K00853

研究課題名(和文) Advancing written corrective feedback: developing and testing a support site for writers

研究課題名(英文) Advancing written corrective feedback: developing and testing a support site for writers

研究代表者

R・S・Lavin (Lavin, Richard)

熊本県立大学・文学部・教授

研究者番号：70347699

交付決定額(研究期間全体)：(直接経費) 3,300,000円

研究成果の概要(和文)：英作文は頻繁に学生に与えられる課題である。教員によるそれに対するフィードバックを巡って、様々な問題がある。通常、フィードバックの仕方が標準化されていないので、全ての学生に同質のフィードバックを与えていない。そして、個々のエラーを直すことを目的にし、将来同じ類のエラーが出ても、学生が気づかない可能性がある。

これらの問題に対して、本研究が特殊のウェブサイトを提案する。ブログエンジンに基づいて、マイクロポストから構成されて、各ポストが一つの日本人学習者によく見られるエラー・タイプを説明している。関係のポストのURLを英作文に貼り付けることによって、フィードバックの質と効率を同時に向上ができる。

研究成果の学術的意義や社会的意義

The current research allows writing instructors to provide feedback on errors in an efficient and standardized way. This enhances students' consciousness of errors as reflections of incorrect understandings, and increases the likelihood that they will be able to avoid similar errors in future.

研究成果の概要(英文)：Writing compositions in English is a common task given to students at universities. Without feedback, only very limited progress in students' writing performance can be expected. Problems with standard feedback practices include: (1) It tends to be time-consuming for teachers; (2) It is not standardized and therefore may be arbitrary; (3) It may not be understood by students; (4) It is often focused on correcting individual errors, rather than teaching students to recognize types of errors.

The current research attempts to overcome these limitations through the creation of a custom website that provides feedback on error types that frequently occur in Japanese students' compositions. The website runs on a blog engine and features many micro-posts, one post per type of error, each with its own unique URL. When encountering an error of a familiar type, a teacher can copy the URL of the relevant micropost and paste it into the relevant part, thus providing standardized feedback.

研究分野：応用言語学

キーワード：writing feedback ライティング フィードバック language education 英語教育

## 1 . 研究開始当初の背景

There is a long tradition of research in how to respond to student compositions. A typology introduced by Ellis (2008) is often used. This divides corrective feedback according to the strategies by which it is delivered: direct and indirect feedback; metalinguistic feedback; focused and unfocused feedback; electronic feedback; and reformulation. After Ellis's work, with progress in technology, there have been a number of reports on feedback delivered electronically. However, too little attention has been given to the question of how electronic feedback may change the tradeoffs entailed by the use of paper and thus ultimately the appropriate typology of corrective feedback. In particular, insufficient attention has been paid to how electronic feedback can remove ambiguities regarding the exact scope of the site of the feedback and make detailed feedback possible while increasing efficiency and the resultant fatigue on the part of the instructor.

## 2 . 研究の目的

The current research addresses the “linguistic gulf” identified by Hartshorn (2008). Perhaps due to the importation into Japan of the “process approach” (Emig, 1971), focus in writing instruction has shifted to rhetorical conventions and there has been a corresponding neglect of grammar and vocabulary (Hinkel, 2004), whereas for most non-native speaker writers errors in vocabulary and grammar tend to be the most pressing issue (Qu, 2017).

However, it would not be appropriate to focus only on grammar and vocabulary, since rhetorical conventions are still important. In addition, feedback on writing is an act of communication between instructor and student, rather than simply a mechanical act of pointing out as many errors as possible. It is necessary that a role be left for personalized feedback, which may include messages of encouragement or general comments on the quality of the work. Therefore, we seek to distinguish between such feedback, which can be done in traditional ways, and feedback on grammar and vocabulary, which we hope to make more efficient.

A common issue pointed out in the literature is the time-consuming and exhausting nature of feedback for busy instructors. Beyond the obvious fact that feedback that is too taxing may not occur at all, there are various knock-on effects, such as inconsistencies and a decrease in quality and volume of feedback as an instructor delivers feedback over an extended period of time to a large number of students. Thus, another issue this research seeks to address is the efficiency and sustainability of feedback practices.

In addition, this research seeks to address the nature of electronic feedback and clarify its possible advantages, particularly in terms of its effects on the tradeoffs inherent in paper-based feedback.

## 3 . 研究の方法

The approach taken to address these issues is firstly to divide feedback conceptually into two types: feedback that can be standardized and delivered quickly, and feedback that should be delivered in a more personal way. We propose to leave aside the latter for instructors to do in traditional ways, while making feedback on vocabulary and grammar more efficient and thus more sustainable. One by-product of this will be that instructors have more time for the former type of feedback.

The proposed solution to the issues discussed above was, firstly, to require electronic submission of students' English compositions. The medium chosen was Google Docs (<https://docs.google.com/>). One feature of that site is that it allows insertion of comments into documents; crucially, the scope of the original text to which each comment applies can be made clear, something that is difficult to do with paper-based feedback. In addition to plain text, comments can also hold clickable links. This is an essential feature for the chosen method.

The other part of the feedback method chosen is a website consisting of micro-posts, each with its own URL. Each micro-post addresses one error type commonly found in Japanese students' English compositions. When such an error is discovered in a student

composition, the instructor creates a comment in Google Docs. Rather than writing a comment created ad hoc to address the specific error in play, instead the instructor simply inserts the URL of a micro-post that addresses that error *type*.

We began by evaluating a small prototype site that contained microposts addressing a small subset of the errors that the principal investigator had observed frequently in recent months. This evaluation was done by language instructors with extensive experience of delivering written feedback on student compositions. The evaluation was focused on their subjective impressions of the utility and usability of the site. Overall, their evaluations were positive, in that they felt the site was useful in delivering feedback on the specific types of error that their students made. Criticisms and suggestions for improvement focused on the provision of more types of feedback, and improving the findability of the types of feedback provided.

The subsequent developments of the site constituted a stepwise refinement. A new version was created, and evaluation sought. That evaluation guided the design of the next version, and so on. Evaluation was sometimes sought from instructors, and sometimes from students who experienced feedback from instructors using the system.

#### 4 . 研究成果

It became clear that such a system was important and useful. Many instructors did not have a real system for giving feedback on vocabulary and grammar. For some that was due to a desire to give holistic and/or affective feedback. The realization that it is possible to give holistic or affective feedback in the usual way while relying on the system described here for feedback on grammar and vocabulary opened the way to broadening the scope of feedback offered to students. Others did have a system but found it unwieldy or overly time-consuming; the described system saved them time.

An important feature of the micro-post-based website is that the pre-prepared micro-posts not only save time but allow for standardized feedback. It was found that this has at least three advantages:

- Even when fatigued, instructors can give high-quality feedback;
- Since instructors are not writing custom feedback (at least on commonly occurring grammar and vocabulary errors), it becomes clear to students that the feedback they are receiving is in regard to types of errors rather than idiosyncratic mistakes. This enhances metalinguistic awareness, and the micro-posts themselves, since they are addressed at types of errors and use some metalinguistic language, further strengthen this.
- In most cases, instructors were giving the same feedback on multiple errors of the same type both within single compositions and across multiple compositions. Students became conscious of reading the same feedback many times, which heightened their awareness that they were making the same types of errors consistently. Some instructors encouraged students to create tables of their own errors, strengthening their awareness further.

One persistent type of feedback on the system from instructors was that they wanted more posts on a wider range of error types. It was inconvenient for them to be provided feedback on some very frequent error types but not on others that were slightly less frequent. The initial iteration of the site was based on anecdotal and experiential evidence, viz. the intuition on the part of the principal investigator that certain error types were frequent. The formalization of a cycle of improvements encouraged multiple instructors to log error types as they occurred in student compositions and then request their inclusion in the site. Thus, the most common and time-consuming type of change to the site in each iteration was the authoring of more posts.

Another frequent change was the editing of already existing posts. Sometimes this was occasioned by instructors suggesting different wording or providing different examples. These may be better because they were easier to understand or more vivid for students. Sometimes, students expressed difficulty understanding posts, and they were then swiftly rewritten.

A persistent issue was the findability of specific content. Findability is naturally a crucial issue for instructors: if they cannot find the feedback they need, they will likely revert to providing ad hoc feedback in traditional ways. To a lesser extent, it is also important for students, for reasons that will be discussed below. In early iterations, attempts were made to use a “cleaner” design and arrange the most common types of errors at the top of the site. This attempt was quickly abandoned, as it was found that instructors’ intuitions of what errors were most common differed according to the instructor. Furthermore, the frequent

addition of new micro-posts to the site necessitated equally frequent reordering of micro-posts. The solution settled on by the end of the project was the provision of tags in a sidebar. Initially, there was an attempt to use a small number of tags, so that instructors could quickly grasp what types of feedback were available on the site. However, a very common criticism was that an instructor was unable to find micro-posts that existed on the site because the tags under which they had tried to find those micro-posts were different from the ones actually used. In the end, it was decided that tags should be comprehensive: whenever an instructor reported looking for a tag that was not provided, or expected to find a particular kind of post labeled with a specific tag, but found the tag was not used, that tag was added. This led to a large number of tags. It was judged that, since these are in alphabetical order, the cost of this choice is low while the benefits are considerable.

The approach exemplified by the described system is one of remediation of errors (James, 1998), i.e. learners are provided with information that allows them to “revise or reject the wrong rule they were operating with, thereby inducing them to revise their mental representation of the rule and avoid recurrence of this type of fault”. The hope is that, ultimately, learners will not simply read the specific micro-posts pointed to by links within instructor comments, but will also start exploring the site, looking for connections between posts. (For example, one tag is “number”; this groups together errors such as those addressing a missing “s” on third-person singular present tense verbs and those addressing plural marking on nouns.) By clicking on a tag, learners can read multiple connected posts and gain a more metalinguistically aware view certain types of errors.

## REFERENCES

- Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107. doi:10.1093/elt/ccn023
- Emig, J. A. (1971). *The composing processes of twelfth graders*. Urbana, IL, National Council of Teachers of English.
- Hartshorn, K. J. (2008). The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University). Available from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=2521&context=etd>
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing: Practical techniques in vocabulary and grammar*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Essex: Longman.
- Qu, W. (2017). For L2 writers, it is always the problem of the language. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 38, 92–93. doi:10.1016/j.jslw.2017.10.007

## 5. 主な発表論文等

〔雑誌論文〕 計4件（うち査読付論文 4件/うち国際共著 2件/うちオープンアクセス 0件）

1. 著者名 Lavin, R.	4. 巻 2023
2. 論文標題 The social turn in second language writing instruction: A quarter-century of research	5. 発行年 2023年
3. 雑誌名 INTED2023 Proceedings	6. 最初と最後の頁 7993-7997
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） 10.21125/inted.2023.2172	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスではない、又はオープンアクセスが困難	国際共著 -

1. 著者名 Richard S. Lavin	4. 巻 27
2. 論文標題 Towards a useful conception of the ZPD for language education	5. 発行年 2021年
3. 雑誌名 Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Prefectural University of Kumamoto	6. 最初と最後の頁 9,24
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） なし	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスではない、又はオープンアクセスが困難	国際共著 -

1. 著者名 Richard S. Lavin	4. 巻 IV
2. 論文標題 Towards improved corrective feedback in Japanese EFL writing instruction	5. 発行年 2019年
3. 雑誌名 Education Applications & Developments	6. 最初と最後の頁 124-137
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） なし	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスではない、又はオープンアクセスが困難	国際共著 該当する

1. 著者名 Richard S. Lavin	4. 巻 2019
2. 論文標題 Sociocultural and interactionist approaches to second language acquisition: Are they compatible?	5. 発行年 2019年
3. 雑誌名 Education and New Developments	6. 最初と最後の頁 66-70
掲載論文のDOI（デジタルオブジェクト識別子） なし	査読の有無 有
オープンアクセス オープンアクセスではない、又はオープンアクセスが困難	国際共著 該当する

〔学会発表〕 計5件（うち招待講演 0件 / うち国際学会 4件）

1. 発表者名 Lavin, R. S.
2. 発表標題 The social turn in second language writing instruction: A quarter-century of research
3. 学会等名 INTEd2023 (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2023年

1. 発表者名 Lavin, R. S.
2. 発表標題 Evolution of the ZPD in second language research
3. 学会等名 SUTLF 2023
4. 発表年 2023年

1. 発表者名 Richard S. Lavin
2. 発表標題 Sociocultural and interactionist approaches to second language acquisition: Are they compatible?
3. 学会等名 END 2019 (Porto, Portugal) (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2019年

1. 発表者名 Richard S. Lavin
2. 発表標題 Towards a useful conception of the Zone of Proximal Development for language education
3. 学会等名 2nd International Conference on Advanced Research in Teaching and Education (Vienna, Austria) (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2019年

1. 発表者名 Richard S. Lavin
2. 発表標題 Operationalizing the zone of proximal development in foreign language writing instruction
3. 学会等名 14th annual International Technology, Education and Development Conference (Valencia, Spain) (国際学会)
4. 発表年 2020年

〔図書〕 計0件

〔産業財産権〕

〔その他〕

-

6. 研究組織

	氏名 (ローマ字氏名) (研究者番号)	所属研究機関・部局・職 (機関番号)	備考
研究分担者	Morrow Jeffrey  (Morrow Jeffrey)  (10760093)	熊本県立大学・共通教育センター・准教授   (27401)	
研究分担者	吉井 誠  (Yoshii Makoto)  (70240231)	熊本県立大学・文学部・教授   (27401)	

7. 科研費を使用して開催した国際研究集会

〔国際研究集会〕 計0件

8. 本研究に関連して実施した国際共同研究の実施状況

共同研究相手国	相手方研究機関
---------	---------