



Investigating Effective Error Correction Strategies Employed by Teachers in Enhancing Students' Writing Skills at the Higher Education Level

Kusuma Pitukwong*

**English Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University,
Nakhon Pathom, Thailand*

*Corresponding Author. E-mail address: Kusuma.pw@gmail.com

Received: 4 September 2023; Revised: 22 November 2023; Accepted: 24 November 2023

Published online: 29 June 2024

Abstract

The study aimed to investigate the strategies employed by higher education teachers to correct errors and enhance students' writing and language proficiency. Despite the limited literature on this topic in higher education, qualitative methods such as interviews and classroom observations were utilized to delve into teachers' perspectives. The findings underscored teachers' preferences for specific error correction approaches, consideration of individual student needs, and the delicate balance between providing corrective feedback and positive reinforcement. Identified challenges in implementing these strategies, including time constraints, balancing correction with content instruction, and addressing diverse language proficiency levels, were common. Recommended pedagogical practices center around student-centric and reflective approaches, encompassing timely and constructive feedback, a balanced integration of correction with content instruction, differentiation based on individual needs, and the promotion of self-correction skills. Moreover, the integration of peer feedback, scaffolded error correction, and continuous professional development were highlighted as crucial elements for enhancing effective teaching practices.

Keywords: Error correction strategies, Higher education, Teacher perspectives, Writing skills

I. INTRODUCTION

At the higher education level, effective error correction is a pivotal aspect of writing instruction, playing a crucial role in advancing students' language skills, nurturing language proficiency, and elevating overall writing competence (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012). Despite numerous studies exploring error correction strategies across various educational contexts, there exists a research gap, particularly in higher education settings. This study seeks to address this gap by investigating the strategies employed by teachers in correcting students' writing at the higher education level and assessing their effectiveness in improving writing skills (Ellis, 2009b).

Error correction entails teachers offering feedback to students on their written work, identifying and rectifying errors in grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and organization. Teachers employ diverse approaches, ranging from direct correction of specific errors to indirect correction, and from targeted correction to a more comprehensive approach addressing multiple facets of writing. Understanding these strategies and their perceived effectiveness is vital for refining pedagogical practices and enhancing writing instruction in higher education (Ellis, 2009a).

Although existing research has explored error correction in various educational contexts, including primary and secondary schools, there is a noticeable scarcity of studies dedicated to higher education settings. Therefore, it is imperative to delve into the unique context of higher education and scrutinize the specific strategies employed by teachers for error correction at this level. By investigating teachers' perspectives and practices, this study aims to contribute valuable insights, identifying effective error correction strategies that can elevate students' writing skills and foster language proficiency within higher education institutions.

The investigation into the effective error correction strategies utilized by higher education teachers to enhance students' writing skills is underscored by several crucial factors, all supported by referenced scholarly works. Firstly, the significance of effective error correction lies in its pivotal role in students' language development and proficiency. The complexity of writing, encompassing grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, and coherence, necessitates accurate and timely feedback. Teachers, drawing from strategies explored by Sheen (2007), can assist students in identifying and rectifying writing errors, thereby fostering language growth.

Moreover, the consistent application of error correction strategies allows students to internalize correct language forms and structures. This internalization process, as advocated by Sheen (2007), contributes to an overall improvement in writing competence. Secondly, higher education institutions bear the responsibility of preparing students for academic and professional success. Proficiency in effective writing skills is paramount in these contexts, where students are tasked with producing well-structured essays, research papers, and various written assignments. The research on error correction strategies at the higher education level, as discussed by Sheen (2007), has the potential to inform the development of pedagogical practices that facilitate the acquisition of advanced writing skills.

By understanding and exploring the strategies employed by teachers in higher education, the research contributes to the enhancement of pedagogical practices. These practices, grounded in evidence from Sheen (2007), empower students to meet the rigorous demands of academic writing and excel in their future professional endeavors.

Moreover, the exploration of error correction strategies within higher education settings serves to



bridge a gap in current literature, a point supported by the references provided. While prior studies have delved into error correction at the primary and secondary levels, a scarcity of research exists specifically focusing on the distinctive realm of higher education. This research initiative, informed by the insights of Hyland and Hyland (2006), addresses this gap by spotlighting the strategies employed by teachers in higher education—a context where students encounter unique challenges and possess specific language needs.

Furthermore, beyond addressing this gap, the research has broader implications for teacher professional development programs. As elucidated by Hyland and Hyland (2006), teachers in higher education necessitate guidance and training to effectively navigate students' writing errors. Identifying error correction strategies that yield positive outcomes becomes a crucial foundation for developing targeted professional development initiatives. These initiatives, informed by evidence, can empower educators with the requisite tools and techniques to deliver efficient and impactful error correction. Ultimately, this leads to enhanced writing outcomes for students, aligning with the overarching goals of teacher professional development in higher education.

In conclusion, investigating effective error correction strategies employed by teachers in enhancing students' writing skills at the higher education level is important due to its impact on language development, academic and professional preparation, addressing research gaps, and informing teacher professional development. This research will contribute to the advancement of pedagogical practices in higher education institutions, ultimately benefitting students and their future success.

Research Questions:

1. What are the common error correction strategies employed by teachers in correcting students' writing at the higher education level?
2. How do teachers perceive the effectiveness of different error correction strategies in enhancing students' writing skills?
3. What challenges do teachers encounter when implementing error correction strategies in higher education settings?
4. What pedagogical practices can be recommended based on effective error correction strategies identified in this study?

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Writing proficiency holds paramount importance in the realm of higher education and beyond. To facilitate the development of robust writing skills, educators play a vital role in employing effective error correction strategies. This comprehensive literature review endeavors to delve into and scrutinize a spectrum of error correction strategies deployed by instructors at the higher education level, aimed at augmenting students' writing aptitudes. The review seeks to provide insights into the efficacy of these strategies and their implications for pedagogical practice.

Direct Correction: The practice of direct correction involves educators identifying and rectifying errors within students' written assignments, furnishing them with immediate feedback to cultivate precise language usage. Ferris (2004) cautions against an overreliance on this approach, highlighting its potential to dissuade independent error recognition and rectification among students.

Indirect Correction: Conversely, indirect correction entails providing students with feedback devoid of direct error rectification, fostering a proactive approach

to error analysis and remedy. This approach encourages students to engage in critical thinking and introspection about their writing, subsequently contributing to an elevation in their writing prowess (Hyland & Hyland, 2006).

Error Coding and Highlighting: Employing symbols or codes to accentuate errors, error coding is a method where educators prompt students to identify and rectify their own mistakes. While Truscott (1996) advocates for the efficacy of error coding in enhancing student engagement, Ferris (2002) underscores the necessity of accompanying explanations to preclude any potential confusion.

Peer Feedback and Peer Review: Within the collaborative setting of peer feedback, students actively contribute constructive evaluations. As supported by Liu and Hansen (2002) and Liu and Brown (2015), not only cultivates diverse perspectives but also encourages collaborative learning and facilitates the identification of common errors. Bandit Anuyahong (2021) further emphasizes the necessity of effective feedback training to ensure accurate and constructive assessments, aligning with the principles highlighted by Cho and MacArthur (2010) regarding the importance of training in peer and expert reviewing.

Conference-Based Correction: In personalized, one-on-one conferences, educators engage in tailored feedback sessions with students, aligning with the reflective teaching principles outlined by Richards and Lockhart (2020). Bandit Anuyahong's (2017) research on the development of a research supervision model supports the notion that such personalized conferences offer valuable insights into students' writing processes, allowing for precise guidance and comprehensive skill enhancement. This approach, when integrated with other strategies, can prove effective in nurturing adept writers.

Error-Centered Instruction: Error-centered instruction, as discussed by Ferris (2002, 2010), involves a focused approach on specific error patterns, with lessons tailored to address common errors. Bandit Anuyahong's (2014) assessment of English language learning proficiency complements this, emphasizing the positive impact of error-centered instruction on grammatical accuracy and writing quality. It is essential, as Bandit Anuyahong (2021) notes, to maintain a balanced approach to prevent an undue fixation on error eradication, ensuring a holistic focus on skill development.

Process-Oriented Approach: Embracing a Process-Oriented Approach prioritizes the intricacies of the writing process, spanning drafting, revising, and editing, fostering a culture of continuous refinement. This methodology, as emphasized by Flower and Hayes (1981) in their cognitive process theory of writing, asserts that refining the writing process leads to the creation of more coherent, organized, and thoughtful compositions. Bandit Anuyahong's (2012) exploration of English writing techniques based on metacognitive knowledge further supports this perspective by advocating for a focus on the writing process to enhance overall writing proficiency. By encouraging reflective practice among students, this approach contributes significantly to the gradual augmentation of their writing skills over time, aligning with the insights provided by Bandit Anuyahong (2018) regarding the use of task-based learning activities to enhance writing ability.

In conclusion, adopting an amalgamation of error correction strategies, thoughtfully selected based on students' individual needs, empowers educators to effectively enhance writing skills in higher education settings. Bitchener and Ferris's (2012) research on written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing underscores the significance of choosing appropriate strategies. Ferris's extensive work



(2002, 2010, 2014) on error correction in second language writing research provides valuable insights into the intersections and practical applications of various error correction methods. This comprehensive approach, observed through the lenses of these scholars, contributes to a holistic method in facilitating students' journey towards writing excellence. It is evident from the research by Ferris (2019) that these strategies, when implemented judiciously, have both short- and long-term effects on improving written expression, aligning with the broader insights provided by Truscott (2007) on the effects of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employed a qualitative approach to ensure a comprehensive and detailed exploration of teachers' error correction strategies in higher education.

There were four primary objectives of the study: 1) to explore the common error correction strategies utilized by higher education-level teachers when correcting students' writing., 2) to investigate teachers' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of various error correction strategies in fostering the improvement of students' writing skills., 3) to examine the challenges faced by teachers in the implementation of error correction strategies within higher education settings., and 4) to identify and recommend pedagogical practices based on effective error correction strategies uncovered in this research.

Qualitative research methods are well-suited for investigating complex phenomena such as teaching practices and provide rich and nuanced insights into the topic.

To gather data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposive sample of experienced teachers who possess expertise in teaching writing at the higher education level. The purposive sampling

approach allowed for the selection of participants with extensive knowledge and experience in the specific context of interest, ensuring the collection of relevant and insightful information. The interviews were designed to be semi-structured, providing a flexible framework for participants to share their perspectives, experiences, and strategies related to error correction.

In addition to interviews, classroom observations were conducted to directly observe the practical implementation of error correction strategies. These observations allowed researchers to gain an in-depth understanding of how teachers incorporate error correction within their instructional practices, observe the interaction between teachers and students during the writing process, and capture the dynamics and nuances of the classroom environment.

The data collected from interviews and classroom observations were subjected to thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a widely used qualitative data analysis method that involves identifying patterns, themes, and recurring ideas within the data. This process involved systematically reviewing the interview transcripts and observational notes, coding the data into meaningful categories, and then organizing these codes into overarching themes. By analyzing the data thematically, the researchers were able to identify commonalities, variations, and key trends related to teachers' error correction strategies in higher education.

This qualitative approach, combining interviews and classroom observations, allowed for a multi-dimensional exploration of teachers' error correction strategies. It provided a holistic view of teachers' perspectives, practices, and the contextual factors influencing their strategies. By employing this methodology, the research aimed to capture the complexities and nuances of error correction in higher education and generate insights that can inform

pedagogical practices and support the development of effective error correction strategies.

A. Population and Samples

For this research on exploring teachers' error correction strategies in enhancing students' writing skills at the higher education level, a purposive sampling method was employed to select participants who possess expertise in teaching writing and have experience in higher education settings. The sample comprised experienced teachers in higher education who could provide valuable insights into their error correction practices.

The population of interest for this study includes teachers who are actively involved in teaching English writing courses at the higher education level. These teachers came from diverse academic disciplines such as English, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. They were employed in universities, colleges, or other higher education institutions.

Within this population, a purposive sampling technique was employed to select a sample of participants who can provide rich and varied perspectives on error correction strategies. Purposive sampling involves selecting participants based on their specific characteristics, expertise, and relevance to the research topic. In this case, the participants were selected based on their experience in teaching writing and their familiarity with higher education contexts.

The sample size for the study would depend on the scope and specific requirements of the research. A suitable sample size aimed for an adequate representation of different perspectives and experiences, ensuring that a comprehensive understanding of error correction strategies is achieved. It is crucial to ensure that the sample size is sufficient to capture diverse insights while maintaining the manageability of data collection and analysis.

The sample for this research included 10 teachers who meet the criteria of having more than 5 years of experience in teaching English writing at the higher education level. There were 6 female and 4 male teachers. These participants were invited to participate in semi-structured interviews, where they shared their perspectives, experiences, and strategies related to error correction. The sample selection prioritized diversity in terms of disciplines, teaching experience, and institutional backgrounds to obtain a comprehensive range of insights.

Additionally, practical observations of classroom activities were carried out between June and July 2023 to observe the practical implementation of error correction strategies in real classroom settings. The observations involved a subset of participants from the interview sample, selected based on their willingness to have their classes observed. The classroom observations provided valuable data on how teachers interact with students during the writing process and how error correction strategies are integrated into their instructional practices.

The thematic analysis delved into various facets concerning the influence of peer feedback on students' writing skills, unraveling several discernible themes:

1. Positive Impact on Writing Skills
2. Encourages Collaborative Learning
3. Identification of Common Errors
4. Effective Feedback Training is Crucial
5. Varied Perspectives Enhance Learning

The semi-structured interview questions were thoughtfully categorized to cover various essential aspects of teaching writing skills and error correction. The topics and questions were systematically organized as follows:



Table 1: The list of semi-structured interview questions

Introduction	Can you provide a brief overview of your approach to teaching writing skills?
Error Correction Strategies	1. How do you typically approach error correction in students' writing assignments? 2. Are there specific error correction strategies you find more effective than others?
Preferences and Considerations	1. Do you have a preference for direct or indirect error correction? Why? 2. How do you consider individual student needs when implementing error correction strategies?
Challenges Faced	1. What challenges do you encounter when implementing error correction strategies in higher education settings? 2. How do you balance the need for error correction with other instructional priorities?
Effectiveness of Strategies	1. In your experience, how do different error correction strategies impact students' writing skills? 2. Can you share a specific example where a particular strategy was particularly effective?
Recommendations and Pedagogical Practices	1. What pedagogical practices do you recommend for effective error correction in writing? 2. How do you integrate error correction seamlessly into the writing process?
Peer Feedback and Collaboration	1. How do you incorporate peer feedback and collaboration in your writing courses? 2. In your view, what role does peer feedback play in error correction and skill development?
Continuous Professional Development	1. How do you engage in continuous professional development to enhance your error correction strategies? 2. Are there specific workshops or resources you find particularly beneficial?
Reflective Practices	1. How do you engage in reflective practices to assess and refine your error correction approaches? 2. Can you share an instance where reflective practice led to a positive change in your teaching?
Conclusion	Based on your experiences, what advice would you give to educators seeking to improve their error correction strategies for writing skills?

Table 2: Observation checklist for classroom teaching

Observation Checklist for Classroom Teaching	Categories
Teacher-Student Interaction	1. Frequency of teacher-student interactions: - High (frequent interaction) - Moderate - Low (limited interaction) 2. Clarity in explaining concepts and instructions: - Clear and concise - Moderate clarity - Unclear
Student Engagement	3. Level of engagement during different activities: - Actively engaged - Partially engaged - Disengaged 4. Participation in class discussions: - Actively participates - Occasionally participates - Rarely participates
Use of Teaching Aids	5. Integration of visual aids or technology: - Frequently used - Occasionally used - Rarely used
Classroom Management	6. Strategies for maintaining discipline: - Effective strategies observed - Moderate effectiveness - Ineffective 7. Transition between activities: - Smooth transitions - Moderate transitions - Disruptive transitions
Student Collaboration	8. Opportunities for and effectiveness of student collaboration: - Frequent and effective collaboration - Moderate collaboration - Limited collaboration
Feedback and Assessment	9. Provision of feedback on student work: - Detailed and timely feedback - Moderate feedback - Limited feedback 10. Assessment methods used: - Varied and appropriate - Moderately varied - Limited variety
Inclusion of Diverse Learning Styles	11. Adaptation of teaching methods for different learning styles: - Evident adaptation - Partial adaptation - Limited adaptation

Table 2: Observation checklist for classroom teaching (Cont.)

Observation Checklist for Classroom Teaching	Categories
Time Management	12. Efficient use of class time: - Optimal use of time - Moderate time management - Inefficient use of time
Incorporation of Error Correction	13. Strategies used for error correction in students' work: - Clearly defined error correction strategies - Moderate use of strategies - Limited use of strategies
Overall Classroom Atmosphere	14. General atmosphere and tone of the classroom: - Positive and inclusive - Moderately positive - Negative or exclusive

This observation checklist for classroom teaching provides a comprehensive framework for assessing various aspects of the teaching environment.

By utilizing a purposive sampling method and incorporating both interviews and classroom observations, this research aims to gather insights from a select group of experienced teachers in higher education. The findings from this sample provide valuable perspectives on error correction strategies and their effectiveness in enhancing students' writing skills at the higher education level.

IV. RESULTS

A. The study explored the common error correction strategies employed by teachers in correcting students' writing at the higher education level. The following strategies were identified:

1) *Direct Correction:* Teachers explicitly identify and correct errors in students' writing by marking errors or providing written comments to guide students towards the correct usage or form.

2) *Indirect Correction:* Teachers provide feedback that prompts students to self-identify and correct their errors, fostering their self-monitoring and reflective skills.

3) *Error Coding or Symbol Use:* Teachers use specific codes or symbols to annotate errors, indicating the type or nature of the mistake without directly correcting it. This strategy encourages active engagement in error identification and self-correction.

4) *Focused Error Correction:* Teachers adopt a targeted approach, focusing on specific error types or linguistic features in students' writing, such as grammar, vocabulary, or organization.

5) *Recasting or Reformulation:* Some teachers use recasting or reformulation techniques to correct errors by restating or rephrasing the incorrect sentence or phrase, modeling the correct form or structure.

6) *Peer Review and Collaboration:* Teachers incorporate peer review and collaboration activities where students provide feedback to their peers' writing, identifying errors, and suggesting improvements. Teachers facilitate and guide these peer interactions to enhance error correction and promote collaborative learning.

7) *Error Explanation and Clarification:* Teachers provide explicit explanations and clarifications of errors, offering detailed linguistic or contextual explanations to help students understand the nature of their mistakes and how to avoid them in the future.

For instance, in the strategy of direct correction, the teacher identifies and corrects the error by explicitly pointing it out and providing the correct form. In the case of a subject-verb agreement error, the teacher's comment may be: "You have a subject-verb agreement error in this sentence. It should be 'The students were' instead of 'The students was'." The teacher guides the student by highlighting the error and offering guidance on rectifying it.



Alternatively, the recasting or reformulation strategy involves the teacher restating the incorrect sentence in the correct form. For instance, if the sentence is "The students was happy," the teacher may suggest: "Consider revising this sentence: 'The students were happy.' This captures the plural subject-verb agreement." The teacher models the correct form to help the student understand and internalize the correction.

These findings provide insights into the common error correction strategies employed by teachers at the higher education level, illustrating their approaches to identify and rectify errors in students' writing.

B. The study explored how teachers perceive the effectiveness of different error correction strategies in enhancing students' writing skills. The findings include the following:

1) Preference for Specific Strategies: Teachers express a preference for certain error correction strategies based on their beliefs and experiences. Some teachers find direct correction more effective in providing immediate feedback and guiding students towards the correct form. Others perceive indirect correction as more beneficial in fostering students' autonomy and self-correction skills.

2) Consideration of Individual Student Needs: Teachers emphasize the importance of tailoring error correction strategies to meet individual student needs. They recognize that different students require varied approaches based on their proficiency levels, learning styles, and specific language challenges. Teachers perceive strategies that allow for personalized feedback and targeted support as more effective in addressing individual needs and promoting writing skill development.

3) Balancing Corrective Feedback and Positive Reinforcement: Teachers highlight the significance of balancing corrective feedback with positive reinforcement.

They perceive that a supportive and encouraging approach, alongside error correction, can motivate students and maintain their engagement in the writing process. Teachers value strategies that not only identify and rectify errors but also acknowledge and highlight students' strengths and improvements.

4) Integration of Error Correction in the Writing Process: Teachers emphasize the importance of integrating error correction strategies seamlessly into the writing process. They perceive that error correction is most effective when it is incorporated throughout the various stages of writing, such as planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Strategies that promote ongoing feedback and revision cycles are perceived as more effective in enhancing students' writing skills.

5) Reflective and Metacognitive Practices: Teachers recognize the value of fostering students' reflective and metacognitive skills in error correction. They perceive that strategies that encourage students to analyze and reflect on their errors, understand the underlying reasons, and develop strategies for improvement are more effective in facilitating long-term writing skill development. Teachers value approaches that promote self-awareness and metacognitive control in error correction.

Teacher A believes that direct correction is an effective strategy as it provides immediate feedback and helps students understand specific language rules and structures. They also emphasize the importance of positive reinforcement to motivate students and recognize their strengths. In contrast, Teacher B finds indirect correction more effective in promoting critical thinking, self-reflection, and independent learning. They value the long-term growth and self-correction abilities fostered by this strategy.

These results illustrate the varied perspectives of teachers regarding the effectiveness of different error correction strategies. Teachers' beliefs and experiences

shape their preferences, highlighting the need for a flexible approach that considers individual student needs and integrates error correction effectively within the writing process.

C. The study investigated the challenges that teachers encounter when implementing error correction strategies in higher education settings. The findings include the following challenges:

1) *Time Constraints:* Teachers express challenges related to time constraints when implementing error correction strategies. The large class sizes and high volume of student work make it challenging to provide thorough and timely feedback on students' writing. Teachers find it difficult to allocate sufficient time for error correction, particularly when individualized attention is required for each student's work.

2) *Balancing Corrective Feedback and Content Instruction:* Teachers face challenges in balancing error correction with other instructional priorities, such as delivering content knowledge and covering the curriculum. It becomes a challenge to find a balance between providing adequate error correction and ensuring the completion of syllabus and course requirements. Teachers need to make strategic decisions about the frequency and depth of error correction to optimize learning outcomes.

3) *Addressing Diverse Language Proficiency Levels:* In higher education settings, students come from diverse linguistic backgrounds and have varying levels of language proficiency. Teachers encounter challenges in providing effective error correction strategies that cater to these differences. It is challenging to simultaneously support students who require remedial assistance while also challenging those who are more proficient in their writing skills.

4) *Individualized Feedback for a Large Number of Students:* Higher education classes often have a large

number of students, making it challenging for teachers to provide individualized feedback to each student. Teachers find it difficult to provide personalized error correction strategies that address the specific needs of every student. This challenge may require alternative approaches, such as group feedback or targeted feedback on common errors.

5) *Managing Student Expectations and Receptiveness to Feedback:* Teachers encounter challenges related to student expectations and receptiveness to error correction feedback. Some students may have different attitudes towards error correction, with varying levels of receptiveness and motivation. Teachers need to navigate these different perspectives and employ strategies to maintain students' engagement and motivation in the face of error correction.

6) *Providing Effective Guidance for Error Correction:* Teachers face challenges in providing clear and effective guidance for error correction. This includes ensuring that students understand the feedback provided, can apply the correction to future writing, and develop strategies for self-correction. Teachers need to find ways to deliver feedback that is constructive, actionable, and promotes students' continuous improvement.

These findings highlight the challenges that teachers encounter when implementing error correction strategies in higher education settings. Time constraints, balancing instructional priorities, addressing diverse student needs, managing student expectations, and providing effective guidance are key areas where teachers face difficulties. Understanding and addressing these challenges are essential for developing strategies, professional development programs, and support systems that assist teachers in effectively implementing error correction and supporting students' writing skill development.



The perspectives of two teachers shed light on the challenges they face when implementing error correction strategies in higher education settings:

Teacher A: "One of the challenges I face is time constraints. With a large class size and numerous assignments to assess, it becomes difficult to provide detailed feedback on each student's writing. I want to give thorough and personalized error correction, but it's challenging to manage the workload within the limited time available. Balancing error correction with content instruction is another challenge. I want to cover the course material effectively, but I also recognize the importance of providing constructive feedback on writing. Finding the right balance can be demanding."

Teacher B: "I encounter challenges in addressing diverse language proficiency levels among students. In a higher education classroom, students come from various linguistic backgrounds and have different levels of proficiency. It can be challenging to provide error correction strategies that cater to each student's specific needs. I want to offer individualized feedback and support, but it becomes overwhelming when dealing with a wide range of language abilities. Managing student expectations and receptiveness to feedback is also a challenge. Some students may appreciate error correction and actively work on improving their writing, while others may feel discouraged or resistant. It requires effort to foster a positive attitude towards error correction and maintain students' motivation throughout the process."

In these perspectives, Teacher A highlights time constraints and the need to balance error correction with content instruction as their primary challenges. They struggle to provide thorough and timely feedback while fulfilling the demands of the course curriculum. Teacher B, on the other hand, emphasizes challenges related to addressing diverse language

proficiency levels and managing student expectations. They face the difficulty of tailoring error correction strategies to meet individual students' needs and fostering a positive learning environment.

These perspectives reflect the challenges that teachers encounter in higher education settings, such as time constraints, balancing instructional priorities, addressing diverse student needs, and managing student expectations. Understanding these challenges helps in developing strategies and support systems that assist teachers in effectively implementing error correction and supporting students' writing skill development.

D. The study identified pedagogical practices that can be recommended based on the effective error correction strategies identified in this research. The following practices are suggested:

1) *Providing Timely and Constructive Feedback:* Teachers prioritize providing timely feedback on students' writing, ensuring that they receive input at a stage where it is most beneficial for their learning. Feedback is constructive, highlighting both areas for improvement and recognizing strengths. This practice encourages students to actively engage with their errors and make necessary revisions.

2) *Balancing Error Correction and Content Instruction:* Teachers aim to strike a balance between error correction and delivering content instruction. This involves thoughtful planning to allocate adequate time for error correction while ensuring the coverage of course material. Teachers integrate error correction activities into the writing process, allowing students to receive feedback throughout the stages of planning, drafting, revising, and editing.

3) *Differentiating Error Correction Strategies:* Recognizing the diverse language proficiency levels and needs of students, teachers adopt differentiated error

correction strategies. This approach involves tailoring feedback and instructional interventions to cater to individual student requirements. Providing targeted support to students who require remedial assistance while challenging more proficient students helps maximize the impact of error correction on writing skill development.

4) *Promoting Self-Correction Skills*: Teachers encourage the development of students' self-correction skills by implementing error correction strategies that foster metacognitive awareness. This involves guiding students to reflect on their errors, identify patterns, and develop strategies for self-correction. By promoting self-monitoring and self-correction, students become active participants in their own learning process.

5) *Scaffolded Error Correction*: Teachers scaffold the error correction process by gradually shifting responsibility to students. Initially, teachers provide explicit correction and guidance, gradually reducing the amount of direct intervention over time. This practice promotes students' autonomy and independence in error identification and correction, fostering their self-regulation skills.

6) *Peer Feedback and Collaboration*: Teachers incorporate peer feedback and collaboration as a complement to teacher feedback. Peer review activities allow students to engage in error detection, provide suggestions, and learn from each other's writing. Teachers facilitate structured peer feedback sessions and provide guidance to ensure effective and constructive peer interactions.

7) *Professional Development and Reflective Practice*: Teachers engage in ongoing professional development and reflective practice to enhance their error correction strategies. Participating in workshops, conferences, and collaborative learning communities provide opportunities for teachers to learn and share effective practices. Reflective practice allows teachers

to continually assess and refine their error correction approaches based on student needs and feedback.

By implementing these pedagogical practices, teachers can enhance their error correction strategies and promote students' writing skill development. These practices emphasize timely and constructive feedback, a balance between error correction and content instruction, differentiation based on student needs, promotion of self-correction skills, scaffolded error correction, peer feedback and collaboration, and continuous professional development and reflective practice.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study illuminate the prevalent error correction strategies employed by instructors in higher education, offering insights into their perceived effectiveness and the challenges encountered in their implementation. Rooted in a diverse array of error correction strategies sourced from the literature and enriched by the research of Bandit Anuyahong (2021), this discussion delves into the implications of the results, incorporating relevant citations.

The spectrum of error correction strategies identified in this study aligns with the comprehensive review conducted by Bitchener and Ferris (2012) on written corrective feedback. The study recognizes strategies such as direct correction, indirect correction, error coding, focused error correction, recasting, peer review, and error explanation. Notably, Bandit Anuyahong's (2012) research, particularly the exploration of English writing techniques based on metacognitive knowledge, adds depth to the discussion by emphasizing the integration of metacognitive practices into error correction. This integration resonates with Flower and Hayes's (1981) cognitive process theory of writing, which underscores the importance of reflective practice in the writing process.



The nuanced perspectives of teachers on the effectiveness of error correction strategies align with the broader discourse on this topic. The preferences for specific strategies, consideration of individual student needs, and the delicate balance between corrective feedback and positive reinforcement echo the complexity discussed by Truscott (1996) regarding the efficacy of error correction. The study contributes a nuanced perspective by recognizing potential benefits when error correction is complemented by positive reinforcement.

Bandit Anuyahong's (2018, 2021) research on task-based learning activities and the development of a research supervision model provides additional layers to the discussion. These practices, advocated by Bandit Anuyahong, align with the study's findings, emphasizing the importance of seamlessly integrating error correction into the writing process. This integration resonates with the principles of process-oriented writing, contributing to a holistic approach to nurturing adept writers.

The challenges voiced by teachers align with broader issues in higher education. Time constraints, balancing correction with content instruction, addressing diverse language proficiency levels, providing individualized feedback, managing student expectations, and delivering effective guidance are challenges acknowledged in both the study and Bandit Anuyahong's (2018, 2021) research.

Teacher A and Teacher B's perspectives provide valuable insights into the practical difficulties faced by educators. Teacher A's challenges with time constraints and balancing correction with content instruction align with the issues highlighted by Ferris (2019), emphasizing the need for strategic decisions in optimizing learning outcomes. Conversely, Teacher B's struggles with diverse language proficiency levels and managing student expectations echo the nuanced nature of

implementing error correction strategies across a heterogeneous student population.

Building upon the effective error correction strategies identified in the study, the recommendations align with Bandit Anuyahong (2021) research, providing a set of pedagogical practices for educators. Timely and constructive feedback, balancing error correction with content instruction, differentiating strategies based on individual needs, promoting self-correction skills, scaffolded error correction, peer feedback, and continuous professional development resonate with the principles outlined by Bandit Anuyahong (2018, 2021).

In conclusion, the synthesis of results and integration of Bandit Anuyahong's (2012, 2014, 2018, 2021) research contribute to a comprehensive understanding of error correction in higher education settings. The multifaceted nature of error correction, the importance of metacognitive practices, and the need for tailored strategies underscore the complex landscape educators navigate in fostering effective writing skills among students. As the discussion unfolds, it becomes evident that an integrative and reflective approach, drawing from diverse strategies and informed by research findings, can enhance the efficacy of error correction practices in higher education.

VI. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this research provides a comprehensive exploration of error correction strategies in higher education, offering valuable insights into the complexities faced by educators. The identified strategies, including direct correction, indirect correction, error coding, and focused error correction, reveal a nuanced interplay between cognitive processes and the correction of written work.

Teachers' perspectives on the effectiveness of these strategies enrich the ongoing discourse in the

field, highlighting the preferences for specific approaches, consideration of individual student needs, and the delicate balance between corrective feedback and positive reinforcement. Challenges in implementing these strategies, such as time constraints, balancing correction with content instruction, and addressing diverse language proficiency levels, reflect common issues faced in higher education settings.

Recommendations for pedagogical practices align with student-centric and reflective approaches, emphasizing timely and constructive feedback, balancing correction with content instruction, differentiating strategies based on individual needs, and promoting self-correction skills. Integration of peer feedback, scaffolded error correction, and continuous professional development further contribute to effective pedagogical practices.

In essence, this research underscores the dynamic and interconnected nature of error correction in higher education. By amalgamating empirical findings with existing research, the study contributes to a comprehensive understanding of effective error correction practices. As educators navigate the intricate terrain of developing writing skills, an integrative and reflective approach emerges as a key determinant of success in fostering adept writers in higher education.

Suggested Pedagogical Practices for Effective Error Correction Strategies:

1. Teachers should prioritize providing timely feedback on students' writing assignments. Feedback should be specific, offering suggestions for improvement while guiding students towards correct language usage and form. Constructive feedback encourages students to actively engage with their errors and make necessary revisions.

2. Teachers should integrate error correction activities into the overall writing process. This involves allocating specific class time or homework assignments for

students to revise and improve their writing based on feedback received. By making error correction an ongoing and integrated part of writing instruction, students can apply feedback in subsequent drafts and revisions.

3. Teachers should tailor their error correction strategies based on students' language proficiency levels and individual needs. Providing more explicit correction and guidance for students with lower proficiency levels, while encouraging more independent error identification and self-correction for advanced learners, can help maximize the impact of error correction on writing skill development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express deep gratitude to the English Program at Nakhon Pathom Rajabhat University in Thailand for their generous support, crucial in the successful completion of my research project. The assistance, academic backing, and conducive environment provided by the program were instrumental from conceptualization to data analysis. Their commitment to academic research significantly contributed to the project's success, enriching its quality and depth. The invaluable guidance and expertise of the faculty and staff played a pivotal role in shaping the research direction and methodology, making their encouragement and mentorship essential throughout the entire process.

REFERENCES

- Bandit Anuyahong. (2012). English writing techniques based on metacognitive knowledge used by technical and business students: A case study of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology. *In Proceedings of ICER 2012: Challenging Education for Future Change* (pp. 155–167).
- Bandit Anuyahong. (2014). The six English writing strategies of undergraduate students in Thailand: A case of Thai-Nichi Institute of Technology. *In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Language and Communication*. (pp. 46–78).



- Bandit Anuyahong. (2018). Using Facebook based on constructivist teaching method to develop English writing dexterity of undergraduate students in Thailand. In *Proceedings of 5th International Conference on Business and Industrial Research (ICBIR)*. 639–643.
- Bandit Anuyahong. (2021). The development of intensive English research writing training model to encourage international publishing for university lecturers. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12(14), 5374–5382.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cho, K. S., & MacArthur, C. A. (2010). Student revision with peer and expert reviewing. *Learning and Instruction*, 20(4), 328–338.
- Ellis, R. (2009a). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107.
- Ellis, R. (2009b). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3–18.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). Treatment of error in second language student writing. *The CATESOL Journal*, 15(1), 183–190.
- Ferris, D. R. (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), 49–62.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181–201.
- Ferris, D. R. (2014). Responding to student writing: Teachers' philosophies and practices. *Assessing Writing*, 19, 6–23.
- Ferris, D., & Kurzer, K. (2019). Does error feedback help L2 writers?: Latest evidence on the efficacy of written corrective feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 106–124). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365–387.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101.
- Liu, J., & Brown, D. (2015). Methodological synthesis of research on the effectiveness of corrective feedback in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 30, 66–81.
- Liu, J., & Hansen, J. G. (2002). *Peer Response in Second Language Writing Classrooms*. Michigan, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (2020). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327–369.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255–272.