



Teachers' Corrective Feedback in Writing Classes: The Impact of Collaborating with a Peer during the Editing Process on Students' Uptake and Retention

Eda Kahyalar
Çukurova University

Figen Yılmaz
Çukurova University

ABSTRACT

Language teachers devote a lot of time and energy to provide corrective feedback (CF) to help student writers improve the accuracy of their writing. However, regardless of the CF approach adopted, similar types of errors usually appear in students' new pieces of writing. Thus, most teachers have some doubt about the impact of CF, and some see it as a waste of time and energy. Similarly, our personal experience as writing teachers has led us to the conclusion that CF is not beneficial to some learners' accuracy development, and we need new methods to make it more effective. In the present multiple case study, we aim to investigate whether collaborating with a peer in the editing process could have a positive impact on our students' uptake and retention. More specifically, the study compares the nature of eight learners' engagement with and utilization of comprehensive coded indirect CF (CCICF) they receive on the errors in their paragraphs under two different editing conditions: individually or with a peer. In addition, pair talks during the editing process are analyzed to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' response to CCICF. Lastly, their feedback about the process is explored through a questionnaire.

INTRODUCTION

The term corrective feedback (CF) in second language acquisition is used to refer to responses to the errors in learners' second language productions, and giving effective CF is a central concern for teachers of writing. L2 writing teachers usually provide indirect CF on the errors in students' written productions and ask learners to edit their errors because a number of theorists and researchers in the field of SLA agree that positive evidence alone is not sufficient and that CF as a form of negative evidence is generally considered to be a necessary condition for L2 learning. However, although they devote a lot of time and energy to the provision of CF and to the editing process, teachers have some concerns about its beneficial effects, especially in the long term.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In education, feedback is widely seen as crucial for both encouraging and consolidating learning and this significance has also been recognized by the ones working in the field of L2 writing (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Feedback can be divided into two categories: positive or negative. Positive feedback confirms that a learner response to an activity is correct in terms of content or linguistic correctness. Negative feedback, on the other hand, indicates that the learner's utterance lacks accuracy or is linguistically deviant. Negative feedback is corrective in intent. Language educators and SLA researchers have paid careful attention to CF, but they have different views about issues such as whether to correct errors, what errors to correct, how to correct them, and when to correct them (Ellis, 2009). L2 writing teachers give feedback to their students on a wide range of issues such as the text's content, organization of the ideas, the appropriateness of the vocabulary used; however, it is feedback on linguistic errors that has received most of the researchers' attention. Teachers' responses to L2 learners' non-target like production have been commonly referred to as CF or error correction (Van Beuningen, 2010), and it is probably the most widely used feedback form in present-day L2 classrooms (Van Beuningen, et al, 2012).

In a recent international survey completed by 1,053 L2 writing practitioners in 69 different countries, 99 % of all respondents reported that they provide at least some error correction on student writing, and 92 % of the respondents indicated that error correction is typically what they do as L2 writing teachers (Evans et al, 2010 p. 57). However, although it is extensively used by almost all of the L2 writing teachers, the role and usefulness of CF as a pedagogical tool in L2 writing has been an issue of controversy in the last decades. Since Truscott's (1996) article "The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes", in which he claimed that error correction is necessarily ineffective and potentially harmful, CF in L2 writing has attracted great attention by L2 writing scholars (Hyland, 1998; Ferris, 1999; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Chandler, 2003; Bitchener et al., 2005; Guenette, 2007; Sachs & Polio, 2007; Liu, 2008; Ellis et al., 2008; Ellis, 2009; Li, 2010; Van Beuningen, 2010; Van Beuningen et al, 2012). Many studies have been carried out to find out whether CF helps L2 student writers to write more accurately in revised drafts and new texts, whether it helps them to improve the overall quality of their future written production, how explicit CF should be, and what different effects different types of CF have on different error types and on different learners. However, research results indicated that there are no simple answers to these questions, and the role played by CF in L2 writing is still a controversial issue among L2 writing scholars and teachers.

According to Ferris (2006), individual variation in students' ability to utilize and process teacher feedback successfully (in the short or long term) has been a largely unexplored question in error correction research. The relevant literature on CF demonstrates the necessity of doing case studies to develop a sound understanding of the feedback and revision process and to look at each student on his/her own context individually (Hyland, 2000; Hyland, 2003; Goldstein, 2006; Ferris, 2006; Storch, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010).

METHODOLOGY

Aims

The present study focused on the nature of learners' engagement with and utilization of CCICF they receive on the errors in their written productions under two different editing conditions: individually or with a peer. The aim of the study was to investigate whether collaborating with a peer in the editing process could have a positive impact on the students' uptake and retention. The impact of CCICF was first evaluated on the immediate edited drafts to gain a better understanding of uptake. After three weeks, all the participants were given their initial drafts without any errors marked and they were asked to revise the errors they noticed individually. Their edited texts were analyzed for evidence of retention. In addition, pair talks during the editing process were analyzed to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' response to CCICF, and their feedback about editing with a peer was explored through a questionnaire.

Participants

A multiple case study approach was adopted, with eight cases selected randomly from the researchers' classes. Assignment of the participants to the different editing conditions (individually or with a peer) was also done randomly. The participants (4 females, 4 males) were from the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture who were taking an English preparation class at Çukurova University School of Foreign Languages during 2014-2015 academic year at pre-intermediate level.

Procedure

Before collecting data, the researchers held an orientation meeting with the participants to give information about the process they would go through in the study and to help them familiarize with the error correction codes. In the orientation meetings, each participant received a file which included a list of error families, error categories and error types, a list of coding symbols, and a list of error samples and examples of CCICF. The researchers explained what they were required to do as a participant, and answered their questions if they had any. The orientation meeting was held in Turkish, the participants' native language, in order to avoid any confusion or misunderstanding.

During the study, the participants attended 5 sessions. In session 1, all of them wrote a paragraph individually in about 160 words (8-12 sentences) about the reasons why online shopping is a popular trend nowadays. They were given 30 minutes and allowed to use dictionaries. The researchers checked the papers and gave written feedback dealing with the content and organization. In session 2 (Day 2), they revised their paragraphs individually using the feedback and submitted their revised drafts after proofreading them. These drafts were considered as the initial drafts, and the researchers provided CCICF on the grammatical, lexical and mechanical errors by underlining/bracketing the errors and attaching appropriate error codes. CCICF was given systematically according to a chart which had been adapted from Hartshorn (2008) and Ferris (2006) and modified by Kahyalar (2013). In session 3 (Day 3), the pairs were given their paragraphs with the errors marked and had 40 minutes to discuss the feedback in each paragraph and rewrite it together. Pair talks during these sessions were audio recorded, transcribed and analyzed to gain a deeper understanding of their engagement with and utilization of CCICF. The participants in the individual revision group, on the other hand, were provided with CCICF and required to edit their errors and rewrite their paragraphs individually. The researchers checked these papers, and in session 4 (Day 5), they had a conference session with each participant. In these

sessions, they reformulated the sentences with errors if there were any. In session 5 (Day 26), all of the participants were given the unmarked and original version of their text (written in session 2) and had 30 minutes to rewrite it individually by correcting the errors they noticed. After that session, the “revision with a peer” group were given a questionnaire to get their feedback about the process.

Data Analysis

In the present study, three sources of data were used: students’ texts written on day 2, 3 and 26; the transcribed pair talks during the rewriting sessions on day 3; and the questionnaires given to the participants who worked with a peer.

First, we focused on each participant’s texts written on day 2 and day 3 for evidence of uptake. We used an analysis scheme which was adapted by Kahyalar (2013) from Ferris (2006). Revisions made in response to CCICF on the grammatical, lexical and mechanical errors were counted for each category (Error corrected, incorrect change, no change, deleted text, substitution correct, substitution incorrect, unnecessary change, revision-induced error), and the results for individual revision group and revision with a peer group were analyzed and displayed in percentage terms.

The transcribed pair talks from the rewriting sessions were analyzed for language-related episodes (LREs) (Swain & Lapkin, 1998), which were defined as parts in the pair talk during which learners focused explicitly on language items. Based on the work of Storch & Wigglesworth (2010), LREs were analyzed for the nature of engagement. LREs in which the participants offered suggestions and counter-suggestions, explanations, or any evidence of meta-awareness of the CF received were included in “extensive engagement” category. On the other hand, LREs in which one member of the pair simply read the feedback and the other only repeated or acknowledged it were included in the limited/no engagement category. LREs in both categories were examined to find out what level of engagement led to higher number of successful revisions.

Next, the texts written on days 2 and 26 were compared for evidence of retention of CCICF for the two groups. We developed an analysis scheme with four categories according to what we found in the data. Finally, the data from the questionnaires were analyzed to explore the attitudes of the participants who worked with a peer in the editing process.

RESULTS

With regard to grammatical errors, the participants in the two groups responded to almost all the CF they had been offered and the percentage of “Error Corrected” category is the highest among all the categories. In Table 1 below, the results concerning the grammatical errors and related revisions are presented.

Table 1. Revision Analysis Categories for Grammatical Errors (Uptake)

| Category | Individual Revision | | Revision with a Peer | | Total | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Error Corrected | 45 | 55.55 | 57 | 61.95 | 102 | 58.95 |
| Incorrect Change | 18 | 22.22 | 15 | 16.3 | 33 | 19.07 |
| No Change | 5 | 6.17 | 8 | 8.69 | 13 | 7.51 |
| Deleted Text | 4 | 4.93 | 5 | 5.43 | 9 | 5.2 |
| Substitution Correct | 3 | 3.7 | 2 | 2.17 | 5 | 2.89 |
| Substitution Incorrect | 6 | 7.4 | 3 | 3.26 | 9 | 5.2 |
| Unnecessary Change | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Revision-induced Error | - | - | 2 | 2.17 | 2 | 1.15 |
| Total | 81 | ≈ 100 | 92 | ≈ 100 | 173 | ≈ 100 |

It is apparent from Table 1 that, in general terms, CCICF was effective to treat the errors in grammatical error family because the total percentage of errors corrected is 58.95. This outcome is in accordance with Ferris (2006), Van Beuningen et al. (2008), Truscott & Hsu (2008) and Storch (2009 cited in Storch, 2010) in that unfocused CF led to improved accuracy from one draft of a paper to the next. This finding stands in contrast to Truscott's (1996; 2001; 2007) claims that students may fail to understand teachers' grammar feedback and CF could not have any value for errors in grammar. As is shown in Table 1, the participants who worked with a peer managed to correct their errors more successfully than those who worked individually. Moreover, the percentage of "incorrect change" category is lower for the revision with a peer group. As for the other categories, the two groups were quite similar. These results can be viewed as a positive impact of collaborating with a peer on uptake.

As for lexical errors, all the participants appeared to address almost all the feedback; however, unlike the revision of grammatical errors, the participants in the individual revision group performed better. Table 2 below provides the results about the two groups' lexical errors and related revisions.

Table 2. Revision Analysis Categories for Lexical Errors (Uptake)

| Category | Individual Revision | | Revision with a Peer | | Total | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Error Corrected | 11 | 50 | 8 | 44.44 | 19 | 47.5 |
| Incorrect Change | 3 | 13.63 | 5 | 27.77 | 8 | 20 |
| No Change | 2 | 9.09 | 2 | 11.11 | 4 | 10 |
| Deleted Text | 3 | 13.63 | 2 | 11.11 | 5 | 12.5 |
| Substitution Correct | 3 | 13.63 | 1 | 5.55 | 4 | 10 |
| Substitution Incorrect | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Unnecessary Change | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Revision-induced Error | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 22 | ≈ 100 | 18 | ≈ 100 | 40 | 100 |

A quick glance at Table 2 makes it clear that the participants in the individual revision group were able to edit their lexical errors more successfully. We should also note that the percentage of “incorrect change” category is noticeably higher for the revision with a peer group, and that the number of corrections invented by the participants that was not suggested by CCICF (substitution correct) was higher for the individual revision group. The two groups were quite similar in their revisions related to the other categories. It is difficult to speculate on the causes of these findings but it seems plausible to conclude that working with a peer caused some hesitation and/or confusion while discussing and editing lexical errors. This may be explained by the fact that lexical errors result from ignorance of idiosyncratic language rules, which means “There is no handbook or set of rules students can consult to avoid or fix those types of errors” (Ferris, 1999 p. 6). These results suggest that when we consider the idiosyncrasies in language, learners might not benefit from deliberating over the CF with a peer and discussing how to revise an error in response to it.

Regarding mechanical errors, it was found out that the percentages of correct revisions were really high for both groups. The results about the mechanical errors and revisions based on CCICF are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Revision Analysis Categories for Mechanical Errors (Uptake)

| Category | Individual Revision | | Revision with a Peer | | Total | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Error Corrected | 29 | 74.35 | 34 | 85 | 63 | 79.74 |
| Incorrect Change | 3 | 7.69 | 5 | 12.5 | 8 | 10.12 |
| No Change | 3 | 7.69 | 1 | 2.5 | 4 | 5.06 |
| Deleted Text | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Substitution Correct | 3 | 7.69 | - | - | 3 | 3.79 |
| Substitution Incorrect | 1 | 2.56 | - | - | 1 | 1.26 |
| Unnecessary Change | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Revision-induced Error | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 39 | ≈ 100 | 40 | 100 | 79 | ≈ 100 |

As is shown in Table 3, the percentages of correct revisions are the highest for the two groups when compared to their revisions of grammatical and lexical errors, which implies that mechanical errors were more amenable to CCICF than others. This finding is in accordance with the related literature (Ferris, 2006; Truscott, 2007). It can also be observed from Table 3 that revision of mechanical errors with a peer led to higher percentage of correct revisions (85 %) than individual revision (74.35 %). However, the percentage of “incorrect change” category is slightly higher for the revision with a peer group. As for the “no change” category, the percentage is higher for the individual revision group. These results may indicate that the participants who worked with a peer preferred to take risks instead of not trying to correct their mechanical errors, while those in the other group chose not to respond to CCICF in some cases.

The transcribed pair talk from the rewriting sessions were analyzed for language related episodes (LREs), which were defined as segments in the pair talk during which learners focused explicitly on language items. Table 4 shows the analysis of the nature of engagement appeared in LREs based on the distinction made between extensive and limited/no engagement.

Table 4. Nature of Engagement Appeared in LREs during Pair Talk

| Nature of engagement | Correct Resolution | | Incorrect Resolution | | Unresolved | | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------|------|----------------------|--------|------------|-------|---|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | | |
| Limited / no engagement | 82 | 65.1 | 73 | 89.024 | 8 | 9.756 | 1 | 1.219 |
| Extensive engagement | 44 | 34.9 | 17 | 38.64 | 23 | 52.27 | 4 | 9.09 |

As can be seen in Table 4, most of the LREs showed evidence of limited/no engagement episodes, and 89.024 % of them led to correct resolutions. Only 34.9 % of all LREs included extensive engagement in which participants offered suggestions, explanations or any comments. Unlike in limited/no engagement, only 38.64 % of the errors were resolved correctly at the end of extensive engagement episodes.

LREs were also analyzed to find out what level of engagement appeared as response to CCICF on different error families. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Nature of Engagement in Pair Talk for Grammatical, Lexical and Mechanical Errors

| Nature of engagement | Grammatical | | Lexical | | Mechanical | |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------|---------|-------|------------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Limited/no engagement | 34 | 41.46 | 11 | 13.42 | 37 | 45.12 |
| Extensive engagement | 17 | 38.63 | 25 | 56.83 | 2 | 4.54 |

Table 5 shows that most mechanical (45.12 %) and grammatical (41.46 %) errors elicited limited/no engagement, most of which were composed of short turn as can be seen in the example below.

Student 1: *Let's start. "Advantage of online shopping". Spelling mistake. In online shopping, there is no capital "I", and we are going to make advantage plural. "Advantages of online shopping".*

Student 2: *"Advantages of online shopping". OK.*

However, most lexical errors (56.83%) elicited extensive engagement LREs which occurred in multiple turns (See the example below). This might be due to inadequate lexical repertoire of the learners'.

Student 1: *"Online shopping is more advantage than shopping center, so ..." is more? It should be followed by a plural noun. Isn't it?*

Student 2: *No not plural. The word form is wrong there. The form ...?*

Student 1: *Is it "advantage"?*

Student 2: *No*

Student 1: *Isn't "advantage" used with more?*

Student 2: *But, we can't say "more advantage". "Advantager" or "more advantage". But word form is wrong. Advantage is a noun. We need an adjective. Because we need an adjective for a comparison.*

Student 1: (Looks up the word in the dictionary) *It is "advantageous"*

The texts written on days 2 and 26 were compared for evidence of retention of CCICF for the two groups. We developed an analysis scheme with four categories according to what we found in the data. The results about the retention of feedback on grammatical errors are demonstrated in Table 6.

Table 6. Retention of Feedback on Grammatical Errors

| Category | Individual Revision | | Revision with a Peer | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Remembered and corrected | 31 | 38.27 | 23 | 25 | 54 | 31.21 |
| Did not remember | 38 | 46.91 | 55 | 59.78 | 93 | 53.75 |
| Deleted that part of the text | 2 | 2.46 | 3 | 3.26 | 5 | 2.89 |
| Incorrect change | 10 | 12.34 | 11 | 11.95 | 21 | 12.13 |
| Total | 81 | ≈ 100 | 92 | ≈ 100 | 173 | ≈ 100 |

On the whole, the results in Table 6 suggest a low level of retention, but on day 26, the individual revision group performed better than the revision with a peer group in noticing and correcting the grammatical errors in their initial drafts. They could remember and correct 38.27 % of their errors while the participants in the revision with a peer could remember and correct only 25 %. It should also be noted that the revision with a peer group did not remember 59.78 % of the grammatical errors that had received CCICF, which is higher than the percentage of the individual revision group (46.91 %) related to this category. As for “Incorrect change” category, the percentages are quite high for the two groups. In a small number of cases (5 in total), the participants deleted the part of the text that contained the error. These results, taken together indicate that although the participants who worked with a peer were able to make successful revisions in response to a large majority of feedback points and benefited more from CCICF in the short term (uptake) than those who worked individually, deliberating over the CCICF with a peer did not lead to a higher level of retention. However, it is worth noting that there was great individual variation in the level of retention. One participant in each group showed greater accuracy than the others in the group, which might be attributed to a number of factors such as the attention they paid to the feedback, their attitudes towards the CF practices and the editing processes in the study, and the amount of time they spent to study English.

Retention of CCICF on lexical errors was lower for both groups than that of grammatical errors. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Retention of Feedback on Lexical Errors

| Category | Individual Revision | | Revision with a Peer | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Remembered and corrected | 6 | 27.27 | 2 | 11.11 | 8 | 20 |
| Did not remember | 14 | 63.63 | 15 | 83.33 | 29 | 72.5 |
| Deleted that part of the text | 1 | 4.54 | - | - | 1 | 2.5 |
| Incorrect change | 1 | 4.54 | 1 | 5.55 | 2 | 5 |
| Total | 22 | ≈ 100 | 18 | ≈ 100 | 40 | 100 |

As illustrated in Table 7, in general, retention of feedback on lexical errors was low for the two groups. As a result of this, most of the lexical errors persisted in the texts written on day 26. Similar to the retention of CCICF on grammatical errors, individual revision group performed better than revision with a peer group regarding remembering and correcting the lexical errors in their initial drafts. Furthermore, the percentage of “Did not remember” category is lower (63.63) for individual revision group. As for the other categories, there is not much difference between the two groups. The findings, taken together, indicate that CCICF on lexical errors was more effective in uptake than in retention, and working individually resulted in higher levels of retention than revision with a peer. An important point we should mention here is that there was considerable individual variation in retention, especially in the individual revision group. This finding supports the claims of several researchers (Hyland, 1998; Hyland, 2000; Goldstein, 2006; Ferris, 2006; Storch, 2010; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010) that it may be better to adopt a more qualitative research design to investigate the effects of CF on individual learners since there is tremendous individual variation in terms of accuracy gains in the long run.

The analysis of texts written on days 2 and 26 revealed that the retention of feedback on mechanical errors was higher than those of grammatical and lexical errors for the two groups. The results concerning retention of feedback on mechanical errors are provided in Table 8.

Table 8. Retention of Feedback on Mechanical Errors

| Category | Individual Revision | | Revision with a Peer | | Total | |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|----------------------|------|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Remembered and corrected | 16 | 41.02 | 15 | 37.5 | 31 | 39.24 |
| Did not remember | 15 | 38.46 | 21 | 52.5 | 36 | 45.56 |
| Deleted that part of the text | 1 | 2.56 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3.79 |
| Incorrect change | 7 | 17.94 | 2 | 5 | 9 | 11.39 |
| Total | 39 | ≈ 100 | 40 | 100 | 79 | ≈ 100 |

As can be seen in Table 8, the participants in the individual revision group were able to remember and correct a higher percentage (41.02) of their mechanical errors than those in the revision with a peer group. The percentage of “Did not remember” category is 38.46 for the individual revision group, whereas it is 52.5 for the revision with a peer group. Another finding is that the participants who worked individually during the editing process made more incorrect changes (17.94 %) than the ones who worked with a peer (5 %). These results indicate that mechanical errors were more suitable targets for CCICF in general, and individual revision of mechanical errors usually had a more beneficial effect on retention. However, there was again great individual variation among the participants in both groups in terms of accuracy gains in the long term.

As already noted, the participants who worked with a peer in the editing process were given a questionnaire to find out their attitudes towards editing with a peer, and their opinions about the impact of collaborating with a peer on their uptake and retention. The questionnaires which included five open-ended questions were analyzed for content.

As regards affectivity experienced while collaborating with a peer in the editing process, all four participants indicated that they had positive affectivity in spite of some preconceived concerns, shown in the following quote from a participant:

“Because of the high number of errors in my writing, I was a bit concerned at the beginning. After we started editing, I felt better. It was much easier to recognize and correct the errors together.”

The participants did not mention any drawback as regards to editing with a peer. They quoted benefits such as the following:

“... It is time-saving and easier.”

“... I could examine my writing in more detail. My friend helped me find and correct the errors, particularly when I was confused.”

“... his suggestions helped me while I was correcting my errors.”

When the participants were asked to compare and contrast individual editing, which they normally do, with editing with a peer, they valued editing with a peer more uttering the benefits similar to those cited previously. All four participants admitted that they could notice their errors more easily when they collaborated in the editing process. Similarly, they all said that editing with a peer helped them raise their awareness about the errors in their writings. A striking comment emerged from one of the participants' quotes. She suggested that she could have worked more effectively with a partner whom she had closer relationship. In short, the participants' comments show that collaborating with a peer impacted uptake and affectivity positively.

However, the participants indicated that editing with a peer had little or no impact on retention as shown in the following quotes.

“Unfortunately, not. I had forgotten most of the things. I was unable to recognize my errors and I could not correct them. But, I learnt how to write a paragraph.”

“It had very little impact...”

“Although I could not remember all, I corrected some of them...”

CONCLUSION

This study investigated and compared the nature of learners' engagement and utilization of CCICF under two editing conditions: individually or with a peer. The main aim of the study was to find out whether collaborating with a peer in the editing process could have a positive effect on students' uptake and retention. Furthermore, pair talks during the editing process were analyzed to gain a deeper understanding of the learners' response to CCICF, and the attitudes and opinions of the participants about collaborating with a peer were examined through a questionnaire.

The findings showed that the revision with a peer group managed to correct their grammatical and mechanical errors more successfully than the individual revision group, whereas the individual revision group showed higher levels of uptake when CCICF on lexical errors was considered. These results can be viewed as a beneficial effect of working with a peer on improved grammatical and mechanical accuracy in the short term. However, the participants did not benefit from deliberating over CF with a peer and discussing how to revise their lexical errors in response to it.

The analysis of the pair talks showed that most of the LREs showed evidence of limited/no engagement but led to correct resolutions, while only a small percentage of them included extensive engagement and resulted in successful corrections. Another finding was that most lexical errors elicited extensive engagement with CF, and occurred in multiple turns. A possible explanation for the lack of successful revisions might be the idiosyncrasy of lexical errors, which makes them untreatable and less suitable targets for CF (Ferris, 1999, 2002, 2006). These findings

might imply that working with a peer caused even more hesitation and/or confusion while editing the lexical errors. This might also be attributable to the participants' inadequate lexical repertoire.

With regard to retention, the results indicate that on day 26, individual revision group performed better than the revision with a peer group in noticing and correcting the grammatical, lexical and mechanical errors in their initial drafts. With these results, we can conclude that despite being beneficial and leading to higher levels of uptake in terms of grammatical and mechanical errors, collaborating with a peer in the editing process did not aid the retention of CF in any error family. This might be attributed to the students' lack of experience in editing with a peer in response to CF.

However, it is important to reiterate that there was tremendous individual variation in the level of retention. As several researchers (e.g. Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010) suggest, learners' attitudes towards the feedback affect whether and how they respond to it and whether there is long-term learning. The analysis of the texts written on days 2, 3 and 26 showed that one participant in each group outperformed the others in the group. This might have stemmed from a number of factors such as the attention they paid to the feedback, their attitudes towards the CF practices and the editing process in the study, and the time they spent to study English. This finding is in line with the relevant literature in that it demonstrates the necessity of conducting case studies to have a better understanding of the feedback and revision process by looking at each learner in his/her context individually (Hyland, 1998; Goldstein, 2006; Hyland, 2000).

The data from the questionnaires indicated that all four participants had positive feelings about working with a peer and believed in its benefits. They commented that although they had some concerns at the beginning, they felt better and found it easier to recognize and correct the errors together. Their positive attitude might have had a positive effect on their revisions on day 3. However, one participant mentioned that she could have worked more effectively with a peer whom she had a closer relationship. This comment highlights the importance of exploring students' preferences and giving voice to them in CF practices. In addition, relying on the findings that show positive affectivity in the process of editing with a peer as practiced in this study could be improved, given the fact that affective factors are often ignored in research on CF although they play an important role in uptake and retention of feedback.

Eda Kahyalar(PhD) is a lecturer of English at School of Foreign Languages, Çukurova University, Turkey. Her current research interest focuses on investigating the role of teachers' corrective feedback in second language writing. She is also interested in teacher education and individual differences in adult second language learning.

Email: ekahyalar@gmail.com

Figen Yilmaz (PhD) is a lecturer of English at School of Foreign Languages, Çukurova University, Turkey. Her research areas/interests are music and language learning, young learners, content language learning, teacher training and teacher efficacy beliefs.

Email: fyilmazs@yahoo.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Another version of this study was presented at Teachers Research-IATEFL ReSIG Annual International Conference & 5thGediz University Annual Teacher Research Conference, İzmir, June 2015.

REFERENCES

- 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*, 191-205.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*(3), 267-296.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System, 36*, 353-371.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal, 63*(2), 97-107.
- Evans, N. W., Harshorn, K. J., McCollum, R. M., & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(4), 445-463.
- Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*, 1-11.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. (pp.81-104). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161-184.
- Goldstein, L. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: Contextual, teacher, and student variables. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. (pp.185-205). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 16*, 40-53.
- Hartshorn, J. K. (2008). The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo UT.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*(3), 255-286.
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL Writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 33-54.
- Hyland, F. (2003). Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback. *System, 31*(2), 217-230.
- Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing: An introduction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. (pp.1-19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kahyalar, E. (2013). An investigation into the impact of corrective feedback on second language learners' written production. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Çukurova University, Adana.

- Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-65.
- Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of error feedback in second language writing. *Arizona Working Papers in SLAT*, 15, 65-79.
- Sachs, R. & Polio, C. (2007). Learners' uses of two types of written feedback on a L2 writing revision task. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 29, 67-100.
- Storch, N. (2010). Critical feedback on written corrective feedback. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 29-46.
- Storch, N. & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). Learners' processing, uptake, and retention of corrective feedback on writing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303-334.
- Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-337.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (2001). Selecting errors for selective error correction. *Concentric: Studies in English Literature and Linguistics*, 27, 225-240.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272.
- Truscott, J. & Hsu, A. Y. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292-305.
- Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives, empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 1-27.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy. *ITL: International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 156, 279-296.
- Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in second language writing. *Language Learning*, 62(1), 1-41.