

A Review of Foreign Research on Written Corrective Feedback

Si Zhou, Xiuzhi Li*

Department of Foreign Languages, Yangtze University, China

Email: 1153744276@qq.com

Received: 09 Apr 2023; Received in revised form: 15 May 2023; Accepted: 27 May 2023

©2023 The Author(s). Published by TheShillonga. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract

This paper mainly reviews the empirical research and descriptive research on written corrective feedback in foreign countries. In the introduction part, it mainly clarifies the theoretical and practical needs of the research on corrective feedback in writing. In the theoretical foundation part, it mainly explains some core concepts about errors and corrective feedback and clarifies the research paradigm of error analysis. The key part of this paper is a systematic review of the empirical research and theoretical research on written corrective feedback and provides some implications for the respective research directions of the two types of research in the future. In addition, this paper hopes to provide useful enlightenment for second or foreign language teachers who provide written corrective feedback in their teaching practice.

Keywords— *error analysis, grammatical accuracy, second language writing, written corrective feedback*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the past 25 years, there has been a lot of research on written corrective feedback. The reason may be closely related to the development of corrective theory and the application of corrective feedback in teaching practice.

Firstly, corrective feedback can be divided into two categories according to the form of learner's second language output: oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback. The former is not within the scope of this paper, but the research results and paradigms of oral corrective feedback are indeed worthy of reference. The focus of this paper is the research on the latter, that is, written corrective feedback.

The next question we are faced with is: why are so many researchers interested in written corrective feedback? In other words, is written corrective feedback really necessary? There is a hot debate in the field of second language acquisition: is negative evidence necessary for

learners to learn a second language, given that most, if not all, of the input they receive is positive? The jury is still out on this issue. It is natural for scholars who hold the view that negative evidence is unhelpful to think that error-correcting feedback in writing is unnecessary or even a waste of time when learners could have obtained more positive evidence. However, if negative evidence is not completely unhelpful to learners' writing, then it is not difficult to explain the large amount of research on error-correcting feedback in writing.

In the current writing teaching practice in Chinese middle schools, error feedback has become an indispensable or even too important part of teachers' feedback to students' writing. Some high schools have even made relevant regulations and suggestions on written corrective feedback at the level of school management. For example, students should adhere to the guiding principle that mistakes must be corrected, and even give suggestions

on specific types of corrective feedback. On the level of schools at all levels, due to the fact that our country is in a foreign language environment, namely, learners have little need and opportunity to use the target language in real communication situations in daily life except for limited communication in the classroom, in this situation, learners' interlanguage fluency is difficult to be demanding, but the accuracy of learners' output has attracted attention from all sides: Including the national evaluation system (high school entrance examination, college entrance examination); The school's evaluation system for teachers (ranking student achievement); Teachers' attention to "low-level" mistakes in students' writing; Even learners themselves may wonder what mistakes they have made.

The practice of error feedback is closely related to the improvement of the accuracy of learners' exercise output. With the continuous reduction of errors in learners' exercise, teachers and students may easily attribute this to corrective feedback. However, whether the improvement of students' exercise accuracy is due to corrective feedback or other variables brings us back to the core issue mentioned above: is corrective feedback necessary and effective?

The academic circle has made a lot of attempts and efforts to solve this core issue. In addition to a wide range of relevant empirical studies, there are also two fierce debates.

The first debate took place in the late 20th century. In 1996, John Truscott pointed out that grammar correction in second language writing is harmful and should be abandoned, but Ferris (1999) insisted on the validity of grammar correction and thought Truscott's research was not comprehensive and persuasive. Truscott, on the other hand, argued that Ferris did not provide valuable evidence that corrective worked, nor did he discuss his evidence that grammar correction did not work. In the ensuing debate, both sides changed their views. Although the debate was ultimately inconclusive, the contrasting views of both sides have led to a great deal of empirical research into the feedback effects of writing corrective, as well as a second debate.

The second debate between Bruton and Truscott involved not only the effect of corrective, but also the questioning of the research on corrective. Bruton gives an

early warning of future research in this field from the perspective of ecological validity, and also clarifies the future research direction.

According to what is mentioned above, it is necessary and of great significance to review the research on error-correcting feedback in writing from both theoretical and practical levels. This is because the review of existing descriptive and empirical studies can not only clarify the trend of theoretical development, but more importantly, provide specific suggestions for the improvement of practice of first-line written corrective feedback.

II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The concept of written corrective feedback has many similar terms in different studies, such as error feedback, corrective or grammar correction (Lee, 2004; Truscott, 1996). These seemingly different terms are essentially the same, so they can be used interchangeably in this field of research. However, there is a kind of written corrective feedback or written correction feedback, which the author believes is very misleading about the essence of written corrective feedback, because written corrective feedback refers to the feedback of language errors in students' exercises, with the purpose of improving the accuracy of learners' exercises (Bitchener & Storch, 2016). That is to say, as long as the feedback for the language errors in students' work, no matter in oral form or written form, it belongs to the written corrective feedback. However, written corrective feedback may easily lead people to believe that written corrective feedback is limited to teachers' written feedback on language errors in students' work, which is exactly what this concept is trying to avoid.

From this definition, it is easy to find that the concept contains many key words. The first is feedback. Undoubtedly, written corrective feedback is only a small part of feedback (feedback can be divided into corrective feedback and critical non-corrective feedback, and corrective feedback is divided into oral corrective feedback and written corrective feedback). After this is clear, we narrow the research object to a relatively concentrated area: language errors in the work of second or foreign language learners. Since it is aimed at language errors, it is distinguished from non-error correcting comment type

feedback; At the same time, since it is a mistake in writing, it is distinguished from oral corrective feedback. Therefore, written corrective feedback is a sub-concept under the relatively complex concept of feedback, and "writing" is more embodied in the "where to correct", the correction is carried out in student writing rather than in student discourse, which also clarifies the limits that should be paid attention to when data collection in this field. Next comes the core concept of corrective, which can be broken down into "error" and "correction."

The significance of learner errors may be taken for granted at present, but in the 1950s and 1970s, the oral and oral law argued that errors were the embodiment of learners' language imperfection, which should be completely eliminated through repeated mechanical practice and reinforcement. Without much thought to the possible significance of the error itself. But since 1967, Corder first interprets the significance of Learners' Errors in *The Significance of Learners' errors*, the former view on errors as "thorns" that the corresponding teaching practice method gradually begins to decline. On the contrary, the analysis and study of errors have attracted the attention of a large number of second language acquisition researchers, and have derived a large number of valuable discoveries about the learning process and learners themselves.

We can use Lennon's 1991 definition of error: A mistake is a form of language produced by a learner that is highly unlikely (in all likelihood) to be produced by a native speaker corresponding to that learner in the same context.

One advantage of this definition is that it avoids the problem of "semantic intention" versus "formal intention". Semantic intention refers to the material content or information that learners want to communicate and express, while formal intention is the means that learners take to achieve semantic intention. Lennon's mis-definition of "the same situation" left the meaning/semantic intent variable constant, leaving only the form variable. Another laudable feature lies in the connection between learners and the corresponding social individuals in the target language system, who are native speakers (NS) of similar education level, the same age group, the same socioeconomic class, the same gender and even the same profession with learners.

Before distinguishing errors from other confounding concepts, it is necessary to clarify why errors are worth studying, that is, what is the significance of errors. Carl James pointed out in his book *Errors in Language Learning and Use* that the significance of errors is mainly reflected in three aspects: First, errors help teachers clarify the key and difficult points of teaching, and also provide early warning for the need to optimize subsequent teaching. Secondly, errors help researchers to study learners and the learning process more specifically. Thirdly, learners test their assumptions about the target language by making mistakes.

The relevant concepts of error involve slip, mistake, error and solecism, and the previous definition of error is the elaboration of error: that is, error refers to the language form produced by the learner, which is highly unlikely (nine out of ten) to be produced by the native speaker corresponding to the learner in the same situation (Lennon, 1991). As for slip, it is our daily mistakes, including slip of the tongue and slip of the pen, and learners can quickly find and correct it without feedback from others. But mistakes are more complicated, which can be divided into first-order mistake and second-order mistake. Among them, the former refers to the mistakes that the learner can self-correct when he/she is prompted to have deviations. The latter refers to errors that can be corrected for learners only after additional information is provided, such as providing the exact location of the error or providing hints on the nature of the deviation (metalinguistic interpretation). A final, less familiar concept is solecism, which refers to "fallacies" that violate the rules of what purists believe to be right. For example, split infinitives. Purists argue that infinitives cannot be split. Dangling participle. What's interesting about this type of error is that native speakers are likely to make it more often than learners, because it goes against native speakers' intuition and sense of language.

What's followed is the explanation of corrective. Since corrective is to comment on language, corrective is essentially to comment on language with language, which is a kind of metalinguistic behavior. The errant is usually the learner, and the errant is usually the teacher, but it may also be the helpful native speaker, the learner's companion or even the learner himself. However, when both the

error-correcting person and the error-correcting person are learners themselves, self-correction comes into being. As mentioned above, learners can self-correct their mistakes without the help of external forces.

The concept of corrective is used in many contexts. First, corrective may mean informing the learner that there is an error and then letting them find and correct it themselves. That is, to tell the learner whether the words or sentences they have produced are correct or not. (Feedback, as indicated here, is different from the broader meaning of feedback.) Second, the purpose of correction is to provide information to assist in the correction of a particular type of error, rather than to prevent such errors from occurring in the future (only for the current output, in a narrow sense of correction). Finally, the purpose of corrective is to provide learners with information to help them correct or abandon the wrong rules used when making mistakes. The fundamental purpose of such corrective is to guide learners to correct their mental representations of the rules of the target language so as to ensure that such errors will not occur in the future. (Remediation for all outputs, including future ones).

Prabhu (1987) distinguished the correction of error cases (error-token) and error types (error-type), which is of great significance for judging corrective of individual cases and system. The former only corrects specific error cases, that is, although the error itself is corrected, there is no induction of the type of error reflected by the error.

Lapses can be corrected by the learner without feedback from others, but there must be some kind of feedback coming from the learner himself, that is, from the learner's intuition: after a slip of the tongue or a mistake, one realizes that one has misspoken or written something. mistake, on the other hand, is different from mistakes. Learners can correct themselves only with the help of others' feedback. That is to say, the mistake correction must inform learners of the existence of the mistake without further explanation. However, if the learner fails to correct himself after being informed that there is a mistake, then the mistake is an error rather than a mistake. In this case, the learner should not only be informed of the error, but also be explained to the TL corresponding to the learner's interlanguage containing error, which can be explicit or implicit.

III. WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK (EMPIRICAL RESEARCH + DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH)

As mentioned above, empirical studies have sprung up since the first controversy over error-correcting feedback in writing, including a large number of studies showing the effectiveness of error-correcting feedback in student writing in English as a second language. In 2004, Ferris and Truscott agreed in their respective studies that the results and findings of a study that did not involve a comparison between a group that received feedback and a group that did not receive feedback (a control group) should not be evidence that corrective feedback is effective. In other words, the study design without a control group is not rigorous enough, and the resulting conclusions are not convincing.

Thus, research on written corrective feedback with control group (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Kepner, 1991; Polio, Fleck, & Leder, 1998) illustrates the significance of polio. Among them, three studies have pointed out that error-correcting feedback has a positive effect on grammatical accuracy, but these three studies also have problems in the level of research design. In the study of Fathman and Whalley (1990), the measure of post-test was to ask students to revise and rewrite the exercises in the pre-test without involving new writing tasks under the same genre and similar topics, which undoubtedly shook the foundation of the research conclusion. Ashwell and Ferris & Roberts had the same problem, neither of which examined students' accuracy on subsequent new assignments, which is a big reason why Truscott is skeptical of the results of such study designs. He points out that feedback is ineffective because the knowledge gained through error-correcting feedback is a form of "false knowledge", a term he does not define, but most likely refers to superficial and non-systematic knowledge, such as that reflected by correcting errors in a rewrite. Therefore, in our future research design, we should focus on introducing new writing tasks for post-test to measure whether learners can transfer after receiving feedback on corrective, rather than just asking students to rewrite the original writing tasks and correct the previous language errors.

Although the control group was not included in the

written corrective feedback study (Chandler, 2000; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Ferris, Chaney, Komura, Roberts, & McKee, 2000; Lalande, 1982) cannot be used as valid evidence, but these studies all agree that error-correcting feedback is beneficial for those students who receive feedback. However, due to the loss of the necessary study design of a control group, these studies can only be seen as providing some insight into the effectiveness of different types of feedback and subsequent hypotheses that need to be more rigorously tested. However, 95% of the written corrective feedback studies were conducted in the classroom, which improved the ecological validity of the studies at the cost of weakening experimental control.

Empirical studies on written corrective feedback mainly fall into four categories: 1. Whether written corrective feedback is effective for language learning; 2. Comparison between the effects of different types of written corrective feedback, that is, which is more effective; 3. Whether the effect of written corrective feedback can be sustained, and if so, for how long; 4. What are the factors that affect the feedback of writing corrective? The first type of study, as mentioned above, should include the control group as far as possible, so as to compare with the feedback group. For the third type of research, the research design including pre and post testing is not enough to explain the problem, at least should include pre testing, timely post-testing and delayed post-testing to a certain extent to answer that the corrective feedback effect can be sustained after, if conditions allow, after the delayed post-testing can continue tracking research. For the research design aspect of empirical studies on corrective feedback, please refer to Li's integrative review in 2018.

Liu and Brown (2015) also integrated the research methods of written corrective feedback and pointed out many issues that need to be solved in future research. Their research found that most studies on written corrective feedback focused on the short-term effect of feedback, while delayed post-test was rare. That is to say, most relevant studies ignored the long-term effect of written corrective feedback. Only 30 percent of the studies that included delayed posttests spanned more than one semester. The only exception was the Bitchener and Knoch (2009) study, which lasted for 10 months.

Liu and Brown (2015) also found that it is of great

significance to describe text length in the study of written corrective feedback. They pointed out that half of the studies did not provide the average number of words in the student work sample and suggested that this detail could be described in future studies in order to provide a reference for students' writing proficiency, fluency, and overall writing ability. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) argued that the more words in the writing sample, the more mistakes student writers are likely to make, and correspondingly, the more feedback they will get about their mistakes. For essays with more words, an increase in the amount of error-correcting feedback either promotes or hinders learning. In other words, longer student exercises are likely to obtain more error-correcting feedback, which can enhance students' attention to the target language structure or a certain error category through focused feedback and promote learning. Or maybe the cognitive burden is increased by the increase in unfocused feedback.

As for the definition of written corrective feedback, it has been described in the previous article. It should be emphasized again that written corrective feedback includes both written feedback to students' writing mistakes and oral feedback to students' writing mistakes, such as private meetings, usually after the writing is completed. Discussion on the problem of writing between teachers and individual students (Erlam, Ellis, & Batstone, 2013). Teachers can also discuss common problems in their work directly in the classroom with all students (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009).

Some scholars, such as Ashwell, believe that written corrective feedback pays attention not only to language but also to content. However, in his actual research (Ashwell, 2000), the focus is still on language-related errors. Generally speaking, the target of studies on corrective feedback are mainly feedback for certain errors, but there are exceptions. This study provides a sample for students to guide them to find the mistakes and the things to be improved in their writing (Canovas Guirao, Roca de Larios, & Coyle, 2015). Since most written corrective feedback studies focus on teachers' written feedback on language-related errors in students' writing, this paper will focus more on such feedback.

Ellis (2009) roughly divides feedback into three categories: direct feedback, metalinguistic feedback, and

indirect feedback. For example, if a student's writing includes such a sentence: "Nowadays, the Internet have made it easier for people to communicate," then teachers can give feedback to students in three ways: 1. Direct feedback: provide students with the correct form, that is, replace "have" with "has"; 2. Metalinguistic feedback: A brief description of the nature of the error, where subject-verb agreement errors are involved. Another approach is error marking, which indicates error types (T for tense and Art. for article, etc.); 3. Indirect feedback: indicate the existence of mistakes by crossing, circling or other ways of marking "have", which in essence indicates the wrong position but does not give the learner any additional information. Although metalinguistic feedback is usually achieved through brief comments or error markers, it is usually scattered throughout the student's work, but there are exceptions. The implementation of the metalinguistic feedback in this study is to provide students with materials with explanations and examples of the rules of the target structure, and then apply the rules to self-correct after self-learning the materials (Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2013). The author believes that this study organically links corrective to post-writing grammar teaching. Although the study does not mention whether the teacher provided necessary guidance during the process of self-learning the rules, this study echoes Icy Lee's 2004 study's implication that students will benefit if teachers directly link corrective to grammar teaching; In addition, the study is exploring ways to help students become more independent learners, which is consistent with the implications mentioned in Lee's study.

Based on the number of error categories or target structures, written corrective feedback can also be divided into focused corrective feedback and non-focused corrective feedback. Some scholars believe that focused corrective feedback refers to the feedback used to correct a specific type of error (Sheen, 2007; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008). Some scholars believe that the feedback that pays attention to a few language structures is focused corrective feedback, while the non-focused corrective feedback is for the error related to multiple structures (Shaofeng Li & Alyssa Vuono, 2019). The degree of focus of corrective feedback is a continuum, in which the former refers to the corrective feedback with the highest degree of focus, while

the feedback with the lowest degree of focus is the error related to all language structures. Liu and Brown (2015) pointed out that there was a moderate degree of focused corrective feedback between the two poles of the degree of focus. According to their classification criteria, the degree of focus of feedback for 2 to 6 language structures was moderate. However, it is interesting to find that there is a lack of classification for a certain dimension in the literature, namely, comprehensive feedback and selective feedback (Shaofeng Li & Alyssa Vuono, 2019). The degree of focus of feedback depends on the number of language structures targeted by the feedback, while comprehensive feedback and selective feedback are determined by whether all errors in the student's work are given feedback. Therefore, even if the feedback is only for a certain language structure or error category, the researcher still needs to choose whether to correct part of the mistakes made by the learners about the structure or all the mistakes. The former is selective feedback, while the latter is comprehensive feedback. The author believes that subsequent research could also explore how to determine the criteria for selecting corrections or feedback for partial errors.

Next, another research hotspot that needs attention is the practice of written corrective feedback by front-line teachers. According to the study of Lee (2004), 67% of foreign language teachers in second-language schools in Hong Kong would give feedback on all the mistakes made by students in their work, and 55% of teachers who gave comprehensive feedback provided direct feedback. In this study, teachers provided only one type of indirect feedback: marking errors and providing metalinguistic feedback through error markers, so strictly speaking it was a kind of mixed feedback, including both indirect and metalinguistic feedback according to Ellis's classification. In her interview results with teachers, she mentioned that most teachers responded that the school management level requires teachers to give comprehensive feedback, which indicates that educational administrators in Hong Kong second language schools attach great importance to non-focused comprehensive feedback. Ferris' research in 2006 also found that the proportion of direct corrective feedback was equal to that of indirect corrective feedback. When California second language teachers gave feedback

to students' writing, direct feedback accounted for 45.3% and indirect feedback accounted for 51.1%. The study also revealed that teachers were more likely to provide direct feedback for non-rules-based errors; Indirect feedback is more about rule-based errors. Ferris further speculates that teachers may believe that learners, prompted by indirect feedback, can self-correct rule-based errors in combination with language rules. For errors that are not based on rules, teachers tend to believe that students cannot correct errors based on indirect feedback, but directly present correct language forms and structures. Ferris' research findings show that teachers' feedback practice of writing corrective is closely related to the types of errors.

The research on teachers' and students' beliefs and attitudes towards error-correcting feedback in writing focuses on the following contents:

3.1 The importance of correcting feedback in writing

Teachers and students generally hold a positive attitude towards the feedback of writing corrective. For example, research by Jamoom (2016) found that college foreign language teachers who participated in the project all recognized the value of written corrective feedback. In a study on students' attitudes, using a five-point scale, the researchers found that the average rating of students on questions about feedback attitudes towards writing corrective was 4.37 (Chen, Nassaji & Liu, 2016).

3.2 Attitudes towards different types of feedback

Learners seem to prefer direct feedback. For example, Lee (2005) pointed out in her study that 75.7% of students in second language schools in Hong Kong preferred direct or explicit feedback from teachers. Chen et al.'s (2016) research shows that learners prefer the following three specific types of feedback: the feedback indicating the error location, the feedback explaining the nature of the error, and the feedback providing the correct form (with an average rating of 4 on the five-level Likert scale). In addition, learners did not like feedback indicating errors without any additional information (the average rating was only 2.9).

3.3 Error categories

This research field involves the question of what to correct, that is, what types of errors should be given feedback. Learners' preferences in this respect will be affected by the learning environment and their own language proficiency

level. Hedgecock and Lefkowitz (1994) found that foreign language learners (Spanish, German and French learners) and second language learners have great differences in this respect: As many as 72% of the former learners prefer to correct errors related to language, while the latter believe that both language errors should be corrected and content feedback should be paid attention to. Lee (2008) found in the questionnaire results of students that for the question "What aspects of your work do you hope your teacher will pay more attention to when giving feedback in the future?" 51.4% of high proficiency learners expect more content level feedback and 34.3% expect more language-related feedback. For learners at low proficiency levels, they expect either content or language related feedback to be between 20 and 30 percent. Notably, 28% of low-proficiency learners did not want any additional feedback in the future, while all high-proficiency learners expected more of at least one type of feedback related to content, language, and organization.

3.4 The "dose" of corrective feedback

Lee's (2005) research shows that 83% of students in Hong Kong second language schools prefer comprehensive feedback, which means that they expect all their mistakes to be corrected. Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) also came to a similar conclusion, which found that as many as 94% of second language learners expected their teachers to correct all mistakes. However, only 45% of teachers who took part in the study felt it was necessary to provide feedback on all errors.

3.5 The agent of corrective

This area involves questions about Who to correct. According to the teacher questionnaire survey conducted by Lee (2004), among 206 teachers from universities and middle schools, 60% clearly stated that it was the teacher's job to correct mistakes, and more than 90% of teachers said that students should try their best to locate and correct their own mistakes. This survey result seems contradictory, but it is not, because in the follow-up in-depth interviews with teachers, although teachers strongly support students to identify and correct mistakes by themselves, many teachers believe that students' ability is not up to the mark. Even if some teachers do try to ask students to self-correct, the effect is not ideal. The results of student questionnaire show that both teachers and students should participate in

the process of correcting errors. When students were asked to choose between teacher feedback and non-teacher feedback (peer feedback or self-correction), as many as 93.8% chose teacher feedback (Zhang, 1995). However, it is important to note that making students choose between two kinds of feedback may not be the most effective way to get their true attitude. Although it is very likely that students value teacher feedback very much, it is not excluded that they value peer feedback equally (Shaofeng Li & Alyssa Vuono, 2019).

3.6 Learner's response to corrective feedback

One study found that 90% of learners said they would look at the teacher's feedback and correct mistakes (Chen et al., 2016; Leki, 1991). However, Han (2017) found that although students could realize the value of keeping a log of errors, 33% of them did not actually revise their exercises, but only kept errors related corrections in their mind for a short time.

In addition to studying teachers' and students' attitudes towards corrective feedback, researchers focused on error feedback have also studied the relationship between teachers' expressed beliefs and their error-correcting feedback practices. Similar to the results of the oral corrective feedback research, the written corrective feedback research shows that the beliefs held by teachers are inconsistent with the actual corrective feedback practice. Lee's (2009) study has a sufficient sample, in which she analyzed the feedback provided by 26 second-language school teachers to 174 students' exercises and compared the results with the questionnaire results of 206 teachers from the same group. She pointed out 10 discrepancies between teachers' belief and practice. For example, teachers generally believe that effective writing covers more than grammatical elements, but 94.1% of the feedback is grammatically oriented, which means that less than 6% of the comments are related to the meaning, content, organizational structure, and genre of the exercise. Teachers indicated that they preferred to use selective feedback, but they generally used comprehensive written corrective feedback, with an average of one corrective for every seven words in a student's work. In addition, teachers who responded to the questionnaire felt that students needed to write multiple essays if they were to benefit from feedback on writing errors, yet they

continued to assign one-off writing tasks in their classrooms. One of the reasons for such inconsistencies between belief and practice as described above may be that teachers' practice is influenced by local public testing requirements, and this is indeed mentioned in teacher interviews.

IV. IMPLICATIONS ON FUTURE RESEARCH

Some scholars point out that future empirical studies on the effectiveness of written corrective feedback should be included in the control group, so that convincing evidence can be obtained by comparing with the feedback group. The research design of pre-test and post-test should also be included in the research to measure whether the effect of written corrective feedback is sustained. The longitudinal research in this field needs to be strengthened. For example, the follow-up survey after delayed post-test is not mentioned in the literature, and the time span is short, so there is no long-term longitudinal research. Another point that follow-up researchers should try to avoid is the original writing task of rewriting and correcting errors. The new writing task should be investigated to make it clear whether the feedback of correcting errors is beneficial to the accuracy of students' subsequent writing (Bitchener, 2008). Studies on second language acquisition show that focused corrective feedback may be more effective than unfocused feedback, but this finding is inconsistent with the practice of first-line corrective feedback. Subsequent studies can further explore this field, such as the reasons why teachers do not give focused feedback and how to balance the use ratio of the two types of feedback in real classroom situations.

In terms of descriptive research and pure theoretical research, the types of error-correcting feedback should be described more systematically. For example, the research on comprehensive feedback and selective feedback can be combined with the category of error. For example, when researchers study selective feedback, how to determine the criteria for wrong selection? Subsequent studies can also integrate teacher and student factors into written corrective feedback research, that is, how these factors will affect teachers' corrective feedback practice and students' effect after obtaining corrective feedback. Truscott once criticized the ineffectiveness of corrective feedback from

the perspective of teacher and student factors. He believed that teachers may not be able to identify errors in the first place. Even if teachers can identify errors, teachers may not have enough metalinguistic knowledge to explain the errors, but only provide correct forms for students to memorize. In addition, regarding student factors, Truscott points out that students may not understand student feedback or explanations, which is partly supported by Icy Lee's research. Teachers' widespread use of comprehensive feedback in practice may make handwriting illegible and make it difficult for students to understand. On the other hand, due to the knowledge reserve of students, it may not be able to feedback from teachers. Finally, learners may be reluctant to respond to teacher's corrective feedback, which will seriously affect the effect of teacher's corrective feedback. Chandler pointed out in 2003 that if students did not make any response to teachers' feedback on writing corrective, there would be no difference with the effect of the control group (which did not accept teachers' feedback). Therefore, how to enhance students' understanding of teachers' feedback on writing corrective and how to motivate learners to respond to teachers' feedback and consciously correct it still needs further exploration in future studies.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper mainly reviews the empirical research and descriptive research on written corrective feedback in foreign countries. After sorting out and clarifying related concepts, this paper summarizes the theoretical and practical needs of corrective feedback research. Due to the late start of Chinese written corrective feedback research, this paper is left for further in-depth understanding and review, hoping that this review of foreign written corrective feedback research will provide enlightenment for the subsequent research direction of researchers and provide useful enlightenment for teachers in the practice of written corrective feedback.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ferris, D. The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996) [J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 1999, 8(1): 1–11.
- [2] Ferris D. Treatment of error in second language student writing[M]. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2011.
- [3] Ferris, Dana. “Does Error Feedback Help Student Writers? New Evidence on the Short- and Long-Term Effects of Written Corrective.” In K. Hyland and F. Hyland (ed.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issue*[M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006:81–104.
- [4] Ferris, D. R., Liu, H., Sinha, A. and Senna, M. Written corrective feedback for individual L2 writers[J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2013, 22(3): 307–329.
- [5] Furneaux, C., Paran, A. and Fairfax, B. Teacher stance as reflected in feedback on student writing: An empirical study of secondary school teachers in five countries[J]. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 2007, 45(1).
- [6] Flower, L. and Hayes, J. R. A cognitive process theory of writing[J]. *College Composition and Communication*, 1981, 32(4): 365–377.
- [7] Hyland, K. and Hyland, F. Feedback on second language students' writing[J]. *Language Teaching*, 2006, 39(2): 83–101.
- [8] Hyland, F. Focusing on form: Student engagement with teacher feedback[J]. *System*, 2003, 31(2): 217–230.
- [9] Han, Y. and Hyland, F. Exploring learner engagement with written corrective feedback in a Chinese tertiary EFL classroom[J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2015, 30: 31–44.
- [10] Han, Y. Mediating and being mediated: Learner beliefs and learner engagement with written corrective feedback[J]. *System*, 2017, 69: 133–142.
- [11] Han, Y. Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual learners[J]. *System*, 2019, 80: 288–303.
- [12] Keh, C. L. Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation[J]. *ELT Journal*, 1990, 44(4): 294–304.
- [13] Kuh, G. D. What we're learning about student engagement from NSSE: Benchmarks for effective educational practices[J]. *Change: The magazine of higher learning*, 2003, 35(2): 24–32.
- [14] Lee, I. Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms[J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2008, 17(3): 144–164.
- [15] Lee, I. Feedback in writing: Issues and challenges[J].

- Assessing Writing, 2014, 19: 1–5.
- [16] Li, J., Link, S. and Hegelheimer, V. Rethinking the role of automated writing evaluation (AWE) feedback in ESL writing instruction[J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2015, 27: 1–18.
- [17] Newmann, F. M., Wehlage, G. G. and Lamborn, S. D. The significance and sources of student engagement. In F. M. Newmann (Ed.), *Student engagement and achievement in American secondary schools* [M]. New York: Teachers College Press, 1992:11-39.
- [18] Philp, J. and Duchesne, S. Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom[J]. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 2016, 36: 50–72.
- [19] Qi, D. S. and Lapkin, S. Exploring the role of noticing in a three-stage second language writing task[J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2001, 10(4): 277–303.
- [20] Rod Ellis. A typology of written corrective feedback types[J]. *ELT Journal*, 2008, 63(2): 97-107.
- [21] Rod Ellis et al. The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context[J]. *System*, 2008, 36(3): 353-371.
- [22] Rosemary Erlam, Rod Ellis, Rob Batstone. Oral corrective feedback on L2 writing: Two approaches compared[J]. *System*, 2013, 41(2): 257-268.
- [23] Shaofeng Li & Alyssa Vuono. Twenty-five years of research on oral and written corrective feedback in System[J]. *System*, 2019, 84: 1-60.
- [24] Storch, N. and Wigglesworth, G. Learners' Processing, Uptake, and Retention of Corrective Feedback on Writing[J]. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 2010, 32(2): 303–334.
- [25] Tian, L. and Li, L. Chinese EFL learners' perception of peer oral and written feedback as providers, receivers and observers[J]. *Language Awareness*, 2018, 27(4): 312–330.
- [26] Willms, J. D. *Student engagement at school: A sense of belonging and participation: Results from PISA 2000*[M]. OECD Publishing, 2003.
- [27] Wehlage, G., Rutter, R., Smith, G., Lesko, N. and Fernandez, R. *Reducing the Risk: School as communities of support*[M]. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1989.
- [28] Xu, L., Teng, L. S. and Cai, J. Feedback engagement of Chinese international doctoral students[J]. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 2020, 43(1): 119–135.
- [29] Yu, S. and Lee, I. Understanding EFL students' participation in group peer feedback of L2 writing: A case study from an activity theory perspective[J]. *Language Teaching Research*, 2014, 19(5): 572–593.
- [30] Yu, S. and Lee, I. Peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014) [J]. *Language Teaching*, 2016, 49(4): 461–493.
- [31] Yu, S. and Jiang, L. Doctoral students' engagement with journal reviewers' feedback on academic writing[J]. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 2022, 44(1): 87-104.
- [32] Yu, S., Zhang, Y., Zheng, Y., Yuan, K. and Zhang, L. Understanding student engagement with peer feedback on master's theses: A Macau study[J]. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 2018, 44(1): 50–65.
- [33] Zhao, H. Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom[J]. *Assessing Writing*, 2010, 15(1): 3–17.
- [34] Zhu, W. Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups[J]. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 2001, 10(4): 251–276.
- [35] Zhang, Z. (Victor). Student engagement with computer-generated feedback: a case study. *ELT Journal*, 2017, 71(3): 317–328.
- [36] Zhang, Z. (Victor) and Hyland, K. Student engagement with teacher and automated feedback on L2 writing[J]. *Assessing Writing*, 2018, 36: 90–102.