

### A Student's Source Summary Log – Partial Sample

**Topic:** Written instructor feedback on assignments written by English-as-a-Second Language students

**Research Question:** Does written corrective feedback from instructors help ESL students improve their accuracy in English?

**Thesis Statement:** Written corrective feedback from instructors can improve the written accuracy of ESL students. *(The thesis statement answers the research question. From skimming a few of the sources in the field, you believe that the answer to the research statement is “yes,” so this answer becomes your preliminary or working thesis statement. However, as you read the research sources more deeply, you have to be prepared to revise your thesis statement.)*

Sources <i>(This column contains bibliographic information for the sources read)</i>	Does Written Corrective Feedback Improve Accuracy? <i>(This column contains your sources responses to your research question.)</i>	Comments <i>(This column contains your overall comments on the sources.)</i>
Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. <i>Language Learning</i> , 46, 327-369.	<p><b>No: Written corrections from the instructor interferes with second language acquisition; encourages students to use simple language to avoid errors; affects content as there is too much attention on form.</b></p> <p>Truscott says that corrections can cause stress and can demotivate students.</p>	<p>Did Truscott have enough evidence to draw this conclusion? Others studies (e.g., Bitchener and Knock) show that written corrective feedback can help, as long as the explanations are clear.</p> <p>A controversial review paper, which claimed that written corrective feedback on student papers is useless and even harmful.</p>
Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). <i>Journal of Second Language Writing</i> , 8, 1-10.	<p><b>Yes: Written corrections from the instructor can help students improve their writing.</b></p> <p>The paper looks closely at Truscott's arguments. Ferris concludes that Truscott's argument (grammar errors should not be corrected in student papers because this</p>	<p>Ferris does a good job picking apart Truscott's arguments. I agree with her that Truscott had insufficient evidence to draw his conclusions and that more research needs to be done.</p>

	<p>type of feedback hinders development of the language) is “premature” and “overly strong” p. 1.</p>	
<p>Bitchener, J., &amp; Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. <i>Journal of Second Language Writing</i>, 19 (4), 207-217.</p>	<p><b>Yes: Written corrections can help students improve accuracy. The best feedback is in the form of simple explanations. E.g., the rule with an example.</b></p> <p>This paper describes a study of the effectiveness of different types of feedback on student writing. Some participants had no feedback at all; some had their errors corrected; others were given an explanation.</p>	<p>This seems a solid experimental study. Results suggest that clear explanations of errors are the best. The students who received no feedback made the least progress in their writing.</p>
<p>Li, S. &amp; Li, P. (2012). Individual differences in written corrective feedback: A multi-case study. (2010). <i>English Language Teaching</i>, 5, (11), 38 – 44.</p>	<p><b>Yes: WCF improves accuracy, but student progress depends on the student’s motivation to learn.</b></p> <p>The study followed four students (case studies) and their progress on drafts of papers following their instructor’s written corrective feedback. The students’ writing development depended on their motivation to learn from the feedback.</p>	<p>Li and Li’s case study did not have enough participants to draw conclusions. They concede this at the end of the paper.</p>