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This study examined the effects of learner-initiated noticing through comparison and teacher-initiated noticing through grammar instruction on EFL middle school learners’ English writing process and uptake. For the study, 18 second-year middle school students with intermediate-high English proficiency were divided into three groups. After the first writing composition, one group (Group C) underwent a comparison stage, in which they compared their original writings and reformulated versions. Another group (Group I) received reactive grammar instruction on the four most frequent types of grammar errors, while the other group (Group IC) underwent both stages. All three groups revised their original writings in the next stage. To examine the learners’ cognitive processes, think-aloud protocols were analyzed. The results showed that Group IC performed better in uptake than the other two groups, while no major differences were found between Groups I and C. This suggests that a mixture of learner-initiated noticing and teacher-initiated noticing influenced the learners’ uptake.
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1. INTRODUCTION

A number of studies (Chon & Shin, 2009; Jung, 2010; D. Kang, 2008; H.-S. Kang, 2011; Kim, 2005; Kim & Ryoo, 2011; Ma, 2006; Oh & Kang, 2013; Shin, 2011; Yoon & Yoo, 2011) dealing with L2 writing tasks have mainly focused on the outcome of writing while neglecting the cognitive process L2 learners engage in while writing (Baek, Song, & Lee, 2012). Baek et al. (2012) claims it is necessary to understand L2 learners’ cognitive processes – “what they focus on and notice while writing a text and processing feedback,
and how this noticing contributes to acquisition” (p. 184).

For effective L2 acquisition, the first and most important stage is noticing (Ellis, 1995; Schmidt & Frota, 1986). If learners cannot find the gap between their interlanguage and target-like language, it will be difficult to master the target language (TL) (Swain, 2005). However, as presented in Baek et al.’s (2012) study, noticing is not a sufficient factor to enhance learners’ uptake. It is possible that the learners do not have enough linguistic background knowledge or are not capable of activating their partially internalized knowledge for productive language use. In that case, learners would simply find differences and learn nothing; even worse, they would not be able to notice the gap. This implicates that the need for more direct help such as instruction with a chance of noticing for better L2 acquisition and its application.

The present study aims to take a step back from Baek et al.’s (2012) study and to investigate a better means of facilitating EFL learners’ uptake in L2 writing production. More specifically, the learners in this study received different types of learning experience in each group: being provided an opportunity for noticing the gap between their interlanguage and model writing (learner-initiated), receiving grammar instruction (teacher-initiated), and receiving both comparison opportunity and the instruction. Each group’s noticing and uptake was studied to clarify the influence of learner-initiated and teacher-initiated noticing on EFL learners’ uptake.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Noticing and L2 Learners’ Writing Performance

Swain (2005) suggested three functions of output such as noticing and triggering, hypothesis testing and the metalinguistic (reflective) function. Written output is important because of these three functions. While producing the target language, learners are helped to become aware of their deficiency in L2 knowledge. Through this noticing process, they gain novel L2 knowledge or strengthen their existing knowledge (Swain & Lapkin, 1995). If learners do not test hypotheses or use their current linguistic knowledge through composing, they cannot gain an opportunity to produce modified output after receiving proper feedback. Many researchers stressed the significance of modified output because it is essential to L2 learning (e.g., He & Ellis, 1999; McDonough, 2001; Storch, 2000, 2001; Swain, 2005).

Barnawi (2010) defined noticing as “a strategy of recognizing gaps, problems, mistakes, or errors in a particular piece of writing” (p. 210). In the process of noticing, learners realize the differences between what they can express and what they want to write – their
interlanguage and the target language (Swain, 2005). As they tried to solve the problems, they also develop their linguistic knowledge and improve fluency and accuracy in writing (Barnawi, 2010). Therefore, writing is an important catalyst for noticing forms as well as meaning (Cumming, 1990; Qi & Lapkin, 2001).

In this sense, output is not only a final product but a type of learning process which promotes focus on form as well as focus on meaning. Many studies have emphasized the importance of output for noticing.

2.2. Studies on Cognitive Processes in Korean EFL Writing

As Baek et al. (2012) noted in their study, Korean EFL learners’ cognitive processes in writing have not been a main concern of researchers. A number of studies investigated learning outcome of writing (Choi, 2011; Chon & Shin, 2009; Jung, 2010; D. Kang, 2008; H.-S. Kang, 2011; H.-J. Kim, 2005; Kim & Ryoo, 2011; Ma, 2006; Oh & Kang, 2013; Shin, 2011; Yoon & Yoo, 2011). Only a few studies explored college students’ writing process using retrospective questionnaire surveys (S.-Y. Kim, 2007), or learners’ introspective self-descriptions of English writing process (Choi, 2011).

In the meantime, Han (2011) attested the importance of attention and noticing for L2 acquisition by employing the dictogloss procedure with 16 adult L2 learners. The researcher investigated the extent to which learners may notice the target form and its subsequent learning through noticing by examining the participants’ language learning episodes (LREs) and three grammar tests: a grammaticality judgement test (GJT), an error correction test (ECT) and a metalinguistic knowledge test (MKT). A positive relationship between the extent of noticing and subsequent learning, and learner’s readiness for the target form was found.

In contrast, Baek et al.’s (2012) study showed that having an opportunity for noticing the gap between their own writing and the reformulation led to some degree of noticing in their errors, while most of them did not attain uptake. They used the think-aloud protocol analysis for data collection in order to investigate “what L2 learners notice and uptake while writing in English” (p. 188) and self-correction for measuring the participants’ uptake. Nine Korean EFL middle school students with different levels of English proficiency participated in a three-stage writing task – composing, reformulation checking, and revising. With a different research setting and measurement from Han’s (2011); Baek et al. (2012) concluded that noticing the gap was not sufficient to lead EFL middle school learners’ uptake. This suggests that additional learning events would be needed for learners’ L2 acquisition.
2.3. Reactive Grammar Instruction

Noticing is a necessary process for effective language acquisition, but it does not happen in all language learning contexts. Learners’ proficiency, what they focus on, and other factors would influence the occurrence of noticing. Lightbown (2005) insisted that learners would not be able to notice language forms when they focus on meaning, and focused instruction could lead learners to notice the forms. Sharwood Smith (1981) also noted the value of instruction, in that metalinguistic knowledge or memorized utterances allow the learner to produce useful input to the learner’s own system. Kim (2014) investigated effects of form-focused instruction on the development of explicit and implicit knowledge of L2 when instruction is offered within the context of meaning-focused instruction. The findings suggested that form-focused instruction led to positive developmental trends in implicit knowledge of L2, while the control group did not show a clear learning effect. This indicates benefits of providing grammar instruction to facilitate L2 learners’ noticing and learning.

There are mainly two methods of selecting target language items for instruction: a proactive approach and a reactive approach. In a proactive approach, the target aspect to focus on is selected in advance. On the other hand, a reactive approach would expect the teacher to notice and to be prepared to “handle various learning difficulties as they arise” (Doughty & Williams, 2005, p.198). Considering that Long and Robinson (2005) defines focus on form as a responsive teaching intervention that involves reaction to salient errors using devices to increase perceptual salience, “the reactive approach would be congruent with the general aims of communicative language teaching” (Doughty & Williams, 2005, p.205). Long and Robinson (2005) and Doughty and Williams (2005) suggest some appropriate conditions for reactive instruction. The reactive instruction would be effective when the learners are of the same L1 background and the teacher is experienced enough. The focus of instruction needs to be on classroom learner errors that are “pervasive,” “systematic,” and known to be “remediable” for learners at the present stage of development. Considering these features noted in the previous studies, a reactive stance was selected as the additional treatment in the present study in addition to allowing an opportunity for noticing the gap. In this study, the influence not only of learner-initiated noticing through formulation but also of teacher-initiated noticing through a reactive grammar instruction is investigated in order to study a better means of enhancing EFL learners’ acquisition of form-related knowledge and its productive use. The following research questions guided the study.

1. How does student uptake occur when they have an opportunity for learner-initiated noticing through comparison between their original writing and reformulation after writing practice?
2. How does student uptake occur when they have a chance of teacher-initiated noticing through reactive grammar instruction after writing practice?
3. How does student uptake occur when they have a chance of learner- and teacher-initiated noticing?

3. METHODS

3.1. Participants

The participants of this study were 18 second-year students in the same middle school in Seoul. Table 1 shows information on the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>Participants’ English Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group (C)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Group (I)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Comparison Group (IC)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They were selectively drawn from three classes according to the following criteria. Three classes of students composed a writing draft as a whole class and those who wrote more than five sentences and whose latest English score on a school exam was between 79 and 94 were asked to participate in this study. Their English exam consisted of multiple choice items about reading passages and grammar knowledge (50%), sentence writing questions (10%), a speaking test (10%), a listening test (20%), and participation (10%). A total of 18 accepted the offer and they were divided into three groups.

3.2. Procedures

This study used three stages of writing consisting of writing, comparing, and revising, following Qi and Lapkin (2001). Another stage for reactive grammar instruction was added in between Stages 2 and 3. All three groups composed their original drafts in class. After one week from Stage 1, Groups IC and I received reactive grammar instruction which was based on the researcher’s analysis of the two groups’ linguistic errors in their first drafts (see Appendix B for a participant’s writing sample). After another week, Groups IC and C compared their original and revised versions of the drafts. In this stage, reformulation is given as corrective feedback. Qi and Lapkin (2001) and Cohen (1989) argued that reformulation is more helpful than error correction, in that it helps learners “to obtain
deeper feedback than in the simple correction of surface errors, which is often what learners receive as feedback on their essays” (p.9). Therefore, reformulation may trigger a deeper level of cognitive processing than simple error correction (Baek et al., 2012). After one week, unannounced, all the groups revised their original drafts. Table 2 shows the research schedule for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Comparison Group (C)</th>
<th>Instruction Group (I)</th>
<th>Instruction Comparison Group (IC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Writing a draft</td>
<td>Writing a draft</td>
<td>Writing a draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Reactive grammar instruction based on error analysis</td>
<td>Reactive grammar instruction based on error analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td>Comparison with think-aloud</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Comparison with think-aloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td>Revising a draft</td>
<td>Revising a draft</td>
<td>Revising a draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Stage 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The details of each writing stages were as follows. In the first writing stage (Stage 1), the students wrote for 30 minutes with a clue picture. The same picture from Qi and Lapkin’s (2001) study was also used for the students’ writing (see Appendix A). The picture contains various characters and likely events, so that students could compose a story-line using their imagination. Based on the picture, students could make up their own stories. While the students wrote, they could not use dictionaries and the teacher did not provide them any help. Before they submitted their writing, they performed self-correction.

Based on an analyses of students’ linguistic errors in Stage 1, 14 categories of error types were identified as follows: S-V agreement, reference, prepositions, be-verbs, impersonal subjects, relative clauses, sense verbs, incomplete clauses, possessives, interrogatives, imperatives, tenses, plural forms, and indirect questions. Some errors that are grammatical at the sentence level but do not correctly refer to a person were categorized as reference errors along with determiner errors, in that they failed to clearly refer to the intended person. Among the 14 error types, the four most frequent errors were reference, be-verbs, tenses, and S-V agreement. Errors related to lexis were in the top four most frequent error categories, but they were excluded, since they were to be explained in item-based rather than rule-based manner. Group C made 39 reference errors, 6 be-verb errors, 21 tense errors, 3 S-V agreement errors and 44 other errors. Group I made 10 reference errors, 10 be-verb errors, 20 tense errors, 7 S-V agreement errors and 28 other errors. Group IC made 33 reference errors, 11 be-verb errors, 12 tense errors, 3 S-V errors and 27 other errors. Since this research has a small number of participants, unusual language usage of
individual learners influenced the group’s number of errors in each category. For instance, half of the total tense errors in Group IC \((N = 2)\) were made by IC6 \((N = 6)\), and C2 and C5 comprised about half \((N = 20)\) of the total errors in Group C’s reference category \((N = 39)\).

The four most frequent error types—reference, be-verbs, tenses, and S-V agreement—were covered in the instructional stage (Stage 2). The students in Groups IC and I received a 40-minute lecture and learned examples of ungrammatical sentences (see Appendix C).

For the comparison stage (Stage 3), linguistic errors in the students’ writings were corrected by their English teacher without changing the writers’ own ideas. The students in Groups IC and C received their original drafts and the reformulated versions, and they compared the two versions and checked the differences. The participants practiced a concurrent think-aloud technique before the comparison stage. Specifically, the teacher demonstrated how to perform think-aloud while comparing the two types of writing, the original and reformulated versions. Then the teacher let one student perform a think-aloud in front of the participants before their individual practice. In order to elicit as many Language-Related Episodes (LREs) as possible, the students were encouraged to jot down what they were thinking either on the original or reformulated drafts.

Without any prior notice, one week after Stage 3, the teacher let the students revise their original drafts (Stage 4, revising). Their original drafts were newly typed and had enough space to write corrections. The students were encouraged to mark ungrammatical items, replace them, and write down the reason. The teacher let the students “think aloud” in Korean and did audio-recording.

3.3. Data Analysis

3.3.1. Language-related episodes (LREs)

In order to trace the students’ noticing process, think-aloud protocols were used. LREs are originally defined as “any part of a dialogue in which students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or other- or self-correct” (Swain, 1998, p. 70). In this study, LREs are concerned with learners’ episodes made when they find or solve language-related problems during the process of comparing the draft and the reformulated version and revising their own drafts. The LREs were coded into four categories that were derived from the error analysis (reference, be-verbs, tenses, and S-V agreement) and other form- or discourse-related episodes. Discourse-related episodes include any utterances about cohesion, coherence, inter sentential clarity, and stylistics (Qi & Lapkin, 2001). Examples of each category are as follows.

Examples 1 and 2 show how two participants, IC5 and IC3, noticed their reference and be-verb errors, respectively. IC5 started her original story with “She is crying.”, but she
noticed her error and gave a valid reason why it is better with ‘A woman’. IC3 made a mistake when she used “are” and “don’t” in a sentence, and she noticed why there was not “are” in the reformulated version.

(1) Example 1 – Reference (ICS’s protocol in the comparison stage)
“It should be ‘A woman’, not ‘She’ because this is one woman among lots of women.”

(2) Example 2 – Be-verbs (IC3’s protocol in the comparison stage)
“I can’t use an action verb and a be-verb in a sentence at the same time. So there should be no be-verb.”

Examples 3 and 4 show how two students, C7 and I6, noticed their errors with tense and S-V agreement. Both of them specified a valid reason in the comparison stage, regardless of grammar instruction.

(3) Example 3 – Tense: C7’s protocol in the comparison stage
“‘lie’ changed into ‘lying’... because it’s progressive....”

(4) Example 4 – S-V agreement: I6’s protocol in the revision stage
“‘my dad come’ needs to be ‘my dad comes’ because it ‘third person singular.’”

In the comparison or revision stage, some students in Group I noticed errors that were not covered during the instruction session. Example 5 shows that I1 activated his previous knowledge and used it in the revision stage to correct his or her error with the possessive.

(5) Example 5 – Other form-related errors: I1’s protocol in the revision stage
“he’s wife... It should be possessive. So, ‘his’ is correct.”

3.3.2. Participants’ noticing

The participants’ noticing was measured by their LREs. If a participant mentioned his or her errors or differences between his or her own writing and a reformulated version, it was marked as noticed. The number of noticed errors of Groups C and IC was considered as evidence of noticing occurring in the two groups. It was also used to measure the two groups’ uptake by comparing this with the number of errors resolved in Stage 4.
3.3.3. Participants’ uptake

Students’ uptake was measured by their own revision in the last stage. The analysis of participants’ uptake consisted of two aspects: the number of unresolved errors (remainder of total errors and resolved errors) and the uptake rate (percentage of resolved errors out of total noticed errors in the comparison stage). Since Group I did not experience a comparison stage, uptake for Group I was discussed only with the number of unresolved errors.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Noticing in the Comparison Stage

4.1.1. Group C’s error noticing

In Group C, students noticed 57.97% of the four most frequent errors, with 40.90% of errors in other forms noticed. Table 3 indicates Group C’s error noticing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Categories</th>
<th>Noticed Errors</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
<th>Noticing Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-verbs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-V agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Noticing rate = noticed errors/total errors*

Despite Group C not receiving grammar instruction, some participants noticed their errors by reasoning and activating their prior knowledge. This illustrates how the comparison stage provided the learners with chances to recall and adopt their knowledge of language form. Excerpts 1 and 2 show how some students in Group C noticed their errors with and without reasoning, respectively.

(6) Excerpt 1 – C9’s noticing with a reason
Original writing: They are drink water.
Reformulation: They are drinking water.
Utterance: “It should be the present progressive because they are in the middle of
drinking.”

(7) Excerpt 2 – C5’s noticing without a reason
Original writing: The man drink water. The woman wearing a crown. The man is thinking. The woman wearing a earing.
Reformulation: Another man is drinking water. Another woman is wearing a crown. Another man is thinking. Another man is smoking. Another woman is wearing an earing.

Utterance: “Everything changed into ‘another.’ I don’t know why.”

4.1.2. Group IC’s error noticing

Table 4 shows how the students in Group IC found differences between their original drafts and the reformulated versions. They noticed 69.49% of their errors in the four categories, for other forms, they noticed 55.56% of errors, approximately 15% higher than for Group C’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Categories</th>
<th>Noticed Errors</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
<th>Noticing Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be-verbs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-V agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Noticing rate = noticed errors/total errors

Excerpts 3 and 4 show different types of noticing on the same type of errors for C1 and IC3–be-verb errors. IC1 noted the reason for the differences between the original and reformulated writing, while IC3 did not. This shows that the reactive grammar instruction did not work evenly but helped some learners to activate what they learned, from the instruction or from previous learning experiences, for noticing their gaps.

(8) Excerpt 3 – IC1’s noticing with a reason
Original writing: there is a clock, knife, chair.
Reformulation: there are a clock, a knife, and a chair.
Utterance: “It changed into plural form.”
(9) Excerpt 4 — IC3’s noticing without a reason
Original writing: There are my hat in the picture.
Reformulation: There is my hat in the picture.
Utterance: “I don’t know why it was changed.”

In one instance a student assumed an improper reason for the reformulation that fell into a category that was not included in the instruction, as seen in Excerpt 5. He or she inferred that decorated in the reformulation was the past form of decorate, not noticing is which made decorated the past participle in the passive voice.

(10) Excerpt 5 — IC4’s wrong reasoning
Original writing: The house decorate knife and pig in the picture.
Reformulation: The house is decorated by a knife and a pig in the picture.
Utterance: “Decorated... because it should be the past tense.”

4.2. Uptake in the Revision Stage

4.2.1. Group C’s uptake

In order to investigate the effect of the comparison process, the following features in Table 5 were analyzed: the number of Group C’s total errors, number of LREs in the comparison stage, number of resolved errors, number of unresolved noticed errors, number and percentage of unresolved errors, and number and percentage of resolved errors that were mentioned in the comparison stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group C’s Uptake in the Revision Stage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be-verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S-V agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other errors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that 33.33% of total errors in the four categories were resolved. 54.76% of LREs in the comparison stage were corrected in the revision stage. Since Group C did not receive the grammar instruction, a significant difference was not expected for uptake.
among the four instructed error types and the other error types, and in fact, no major
difference in percentage of uptake was found among the four instructed error types
(54.76%) or the others (61.11%).

Excerpt 6 shows an example of inconsistency for a learner in Group C. C2 noticed two
errors in a sentence and gave a valid reason in the comparison stage. But she was able to
find and correct only one of the errors and did not note a valid reason in the revision stage.

(11) Excerpt 6 – C2’s noticing and uptake
Original writing: But they don’t see …
Reformulation: But people in the picture don’t see them.
Utterance (Stage 3): “I didn’t write who saw what in the original writing.”
Revision: But they don’t see the thieves.
Utterance (Stage 4): “I need to write that they saw the thieves.”

4.2.2. Group I’s uptake

Table 6 shows Group I’s uptake. Since they did not undergo the comparison stage, their
errors in the first draft and the revised writing only were analyzed. The details are in Table
6, which show that 34.48% of total errors in the four instructed error types were resolved,
while only 28.57% of other error types were corrected in the revision stage. The percentage
of unresolved errors of the four error types (65.52%) and the other error types (71.43%) did
now show a gap with those of Group C’s (66.67% and 75%, respectively). When
interpreting the results of Group I, it should be noted that a single error might have
disproportionately affected the percentage, as the total number of errors of Group I was
very small.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>(a) Number of Errors</th>
<th>(b) Resolved Errors</th>
<th>Noticed errors</th>
<th>(a-b) Unresolved Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reference</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be-verbs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tense</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S-V agreement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other errors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Excerpt 7, I5 came up with the valid reason to correct the errors but did not
find a suitable correction. She noticed the tense was wrong in a sentence, but made it
passive, not correcting overuse of the be-verb.

(12) Excerpt 7 – IS’s noticing and uptake
Original writing: I was sleep in the bedroom.
Revision: I was slept in the bedroom.
Utterance: “Slept is correct because it happened in the past.”

4.2.3. Group IC’s uptake

Group IC’s uptake was analyzed in the same way as Group C and is described in Table 7 in detail. Among the four instructed error types, 48.48% of errors were resolved. In Group IC, 50.85% of the four types of errors remained unresolved, which was the lowest percentage among the three groups. Furthermore, 70.73% of LREs occurring in Stage 3 were resolved, which is around 15% higher than for Group C. For other errors not treated in the instruction session, however, the majority of errors (81.48%) remained at the revision stage. This is the highest percentage amongst the three groups. The uptake rate (33.33%) is also much lower than for Group C (61.11%), which shows that Group IC worked better only on the four types of instructed errors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>(a) Number of Errors</th>
<th>(b) Number of LREs</th>
<th>(c) Resolved Errors</th>
<th>Noticed Errors</th>
<th>(d) Unresolved Errors N (%)</th>
<th>(e) Uptake (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reference</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Be-verbs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tense</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. S-V agreement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other errors</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IC4 shows an example of corrected LREs through the comparison and the revision stage. She missed a determiner in the first composition. After noticing a determiner in the reformulated version, she accepted it with a reason and corrected the error in the revision stage. See Excerpt 8.

(13) Excerpt 8 – IC4’s noticing and uptake
Original writing: wife was crying.
Reformulation: His wife was crying.
“his needed to be there … to tell the woman is the man’s wife.”
Revision: His wife was crying.
“... because I should say whose wife she is.”

IC2 shows a different kind of example. She accepted the reformulation in the comparison stage as shown in Excerpt 9; but she revised her error in the revision stage, not stating the reason she mentioned in the comparison stage.

(14) Excerpt 9 – IC2’s noticing and uptake
Original writing: Woman is smoking.
Reformulation: A woman is smoking.
Utterance (Stage 3): “There should be something like ‘a’ or ‘the’ in front of a noun.”
Revision: A woman is smoking.
Utterance (Stage 4): “Woman just looks strange.”

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Group C with the learner-initiated noticing session noticed 57.97% of errors in the top-four-frequent error categories and 54.76% of the noticed errors were resolved in the revision stage. With only an opportunity for comparison between the original and reformulated writing, they made some improvements. Compared to Group IC, however, the percentages for Group C’s noticing and error uptake in the top four frequent categories were lower than for Group IC (69.49% and 70.73, respectively), and the percentage of unresolved errors in the top four frequent categories (66.67%) is higher than for Group IC (50.85%). This indicates that the reactive grammar instruction greatly influenced Group IC’s writing process and uptake.

It may be simply expected that Group C would show little improvement in the four types of instructed errors because Group C did not receive instruction. Compared to Group I, however, no difference in percentages for unresolved errors in the top four frequent categories was found (66.67% for Group C and 65.52% for Group I). For “other” errors as well, the two groups did not show a big difference on unresolved error rate (75.00% for Group C and 71.43% for Group I). These findings indicate that no certain type of treatment for noticing through comparison or reactive instruction exerted a greater influence on the learners’ uptake than the other. At the same time, this suggests that Group IC’s better performance for the four frequent errors did not solely come from the instruction.

Among the three groups, Group IC showed the greatest amount of noticing and uptake. Their percentage of uptake (corrected LREs) is much higher than that in the High group (25%) in Back et al.’s (2012) study as well. This would not be surprising, considering the
double amount of treatment they received—noticing through reformulation and reactive grammar instruction. We can conclude from the results of this study, as mentioned above, that one sole type of noticing is not influential enough. Rather, self-initiated noticing of the gap and teacher-initiated learning via grammar instruction are both equally influential. The fact that the group which received both treatments showed the best results further indicates that when combined, self-initiated and other-initiated noticing can create synergistic effects.

Another possible reason for Group IC’s increased uptake is that they were encouraged to jot down their thinking plus think-aloud protocols during the comparison stage. This would have reminded them of what they had noticed. Group C’s percentage of resolved errors out of the total LREs is also higher than in Baek et al.’s (2012) study. This jotting down during the comparison may also have been beneficial to strengthening the learners’ noticing.

These findings may provide some meaningful implications for English education in Korean school classrooms. It is common in Korean English class for a teacher to provide one-way teacher-centered instruction on a particular grammar item, and students solve questions or complete simple tasks. As this study claims, however, they need opportunities to notice their own linguistic errors and repair them for better acquisition. To do so, grammar instruction needs to be followed by productive language tasks and a follow-up noticing and revision session. Also, reactive grammar instruction might be a valuable substitutional or additional option for an English grammar class. Reactive focus on form has its value, in that it is a responsive teaching intervention that can fulfill L2 learners’ “on-demand” linguistic needs. Furthermore, reactive focus on form is congruent with Korean EFL learning contexts in which learners share the same L1 (Doughty & Williams, 2005) and pervasive and remediable linguistic errors exist (Long & Robinson, 2005).

This study found that both the self-initiated learning through noticing the gap and the other-initiated learning through reactive grammar instruction influenced the learners’ uptake in writing accuracy. Also, better results can result when learners have opportunities to engage in two types of learning at the same time. However, this study contains several limitations. It may be difficult to generalize the findings and implications of this study because of the small sample size at a single research site. The small number of participants led to a careful interpretation of the results, in that the small number of participants contributed to a disproportionately large change in each group’s mean with a significantly large or small number of errors. Group 1 in particular made the smallest number of errors, and this characteristic of Group 1 might have interfered with the interpretation of the effects of the reactive grammar instruction. Lastly, the reactive grammar instruction was a single session, so it may have not been enough to show the intensive influence of instruction. Particularly in Group 1, they did not receive either the grammar instruction or the opportunity for comparison in Week 3. This one-week break might have reduced the effects of the grammar instruction. In further studies, the findings and the implications of this
study would be strengthened by implementing studies in a different context with a larger number of participants. Also, careful consideration to research procedures is necessary, lest an unbalanced research schedule weaken the research results.
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APPENDIX A

The Picture for Writing Adopted from Qi & Lapkin (2001)’s Study
APPENDIX B
A Participant’s Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original (Stage 1)</th>
<th>Revision (Stage 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One day, 8 person meet to big party. The party is in <strong>John</strong> house. <strong>John</strong> family is only John and his grandmother. Time <strong>of 10 a clock</strong>, people can <strong>listen</strong> scream in <strong>John</strong> bedroom. The old <strong>mand</strong> and old woman <strong>run</strong> to <strong>John</strong> bedroom. They can see John <strong>die</strong>. <strong>Old</strong> man said, “Is Nife… I look he was die.” Old woman said, “They are gun and clock. The clock is <strong>stop</strong> at 9 a clock.” All people <strong>come</strong> John’s bedroom. Then, one person say “Where is his Diamond ring?” One man said, “look, there message.” The old woman read to message, [Goodbye. – Kid <strong>John</strong> grandmother surprise and say “Kid?” At that moment, one young woman stand up and say “Haha. I’m Kid!” Good bye, see you next time!” And woman change the clothes and <strong>jump</strong> out window.</td>
<td>One day, 8 person <strong>met</strong> to big party. The party is in <strong>John’s</strong> house. <strong>John’s</strong> family is only John and his grandmother. Time <strong>10 o’clock</strong>, people can <strong>listened</strong> scream in <strong>John’s</strong> bedroom. The old <strong>man</strong> and old woman <strong>ran</strong> to <strong>John’s</strong> bedroom. They can see John <strong>died</strong>. <strong>An old</strong> man said, “Is Nife… I look he was die.” Old woman said, “They are gun and clock. The clock is <strong>stopped</strong> at 9 a clock.” All people <strong>came</strong> John’s bedroom. Then, one person <strong>said</strong> “Where is his Diamond ring?” One man said, “look, there message.” The old woman read to message, [Goodbye. – Kid <strong>John</strong>’s grandmother surprised and <strong>said</strong> “Kid?” At that moment, one young woman stand up and <strong>said</strong> “Haha. I’m Kid! Good bye, see you next time!” And woman <strong>changed</strong> the clothes and <strong>jumped</strong> out window.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C
Reactive Grammar Instruction Material

1. S-V agreement
   - Third-person singular subject—action verb+s’
     1) People doesn’t like him. 2) My teacher sit on the chair.
   - Plural noun+s’
     1) There are my book on the table.

2. Determiner
   - a/an/the/this(that)/possessives
1) Girl takes a picture. He likes her. But girl doesn’t like him.
2) There is a orange.
3) You are bigger than a girl.
4) Sister is pretty.
5) I’m the his friend.

- a/the other/another/others
  1) There are five men. One man is running. The man is sleeping. Another men are talking to each other.

3. Tense
- Simple present
  1) I am going to school at 8:20.
- Present progressive
  1) He eats breakfast now.
- Simple past
  1) My friend drinks juice yesterday.
- Past progressive
  1) When you called me I slept.

4. Be-verbs
- Don’t use with an action verbs
  1) They are come to school early.
- Use an adjective not an action verb
  1) I was surprise.

Applicable levels: Secondary