Journal of Language, Literature, Social, and Cultural Studies, Volume 1 Number 2, (Jul 2023), p. 37-43
e-ISSN: 2986-4461 ©Yayasan Mitra Persada Nusantara
https://ympn.co.id/index.php/JLLSCS

The reviews over the cases against correcting grammar for second language writing classes

Sun Ny[1], Doung Dara[2]

Hun Sen Chamkardaung High School Cambodia[1,2]
[2]Email: d_dara09@yahoo.com

Abstract - Writing English is a main productive process emerging from language learners of English writing both in and out the class; meanwhile, grammar correction is a ladder for their development in writing accurately. This study aimed to review the case against grammar correction. At the same time, a qualitative method was used, and the data gathering means was entirely based on secondary data. Collecting other existing research on grammar correction in writing skills was underlined, and all relevant articles and books concerning the matter were chosen and gotten through for the gist. Moreover, the elaborated results of previously operated projects were brought up for discussion. The comments, based on the raised concepts of the case against it, was augured grammar correction with theoretical evidence and were typed in as one of the new proposals. As the results showed, whether or not grammar correction or feedback in writing classes for L2 learners should be applied depends on the purposes, levels, contexts, and others; most importantly, teachers, their qualifications and professionalism are the considered facts. They have to be flexible and rich in teaching experience because it seems like a sitting-on-the-fence situation, whereas bad effects or plausible outcomes are very likely choices. This review is only document-based. Hence, empirical conductance from many corners would be an option, and thorough investigations with lots of methods should be taken into account.

Keywords: the teaching of grammar of English; teacher's feedback; teacher's correction; L2 classroom

Journal of Language, Literature, Social, and Cultural Studies, Volume 1 Number 2 (Jul 2023), p. 37-43
e-ISSN: 2986-4461 ©Yayasan Mitra Persada Nusantara
https://ympn.co.id/index.php/JLLSCS

I. INTRODUCTION

Writing is known as a fundamental main output evaluator for English language learners under all circumstances and contexts, who perform their writing both during having classes or anywhere; meanwhile, learners are, based on grammar competency, capable to produce well-constructed sentences cohesively and coherently. Alongside, grammar correction is a pillar for their developing accurate writing or constructions. However, there are some studies on grammar corrections which suggested that it had better not to be allowed in writing classes because it hadn't worked and also manufactured worsen effects more seriously than expected.

Hence, there has been an argument over if grammar correction should be applied in writing classes of second language learning classrooms. Some of the linguists who conducted research on this issue purported that even if the L1 classes, grammar corrections had to be avoided. This seems an inspirational support to lead him be able to a decisive conclusion without hesitancy that the correcting grammar during offering the lessons must not be done. Contrasting to this raised idea, other scholars who put their interests in teaching grammar of English started to investigate and did empirical studies. The results derived from their projects appeared inconsistently. Some come along with while some are off their lines due to many unpredicted factors, but what we can trust are the statistical figures from their studies. Therefore, the reviews over this case is a very impressive job which can be beneficially contributive to readers and stakeholders for their pre-consideration stage whether or not they should apply these suggested concepts before deliveries of grammar classes in L2.

This short review paper has four (4) parts: part one is introduction which tells about general idea of writing, grammar needs and paper structure; part two is about literature review which accompanied with two sub-parts, the author's case against grammar correction and other research for grammar correction, part three stresses discussion and comments while the last is conclusion about if grammar should be corrected in writing classes.

1. 1 The studies against correcting grammar for second language writing classes

In his paper, the author brought up two essential notions to discuss. Grammar correction, by giving a proliferation of -previously-done research as his strong testimonies, did not work in writing classes and the second was that grammar correction in writing classes produced harmful effects to learners, he hesitated to say whether correction in L2 learners was ineffective, but after giving a number of studies of L1 and comparison of the two languages (L1 & L2) by many researchers of L1 (Kloblauch & Brannon, 1981; Krashen, 1984; Leki, 1990) and some authors did it in L2 like Handrikson (1978); Krashen, 1992); Leki, 1990); Van Patten(1986a, 1986b); and so on. They had uncovered that grammar correction unfavourably had had no or little effectiveness in writing classes. Those inspired him to draw an inference that it was no connection between grammar and writing in writing classes and was no benefits to grammar correction-oriented instruction. The second concepts of this review was that grammar correction would worsen the students; he gave a variety of backing views -- the first seemed to be psychological impacts when the students who were provided advice or feedbacks or numerous red ink lines or brackets might not enjoy them and found them demotivating. Importantly, the students who did not get feedback or corrections may have better writings (Knoblaunch & Brannon, 1981; Hillocks, 1986; Semke, 1984; Kepner,

1991; Sheppard, 1992). More reasons to counter-productive outcome were time factors. The students might have spent a lot of time for reading, considering and correcting their grammatical problems if they were received serious corrections (Hayes & Daiker, 1984) and this problem may occur with teachers too. Distraction from writing may happen to both learners and teachers (Cohen, 1987).

Moreover, he provided a host of both theoretical and practical problem angles to support his ideas. For conceptual issues, problems relating to orders of acquisition were emphasized over developmental sequences of the learners respective to basic needs and the teachers' notice of them unless their teaching writing would be fertile; problems of pseudo learning and the like were, considered the knowledge the students receiving during class as pseudo-knowledge or false recognitions, hopefully unable to use in correction process, which specified differently in metalinguistic competence and intuition of students; hence, meta-ability would do nothing in writing but the intuitive gain would (Ellis, 1988,1 993,1994; Lightbown, 1985; McLaughlin, 1990; Long, 1977). For practical issues, he picked up the teacher's unawareness of correction process or failure to recognize errors and distinctive types of correction, stressing that teachers may have been well known about the errors that could have occurred even though they did not know or perceive exactly why, how and what it was erred. On the other hand, even though teachers explained clearly and students could deal with it, they may not adequately encourage to do so. Other, selective and comprehensive corrections may not result in good ways because it was hard for teachers to use consistency of selective solutions to students 'advancements, facing a number of students but limited time, so they usually overlooked some errors or hardly carefully selected and classified those mistakes or decided if they were relevant or irrelevant.

1.2 The studies supporting correcting grammar for second language writing classes

Even though in his article with many supports, there are still a number of other scholars having opposite ideas against his images. They cannot absolutely negate core functions of grammar in writing as well as grammar correction. Chandler (2003), who was the professor of ESL, energetically affirmed that grammar was still a good way in upgrading writing accuracy and he left some his own ideas in implementing it like asking his students to keep notes on their errors or mistakes. Braddock and Jones (1963), in their research in writing compositions, said though the three experimental groups had not been significantly different in post-tests in one of his research, the college freshmen, in another research theme, whose writings were marked carefully, graded and commented were considerably more improved than those who were not. Davis (2002) assumed that grammar review and writing mechanics did help the students in specific fields for better writing. Regular grammar-oriented writing lectures with feedbacks may improve writing accuracy (Cameron, 2005). Students whose corrections were offered immediately in the classes noticeably much improved if compared to those who did not, their accuracies, good sentence constructions and clear meaning-conveyances (Davis 2012, cited Bitchener et al, 2005). Davis (2012) suggested that student-teacher conferences for adult learners of language had better benefits than the younger, otherwise both teachers and learners had much familiarized with metalinguistic competence and Ferris (2002) had a positive assumption on treatments on error correction for L2 writing which highlighted the improvement could be made but the teacher had to be well instilled and to perceived what beyond error corrections. The suggestion made by Lui (2008) was more writing improvement might emerge if mini-workshops or lessons on types of errors or grammar aspects were beforehand delivered, aiming for self-edition but she did not turn out the roles of grammar and correction. Ferris (2004), seeming not to

support or deny this hypothesis, laid out three considerable generalizations for error treatments turning out with six suggestions: good preparations, at room feedback, different tactics of corrections, capturing learners' favourites and interests.

Barkori (2007) pointed out that they were required to provide comprehensive models, goals, contexts, feedback and encouragements. Moreover, those had to be specific, meaningful, and concise, with high standards (Bitchener et al, 2005) said the feedback provisions were fruitful for intermediate levels of L2 classes if the grammatical rules were corrected immediately or exposed regularly depending on their studies' results along with their expectations. Ehsan (2010), whose results were consistent to these, added broader layers of this issue by perceiving the recasts for the post-test production by metalinguistic feedback. Additionally, related to type feedbacks (Ellis et al, 2008) conducted a research and the researchers explained attentive and inattentive corrective feedback was able to do by some scholars. David (2002/2005) furthered his research and showed that both focused and unfocused direct corrections for controlled groups had significances and out-performance. Lindsay (2009) argued that written feedback actually did matters so, effective strategies were suggested to handle, and so five outlined conditions for this topic were discovered such as criterion, informativeness, time, concentration, and appropriations. Hyland and Hyland (2006), discussing on distinctive sorts of feedbacks on writing stated that feedback has been a sensitive case and noted as a key for encouragement and consolidation of L2 writing learners. Learners can reliably develop their competence and skills if it was classroom process-based.

Barkaoui (2007), who summarized the theories and research on teaching writing to L2 learners, also mentioned the feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Ferris & Robert, 2001; Cassava, 2004; Myles, 2002; Knoblauch & Brannon, 1981; Baleghizadeh, & Gordani, 2012).), with regular practice, motivation and so on Afraz and Ghaemi (2012) did a project by experimental methods, finding out the at-place and in-time corrected group got good results, particularly about verb tenses and results of post-tests. They concluded that the learners had had critical and analytic abilities, which showed the higher degrees of understanding than the uncorrected group. The accuracy was found in the treated group of in-class feedback, while untreated one did poorly and their writing task was rich of ungrammaticality if compared (Farrokhi, 2011). Corrective feedback styles of CFE by Lyster (1994) were employed as the apparatus of analyses and were adjusted for next study (Milla & Mayo, 2013). The findings indicated there were dissimilarities in the kinds, numbers and manner of CFE and between the chosen learning contexts.

In conclusion, all mentioned authors have offered positive options for in- class correction. All of them used various ways for their studies and also came from different places but the results of their research have been the same. This seems to indicate that the ideas that the grammar feedback during teaching in the classrooms are feasibly doable and deny against the opposite perspectives as in what was penned down above. However, some of them cannot guarantee their suggestions will be playable in all conditions whereas some conditions can be found.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There have, evidently, been a host of scholars who still stand on the essence of grammar-orientation and correction in writing classes with some reasons. They also believe that grammar still functions well in writing classes (Chandler, 2003; Davis, 2002; Ferris. 2002; Liu 2008; Mack, 2009; Ehsanm, 2001), but what problems are encountered are that

teachers have to understand their students well; for example, teachers have to take notes or observe the students' background knowledge, variations of students' abilities and also their own continuity of providing grammar corrections. The grammar the author mentioned that it would not do well in writing classes was probably not attaching to levels of learners; therefore, it may be useless because the learners may not bear in such a kind of grammar as their background knowledge. It is also hard for learners' conceptual capabilities to recall those grammar points to reuse after a swift instruction as in form of a short-timed research. Another clarification is that every writing course book contains with grammar lists to teach along with writing process, so if there is grammar teaching, it can be perceived that error forms of grammar items would occur then if there is no correction or feedback from the teacher, the fossilization may appear, so do other mistakes.

The belief that grammar correction is fruitful in writing classes is still surviving in some teachers' abstract mind-sets. That the grammar correction gives disadvantages is not the fault of grammar correction role but rather than from unprofessional feedbacks or corrections the teacher delivers. Not only such a task as grammar correction but also other work will make learners have less preference if they receive a lot of red ink lines or comments. This probably causes by psychological matters, so questions can be raised which ones between barren outcomes of grammar equipment and correction or tactlessness of teachers in communication and feedbacks the real factor will be. The fact that students may dismiss and discourage when they get red-coloured lines of error correction in their writings after their best efforts in doing it can be true and is hard to solve if teacher is blind with psychological solutions; for instance, teacher can alternatively use other colour pens to mark their errors (i.e pink, yellow, green which perhaps lessens their serious feeling of making faults and shame). The teacher is also able to pen a short line of inspiring sentence or drawing a smiling face to egg them on.

There are several kinds of feedbacks or error corrections. Due to them closely pertaining to mental state and psychological conditions, they are so sensitive that demotivation and keenness decrease will unmanageably occur in case they are given untimely, inappropriately and non-pedagogically. That's why there are piles of studies on this matter (Bitchner, 2006; Eshan, 2010; Hyland & Hyland 2006; Ellis et al, 200; Frear, 2009). Some scholars made some suggestions when offering feedbacks among various kinds; meanwhile others raised some conditions and situations. So, it is evident that feedbacks are two sided effects and centre on teachers and how skillful teachers are.

Therefore, the article which raised problems of grammar correction in second language writing classes may base on one side of research scopes. The data collected from previous studies may direct to some situations of grammar instruction and correction (i.e ages, genders, levels…) while there are more effects on learning and teaching to be considered than expected in order to provide a fruitful teaching. Another commentary is that the author should not draw absolute assumptions that the grammar doesn't work and makes deteriorating outcomes of learners, whereas there are many empirical studies on this case and rigid credits of teachers in using grammar and its corrections.

III. CONCLUSION

That grammar teaching or grammar correction should be delivered may rely on the equal percent of choice. There are both large number of researches supporting grammar use in writing classes and heaps of studies whose results are against it. Though, those

research of denying to use grammar and grammar correction are likely not to cover all of aspects, situations and factors in imparting grammar and feedback. Therefore, the conclusions are raised as the following:

- Grammar correction in writing classes is still usable or workable if the professional teaching has been done.
- Besides, instructors are qualified in, experienced with and familiar to these fragile cases of feedback if they are not ready to draw their students' attentions. Not evitable, it will create the harmful impacts to learners.
- Though, it can be operable in teaching writing but lots of factors have to be encountered with severe precautions.

Even though some suggestions are proposed on the discussion about the pros and cons of L2 classroom corrective feedback, some limitations could absolutely be presented because it depends on merely qualitative method. The experimental with large scale should be conducted and diachronic studies would be highly considered etc.

Acknowledgment

We, hereby, would like to show our highest gratefulness to our parents, professors, deans, friends- in profession, subsidizers, who always support, encourage and advise us until we accomplish following our dreams.

Declaration of originality

We, the author and co-author, would like to assert that this piece-work is in our possessions which we have paid our best both bodies and souls to write this paper. Therefore, we clarify all parts of this writing are under copyrights.

REFERENCES

Afraz, S. & Ghaemi, H. (2012). The effect of focused written corrective feedback of contrastive analysis on EFL learners' acquisition of verb tenses. Volume: 2 Issue: 4 Article: 06. (2012)

Baleghizadeh, S. & Gordani, Y. (2012). Academic Writing and Grammatical Accuracy: The Role of Corrective Feedback.

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, (2005, 191-205).

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12(3), (2003, 267-296).

David, Wes. (2002). The Effects of Grammar Testing on the Writing Quality and Reduction of Errors in College Freshmen's Essays. Institute of Education Sciences. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED490473

David, Wes. (2005). The Effects of a review grammar and a mechanics on Quality of College students' Technical/ Business writing. Institute of Education Sciences. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED490473

Ehsanm, Rassaei. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. Vol. 4, No. 2. (2011).

Ellis, R. (1994). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (1994).

Ellis, R. (2001. Form-focused instruction and second language learning (Vol. 3): Wiley-Blackwell.

Farrokhi, F. (2011). The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners. Vol. 1, No. 12, (2011), 1797-1803.

Ferris, D. (2002). Treatment of error in second language writing. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. (2002).

Ferris, D. (2004). The "grammar correction" debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime…?). Journal of Second Language Writing, 13(1), (2004), 49-62.

Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? Journal of Second Language Writing, 10(3), (2001) ,161-184.

Frear, D. (2009). The Effect of Focused and Unfocused Direct Written Corrective Feedback on a New Piece of Writing.

Hayes, M.F., & Daiker, D.A. (1984). Using protocol analysis in evaluating response to students writing. Freshman English News, 13(2), (1984),1-10.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research and practice. Modern Language Journal, 62, (1978), 387-398.

Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). Research on written composition: New direction for teaching. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on research in English and Communication Skills/ National Conference on Research in English. (1986).

Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. Journal of Second Language Writing, 7(3), (1998), 255-286.

Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. Lang. Teach. 39, (2006), 77–95.

Kepner, C.G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. Modern Language Journal, 75, (1991), 305-313.

Knoblauch, C.H & Brannon, L. (1981). Teacher commentary on student writing skill: The state of the art. Freshman English New, 10(2), (1981), 1-4.

Krashen, S.D. (1984). Writing: Research, theory, and application. Oxford: Pergamon Institute of English. (1984).

Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written responses. In B. Kroll (Ed), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1990).

Long, M.H. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognitions. In H.D. Brown, C.A. Yario & R.H. Crymes (Eds), On TESOL's 77: *Teaching and learning English as a Second Language. Trends in research and practices.* (pp.278-293), Washington, DC: TESOL. (1977).

Mack, L. (2009). Issues and Dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL Learners? Polyglossia Vol. 16. (2009).

MILLA, R & MAYO, M.P.G. (2014). Corrective feedback episodes in oral interaction: A comparison of a CLIL and an EFL classroom. IJES, vol. 14 (1), 2014, pp. 1-20.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. Language Learning, 46, (1996), 327-369.