

Learning from Mistakes: Using Correction Code to Improve Student's Writing Skill in English Composition Class

FARHANA FERDOUSE

Abstract

Selecting a right way to provide students with error feedback in their writing has proved to be a complex task for researchers in language pedagogy. Although a lot of studies have been conducted to examine this issue, the teachers are still following their own way of error feed back. So the researchers feel that there is a need to conduct different sort of studies to find out an effective way of error feedback. The present study with 20 participants in second trimester university level proves that students prefer coded feedback more as in this process of error feedback teachers show the error and its type by using a certain code or symbol. This study also shows that the students benefit more from having coded feedback over non-coded feedback.

Introduction:

The use of error codes to help students correct their writing has often been proved to be an effective method to facilitate error correction. For example, the Syllabus for English in Hong Kong (CDC 1983: 47) states that the correction code, "which is a list of grammatical items such as nouns, articles, prepositions and so on, is a common error feedback technique in the ESL classroom." It is believed to be a useful method of helping students correct their own errors, as students need to be guided in discovering the nature of their errors; otherwise, correcting errors on their own risks would become a task that could require extraordinary effort and may end in frustration. Moreover, in a traditional teacher-centered classroom student get less opportunity to participate actively in the lesson and get less opportunity to learn how to write correctly with appropriate punctuation, spelling, grammar, text organization, capitalization and word order. As a

result the students make different types of errors in their writing and gradually they become frustrated as they do not get enough guidance for their improvement. On the other hand, it is really difficult for a teacher to mark all the mistakes of all the students' papers providing correct answers. In this situation, teachers should implement some new methods. Teachers can utilize student's mistakes as their teaching tools using correction code on students' writing so that they can improve their writing skill easily. Riddell (2001, p. 157) states that teachers can use correction symbols (correction codes) to give feedback to students on their writing, and teachers can underline the errors to signify the mistakes and write the symbols for these mistakes in the margin. Then students can correct the mistakes by themselves. Hedge (1988, p. 151) suggests that teachers can indicate "an error and identify the kind of error with a symbol, e.g. wo = wrong word order". This means that teacher can use correction codes when giving feed back on writing tasks and then students should find out the errors they made from the symbols and re-write it again with the corrected mistakes. This strategy "encourages learner independence" (Riddell, 2001, p. 152) and students become more responsible for their learning. Moreover, students can learn better from their mistakes when they correct their work by themselves. Here the teacher conducted a case study, trying to include students' preferences and opinions into the procedures of correcting their composition errors. Two kinds of correction methods, using codes and using individual preferred ways of correction, were implemented on the students. The purpose of this study was to measure the effectiveness of the coded correction system in general, and to uncover the potential significant factors which might involve in and influence the results of the coded correction system.

Literature Review:

Correction Code:

Correction symbols refer to the indication of types and locations of students' mistakes through the use of correction codes such as those

suggested by Oshima and Hogue (1997). The application of correction codes is “normally done by underlining the mistakes and using some kind of symbols to focus the attention of the students on the kind of mistake they have made” (Byrne, 1988, p. 125). So, the coding technique consists of using a number of different codes (either in the body or in a corresponding margin) to refer to the different aspects of language such as word order, spelling, verb, tense etc. Correction symbols are also called minimal marking. Using correction codes is a convenient way of giving learners information on where they have gone wrong and “it is convenient to have a system of signals to the pupil in order to help him to know what he is looking for before he has acquired much proof-reading skill” Bright and McGregor (1970, p. 156). In addition, “this technique makes correction neater and less threatening than masses of red ink and helps students to find and identify their mistakes” (Hyland, 2003, p.181) and “makes correction look less damaging” (Harmer, 2007, p. 121) . “These also have the advantage of encouraging students to think about what the mistake is, so that they can correct themselves” (*ibid.*, 2001, p. 111), correction codes encourage students to look at writing as a skill that can be improved, and train them in looking for areas of improvement (Hedge, 2000, p. 316). Students can therefore correct their mistakes because their mistakes occur in “the hurly-burly of conversation where there are many things to get right at the same time. The learner knows the right form, but produces the wrong one” (Johnson, 2001, p. 335).

Its impact on the students:

The use of error codes to help students correct their writing has often been propounded in the literature as an effective method to facilitate error correction. It is believed to be a useful method of helping students to correct their own errors. As both Allwright (1975) and Long (1977) point out, it is important for teachers not to correct learner errors or give the right answers to them immediately. Cues should be given to the students so that they can correct their own errors. This will further activate their linguistic competence. Lalande (1982) found that American students who used error

codes to correct errors in German had greater improvement in writing than the students who had their errors corrected by their teachers. Mantello (1997) found that coded feedback was effective for weak students. Makino (1993) showed that Japanese learners of English were helped to correct errors better when cues were given than when they were not. Kubota (2001) also reports that her Japanese learners found coding errors useful in helping them correct errors. Lee (1997) did carry out a study on the students' performance in error correction with Hong Kong English learners. However, she has reservations about using error codes. Though she suggests that error feedback is more desirable than overt correction, she warns teachers that error feedback with the help of error codes must be handled with care. Thus, what is reported in the literature mainly focuses on whether error codes help error correction. This study attempts to investigate the usefulness of error codes to help English learners correct their errors more successfully.

A Case Study

Aim of the Study

The present study aims to enhance the effect of correction symbols on promoting learners' abilities to correct their mistakes and examine the use of symbols as a strategy to encourage students to think about their mistakes and to correct them themselves. This procedure is based on the idea that when learners are actively involved in the process of self-correction, they will show more motivation to do this task. It is also based on the idea that teachers should take into account learners' attitudes in order to develop a strategy to evaluate their students' written production.

Hypothesis

In an attempt to examine the effectiveness of using correction symbols to give feedback in the writing process, the teacher hypothesizes that the provision of correction symbols strategy would have positive effects on

promoting learners' self-correction and would improve their written production.

Participants:

This study was conducted on a course titled 'English Composition' in summer 2011, BBA in Stamford University Bangladesh. The participants were the students of 41A and 41B of BBA. The objectives of the course were to help students fully develop their abilities in writing in English. The course began with sentence-level, grammatical practices and then paragraph-level writing and it ended with the production of different types of paragraphs including description, cause and effect and compare & contrast. The classes were in the form of lectures, brainstorming, and group discussion, in class and out of class writing. In both classes, the teacher taught them different types of paragraphs writing. Before mid term examination, students were taught pre writing methods of writing paragraphs and after mid term, they were taught writing paragraphs on different topics. When the students started writing paragraphs, the teacher started applying her method of using correction symbols on the writing of the students of 41A. At the same time, the students of 41B started writing paragraphs on different topics just like the students of 41A. But the teacher did not apply the same method that she applied with 41A. She corrected their paragraphs without providing any correction symbols; rather she just underlined the mistakes that the students of 41B made in their paragraphs. That means she provided the students of 41A with correction symbols so that they could understand their mistakes easily and corrected them properly. On the other hand, the students of 41B did not receive any sort of correction symbols or clues from their teacher. The teacher just underlined the mistakes and asked them to correct them. Finally, 10 student's paragraphs from each batch were selected for the data collection. Ten students from each batch were selected according to their marks they got in mid term examination. Teacher formed Group A from 41A and Group B from 41B with the students who got almost same marks in their mid term examination.

Participant's Information:

Group	Student's Name	Marks Obtained in Midterm exam
Group A (Batch 41 A)	S1	21.75
	S2	19.75
	S3	20.5
	S4	20.25
	S5	21.5
	S6	18.75
	S7	19
	S8	20
	S9	21
	S10	18.5
Group B (Batch 41 B)	S1	21.25
	S2	22
	S3	20.5
	S4	19
	S5	19.25
	S6	21.5
	S7	18.75
	S8	18.5
	S9	20
	S10	21.75

Method:

Before applying the new correction method with the students of 41A, the teacher divided her classes into few sessions:

- First session: Teacher provided the students with a list of correction symbols adapted from Oshima and Hogue (1997). Then, the teacher explained the different symbols of the different mistakes.
- Second Session: Teacher carried on explanations of correction symbols. The teacher sometimes showed the whole class PowerPoint slides with examples demonstrating how to edit a

composition successfully following the clues provided by the teacher.

- Third session: Teacher provided her students with few practice sheets to teach them how to correct their mistakes following the cues provided by the teachers. Finally, students were asked to write paragraphs on different topics. The students' papers were collected and corrected, out of class using correction symbols.

Finally, the students were asked to write three kinds of paragraphs as their written assignments in English Composition Class. After the students submitted the first draft of their paragraphs, the teacher put codes for error correction on the students' work. These codes were developed by the teacher based on common errors made by past students in writing paragraphs in this course. Following James' (James, 1998, p. 95) guideline that description of students' errors must be "simple, self-explanatory and easily learnable", examples of wrong and right sentences were given for each code on the editing checklist to help the students understand how to correct the errors.

Editing Checklist:

agr = agreement

(agr) (agr)

e.g. The cashier read the price of each items.

(reads) (item)

adj. = adjective

(adj.)

e.g. It is more accurately than the old system.

(accurate)

adv. = adverb

(adv.)

e.g. The efficiency is extreme high.

(extremely)

art. = article

e.g. The dot matrix printer can provide cheaper

(art.)

printing whereas laser----- printer can provide high quality printing.

^

(the)
 Conj. = conjunction
 (conj.)
 e.g. Their main functions are to retrieve --- store data in the server.
 (and)

if. = informality
 (if.)
 e.g. We've gotta look at your comments first.
 (would have to)

n. = noun
 (n.)
 e.g. The bulky of data can be easily manipulated.
 (bulk)

pl = plural
 (pl.)
 e.g. The chance of making mistake is great.
 (mistakes)

prep. = preposition
 (prep.)
 e.g. The interview was held at 24-9-2001.
 (on)

p. = punctuation
 (p.)
 e.g. They have to do a lot of work_z
 (.)

sp. = spelling
 (sp.)
 e.g. They have to check the shock of items.
 (stock)

ss. = sentence structure
 (ss.)
 e.g. They are easy to use the package.
 (It is easy for them to)

t. = tense
 (t.)
 e.g. The interview had been held on 24-9-2001.
 (was held)

v. = verb
 e.g. The operator has to know how to import data to Microsoft Excel and some
 (v.)

^

(have)

experience in drawing charts with Excel.

vf. = verb form

(vf.)

e.g. The staff members will concerning about the customers' service.

(be concerned)

voice = active or passive voice

(voice)

e.g. The web materials can share by all students.

(be shared)

ww. = wrong word

(ww.)

e.g. It filters out those people that carry unauthorized items.

(who)

When the drafts with error codes were returned to the students, the students corrected their errors following the correction symbols provided by the teacher. They submitted the revised versions of the paragraphs to the teacher. After re-writing the paragraphs, students of 41A answered the questions on the feed back form.

Feedback form for the students:

Name of the student:

ID:

Instruction: Answer the following questions. Your answers and comments are important to justify the concept that students prefer coded feedback more as they benefit more from having coded feedback over non-coded feedback.

(a) How many mistakes do you have in your paragraph? Ans:

(b) How many corrections have you made? Ans:

(c) Do you like to correct your own mistakes? Ans: Yes - 85%, No - 15%

(d) Have you faced any difficulties in checking your paragraph with the help of the correction codes? Ans: Yes - 21%, No - 79%

(e) Do you think that coded errors / non-coded errors/ direct answers help you more to correct your mistakes?

Ans: Coded feedback prefer - 80%

Direct answer prefer - 15%

Non-coded prefer - 5%

(f) Do you have any suggestion regarding 'use of correction error' to correct your mistakes? Ans:

(g) Do you think 'use of correction errors' is an effective process to correct your mistakes? Ans: Effective - 80%, Ineffective - 20%

At the same time, students of 41B were also asked to write paragraphs on the same topic like the students of 41A. After the submission of their paragraphs, the students of 41B were not provided with same sort of feedback. The teacher didn't mark the errors with correcting symbols, she just underlined them. She didn't give the students any clues about correcting their errors.

Data collection:

Following data were collected from the written paragraphs of Group A and Group B. Group A was provided with clues; whereas, Group B was not provided with any clues for correcting their paragraphs. The performance and improvement of Group A was more praiseworthy than that of Group B.

Data that is collected from the first paragraph:

Table 1

Number of paragraph - 10

Group	Draft	The number of words they used in their paragraphs	The number of errors they made-sp, verb, sub-verb, tense, voice, punctuation, article, preposition, run-on, fragment etc.	%	The number of correction they made after receiving feedback from their teacher	%
-------	-------	---------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Group A	1 st	1350	121	8.96%	80	66.11%
Group B	1 st	1421	105	7.38%	35	33.33%

Data that is collected from the second paragraph:

Table 2

Number of paragraph - 10

Group	Draft	The number of words they used in their paragraphs	The number of errors they made-sp, verb, sub-verb, tense, voice, punctuation, article, preposition, run-on, fragment etc.	%	The number of correction they made after receiving feedback from their teacher	%
Group A	1 st	1570	80	5.09%	63	78.75%
Group B	1 st	1509	98	6.49%	40	40.81%

Data that is collected from the third paragraph:

Table 3

Number of paragraph - 10

Group	Draft	The number of words they used in their paragraphs	The number of errors they made-sp, verb, sub-verb, tense, voice, punctuation, article, preposition, run-on, fragment etc.	%	The number of correction they made after receiving feedback from their teacher	%
Group A	1 st	1890	50	2.64%	43	86%
Group B	1 st	1629	83	5.09%	52	62.65%

Interpretation of the result:

The analysis shows that students made different mistakes in writing. The tables (1-3) show the corrected mistakes of students after providing feedback. Feedback takes the form of using correction symbols and students provided the correct forms depending on these symbols. The teacher corrected students' paragraphs and indicated the place and the kind of mistakes so that learners could distinguish between one kind and another. The obtained results have given an evidence of the effectiveness of correction symbols in enhancing self-correction. Paragraphs written by the students of Group A were compared with that of Group B to find out how successfully error correction helped the students. Results show that with the help of correction symbols provided by the teacher, students of Group A became more skilled in writing effective paragraphs. On the other hand Group B, was very slow in learning and editing as they didn't get any clues or correction symbols from their teacher. In the 1st draft of the first paragraph students of Group A used almost 1350 words altogether, and they made 121 mistakes, and after providing the feedback with correction symbols the students corrected 80 errors. That means they corrected almost 66.11% mistakes after getting the clues from their teacher. On the other hand, students of Group B wrote paragraph using 1421 words, and they made almost 105 errors in their written paragraphs. The teacher didn't provide them with any sort of correction symbols; she just underlined the errors and returned the student's script to her students for further correction. Surprisingly, they couldn't correct their mistakes like Group A. They just corrected 35 mistakes out of 105 errors. That means they corrected only 33.33% mistakes which was less than the percentage of Group A. In the 1st draft of the second paragraph students of Group A used almost 1570 words altogether, and they made 80 mistakes, and after providing the feedback with correction symbols the students corrected 63 errors. That means they corrected almost 78.75% mistakes after getting the clues from their teacher. On the other hand, students of Group B wrote paragraph using 1509 words; they had almost 98 errors in their written paragraphs, and they corrected 40 mistakes out of 98 errors. That means they corrected

only 40.81% mistakes which was less than the percentage of Group A. In the 1st draft of the third paragraph, students of Group A used almost 1890 words altogether, and they made 50 mistakes, and after getting the feedback with correction symbols, the students corrected 43 errors. So they corrected almost 86% mistakes after getting the clues from their teacher. On the other hand, students of Group B wrote paragraph using 1629 words; they made almost 83 errors in their written paragraphs, and they corrected 52 mistakes out of 83 errors. That means they corrected only 62.65% mistakes which was again less than the percentage of Group A. So it is evident that the performance of Group A regarding overall improvement was much better than that of Group B. The students of Group A gradually became more confident and active in their writing. They started writing more matured and correct sentences using new vocabularies as they practiced a lot to correct their mistakes. In fact, the correction symbols provided by their teacher helped them to know about the mistakes and to correct them as well. On the contrary, the improvement of Group B was slower than that of Group A. As the students of Group B didn't have any sort of correction symbols or clues from the teacher, they couldn't manage to sort out their mistakes and to correct it as well.

Result of the feedback form:

Most of the students (80%) reported on the feedback form that the error code was useful in helping them to correct errors. Only 15% students thought that they should have correct answers from their teachers and 5% students thought that they should detect their mistakes themselves. Most of the students believe that as they had been taught the grammatical terms in secondary school, they had no problem using the error codes. They reported liking the use of error codes because the codes helped them to locate errors and to identify easily the type of errors they made. If they could know which type of error was made, they could refer to the examples on the editing checklist and could compare these with their own errors. Thus they could avoid making similar mistakes again because they could

review the errors by studying the editing checklist. Finally, the majority of the students said that they liked correcting their own mistakes.

Free discussion and interviews with the students

At the end of the trimester, the teacher organized an Interview session with selected individual students to find out more information about students' attitudes towards writing and using the codes. By interviewing selected students, the teacher found that the process of correcting their writing using the correction symbols provided by the teacher helped them not only to improve their writing skills but also to develop their autonomy; and to increase their motivation. Teacher asked a direct question to one of her regular and attentive students' of Group A, "Did the correction codes help you to be more skilled and independent?" The students answered- "Yes it helped me a lot. Now with the help of correction code, I can find out the mistakes by myself and correct it by myself. And now I don't need any one to help me to correct the mistakes for me; I can do it by myself. And from codes I know what my mistakes are and I can correct it easily." Another student commented "I want to write by myself, but I do not have the skills to do so. The teacher must give us the way how to write and the topic and then let us do it by ourselves." So it is clear that students had a genuine desire to be developed as autonomous writers. One of the students also said, "the correction codes helped her to be more independent. Now, if the teacher give us any topic to write I can do it, it becomes easier for me now after using the new strategy of correcting our own mistakes." So it becomes almost clear that students like the strategy of self-correction, and they are motivated to write independently. According to Benson and Voller (1997, p.82) "Students' willingness to act independently depends on the level of their motivation and confidence". And the teacher believes that the new process of error correction helps the students to be more confident and dynamic.

Overall findings of the study:

So the results of this study and free discussion with the students support the views of Allwright (1975) and Long (1977) and confirm previous research findings (Mamtello 1997; Makino 1993 and Kubota 2001) that error codes are useful in error correction. This study indicates more clearly than Lee (1997) that error codes are useful. Lee (1997) states that students fail to correct errors not because they lack grammatical knowledge but because they cannot detect the errors. They can correct more errors when direct clues are provided. This study confirms that using error codes is an effective way to help the students solve this problem at an initial stage, especially when the students have acquired basic grammatical knowledge. Makino (1993) states that using error codes help to activate students' linguistic competence. Such a method of error correction is a successful strategy in helping students correct their errors because it can help them practice error correction on their own with the assistance of helpful but not patronizing guidelines. This is a good training for the students in problem-solving. Ingram (1975) and Biggs (1976) contend that "if learners are urged to discover relevant concepts and principles for themselves, then learning is enhanced. Problem-solving affords one the opportunity to reconstruct grammatical structures with the expressed intent of making them more adequate than would otherwise be the case." (Lalande, 1982, p.140).

Some observations:

The teacher discovers few new ideas when she started applying this new approach of correcting student's writing using correcting symbols. She realizes that this new approach of correcting mistakes will be able to create few new opportunities promoting the whole learning process as --

- It may facilitate in-class peer correction work
- Student errors truly become learning opportunities.
- It creates instant homework!
- It supports top-down and inductive learning styles.
- It cuts down of correcting time.

- Students are forced to consider what effect their writing has on others.
- By focusing on only some of the errors, it's easier for students to see recurring errors in their work.
- It supports structural and sentence level approaches to grammar teaching.

The following are some related pitfalls that the teacher noticed in her class when she applied the new methods of correcting student's papers using error codes:

- Some students prefer having 'the answers'.
- Students may be able to correct 'slip' but not 'errors'.
- It does not support students with bottom-up learning styles.
- It clashes with some students learning expectations. Many students expect a teacher to provide corrections, in the old fashioned way.
- There may not be a code for every type of error.
- Sometimes there are more than one problems embedded in an error.
- Teacher can easily de-motivate a student by putting in too many codes.

Few suggestions to overcome the problems:

Importance of common understanding about grammatical knowledge:

The students in this study succeeded in correcting the errors because they were taught grammatical terms and rules in their secondary schools. Since the use of error codes is based on the assumption that the students know the grammatical terms and understand the concepts associated with the grammatical terms used in the correction code before error codes are introduced (Lee 1997), it is important to discover the grammatical knowledge held by the students before error codes are introduced. It must be ensured that both the teacher and the students use the same meta-language and have the same understanding about the meaning of grammatical terms before they can communicate successfully through the

codes. If the students lack this knowledge, they have to be taught the grammatical terms first. Even if the students have such previous knowledge, teachers should review relevant grammatical concepts with the students before the codes are put on their work. Teachers should pay more attention to the types of codes which lead to less successful error correction as identified through this study. They could also spend more time teaching the students the grammatical items related to those codes so as to help them correct their errors more successfully.

Methods to help the students acquire common understanding about grammatical knowledge:

An editing checklist with examples given, like the one designed for this study, is useful means to help the students acquire grammatical knowledge or review what they have learnt in the past. To address Lee's (1997) doubt that mere provision of example sentences in the correction code can help students correct their errors, the examples on the editing checklist in this study were supplemented by teacher explanation of the concepts in class and some exercises given to the students to practice how to use the editing checklist. In other words, putting good examples relevant to the students' type of writing on the editing checklist, carefully explaining the rules in class and providing students with enough practice on how to use the error codes on the editing checklist are useful methods to help the students make proper use of the error codes to correct errors effectively. The success of this study suggests that the techniques mentioned above need to be used in conjunction with the codes when students want to correct errors successfully with the help of codes. The methods used in this study worked well with the students, and they could become a framework for other teachers to follow in the design and use of editing checklists in teaching.

Providing practice sheets:

To make full use of the marking codes, teachers need to ensure that students are clear about the grammar rules. Teachers should come up with a list of correction codes that students can manage and make better use of

it. This will help the students to become de-motivated in reading and learning from the marked compositions. Therefore, teachers need to teach them explicitly and provide students with ample practice until they can master the meta-linguistic terms and knowledge to understand the corrections. As suggested by (Ferris & Roberts 2001), students will be able to develop accuracy if a system of marking codes is used consistently throughout the term and their knowledge about the system is reinforced through lessons. Teaching meta-cognitive strategies will let students know that there are other ways to learn from feedback and that they are responsible for their own learning to a certain extent.

Teacher -student conference:

Moreover, regarding errors that the students did not know how to correct even with the hints given by the codes, the teacher needs to teach them how to correct these errors, for example, through teacher-student conferences. In fact, the use of error codes could best be supplemented by teacher's explanations when necessary.

Conclusion

The data collected from the study, questionnaire, and the interview prove that students prefer coded feedback a lot over non-coded feedback as with the help of the correction codes they get enough opportunity to know about their mistakes and to correct them as well. The study also proves that the students are benefited a lot in this process of error correction as they need to do regular practice on error correction. In fact the correction symbols provided by their teacher work as inspiration for them. When they receive direct clues from their teacher they feel responsibility to complete their tasks properly. So this process of error correction engages the students in a continuous process of correcting, re-writing and submitting their written production to their teacher which obviously improve their overall writing skill a lot. Finally it can be said that teachers should be aware of the effect of their feedback practices on their students through observing their improvement in writing, and identifying their attitudes. Through this work,

the teacher has investigated the effects of correction symbols on promoting students' self-correction. The results show that students are interested in developing their writing skill and correcting their own mistakes, and therefore, want and expect their teachers to use correction codes in marking their written work. The study emphasizes that feedback cannot be rigidly based on any standardized practice derived from the opinions of teachers alone, but must be flexible enough to incorporate the attitudes and needs of the students. In addition, feedback should be used in which students benefit from it and they are encouraged to take more responsibility for their learning, and thereby, result in better learning. To conclude, it can be said that this work has contributed to give a glimpse of the effect of correction symbols, and can pave the way for those who are interested to use this technique of using correction symbols for providing feedback to their students for their better learning.

References

- Allwright, R. L. (1975) Problems in the study of the language teacher's treatment of learner error. In M.K. Burt & H.C. Dulay (Eds). *New Directions in Second Language Learning Teaching and Bilingual Education*. Selected papers from the Ninth Annual TESOL Convention, Los Angeles, March 1975. Washington, D.C. TESOL.
- Benson, P. & Voller, P. (1997). *Does the teacher have a role. Autonomy & independence language learning*. UK: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.
- Biggs, M. (1976) *Learning Theories for Teachers*, 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bright, J. A., and G. P. McGregor. (1970). *Teaching English as a Second Language: Theory and techniques for the secondary stage*. Longman Group Ltd.
- Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching Writing Skills*. Longman Group UK Ltd.
- Curriculum Development Committee (CDC) 1983. *Syllabus for English (Forms I-V)*. The Government Printer, Hong Kong.
- Ferris, D. and Roberts, B. (2001) Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.
- Perspectives: Working Papers in English & Communication, 16 (1) Spring 2004
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Ed. J. C Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ingram, E. (1975). *Psychology and language learning*. In J.P.B. Allen and S. P Corder (Eds.) *Papers in Applied Linguistics*.

- Johnson, K. (2001). *An Introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Pearson Education Limited.
- James, C. (1998) *Errors in Language Learning and Use*. London: New York.
- Kubota, M. (2001) Error correction strategies used by learners of Japanese when revising a writing task. *System* 29, 467-480.
- Lalande, J. F., II. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lee, I. (1997). ESL Learners' Performance in Error Correction in Writing. *System*, 25(4), 465-477. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(97\)00045-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(97)00045-6)
- Long, M. (1977) Teacher feedback on learner error: Mapping cognitions. In Brown, Yorio and Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL '77: Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice*, pp. 278-293. TESOL:Washington, D.C. TESOL.
- Makino, T. (1993). Learner self- correction in EFL written compositions. *ELT Journal*, 47(4), 337-341. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/47.4.337>
- Mantello, M. (1997) A touch of-class! Error correction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 54 (1), 127-131.
- Oshima, A and A, Hogue. (1997). *Introduction to Academic Writing*. Addison Wesley: Longman.
- Riddell, D. (2001). *Teach yourself. Teaching English as a foreign language*. London: Hodder Headline Ltd.

Appendix

1. Practice Sheets:

Correcting punctuation: p

Incorrect	Correct
1. I take my dinner and <u>(P)</u> finally I go to sleep. 2. If I have the power to change it <u>(P)</u> I'll do. 3. I take a short time to relax. <u>(P)</u> and after this <u>(P)</u> I go to the cinema. 4. Everyone feels good <u>(P)</u> 5. On the other hand <u>(P)</u>	1. I take my dinner and, finally I go to sleep. 2. If I have the power to change it, I'll do. 3. I take a short time to relax, and after this, I go to cinema. 4. Everyone feels good. 5. On the other hand,

Subject -verb Agreement: agr

Incorrect	Correct
1. Everyone <u>need</u> (agr) time. 2. It is something which <u>come</u> (agr) first. 3. Students <u>wants</u> (agr) to have extra hour.	1. Everyone needs time. 2. It is something which comes first. 3. Students want to have extra hour.

Spelling: sp

Incorrect	Correct
1. It is very <u>expencive</u> .(sp) 2. We revise our <u>lesons</u> .(sp) 3. I want to <u>devide</u> (sp) my day.	1. It is very expensive. 2. We revise our lessons. 3. I want to divide my day.

Plural: pl

Incorrect	Correct
1. I do some <u>exercise</u> . (pl) 2. Some students like reading <u>book</u> (pl). 3. To get a good jobs...(pl)	1. I do some exercises. 2. Some students like to read books. 3. To get a good job...

Verb-tense: v.t.

Incorrect	Correct
1. I <u>am doing</u> (v.t) many tasks everyday. 2. I <u>don't</u> (v.t.) succeed last year. 3. Everyday, I prepare dinner; listen to music, and <u>sleeping</u> (v.t.) for seven hours.	1. I do many tasks everyday. 2. I didn't succeed last year. 3. Everyday, I prepare dinner, listen to music, and sleep for seven hours.

Wrong word form: w.f.

Incorrect	Correct
1. I try to <u>organized</u> (w.f) my time. 2. Working hard for <u>depelop</u> (w.f.) 3. I prepare myself for <u>revise</u> (w.f.) my lesson.	1. I try to organize my time. 2. Working hard for developing.... 3. I prepare myself for revising my lesson.

Preposition: prep

Incorrect	Correct
1. I go----(prep) university studying. 2. I relax----(prep) sometime. 3. All----(prep) us know that.	1. I go to university for studying. 2. I relax for some time. 3. All of us know that.

Wrong word: w.w

Incorrect	Correct
1. I go <u>house</u> (w.w) to relax. 2. Time is <u>expencive</u> . (w.w.) 3. It is east <u>for</u> (w.w.) continue.	1. I go house to relax. 2. Time is expensive. 3. It is east for continuing.

2. Symbols with examples:

Symbol	Meaning	Incorrect	Correct
p.	Punctuation	P I live ₂ and go to p school here--- where do you work?	I live and go to school here. Where do you work?
Cap.	Capitalization	It is located in Cap cap <u>main</u> and <u>baker</u> streets in the city.	It is located in Main and Baker streets in the city.
v.t.	Verb tense	v.t. I never <u>work</u> as v.t cashier until I <u>get</u> a job there.	I never worked as cashier until I got a job there.
w.f.	Wrong word form	His voice is w.f <u>irritated</u>	His voice is irritating.
w.w.	Wrong word	The food is w.w delicious. <u>Besides</u> the restaurant is always crowded.	The food is delicious. Therefore, the restaurant is always crowded.
Ref.	Pronoun reference error	The restaurant's speciality is fish. ref <u>They</u> are really delicious.	The restaurant's specialty is fish. It is really delicious.
Ro Cs	Run on or comma splices	ro Lily was fired ----she is upset cs Lily was fired----,she is upset.	Lily was fired, so she is upset. Lily was fired; therefore, she is upset.
T	Add transition	She was also t careless.----- She	She was also careless. For example, she frequently spilled coffee

		frequently spilled coffee on the table.	on the table.
S	Subject	s -----Is open from 6: 00 a.m until the last customer leaves.	It Is open from 6:00 a.m until the last customer leaves.
V	verb	v The employees---- on time and work hard.	The employees are on time and work hard.
prep	preposition	We start serving prep dinner----- 6:00pm.	We start serving dinner at 6:00 pm.
Art	article	art Dihaan expects ---- glass of water when she first sits down at table.	Dihaan expects a glass of water when she first sits down at table.
Sp	spelling	sp The <u>maneger</u> is a woman.	The manager is a woman.
Pl	plural	She treats her employees like pl <u>slave</u> .	She treats her employees like slaves.
Frag	Fragment (incomplete)	She was fired. frag <u>Because</u> she was always late.	She was fired, because she was always late.
Agr	Subject-verb agreement	The manager agr <u>work</u> hard. are There <u>is</u> five employees.	The manager works hard. There are five employees.