Faculty of Language and Communication

A Case Study on the Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on Collocation Competence: Evidence from a Public University in Malaysia

Abang Fhaeizdhyall Abang Madaud

Doctor of Philosophy
2023

A Case Study on the Effects of Written Corrective Feedback on Collocation Competence: Evidence from a Public University in Malaysia

Abang Fhaeizdhyall Abang Madaud

A thesis submitted

In fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

(Applied Linguistics)

Faculty of Language and Communication
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA SARAWAK
2023

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this thesis was carried out in accordance with the regulations of Universiti Malaysia Sarawak. Except where due acknowledgements have been made, the work is that of the author alone. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

……

Signature

Name: Abang Fhaeizdhyall bin Abang Madaud

Matric No.: 18010057

Faculty of Language and Communication

Universiti Malaysia Sarawak

Date : September 4, 2023

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I have received a great deal of assistance and support throughout the writing of this thesis.

First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Collin Jerome from UNIMAS for his continuous support in my Ph.D. journey. His guidance, patience, critical views, and great commitment have helped me in all the time of research and writing of my thesis. I could not have imagined having a better supervisor for my PhD journey.

Second, I would like to acknowledge my colleagues from Universiti Teknologi MARA Cawangan Sarawak who have contributed their ideas, guidance, and suggestions during the proposal development stage of the thesis. This is especially for senior lecturers in the Academy of Language Studies and the Faculty of Business Management. Furthermore, some lecturers from the Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Sciences deserve to be acknowledged for guiding me during the data analysis stage. Also, my appreciation goes out to my former students who had agreed to participate in the study,thus contributing to the completion of my study.

In addition, I would like to thank my parents for their wise counsel and understanding of my predicament in completing my Ph.D. study. Also, the process of completing the thesis involved many stimulating discussions with friends who are in the same course, completing their own Ph.D.s. Therefore, their support deserves a mention.

Last but not least, the critical feedback from Prof. Dr. Muhammad Kamarul Kabilan, Prof. Dr. Ting Su Hie, and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shamala Paramasivam on my thesis deserves to be commended. Above all, thank you Allah for answering my prayers.

ABSTRACT

Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) has been and remains one of the most contentious issues in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) studies despite its prevalence in L2 classrooms. The ongoing debate regarding the overall effectiveness of WCF has produced numerous empirical findings that have led to the inconclusiveness of its overall effects. This study was conducted due to the following situations: (1) most undergraduate students in the university, where this study was conducted, had difficulties forming accurate collocations; (2) WCF is broadly used in L2 classrooms despite its inconclusive effects; (3) lack of empirical evidence to support the use of WCF in L2 classrooms in the Malaysian university context. Therefore, this case study was conducted to investigate the effects of direct and indirect WCF on the collocational competence of low and high-proficiency ESL learners in a public university in Malaysia. Four research questions were derived to guide the study: (1) What are the short-term effects of direct and indirect WCF on the collocation competence of the students in the study? (2) What are the long-term effects of direct and indirect WCF on the collocation competence of the students after nine weeks? (3) What WCF type has a greater effect on the students' collocation competence? (4) What are the factors as perceived by the students that can contribute to or hinder the effectiveness of direct and indirect WCF in improving collocation competence? Data were collected from multiple sources which include a quantitative approach of using a series of collocation test instruments (i.e., Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3), an open-ended questionnaire, field notes, and course information document. The study was conducted during the academic session of September 2019-February 2020 with a total of 120 ESL students in a public university in the state of Sarawak, Malaysia. The students were identified based on their performance in the previous semester's English course that was used to determine their proficiency groups which includes several-low-proficiency (e.g., Group 1, Group 2) and high-proficiency

(Group 3, Group 4). The findings have revealed that direct and indirect WCF have positive short-term effects on the collocational competence of all groups. In addition, concerning the students' proficiency inthis case study, the findings suggest that indirect WCF may not provide long-term benefits to low-proficiency ESL students (Group 3), but it may be beneficial to high-proficiency ESL students (Group 4). In highlighting the findings from the third research question,direct WCF is the fittest type of corrective feedback to facilitate their collocation competence. Moreover, this case study has also revealed several causes that can lead to the effectiveness of WCF practices such as learners' factors and the nature of corrective feedback factors. On the other hand, contextual factors and the nature of corrective feedback factors can contribute to the ineffectiveness of WCF. This study has contributed to generating new knowledge in the literature, providing empirical evidence to guide language educators' practices of using WCF, and creating new directions for future researchers.

Keywords: Written corrective feedback, direct, indirect, English collocation, effectiveness, case study.

Satu Kajian Tentang Kesan Maklum Balas Pembetulan Bertulis Terhadap Keupayaan Kolokasi: Bukti daripada Sebuah Universiti Awam di Malaysia

ABSTRAK

Maklum balas pembetulan bertulis (WCF) merupakan satu isu yang berpanjangan didalam Kajian Penggunan Bahasa Kedua (SLA) walaupun ianya merupakan satu teknik yang sering di pakai di dalam kelas bahasa kedua. Kajian ini dijalankan oleh sebab kewujudan pelbagai variasi dapatan kajian mengenai keberkesanan WCF yang tidak konklusif dan penggunaannya masih meluas di dalam kelas bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua. Kajian in dijalankan atas sebab-sebab berikut: (1) kebanyakan pelajar di universiti tempat kajian dijalankan mempunyai masalah dalam menghasilkan kolokasi Bahasa Inggeris dengan tepat; (2) WCF kerap digunakan di dalam kelas walaupun tiada petunjuk yang konklusif tentang keberkesanannya; (3) kekurangan sorotan literatur untuk menyokong penggunaan WCF di dalam konteks pendidikan tahap universiti di Malaysia. Justeru, kajian kes-berganda ini dijalankan untuk mengkaji keberkesanan WCF (secara terlus, dan tidak terlus) untuk meningkatkan penguasaan kolokasi bahasa Inggeris pelajar di sebuah universiti awam di Malaysia. Empat soalan kajian telah digubal untuk mengemudi kajian ini: (1) Apakah kesan jangka pendek daripada penggunaan maklum balas bertulis secara terlus dan tidak terlus terhadap keupayaan kolokasi pelajar?(2) Apakah kesan jangka panjang daripada penggunaan maklum balas bertulis secara terlus dan tidak terlus terhadap keupayaan kolokasi pelajar?(3) Apakah jenis maklum balas bertulis yang memberikan kesan terbaik terhadap keupayaan kolokasi pelajar? (4) Apakahfaktor yang boleh membantu atau mengurangkan keberkesanan maklum balas bertulis dalam meningkatkan keupayaan kolokasi pelajar? Data kajian dikumpul melalui beberapa sumber seperti: (1) ujian kolokasi; (2) survey kualitatif; (3) nota lapangan; (4) dokumen yang berkaitan melibatkan

subjek seperti kursus Bahasa Inggeris semester lalu. Kajian telah dijalankan pada sesi akademik 2019/2020 bersama 120 org pelajar bahasa Inggeris sebagai bahasa kedua di sebuah universiti awam di Sarawak, Malaysia. Kumpulan pelajar telah ditentukanmelalui pencapaian subjek Bahasa Inggeris semester lepas dimana dua kumpulan adalah pelajar berkeupayaan rendah bahasa Inggeris (Kes 1 & Kes 2), dan dua kumpulan berkeupayaan tinggi bahasa Inggeris (Kes 3 & Kes 4). Dapatan menunjukkan kedua jenis WCF mempunyai kesan positif terhadap penguasaan kolokasi pelajar di dalam semua kes. Seterusnya, dapatan juga menunjukan WCF secara terlus mempunyai kesan jangka panjang terhadap pelajar di dalam kes 1 dan kes 3. Tetapi, WCF secara tidak terlus hanyamemberi kesan jangka panjang terhadap pelajar kes 4 sahaja. Ini menunjukkan bahawa WCF jenis ini tidak sesuai untuk pelajar berkeupayaan rendah. Melalui soalan kajian keempat, beberapa faktor telah dirungkai, dimana faktor ini mampu memberi kesan kepada keberkesanan WCF: (1) faktor pelajar; (2) faktor ciri-ciri WCF; dan (3) faktor konteks. Kajian ini telah menyumbang kepada perkembangan literatur, menawarkan bukti empirical kepada pendidik bahasa Inggeris tentang penggunaan WCF, dan membukalembaran baru kajian untuk penyelidik masa hadapan.

Kata kunci: *Maklum balas pembetulan bertulis, secara telus, secara tidak telus, kolokasiBahasa Inggeris, keberkesanan*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
DECLARATION		i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT		ii
ABSTRACT		iii
ABSTRAK		v
TABLE OF CONTENTS		vii
LIST OF TABLES		xv
LIST OF FIGURES		xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		xxii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION		1
1.1	Research Problem	1
1.2	Purpose of the Study	9
1.3	Research Objectives	9
1.4	Research Questions	12
1.5	Significance of the Study	12
1.6	Operational Definitions of Terms	14
1.6.1	Written Corrective Feedback	14
1.6.2	Direct and Indirect Written Corrective Feedback	15
1.6.3	Targeted Linguistic Structure	15
1.6.4	Collocation and Collocational Competence	16
1.6.5	Low and High Proficiency ESL Learners	16
1.7	Thesis Outline and Chapter Summary	17

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 18

2.1 A Brief View of the Teaching of L2 Writing in the Malaysian Education System 18

2.2 The Role of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) 21

2.2.1 The Shifting Roles from the 1950s to the Present Time 21

2.2.2 Acknowledging the Positive Role of Corrective Feedback on L2 Learners' Accuracy 22

2.2.3 The Recognition of Written CF in SLA 24

2.3 Theoretical Discussions of CF Studies 26

2.3.1 Theoretical Arguments against CF 26

2.3.1.1 Krashen's (1981, 1985) Monitor Model 27

2.3.1.2 Truscott's (1996, 2004) Argument of Pseudo-learning, Learnability, and the Side-effect of CF 29

2.3.2 Theoretical Arguments Supporting Corrective Feedback 32

2.3.2.1 Long's (2000) Focus-on-form Approach 33

2.3.2.2 The Noticing Hypothesis 34

2.3.2.3 The Interaction Approach 35

2.3.2.4 Skill Acquisition Theory 36

2.4 The Theoretical Framework of this Case Study 37

2.4.1 Output Hypothesis 40

2.4.1.1 Output as the Noticing Function and the Role of CF 41

2.4.1.2 Output as the Hypothesis Testing Function 43

2.4.1.3 Output Serves as the Metalinguistic Reflections 44

2.4.1.4 Acquisition as the Final Output 45

2.4.2	The Integrated Model to Investigate Corrective Feedback	46
2.4.2.1	Learner Factors: Learner's Prior Experience and Exposure to WCF	47
2.4.2.2	Contextual Factors: Illegible Handwriting of CF Provider and CF Delivery	52
2.4.2.3	Nature of Feedback Factors: Metalinguistic Information in Direct WCF and Degree of Explicitness of WCF	55
2.5	The Typology of Written Corrective Feedback	59
2.6	The Effects of Direct and Indirect WCF	60
2.6.1	Studies Supporting the Indirect Written Corrective Feedback	61
2.6.2	Studies Supporting Direct Written Corrective Feedback	65
2.6.3	Studies Indicating no Differential Effects among WCF Types	69
2.6.4	Uncovering the Knowledge Gaps of Past Studies on the Effects of WCF	72
2.7	Written Feedback Studies in the Malaysian Education System	75
2.8	English Collocational Competence, L2 Accuracy, and Corrective Feedback	81
2.8.1	Defining English Collocation	81
2.8.2	Collocational Competence and L2 Accuracy	82
2.8.3	Several studies investigating the effect of corrective feedback on collocation	84
2.9	Chapter Summary	87
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY		89
3.1	Research Design	89
3.2	The Case	95
3.3	The Units of Analysis: The Four Groups of Students	98
3.3.1	Group 1: The low-proficiency Group Receiving Direct WCF	104
3.3.2	Group 2: The low-proficiency Group Receiving Indirect WCF	105

3.3.3	Group 3: The High-proficiency Group Receiving Direct WCF	105
3.3.4	Group 4: The high-proficiency Group Receiving Indirect WCF	105
3.4	Researcher Positionality as Teacher-researcher in the Case Study	106
3.5	Data Sources and Instruments	108
3.5.1	The Collocation Tests	108
3.5.2	Constructing Test 1 from COLLMATCH	112
3.5.3	Reliability of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3	115
3.5.4	The Qualitative Approach of the Open-ended Questionnaire	118
3.5.5	Field Notes	120
3.5.6	Course Information of Past Semester English Course	121
3.6	Data Collection Procedures	121
3.6.1	Exposure to Collocation Subjects Prior to Doing Test 1	124
3.6.2	The Administration of Test 1 and Providing WCF Types on Errors	125
3.6.3	The Administration of Test 2 and Test 3	128
3.6.4	The Administration of Open-ended Questionnaire and Retrieval of Course Information Document	128
3.7	Ethical Consideration	128
3.8	Trustworthiness	129
3.8.1	Internal Validity	130
3.8.2	Reliability	133
3.8.3	Trustworthiness of Qualitative Data	134
3.8.4	Reliability of the Qualitative Analysis	136
3.9	Data Analysis Procedures	138
3.9.1	Within-case Analysis	139

3.9.2	Pattern-matching in Cross-case Analysis	146
3.9.3	Thematic Analysis	148
3.9.3.1	Familiarisation with the data	152
3.9.3.2	Coding	152
3.9.3.3	Searching and Deducing Themes	154
3.9.3.4	Reviewing the Potential Themes	156
3.9.3.5	Defining and Naming Themes	159
3.9.3.6	Producing the Report	160
3.9.4	Content Analysis	160
3.10	Study Limitations	165
3.10.1	The Practice Effect	165
3.10.2	The Researcher's Bias as an ESL Educator Influencing the Interpretation of Data	166
3.10.3	Generalisability of the Results	166
3.10.4	The Context of this Case Study is Limited to One Local University	167
3.11	Summary of the Chapter	167
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS		168
4.1	Short-term Effects of Direct and Indirect WCF on the Collocation Competence of the Students	169
4.1.1	Group 1	169
4.1.2	Group 2	172
4.1.3	Group 3	173
4.1.4	Group 4	176
4.1.5	Direct and Indirect WCF Can Facilitate Learners' Collocation Competence	178

	in Short-term	
4.2	Long-term Effects of Direct and Indirect WCF on the Collocation Competence of the Students	179
4.2.1	Group 1	179
4.2.2	Group 2	182
4.2.3	Group 3	184
4.2.4	Group 4	187
4.2.5	Indirect WCF was not able to Facilitate Collocation Competence of Low-Proficiency Learners in Long-term as Compared to Direct WCF	190
4.3	Type of WCF that Has a Greater Effect on Students' Collocation Competence	190
4.3.1	Group 1 and Group 2 of Low-proficiency Students	191
4.3.2	Group 3 and Group 4 of High-proficiency Students	196
4.3.3	Direct WCF Has a Better Effect on the Collocation Competence of the Students	202
4.4	Factors Contribute to or Hinder the Effectiveness of Direct and Indirect WCF	202
4.4.1	Within-case Analysis	203
4.4.1.1	Group 1	203
4.4.1.2	Group 2	214
4.4.1.3	Group 3	221
4.4.1.4	Group 4	229
4.4.2	Cross-case Analysis	237
4.4.3	The Effectiveness of WCF is Caused by Learner's and Nature of CF	245

Factors whereas its Inefficiency is Due to Contextual and Nature of CF Factors

4.5 Chapter Summary 247

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSIONS 248

5.1 Direct and Indirect WCF Positively Affects the Collocation Competence of the Students in Short-term 249

5.2 Direct WCF has a Positive Long-term Effect on Collocate Competence whereas Indirect WCF was Less Effective for Low-proficiency learners 252

5.3 Direct WCF is more Effective than Indirect WCF 257

5.4 Learners' Factors and the Nature of CF Factors can Contribute to the Effectiveness of WCF whereas the Nature of CF and Contextual Factors can Degrade WCF 261

5.4.1 Learners' Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of WCF 262

5.4.2 Nature of CF Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of WCF 265

5.4.3 Nature of CF Factors Hinder the Effectiveness of WCF 269

5.4.4 Contextual Factor of Illegible Handwriting of WCF Provider 272

5.5 Chapter Summary 274

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION 275

6.1 Summary of Key Findings 275

6.2 Theoretical Contribution 281

6.3 A Guideline for L2 Educators to Use Written CF with ESL Learners 284

6.3.1 Allow Learners to Indicate their Preference of WCF Type 286

6.3.2 Allocate Time for Learners to Review the CF Provided 286

6.3.3 Address Common Linguistic Errors with the Whole Class 287

6.3.4 Inform the students of the types of WCF used at the start of school terms 287

6.3.5 Employ Focused Written CF (instead of unfocused) 288

6.3.6 Use a Printed Form of Written CF 288

6.3.7 Integrate both Types of Written CF 288

6.3.8 Provide any type of WCF as opposed to not provide any 289

6.3.9 Use explicit CF such as direct WCF 290

6.4 Directions for Future Research 290

6.5 Conclusions 292

6.6 Chapter Summary 293

REFERENCES 294

APPENDICES 330

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	The typology of WCF adapted from Ellis (2009)	61
Table 2.2	The summary of Written CF oriented studies in Malaysia	78
Table 2.3	Types of lexical collocations (Benson et al., 2009)	84
Table 2.4	The summary of WCF studies on English collocation	91
Table 3.1	Descriptive statistics of all groups' performance in ELC151	101
Table 3.2	Mean score difference of performance of all groups in ELC151	101
Table 3.3	Group labels and descriptions	103
Table 3.4	Collocational competence of high-proficiency students (Group 3 & 4) in Test 1	104
Table 3.5	Collocational competence of low-proficiency students (Group 1 & 2) in Test 1	104
Table 3.6	An excerpt of collocation items for COLLMATCH taken from Gyllstad's (2007)	111
Table 3.7	Language focus and categories of errors	127
Table 3.8	Steps in peer debriefing suggested by Janesick (2015)	134
Table 3.9	The Data Sets Selected for ICR	138
Table 3.10	Statistical analysis to determine the short-term effect of WCF	142
Table 3.11	Statistical analysis to determine the long-term effect of WCF	143
Table 3.12	Statistical analysis to identify the fittest WCF type	145

Table 4.1	Levene's test of homogeneity of variances of Test 1 of low-proficiency groups	170
Table 4.2	Descriptive statistics of Group 1 receiving direct WCF	170
Table 4.3	Paired sample t-test of Group 1 receiving direct WCF	171
Table 4.4	Descriptive statistics of low-proficiency students receiving Indirect WCF	171
Table 4.5	Paired sample t-test of the low-proficiency group receiving Indirect WCF	173
Table 4.6	Descriptive statistics of mean score of Test 1 of high-proficiency groups	174
Table 4.7	Test of homogeneity of variances of Test 1 of high-proficiency groups	177
Table 4.8	Descriptive statistics high-proficiency group receiving direct WCF	175
Table 4.9	Paired sample t-test of the high-proficiency group receiving direct WCF	175
Table 4.10	Descriptive statistics of Group 4 receiving indirect WCF	177
Table 4.11	Paired sample t-test of Group 4 group receiving indirect WCF	177
Table 4.12	Tests of within-subjects effects of Group 1	180
Table 4.13	Pairwise comparisons of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 1	180
Table 4.14	Tests of within-subjects effects of Group 2	182
Table 4.15	Pairwise comparisons of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 2	183
Table 4.16	Tests of within-subjects effects of Group 3	185
Table 4.17	Pairwise comparisons of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 3	185
Table 4.18	Tests of within-subjects effects of Group 4	187

Table 4.19	Pairwise comparisons of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 4	188
Table 4.20	Descriptive statistics of Group 1 and Group 2 (low-proficiency students) across three test occasions	192
Table 4.21	Test of normality of Test 1 for Group 1 and Group 2	192
Table 4.22	Test of normality of Test 2 for Group 1 and Group 2	193
Table 4.23	Test of normality of Test 3 for low-proficiency students	193
Table 4.24	Levene's test of equality of error variances of Group 1 and Group 2 across all tests	194
Table 4.25	Multiple comparisons of Test 2 and Test 3 of low-proficiency students	194
Table 4.26	Multiple comparisons of Group 1 and Group 2 in Test 2	195
Table 4.27	Multiple comparisons of Group 1 and Group 2 in Test 3	195
Table 4.28	A comparison of WCF effects in Test 2 and Test 3 of Group 1 and Group 2	196
Table 4.29	Descriptive statistics of Group 3 and Group 4 performance on three test occasions	197
Table 4.30	Test of normality of Group 3 and Group 4 in Test 1, Test 2, Test 3	198
Table 4.31	Levene's test of homogeneity of variances for Group 3 and Group 4	199
Table 4.32	Multiple comparisons of Groups 3 and 4 performances in Test 2 and Test 3	200
Table 4.33	Multiple comparisons of Test 2 (Bonferroni post hoc) of Group 3 and Group 4	200
Table 4.34	Multiple comparisons of Test 3 (Bonferroni post hoc) of Group 3 and Group 4	201

Table 4.35	A comparison of WCF effects in Test 2 and Test 3 of Group 3 and Group 4	201
Table 4.36	Themes and subthemes of factors contributing to the effectiveness of WCF	238
Table 4.37	Themes and subthemes of factors that can hinder the effectiveness of WCF	243

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Theoretical framework of the current study	39
Figure 2.2	Overview of Output Hypothesis	40
Figure 2.3	Learners' factors affecting the effectiveness of WCF	48
Figure 2.4	Contextual factors affecting the effectiveness of WCF	53
Figure 2.5	Nature of CF factors affecting the effectiveness of WCF	55
Figure 3.1	Several types of case study designs (Yin, 2003, 2018)	91
Figure 3.2	An illustration of an embedded case study	93
Figure 3.3	The conceptual framework of the current study	94
Figure 3.4	The sequence of data sources	109
Figure 3.5	An excerpt from the COLLMATCH test by Gyllstad (2007)	111
Figure 3.6	An excerpt from Test 1 (note differences compared with Gyllstad, 2007)	111
Figure 3.7	Item Facility Index formula	115
Figure 3.8	KR20 formula taken from Howit & Cramer (2020)	117
Figure 3.9	Calculating the KR20 value to determine the reliability of the test	118
Figure 3.10	Data collection procedures	124
Figure 3.11	The provision of direct WCF in this current study	128
Figure 3.12	The provision of indirect WCF in this current study	128
Figure 3.13	The calculation involved to determine the ICR percentage	139
Figure 3.14	An illustration of pattern matching in cross-case analysis in this study	137

Figure 3.15	Pattern matching using actual data	149
Figure 3.16	An illustration of TA performed to analyse the open-ended questionnaire responses	151
Figure 3.17	An illustration of TA performed to analyse the open-ended questionnaire responses	151
Figure 3.18	The six phases of thematic analysis	152
Figure 3.19	First phase in TA	153
Figure 3.20	The second phase in TA	153
Figure 3.21	The third phase in TA	155
Figure 3.22	The fourth phase in TA that shows coherent data and theme	157
Figure 3.23	The fourth phase in TA that shows incoherent data and theme	158
Figure 3.24	The second level of the fourth phase in TA	159
Figure 3.25	The fifth phase in TA	160
Figure 3.26	An illustration of how field notes data are used for triangulation	163
Figure 3.27	Steps to analyse course information document	164
Figure 4.1	Estimated marginal means of low-proficiency students receiving	181
Figure 4.2	Estimated marginal means of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 2	184
Figure 4.3	Estimated marginal means of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 3	186
Figure 4.4	Estimated marginal means of Test 1, Test 2, and Test 3 of Group 4	189
Figure 4.5	Factors that can contribute to or hinder the effectiveness of direct WCF perceived by Group 1	204
Figure 4.6	An excerpt of document analysis of the Course Information document	212
Figure 4.7	Factors that can contribute to or hinder the effectiveness of indirect WCF perceived by Group 2	215

Figure 4.8	Perceived factors contribute to or hinder the effectiveness of direct WCF	224
Figure 4.9	Factors that can contribute to or hinder the effectiveness of indirect WCF as perceived by Group 4	230
Figure 5.1	Perceived factors contributing to and hindering WCF effectiveness	261
Figure 6.1	The original Output Hypothesis proposed by Swain (1995)	282
Figure 6.2	Current view of Output Hypothesis highlighting several factors affecting “noticing”	283

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CF	Corrective Feedback
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
L2	Second Language
RQ	Research Question
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
WCF	Written Corrective Feedback