

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

**THE RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMME OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE**

**THE EFFECIVENESS OF INDIRECT FOCUSED AND INDIRECT
UNFOCUSED CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN IMPROVING THE
ACCURACY OF FIRST YEAR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' WRITING**

BY

ASRES NIGUS MEKONNEN

JULY,2014

ADDIS ABABA

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF INDIRECT FOCUSED AND INDIRECT UNFOCUSED
CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN IMPROVING THE ACCURACY OF FIRST YEAR
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' WRITING

BY

ASRES NIGUS MEKONNEN

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMME
OFFICE, ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY, FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY (Ph.D.) IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE
(TEFL)

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

JULY, 2014

ADDIS ABABA

The Effectiveness of Indirect Focused and Indirect Unfocused Corrective
Feedback in Improving the Accuracy of First Year University Students'
Writing

By Asres Nigus Mekonnen

Approved by Board of Examiners

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date

Abstract

The major objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused written corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of Ethiopian university level first year students' exemplification (expository) paragraphs. It also attempted to survey students' and teachers' beliefs about the importance of corrective feedback in improving writing accuracy, students' preferences for receiving CF on their written grammar errors, students' experiences of receiving CF, teachers' practices of CF on their students' written grammar errors, teachers' beliefs about different CF types in improving writing accuracy, and problems (if any) the teachers and students face when providing and receiving CF on written grammar errors.

To achieve these objectives, data were gathered from questionnaires for both the students (N=60) and their writing teachers(N=11) and from 3 paragraphs written by 52 students.

Results from the students' questionnaire indicated that all the students believed teacher CF to be of an immense importance in improving the accuracy of their writings. To this effect, most of the students preferred to have unfocused CF which they believed to be practiced most often by their writing teachers. Besides, a majority of the students preferred to have direct CF followed by a combination of direct and indirect CF and this again went in line with what they said was actually practiced by their writing teachers. It was also found that many students have been facing problems when they received their compositions back with CF. The major problem was the fact that it has been difficult to understand their teachers' CF.

Results from the teachers' questionnaire also showed that the teachers greatly valued CF in improving the accuracy of their students' writings. Most of the teachers believed that focused CF could be more effective than unfocused CF in improving the writing accuracy of their students. It was also found that the teachers were most often employing focused CF. Moreover, it appeared that a majority of the teachers were most frequently employing a combination of direct and indirect CF which they believed could be more effective in improving the accuracy of their students' writings. Finally, it was indicated that all the writing teachers have been facing multi-dimensional problems when they were providing CF on their students' written grammar errors, the major problem being their students' compositions were becoming full of linguistic errors which has been frustrating for them even to start providing CF. The other problem indicated by the teachers was the fact that they were dealing with large class sizes; at times more than 70 students in a class.

From both the questionnaires, it could be deduced that both the students and their writing teachers believed in the importance of CF on improving writing accuracy. However, there were some mismatches in the students' preferences and the teachers' practices and in what the students perceived to be most frequently applied on their grammar errors and what the teachers themselves reported to practice. For example, the students believed that their teachers most often employed unfocused CF while the teachers reported that they most often applied focused CF. Besides, the students preferred to have unfocused CF where as the teachers believed that focused CF might be more effective.

From the students' compositions, it was found out that the students who received indirect focused CF(IFCF) in the form of underlining errors and writing codes for that errors have shown a significant improvement in their writing accuracy levels between the immediate post-test and the delayed post-test which were respectively written about a week and 5 weeks after the onset of the CF intervention process. In addition, the students in this group have brought a significant improvement in their writing accuracy between the pre-test and the delayed post-test. Further, a comparison of the 3 means in the writing accuracy levels of the students in this group has revealed that the IFCF has resulted in an overall significant improvement in the writing accuracy of these students throughout the CF intervention process. The students in the unfocused CF group (IUF CFG), on the other hand, haven't shown any significant improvement in the accuracy of their writing between any of the writing occasions as well as across the 3 writing instances.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Dr. Seime Kebede who has offered me his generous help when I was left on the air due to the departure of my former supervisor.

I am also very grateful to my subjects both in the pilot and main studies. It is the information I have got from them that has made me say something about my research topic.

My thanks should also go to Dr. Kedir Ali, a renowned specialist in internal medicines and an owner of Dr. Kedir Specialized Higher Clinic, Dessie, who had turned me back from the verge of collapse. His continuous encouragement and professional support has made it possible for me to cope with my serious illness and my studies.

I would also like to extend my thanks to my wife Tigist Sissay and my daughter Kalkidan for their continuous care and their enduring the pain of silence throughout the four years. They have also painfully endured the economic disturbances we have had due to this study.

Last, not least, I am very much indebted to my brothers Ato Adane Nigus and Commander Mekennen Yimer for their financial and material support. Wolansa Tekle and Woinshet Teshome, secretaries at Wollo Univesity, also deserve my thanks.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	x
List of Appendices	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiv
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study	
1	
1.2. Statement of the Problem	
3	
1.3. Objectives of the Study	
6	
1.2.1. Major Objective	6
1.2.2. Specific Objectives	6
1.4. Significance of the Study	
7	
1.5. Scope of the Study	7
1.6. Limitations of the Study	
8	
1.7. Definition of Key Terms	
9	
Chapter Two: General Background	10
2.1. Introduction	
10	
2.2. The Development of Education in Ethiopia	
11	
2.2.1. Ethiopian Education until the Early 1900's	11
2.2.2. Ethiopian Education from the Early 1900's -1974	14
2.2.3. Ethiopian Education from 1974-1991	18
2.2.4. Ethiopian Education from 1991-Present	19
2.3. The English Language in Ethiopian Education	
26	
2.4. Summary	
30	

Chapter Three: Review of Related Literature	33
3.1. The Writing Skills	33
3.1.1. Complexity of Learning and Teaching L2 Writing Skills	33
3.1.2. Importance of the Writing Skills	35
3.1.3. Writing: The Neglected Skill	37
3.1.4. Approaches to the Teaching of EFL Writing	38
3.1.5. Current Trends in Composition Instruction	42
3.2. Teaching Grammar	43
3.2.1. The Arguments on Grammar Teaching	44
3.2.2. Importance of Grammar in Different Language Teaching Methodologies	46
3.2.3. Approaches to Grammar Teaching	48
3.2.3.1. Deductive Approach to Grammar Teaching	49
3.2.3.2. Inductive Approach to Grammar Teaching	50
3.2.4. Integrating the Teaching of L2 Grammar and Writing	51
3.3. Corrective Feedback (CF)	52
3.3.1. Attitudes towards L2 Learners' Errors	53
3.3.1.1. Errors as Signs of Failure	53
3.3.1.2. Errors as Signs of Learning	53
3.3.2. Theoretical Developments around the Study L2 Learners' Errors	54
3.3.2.1. Contrastive Analysis	55
3.3.2.2. Error Analysis	56
3.3.3. Decisions Teachers Need to Make when Providing CF	59
3.3.3.1. Unfocused versus Focused Corrective Feedback	59
3.3.3.2. Indirect versus Direct Corrective Feedback	62
3.3.3.3. Error Location versus Error Identification	62
3.3.3.4. CF with or without Grade	63
3.3.4. Problems with Teacher Written CF	64
3.3.5. Conditions for Good Feedback	65
3.4. Measures of Grammatical Accuracy in L2 Composition Studies	67
3.4.1. Holistic Scoring	67
3.4.2. Analytic Scoring	68
3.4.3. Error Counts	69
3.5. Categorization of Grammatical Errors	70
3.6. Challenges Facing Studies on the Effectiveness of CF	74
3.7. Theoretical Framework of the Study	75
3.8. Empirical Review	79
3.8.1. Foreign Research Work	79
3.8.2. Local Research Work	82
Chapter Four: Research Design and Methodology	84
4.1. Research Methodology	84
4.2. Subjects and Samples of the Study	85

4.2.1. Subjects and Samples of the Pilot Study	85
4.2.2. Subjects and Samples of the Main Study	85
4.3. Research Design	87
4.4. Research Methods	87
4.4.1. Procedures for the formation of the Treatment Groups and Treatment Conditions	87
4.4.1.1. Formation of the Treatment Groups during the Pilot Study	88
4.4.1.2. Formation of the Treatment Groups during the Main Study	88
4.4.2. Determining Errors to Target on	89
4.4.2.1. Grammatical Errors Targeted during the Pilot Study	90
4.4.2.2. Grammatical Errors Targeted during the Main Study	90
4.4.3. Duration of the Treatment and Timing of the Writing Tasks	91
4.4.3.1. Duration of the Treatment during the Pilot Study	91
4.4.3.2. Duration of the Treatment during the Main Study	92
4.5. Data Gathering Tools for the Study	93
4.5.1. Questionnaire for Students	93
4.5.2. Questionnaire for Writing Instructors	94
4.5.3. Students' Compositions	95
4.6. Reliability and Validity of Data	97
4.6.1. Reliability	97
4.6.2. Validity	98
4.7. Techniques of Data Analysis	100
Chapter Five: Presentation and Analysis of Results	101
5.1. Introduction	101
5.2. Summary of Findings of the Pilot Study	102
5.2.1. Results from Students' Questionnaire	102
5.2.2. Results from Teachers' Questionnaire	103
5.2.3. Results from Students' Compositions	105
5.3. Lessons Learned from the Pilot Study	106
5.4. Results of the Main Study	108
5.4.1. Results from Students' Questionnaire	108
5.4.1.1. Students' Views on the Values of CF	109
5.4.1.2. Students' Experiences of Receiving CF	111
5.4.1.2.1. Students' Experiences of Direct and Indirect CF	111
5.4.1.2.2. Students' Experiences of Focused and Unfocused CF	114
5.4.1.3. Students' Preference for Different CF Types	115
5.4.1.3.1. Students' Preferences regarding Direct and Indirect CF	116
5.4.1.3.2. Students' Preferences for either Focused or Unfocused CF	119
5.4.1.4. Problems (if any) Students Face when Receiving CF from their Writing Teachers	121
5.4.1.5. Strategies Students Take when they are provided with Written CF	123
5.4.1.6. Possible Implications of Students' Responses to the Questionnaire	124
5.4.1.6.1. Students' Views on the Value of Written Grammar CF versus The Views of Scholars who oppose Grammar CF	124
5.4.1.6.2. Students' Experiences of versus their Preferences for	

Receiving CF on their Written Grammar Errors	125
5.4. 2. Results from the Teachers' Questionnaire	125
5.4.2.1. The Writing Teachers' Qualification and Teaching Experience	126
5.4.2.2. The Writing Teachers' Views of the Value of CF on Written Grammatical Errors	127
5.4.2. 3. The Writing Teachers' Experiences of Employing Different Types of CF	128
5.4.2.3.1. The Writing Teachers' Experiences of Employing Direct, Indirect or a Combination of Direct and Indirect CF Types	129
5.4.2.3.2. The Writing Teachers' Experiences of Employing Focused and Unfocused CF	133
5.4.2.4. Teachers' Identification of their Students' Most Common Grammar Errors	135
5.4.2.5. Problems Teachers Faced when Providing CF on their Students Written Grammar Errors	135
5.4.2.6. Teachers Perceptions about the Importance of Different CF Types	137
5.4.2.6.1. Teachers' Perceptions about the Value of Direct and Indirect CF	137
5.4.2.6.2. Teachers' Beliefs about the Value of Focused and Unfocused CF	138
5.4.2.7. Implications of the Teachers' Responses for Classroom Teaching	140
5.4.2.7.1. Teachers' Views about the Value of Grammar CF in Improving Writing Accuracy	140
5.4.2.7.2. Teachers' Preferences for versus Practices of Providing CF On their Students' Written Grammar Errors	140
5.4.2.7.3. Problems the Teachers Faced while Providing CF	141
5.4.2.8. Implications of Results from Students' Questionnaire versus Results from Teachers' Questionnaire	141
5.4.3. Results from Students' Compositions	142
5.4.3.1. The Effects of Indirect Focused CF on the Accuracy of the Students in the IFCFG	142
5.4.3.1.1. The Effects of IF CF between Compositions 1 and 2	143
5.4.3.1.2. The Effects of IF CF between Compositions 1 and 3	143
5.4.3.1.3. The Effects of IF CF between Compositions 2 and 3	144
5.4.3.1.4. The Effects of the IF CF across the 3 Compositions	144
5.4.3.2. The Effects of IUFCF on the Accuracy of the Students in the IUFCFG	145
5.4.3.2.1. The Effects of the IUFCF between Compositions 1 and 2	145
5.4.3.2.2. The Effects of the IUFCF between Compositions 1 and 3	146
5.4.3.2.3. The Effects of the IUFCF between Compositions 2 and 3	146
5.4.3.2.4. The Effects of the IUFCF across the Three Compositions	147
5.4.3.3. The Effects of the two CF Types on Targeted Grammatical Errors (TGE's)	148
5.4.3.3.1. The Effects of IF CF on TGE's	148
5.4.3.3.1.1. The Effects of the IF CF on the TGE's between Compositions 1 and 2	148
5.4.3.3.1.2. The Effect of the IF CF on the TGE's between	

Compositions 1 and 3	148
5.4.3.3.1.3. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 2 and 3	149
5.4.3.3.1.4. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's Across the Three Compositions	149
5.4.3.3. 2. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's	150
5.4.3.3.2.1. The Effect of the IUFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 1 and 2	150
5.4.3.3.2.2. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 1 and 3	151
5.4.3.3.2.3. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 2 and 3	151
5.4.3.3.2.4. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's across the Three Writing Tasks	152
5.5. Inter-rater Correlation during the Main Study	153
Chapter Six: Summary of the major Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	155
6. 1. Summary of Findings	155
6.1.1. The Students' Questionnaire	156
6.1.2. The Teachers' Questionnaire	159
6.1.3. The Students' Compositions	163
6.1.3.1. The Effects of the IFCF on the Students' Writing Accuracy	164
6.1.3.2. The Effects of the IUFCF on the Students' Writing Accuracy	165
6.1.3.3. The Effects of the two CF types on TGE's	165
6.2. Conclusions	166
6.3. Recommendations	175
6.4. Further Research	177
References	178
Appendices	188

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Pages
Table 1: Polio's Categorization of Linguistic Errors	71
Table 2: Hartshorn's Categorization of Linguistic Errors	72
Table 3: Timing of the Writing Tasks during the Pilot Study	91
Table 4: Timing of the Writing Tasks during the Main Study	92
Table 5: Students' rating of the importance of CF on their grammatical errors	109

Table 6: Students' response on the frequency of different CF techniques	111
Table 7: Students' response regarding the most frequently used direct CF type	112
Table 8: Students' response regarding the most frequently used indirect CF type	114
Table 9: Students' responses on whether their writing teachers most frequently used focused or unfocused CF when responding to their linguistic errors	115
Table 10: Students' Preferences for either Direct or Indirect CF	116
Table 11: Students' rankings of their preferences of the different DCF techniques	117
Table 12: Students' rankings of their preferences of the different indirect CF techniques	118
Table 13: Students' preferences for either focused or unfocused CF	119
Table 14: Students' responses on whether they face problems when receiving CF	121
Table 15: Students' responses on what they do with the CF provided on their Written pieces	123
Table 16: The writing teachers' education background and teaching experience	126
Table 17: Teachers' responses regarding the value of written grammar CF	127
Table 18: Teachers' responses on whether they most often used Direct CF, Indirect CF, or a Combination of these	129
Table 19: Teachers' responses on how often they employed different direct CF types	131
Table 20: Teachers' responses on how often they employed different indirect CF types	132
Table 21: Teachers' responses on whether they mostly used focused or Unfocused CF	133
Table 22: Teachers' beliefs regarding whether Direct or Indirect CF was More Effective	137
Table 23: Teachers' responses regarding whether Focused or Unfocused CF	

was more Effective	139
Table 24: ANOVA test results of the effects of IFCF of students in the FCFG across the three writing occasions	144
Table 25: ANOVA test results of the effects of IUFCF of students in the UFCFG across the three writing occasions	147
Table 26: ANOVA test results of the effects of IFCF TGE's by the students in the FCFG across the three compositions	150
Table 27: ANOVA test results of the effects of IUFCF TGE's by the students in the UFCFG across the three compositions	152
Table 28: Identification of Errors by the Researcher and the Two Raters in the 3 Compositions (Main)	153

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Pages
Appendix I: Questionnaire for Students (Pilot)	188
Appendix II: Questionnaire for Writing Teachers (Pilot)	193
Appendix III: Operationalization of Error Categories and Example Instances	196
Appendix IV: Appendix VI: Questionnaire for Students (Main)	205
Appendix V: Questionnaire for Writing Instructors (Main)	207
Appendix VI: Extracts from Students' Responses to Open-ended Items in their Questionnaire (Main)	213

Appendix VII: Extracts of Teachers' Responses to the Open-ended Items in the Questionnaire (Main)	217
Appendix VIII: Data from the 3 compositions by all students (Main)	222
Appendix IX: No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp.1	223
Appendix X: No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp. 2	224
Appendix XI: No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp. 3	225
Appendix XII: Number and proportion of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in the 3 Compositions (Main)	226
Appendix XIII: Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp.1, main)	227
Appendix XIV: Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp.2, main)	228
Appendix XV: Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp. 3, main)	229
Appendix XVI: Number and proportion of grammar errors and words by the students in the UFCFG in the 3 Compositions (Main)	230
Appendix XVII: Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.1, main)	231
Appendix XVIII: Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.2, main)	232
Appendix XIX: Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.3, main)	233
Appendix XX: Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the 3 compositions (All, Main)	234
Appendix XXI: Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the FCFG	

in the 3 compositions (Main)	235
Appendix XXII: Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the UFCFG in the 3 compositions (Main)	236
Appendix XXIII: Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample paragraphs (Composition 1, main)	237
Appendix XXIV: Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample paragraphs (Composition 2, Main)	239
Appendix XXV: Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample paragraphs (Composition 3, Main)	241
Appendix XXVI: Sample Students' Paragraphs (Main)	243
Appendix XXVII: Categorization of linguistic errors identified from students' pre-test compositions during the pilot study	248

List of Abbreviations

CF: Corrective feedback

DCF: Direct Corrective Feedback

IDCF: Indirect Corrective Feedback

IFCF: Indirect focused Corrective Feedback

IUFCF: Indirect Unfocused Corrective Feedback

FCFG: Focused corrective feedback group

UFCFG: Unfocused corrective feedback group

TGE's : Targeted grammatical errors

WC: Errors in word choice

Pun: Errors in punctuation use

Fra: Sentence Fragment

WF: Errors in word formation

VF: Errors in verb formation

Pre: Errors in preposition use

Art: Errors in article use

OM: Omission

UN: Unnecessary

Awk: Awkward/unclear

Parl: Errors in parallel construction

Pos: Errors in using possessive's

Quant: Errors in quantification/quantifier use

Con: Errors in connector use

Prn: Errors in pronoun use

Sp: Spelling errors

WO: word order errors

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Corrective feedback (CF) has for a long time been one of the key points of discussion in the EFL/ESL methodology courses and books. However, scholars do not agree on the different issues surrounding CF. Researchers have not either come up with conclusive findings about what CF practices could lead to a better learning. The debate among scholars and researchers regarding the value of CF (particularly CF on grammar errors) has been continuing both in the theoretical and practical grounds.

On the one side of the theoretical battle are those scholars who argue that CF might not contribute for the development of L2/FL grammar knowledge. These scholars lend theoretical support basically from Krashen's (1985, 2004) theories of second and/or foreign language learning. According to these theories, language learning could happen naturally if learners were provided with comprehensible positive input. The argument on this side has been strengthened by Truscott's (1996, 1998, 1999, and 2007) strong condemnation of written grammar CF. Nevertheless, there are many scholars who stand on the opposing front of the battle. As to this group, positive evidence alone does not suffice for successful L2 learning (Long, 1990; Schmidt, 1990; Swain, 1985). After witnessing the language deficiencies of French immersion students who were provided with ample positive input, Swain (2010) hypothesized that these students were not as competent in some language skills basically because they were devoid of the chances of learning from their output. To this later group, therefore, CF on students' output (spoken or written) might help them notice their gaps by comparing what they have produced with what should have been in the target language.

The theoretical debate on the value of CF in helping L2 development has in part been fueled by the fact that empirical evidences from different researches were inconclusive and at times contradictory (Ferris, 2004, 2010; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Some researchers (Kepner, 1991; Robb et al, 1986) reported that CF hasn't resulted in significant gains in writing accuracy. On the other hand, other researchers (Bitchener et al, 2005; Chandler, 2003; Van

Beuningen, 2010) have come up with results indicating that CF has resulted in significant gains in the students' writing accuracy.

Therefore, what should EFL/ESL teachers do? On one hand, they are warned that they should not provide CF on their students' grammar errors. Otherwise, they will derail the course of the natural language development. On the other, they are strongly advised that providing students with positive evidence alone might not be enough for successful language learning. At the center of this advice is, thus, negative evidence in the form of CF from external sources like the teacher is very crucially important for L2/FL language learning. Amidst this hot debate, classroom life continues; teachers cannot in any way stop their duties and wait for unanimously agreed up on recommendations regarding best CF practices. The best we could offer these teachers very possibly is conducting context specific researches and coming up with recommendations workable in these contexts.

Corrective feedback is so broad an area that it could be researched from different perspectives. For example, a researcher might compare the effects of direct and indirect CF or might go for a comparison of the effects of different direct and indirect CF types. Other researchers might take the teacher, peer, self CF line and compare the effects of the two or the three of them together. Another line of research could be making a comparison of focused/ selective and unfocused/ comprehensive CF. Still, a further research line might be a study of CF on content versus CF on form. Exploring students' and teachers' preferences for different CF types is another research agenda.

From the many possible areas of inquiry into the effectiveness of CF, this research has picked up the focused-unfocused direction. More specifically, the study undertaken here goes through an investigation of the effects of indirect focused CF versus indirect unfocused CF in improving writing accuracy.

Although different researches have been conducted in some other contexts (e.g., Bitchener & Knock, 2008, 2009, 2010), the effectiveness of focused and unfocused CF has not been researched in our context where English is taught as a foreign language starting from the KG's and where this language plays a very crucial role in the academic and professional lives of many citizens.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It is strongly believed that being able to express oneself in writing in a second language, particularly in English, is immensely advantageous in educational, professional and even ordinary communicative settings (Crandall, 2006; Harmer, 2004; The National Council of Teachers of English, 2008). For many of us, it seems a question of survival that we have to be able to express ourselves in writing. Writing is considered to be an excellent way of processing and practicing many aspects of language (Geremew, 1999).

However, different sources indicate that learning to write in a second language is an extremely complex task because of different factors (see what makes writing in an L2 complex in section 3.1.2). Because of its complexity, it seems obligatory that writing, unlike speech, in a second language is acquired through conscious instruction (Harmer, 2004; Leki, 2001). Hence, English language teachers at different levels must be clear about how to deal with different issues concerning the writing instruction, including the most effective types of corrective feedback.

Meanwhile, different researchers and observers have been reporting that the writing skill instruction is not dealt with sufficiently in the context of the Ethiopian Education, like in many other countries. First, there are reports that (like in other countries) English language teachers usually skip the writing section because of different reasons (e.g., Italo, 1999). Second, if they tried to teach it, they would do it in a traditional way, using some sentence level writing activities basically to reinforce some vocabulary and grammatical items (Alamirew, 2005; Girma, 2005). Further more, there is a tendency among curriculum designers and textbook producers to give a lesser emphasis to writing than other language skills. This could be evidenced in the fact that the writing sections in the English textbooks almost always happen at the end of chapters (Alamirew, 2005).

As a result, it has been noted that when students in our context join universities, they are reported to be seriously handicapped in their English language proficiency in general, and in the writing skills in particular. What is so terribly painful to hear is the concern from many English language and other subject area instructors about the fact that many of their students are not able to compose even a single grammatically correct sentence (Tesfaye, 1995; Italo, 1999; Alamirew, 2005; Haregewoin, 2008). The present researcher also witnessed this

problem while he was teaching different writing courses (for about 10 years) like Sophomore English, Intermediate Writing Skills, and Advanced Composition in addition to other English courses at Bahir Dar and Wollo universities. The problem, as indicated above, is getting so worse and worse from year to year that these days we are having university students who struggle to correctly spell their own names in English. Undoubtedly, this problem calls for different researches.

A very important area of research in the fight against the declining English language proficiency of our students in general and their writing skills in particular is felt to be corrective feedback. Most scholars in language teaching agree that corrective feedback is helpful in developing L2 proficiency, particularly writing skills as it helps learners to notice gaps between their output and the target forms. However, studies on the effectiveness of corrective feedback have come up with different sometimes conflicting findings. Understanding the inconclusive nature of findings from studies investigating the efficacy of corrective feedback, Ferris (2004:58) proposes more research in the area and even argues, "...we need to start from scratch." Ferris (2010) continues to state that a great deal of research is needed in order to provide teachers with the best possible information about the best possible feedback. Ferris advises teachers to take this responsibility very seriously.

The literature on corrective feedback also tells us that most studies on this area have been based on data from short-term, usually one-time, treatments. However, it has been documented that short term gains in linguistic accuracy are not necessarily indicators of acquisition as they will fade away after sometime. Different sources show that the effect of corrective feedback on the long term language development of L2 learners has been rarely investigated. Because of this, different scholars call for longitudinal studies on the efficacy of corrective feedback (Ferris, 2004, 2010).

What is more, all of the local (and most foreign) studies on written error treatment focused on the effectiveness of some correction techniques on text revisions rather than on new pieces of writing over time. Results from such revision exercises are reported to be difficult to make conclusions as language learning happens gradually. Therefore, the need for

researches investigating the efficacy of corrective feedback on EFL students' new pieces of writing is evident (Chandler, 2003).

Furthermore, none of the studies in our country investigated the effectiveness of focused and unfocused corrective feedback. Besides, scholars seem to agree on the fact that feedback is context (culture) bound. What is found to be effective in one context might not work equally for another context. Also, the errors identified in one context might not resemble the ones identified in other contexts.

Finally, most studies on selective/focused corrective feedback have targeted narrowly at 2 or 3 error categories. Besides, these studies seem to be replicative with the majority focusing on the English article system (Bitchener et al, 2005; Bitchener & Knock, 2008; Sheen et al, 2009). This means, there is a gap to be filled by focusing on more and relatively uninvestigated error categories.

Therefore, this study was conducted in response to the calls for more research in the area of corrective feedback in different instructional contexts. Particularly, it was conducted to make some research evidence available in our country regarding the effectiveness of focused versus unfocused corrective feedback.

Having all these issues in mind, this study has tried to give answers for the following research questions.

1. What is the students' opinion about the importance of corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of their writing?
2. What is the teachers' opinion about the importance of corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of their students' writing?
3. What are the students' experiences of receiving CF on their written grammar errors?
4. What are the students' preferences for receiving CF on their written grammar errors?

5. What are the writing teachers' experiences of providing CF on their students' written grammar errors?
6. Which CF types do the writing teachers perceive more effective?
7. How effective are indirect focused and indirect unfocused CF strategies in producing improved accuracy in students' new pieces of writings?

1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.3.1. Major Objective of the Study

Inspired by Bithener et al (2005), Bitchener & Koch (2008), Ellis et al (2009) and Sheen et al (2009), the main purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused and indirect unfocused corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of EFL university level students' writings.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

More specifically, it attempted to:

1. Survey the students' opinions about the importance of corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of their writing,
2. Explore writing teachers' opinions about the importance of corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of their students' writing,
3. Explore students' experiences of receiving CF on their written grammar errors,
4. Assess the writing teachers' experiences of providing corrective feedback on their students' written grammar errors,
5. Survey students' preferences for receiving corrective feedback on their written grammar errors ,
6. Assess the writing teachers' perceptions of the value of different CF practices in improving the accuracy of their students' writings,
7. Investigate the level of effectiveness of indirect focused and indirect unfocused corrective feedback on reducing students' grammatical errors in new pieces of writing,

1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is hoped to be of importance in the following ways. First, it will help writing teachers to reflect on their own practices of error correction. Second, it will add to the already practiced ways of error correction in our educational institutions. In other words, it will provide teachers with more choices to make while undertaking error treatment moves.

Third, it will have some implication for curriculum designers and teacher trainers in that it may come up with recommendations to be included in different language teaching methodology courses. Finally, it will contribute its own to the enrichment of the existing research base on the provision of corrective feedback on students' written grammatical errors.

1.5. SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Although feedback is both positive and negative, this study was delimited to the negative one, for its primary objective is to investigate the efficacy of different types of negative evidence in improving accuracy in EFL students' compositions. It was also confined to written corrective feedback.

Moreover, while corrective feedback is of content (meaning, organization) and form (grammar, mechanics, and spelling), the scope of this study was confined only to formal aspects (grammar) correction. This was because different scholars suggest that these two issues should be treated separately; otherwise, students will be confused and overloaded since humans have limited memory and attentional capacities (Van Patten, 2002). In this regard, Zamel (1985) suggests that content feedback and form feedback should be kept separate in order to avoid students' confusion about what they should attend to at any particular stage of the process. Furthermore, it is documented that whereas students themselves could solve their meaning related weaknesses, through positive input, the grammatical aspect is reported to be resistant, and thus, requires frequent intervention by the teacher. The intervention may be proactive or reactive. For that matter, this study followed a reactive stance, treating grammatical errors when they occurred in students' written pieces.

In its location, this study was delimited to first year students in the Natural Sciences Faculty of Woldiya (pilot) and Wollo (main) Universities who were enrolled for the course Sophomore English/Basic Writing Skills.

1.6. Limitations of the Study

Like many other classroom researches, the present study has some practical limitations.

The major limitation this research had was the absence of a true control group which was not provided with corrective feedback. This was because of the issue of classroom ethics.

One of the tenets of classroom ethics is that teachers should provide CF on their students' errors. Teachers who violate this ethics would be considered irresponsible.

The other limitation of this study might be the nature of the writing tasks from which students' errors are going to be identified. Even though it is felt that the writing tasks the students are going to work on are common for university life, and although these tasks were written by following a similar paragraph development pattern (exposition), they might not produce identical obligatory contexts for the targeted grammatical items. Still, another weakness might be the fact that inter-rater reliability was not reported about all the compositions taken as samples. This was because it was found very difficult for the raters (as they were overburdened) to identify and mark the errors in all the compositions. As a result, only randomly selected compositions (8 paragraphs from each writing occasion during the main study) were marked by the raters and the results were checked against the researcher's markings for reliability.

1.7. DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

There are a variety of terminologies in the area of corrective feedback and classroom discourse. For the purpose of the present study, defining the following main terms in relation to corrective feedback was felt necessary.

Error

In this current research, the term error is defined as the use of a form or structure which deviates from the rules of written English grammar. It also includes a failure to use a form or structure where necessary and the use of one where unnecessary.

Corrective feedback

In the present research, corrective feedback is operationalized as underlining and writing a code for an erroneous form or structure exhibited in the students' paragraphs.

Unfocused/comprehensive corrective feedback

Unfocused CF is a CF that is directed at a wide range of errors that learners make in their writing. It attempts to treat all or most of the errors committed by language learners.

Focused/selective corrective Feedback

Focused corrective feedback is operationalized as a corrective move that is directed at specific, predetermined errors that learners make in their writing.

Indirect/ Implicit Corrective Feedback

In the present research, indirect CF takes the form of underlining a formal/grammar error and writing a code for that error.

Writing Accuracy

Accuracy is operationalized as the ability to write expository/illustration paragraphs in English with as fewer errors of form/grammar as possible.

CHAPTER TWO: GENERAL BACKGROUND

2.1. INTRODUCTION

As this research was conducted in an EFL classroom in a university context in Ethiopia, it is felt necessary to say a few points about this country.

Ethiopia, the second most populous country in Africa, is a beautiful and relatively peaceful country in Eastern Africa bordered by Djibouti, Eritrea, the Republic of the Sudan, the Republic of the Southern Sudan, Kenya, and Somalia. Ethiopia has a great geographical diversity (ranging from as high as 4,550 meters above sea level to as low as 110 meters below sea level). The climate varies with the topography, from as high as 47 degrees Celsius in the low lands to as low as 10 degrees Celsius in the highlands. The Great Rift Valley bisects Ethiopia into two. Ethiopia is a land of many endemic animals and diverse vegetation. It is the source of most of the rivers in east Africa, though not yet harvested.

Ethiopia is an ancient country. Paleontological studies identify Ethiopia as one of the cradles of mankind in which some of the earliest hominoid skeletons aging about 4.5 million years were discovered.

Situated in the Horn of Africa, the country is at the crossroads between the Middle East and Africa. Thus, throughout its long history, Ethiopia has been a melting pot of diverse customs and cultures. Today, it embraces a complex variety of nationalities, peoples, and linguistic groups. Its peoples altogether speak over 86 different languages (Wikipedia, 2013).

Ethiopia is one of the few African countries to have maintained its independence, even during the colonial era. Furthermore, the country is one of the founding members of the United Nations. Ethiopia takes an active role in African affairs, for example, playing a pioneering role in the formation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In fact, the capital city, Addis Ababa, has been a seat for the OAU since its establishment and continues to serve as the seat for the African Union (AU) today.

In this chapter, an attempt was made to review the development of education in Ethiopia and the status of the English language throughout the history of Education in this country.

2.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION IN ETHIOPIA

Historical overviews about the development of education in Ethiopia are often treated under two broad systems- traditional and modern education systems. Traditional education in Ethiopia occupies the time until the end of the 19th century. The modern one, on the other hand, is said to cover the period starting from the early 1900's up to the present. In this study, it is attempted to review the development of the Ethiopian education under four headings: until the early 1900's, from the early 1900's up to 1974, from 1974 up to 1991, and from 1991 up to the present.

2.2.1. Ethiopian Education until the Early 1900's

Education in Ethiopia has been dominated by the Ethiopian Orthodox Church for many centuries (for about 1,700 years as of the 4th century A.D.) until secular education was adopted in the early 1900s.

Traditional education in Ethiopia derives its distinctive character from the unique Christian heritage of the country. Ethiopia is reported to be the only African country to have preserved Christianity as its religion for over a millennium and a half. Moreover, having its own written language and literature, it developed from very early days a tradition of ecclesiastical scholarship. The long monastic tradition dates back to the 4th century. In the Christian highlands of Ethiopia, the Church constituted the main guardian of traditional culture and provided the only schools in the land for many centuries. The church school system has been the instrument that has preserved the traditional learning of Ethiopia and conveyed it faithfully to succeeding generations. In spite of the different changes taking place in Ethiopia with the steady expansion of modern secular education in the present century, church schools still play an active part in the Ethiopian educational scene.

The church school system, which is one of the oldest in Christendom, originated in the Aksumite Kingdom with the introduction of Christianity. The medium of instruction of the church school system was Geez which in the past times was a spoken as well as a written language. Now, however, it is not spoken, and it is only a liturgical medium in the churches; it is only a written and interpreted language similar to that of Latin. Geez alphabets characterize Ethiopia to be the only country which has developed its own alphabets in Africa. Geez has been a literary language for millennia, and it was written on stones and later on goat skins for prayer books and texts for learning. All the other teaching and learning materials like the ink, and different colors were also locally produced by the ecclesiastical groups themselves (Messay, 2008).

It is documented that neither the central government nor the local authority was involved in the curriculum, financing and administration. The church schools were basically non-government schools; hence, they were free from any political interference (Messay, 2008). Though generally similar, every school had established its own curriculum and also its own area of excellence which served as points of reference and standard. The practice was also that students moved from school to school, and a consensus was developed that a certain school was better than the other. In fact, it is reported that there were universally recognized teachers in respective areas of studies.

The church school system was dominantly oral and the main strategy of learning was memorization (Alamirew, 2005; Messay, 2008). Students were required to memorize very long poems, songs, and even books. The school system was divided into different stages; to complete all these stages it used to take up to 20 years. Promotion from one stage to the next was dependent on a student's talent; fast learners could complete the process in a relatively shorter period than others, but there was no dismissal at all. A student who successfully completed all the stages is called "liq" or "debtera".

According to Messay (2008), in their present form the church schools evolved during the "golden age" of the Church from the 13th to the 16th centuries when the literature of the Church had reached its peak. As of the early 16th century, Ethiopia experienced the most destructive and bloodiest war in its history between Islamists headed by Ahmed Gragne and the Christians. Originated from Harar in the east of the country, Gragn invaded most of the country and destroyed churches, monasteries; he killed priests and monks and burned religious heritages until he was defeated in the mid 16th C by a joint force of Ethiopians and Portuguese soldiers. It is believed that this war had brought the cultural and religious activities of the country into a stand still.

Accompanied by all these ups and downs, history teaches us, until the early 1900s, Ethiopian education was confined to a system of religious instruction organized and presented under the guidance of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church. Church schools prepared individuals for the clergy and for other religious duties and positions. Messay (2008) states that the subject of study of the church school was Ethiopia- its legacies, customs, languages, values and history, and the spirit of the education system was also to produce scholars able to serve the Church and the country with a sense of dedication. These schools provided religious education to the children of the nobility and to the sons of limited numbers of tenant farmers and servants associated with elite families. However, some reports indicate that the church schools also included secular education which was interwoven with the religious education. Such schools reportedly served mainly the Amhara and Tigray inhabitants of the Ethiopian highlands.

The role of the traditional school in promoting the useful production related cultural values in a formal way of schooling was reported to be very limited. Neither agriculture nor other activities like the crafts of pottery, blacksmith, spinning, basketry, masonry etc, which were essential in the rural life were recognized and given any place in the traditional system of schooling. On the contrary, according to critics, some less desirable cultural values like too many holidays, lengthy fasting time, and absolute submission and obedience to superiors which were directly and indirectly disseminated through the traditional education have affected the productive life of the nation.

All in all, the church school system has been criticized by many because:

- It served only Christians (i.e., limited only to very few children)
- It didn't give a room for creativity; what was conveyed from earlier generations was passed to the next with no change.
- It didn't allow girls to participate.
- It was based on rote learning.

Nevertheless, the traditional schooling has left us with rich literary heritage like the alphabet itself and a lot of useful documentation. The traditional education had served as a powerful means to unite the spiritual existence with the secular mode of life.

2.2.2. Ethiopian Education from the Early 1900's-1974

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, Menelik II understood the loopholes of the church schools. As a result, he permitted the establishment of European missionary schools. At the same time, he allowed Islamic schools to provide some education for a small part of the Muslim population. In addition, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the education system's failure to meet the needs of people involved in statecraft, diplomacy, commerce, and industry led to the introduction of government-sponsored secular education. The first public school to provide a western style education was the Minelik II School which was

opened in October 1908 furnished with several expatriate teachers. According to the World Bank (2005), this school enrolled only hundred students recruited from the nobility.

However, what is called the modern system of schooling is blamed to have made efforts to erase the immensely rich remains of the century and a half old church school (Messay, 2008). This same scholar criticizes the act of radicalization or westernization of the Ethiopian education system for being unrealistic. The beginning of modern school from zero is reported to be one of the causes of the crisis in our education system.

These modern schools, as indicated above, did not evolve from the traditional schools of the church. Rather, most facilities in these schools (i.e., the curriculum, the teaching staff and books, and even the media of instruction) were foreign to the then Ethiopian situation. Due to this, when modern (secular) schools were introduced to Ethiopia, there was a strong opposition. To appease such an opposition, the first government school used Egyptian Copts as the first teachers because they were considered to be devoted followers of the religion.

The first modern school (Minelik II School) was said to be engaged mainly in the teaching of foreign languages like English, French, and Arabic which for two decades dominated the curriculum content that made it look like a specialized school of languages (Tekeste, 2006). However, some scholars still argue that the legacy of the traditional schools considerably influenced the Ethiopian modern education up to the 1970's. This could be evidenced in the following contexts.

1. What was known as moral education continued until the 1970's; the object of this education was basically religious; this affected the non-secularity of the schools up to the mid-seventies (Messay, 2008).
2. The Ethiopian secular culture and spoken languages were not given appropriate emphasis in the curriculum of the traditional schools. This was the case in the modern system of education also up to the beginning of the 1990's when the Education and Training Policy was issued in 1994.

3. Knowledge was considered untouchable and unchanging and thus to be learned as it is. This wrong concept of epistemology has affected the pedagogy which emphasized rote learning and memorization. This problem spilled into the modern system of education until quite recently.
4. The root of the emphasis on knowledge and disregard of practical skills related to production and livelihood in the current methodology followed by many teachers can be traced to the traditional schools. Even the skill of writing was said to be discouraged.
5. The authoritarian role of the teacher in our schools now and her/his expectation of submissive behavior of the students is not largely different from the traditional schools where the teacher was called 'Yenieta' (my master).

In 1925, the then government, headed by Queen Zewditu, (although she is reported to have been a puppet and the actual leader was Ras Teferi, later Emperor H/Silassie) adopted a plan to expand secular education, but ten years later, there were only 8,000 students enrolled in twenty public schools. Also, a few students (nearly 200) reportedly studied abroad on government scholarships in different countries around the world.

In 1930, Ras Teferi was crowned as Emperor Haile Silassie. This monarch, according to Messay (2008), is universally recognized as being the pioneer promoter of modern education in Ethiopia although some rudimentary bases were passed over from Minelli. Like his predecessor, H/Silassie faced fierce opposition from the powerful Ethiopian church and most members of the nobility. Together with expanding secular education, in an attempt to participate women, H/Silassie permitted the opening of the first school of girls, the Menen School, in 1930. This attempt to expand secular education was, unfortunately, halted by the Italians when they came to avenge their defeat at Adowa by invading the country (1935-41). Most of the educated Ethiopians (75 % of those educated according to Teshome, 1979 cited in Messay, 2008), who could have provided the necessary transitional administrative and teaching staff for the expansion and modernization of education, were exterminated by the Italians.

The transition from traditional to modern education had been extremely difficult. As most of the pre-war educated Ethiopians combined traditional training with modern education, they could have secured a smooth transition. Because of their extermination, the post-war effort to establish and spread modern education had to rely very heavily on expatriate advisors, administrators, and teachers. Besides, as there was acute shortage of qualified teachers and text books, classrooms were extremely crowded, and students were forced to copy and memorize what was written by foreigners; thus, the standard of education became very low. Further, this shortage made it difficult to expand education to the majority. On top of the severe material and human shortcomings, the educational policy is said to have lacked direction and national objectives. The main reason for the lack of a national direction was the system's reliance on foreign advisors, administrators, and teachers. The curriculum tended to reflect courses offered in Western countries because, as Balsvik (1979) cited in Messay notes, appointed foreign advisors seemed to believe that what had proved successful in their countries would also be applicable successfully in the Ethiopian context. What is more, the foreign teachers are reported to have been not fully qualified.

After their conquest of Ethiopia, the Italians acted quickly to reorganize the educational system in Ethiopia. The invaders issued a decree in 1936 stating that the newly conquered country, as in the older colonies, would have two different types of educational institutions- Italian type schools and schools for colonial subjects. Some were reserved for European children. Many other existing schools were converted to Italian-only schools, while new schools were created for the native population, though these were believed to accomplish propaganda purposes. The prewar Empress Menen School for girls was converted into a military hospital.

Following the Italian defeat, the country started to build up the sector again recruiting foreign teachers. As a result, by 1952 a total of 60,000 students were enrolled in 400 primary schools, eleven secondary schools, and three institutions offering college-level courses. Also, in the 1960s, 310 mission and privately operated schools with an enrollment of 52,000 supplemented the country's public school system.

In May 1961, Ethiopia hosted the United Nations-sponsored Conference of African States on the Development of Education. Among other things, the conference highlighted Ethiopia's educational deficiencies. The Ethiopian education system, especially in primary and secondary education, was ranked the bottom among African nations (The World Bank, 2005). There were school and teacher shortages, a high dropout rate, and low overall attendance rates; especially among females, non-Christians and rural children. Embarrassed by this record, the Ministry of Education developed a new education policy, which was in effect until 1974 (Messay, 2008). The policy opened the gate for the establishment of technical training schools together with expansion of academic education; it also introduced curriculum revisions. But Amharic became the language of instruction for the entire primary cycle, which is reported to have handicapped any child who had a different primary language (Messay, 2008; Tekete, 2006)

According to these same scholars, the government expanded the public school system and in 1971 there were 1,300 primary and secondary schools and 13,000 teachers. But the system reportedly suffered from a shortage of qualified personnel, a lack of funds, and overcrowded facilities. It is documented that school construction usually proceeded faster than the training and certification of teachers. In addition, most schools were in the major towns. Crowded and understaffed, those schools in small towns and rural areas provided a poor education.

The inadequacies of public education before the mid-1970s are believed to have resulted partly from the school financing system. To finance primary education, the government levied a special tax on agricultural land (Messay, 2008). The system's biased nature is said to have fostered the expansion of primary education in wealthier regions rather than in poorer ones. Moreover, as Messay (Ibid) notes, urban inhabitants, who did not have to pay the tax but who were predominantly represented in the schools, sent their children at the expense of the taxpaying rural landowners and poor peasants. To solve this imbalance, in 1970, the government imposed an education tax on urban landowners and a 2 percent tax on the personal income of urban residents. But the money is said to have been used not for its intended purpose. Expenditure on education was very low until 1974, compared with other African countries.

Under the pressure of growing public dissatisfaction and mounting student activism in the university and secondary schools, the imperial government initiated a comprehensive study of the education system. According to Messay (2008), the Education Sector Review (ESR) which was compiled in 1972 recommended attaining universal primary education as quickly and with a fair cost as possible, ruralizing the curricula through the inclusion of informal training, equalizing educational opportunities, and relating the system to the national development process.

The ESR, whose report was not published until 1974, criticized the education system because it couldn't prepare students for the next level of academic study; it forced students to complete rigid qualifying examinations. Also the government was criticized for its lack of concern for the young people who dropped out before learning marketable skills, a situation that contributed to unemployment. The report opened a room for rumors to generate opposition among students, parents, and the teachers' union. Strikes and widespread disturbances occurred, and the education crisis is reported to have become a contributing factor for the fall of the imperial regime later that year (Messay, 2008).

2.2.3. The Ethiopian Education from 1974-1991

Prior to 1974, Ethiopia had an estimated illiteracy rate well above 90%, which was rated poor compared with the rest of Africa. During the military regime (1974-1991), emphasis was placed on increasing literacy in rural areas. During the military regime, practical subjects and socialism were stressed.

Despite the efforts to improve the literacy of the population by the military regime, less than 10 percent of the total population was literate by the end of 1974. As Messay (2008) and Tekeste (2006) note, discouraged by this figure, the government initiated a national literacy campaign beginning in early 1975 by mobilizing more than 60,000 students and teachers, sending them all over the country for two-year terms of service. Most critics, however, saw this as the government's way to silence rising opposition while at the same time creating a

network of government spies in the rural areas. Government sources at the time, though, claimed that the campaign to increase literacy brought improvements.

As the military regime was dependent on assistance from the former Soviet Union, the education system during this time was tuned to Marxist Leninist Philosophy. Because of this, it has been criticized for not in line with local needs. Also, most of the years of rule of the military regime were marred by violence both from within and from outside. To quell the internal resistance, the military waged “Red Terror” against those suspected of being members of opposing factions. The Red Terror, like what happened during the Italian invasion, had taken the lives of perhaps tens of thousands of educated Ethiopians; it forced many others to flee their country; still several others, mainly in the northern part of the country, died fighting the regime (those who survived are reported to account for the majority of the current government officials). This loss of many educated Ethiopians has taken the status of the Ethiopian education back to the square both in quality and quantity.

2.2.4. The Ethiopian Education from 1991-Present

Under the current government (after 1991), education began to receive a considerable amount of the country’s budget. The current system follows very similar school expansion schemes to the rural areas as the previous 1980s system with an additional agenda of giving rural education in the children’s own languages at the elementary level.

The 17 years struggle against the Derg regime has come up with a new government led by the Ethiopian People’s Revolutionary Front (EPRDF) in 1991. This government issued its own Education and Training Policy in 1994. This policy vows to avoid the weaknesses of the education systems in the previous military and monarchical rules. It enumerates several limitations in the former education systems. This is evidenced from the policy document as it states:

To date, it is known that our country's education is entangled with complex problems of relevance, quality, accessibility and equity. The objectives of education do not take cognizance of the society's needs and do not adequately indicate future direction (MOE, 1994:3).

According to this document, in the previous education systems:

- a. The contents and modes of presentation were not interrelated in a way that can develop citizens who are equipped with integrated skills and abilities to solve problems.
- b. Inadequate facilities, insufficient training of teachers, overcrowded classes, shortage of books and other teaching materials contributed for the low quality of education provided.
- c. There was very low primary education enrollment rate (below 22% of the relevant age cohort at the time); and a large number of those enrolled children discontinued and relapsed to illiteracy.
- d. There was a high disparity in enrollment among regions.
- e. Opportunities for high school education and technical and vocational training were limited to big towns.
- f. Higher education institutions were found only in very few regions; they were overcrowded and their research capacity was very low.
- g. The necessary infrastructure to provide relevant quality education to the rural population, which is over eighty-five percent of the population of the country, is at an insignificant level of development.

The current training and education policy reiterates that, “Education, as a very important factor to human development, is of a high priority in the overall development endeavor of the government. Hence, it requires an appropriate direction....” (p.4). As a result, the previous education structure was replaced by a new one which begins with kindergarten, and goes to 8 years of primary education and 4 years of secondary education. The primary education is divided into 4 years of first cycle and 4 years of second cycle. The secondary school is again divided into 2 years of general secondary and 2 years of preparatory secondary school education. The structure of the current formal education is usually taken as 4-4-2-2-. Those who leave education at any level are permitted, as to the new education policy, to attend technical and vocational trainings in varieties of fields. The policy also embraces non-formal and basic education.

The other major change by the current education and training policy is the language of instruction. It underlines both the pedagogical advantage of the child in learning in mother tongue and the rights nationalities are endowed with to promote the use of their languages.

Hence, it determines primary education to be given in nationality languages. However, it also gives freedom for nations and nationalities to choose to learn either in their own language or one of the languages of the country. In addition, the language of teacher training for kindergarten and primary education was decided to be the nationality language used in the area. Amharic, which was the language of instruction for primary schools in the previous school systems, was, on the other hand, to be taught as a language of countrywide communication. The policy determined English, which formerly had been used as a medium of instruction as of grade 7, to be the medium of instruction for secondary and higher education as of grade 10. However, it was determined to continue to be taught as a subject starting from grade one. The document at last commends that students should “choose and learn at least one nationality language and one foreign language for cultural and international relations.” (P.24).

The current Ethiopian government has been enumerating different evidences as indicators of success in achieving the goals it has set in its education and training policy. Among the frequently mentioned successes of the current education system are:

- Children of several nations and nationalities in the country are attending their primary education in their mother tongues. Of the total languages spoken by Ethiopians, it has been reported that about 20 are being used as mediums of instruction in the primary schools.
- A lot of schools have been constructed in rural Ethiopia, even in areas which are considered remote.
- Technical and vocational training institutions have been constructed almost in every woreda town.
- The number of universities in the country, which had been confined to large towns, has grown into 30 from 2 when the government had come to power, and this has happened in almost every region.
- Inevitably, the construction of schools, technical and vocational training institutions and universities has led to a swift increase in student enrollment at all levels.
- Most Ethiopians, including those in remote areas, have got equal access to education.
- The affirmative action to encourage girls to come to school has worked very well, and consequently, the gap in enrollment between boys and girls at all levels has been narrowed, etc.

Unfortunately, some scholars (e.g., Messay, 2008; Tekeste, 2006; The World Bank, 2005) argue that the current education system possesses several weaknesses. The major weakness of the federal regime education system is reported to be a decline of the quality of education due to:

- The steep rise in pupil-teacher and pupil-section ratios . It is now a common feature for a section at any public secondary school in Ethiopia to have between 75 and 95 students. Sections of up to 100 students each are also common. Surprisingly, this has also been witnessed at our universities as there are instances of instructors offering courses for a class consisting of up to 150 students in what are called ‘lecture halls’,
- Overloadedness of teachers. It is reported to be a common feature for a secondary school teacher to be responsible for eight sections with an average total of about 1,000 students (The World Bank, Ibid),
- Shortage of text books and other teaching materials. The sector is reported to be underfinanced. At times, 5 or more students are forced to share a single textbook,
- Shortage of qualified teachers for every grade level,
- The use of English as medium of instruction. Students are forced to attend classes in the language which they are not good at,
- Unplanned expansion of the sector, and
- Disparity in teacher- student as well as class-student ratios across the regions and between towns and rural areas.

According to Messay (2008), that many primary school graduate students are not able to read is one indicator for the decline of the quality of education. When teachers voice their concern regarding this problem, government officials at different levels reportedly ridicule them. Another measure of the quality problem is the capacity of the sector to provide permanent literacy (primary school) to as many students as possible. While most of the urban children are reported to complete six years of schooling, in the rural areas the rate of completion is reported to be at the most 30 per cent.

The federal government is criticized for not having invested enough in infrastructure and teachers. The combination of too few teachers and too few classrooms has led, according to a World Bank study, to a serious deterioration of pedagogical conditions. The government’s assumption that the recruitment of unqualified teachers and the introduction of cheap

construction materials would free sufficient funds to be used to reduce the dangerously high pupil-teacher and pupil-section ratios seemed to have added fuel to the quality problem.

The World Bank study argues that the standards for teacher recruitment and school construction do not take into account budget constraints. According to Tekeste (2006), once teacher recruitment and school construction are haphazardly made, there will be budget cutbacks from elsewhere that eventually compromise the ability to provide effective services. This has led, among other things, to a large number of teachers who do not meet the certification standards, and very limited spending on school administration and other pedagogical resources.

The other problem with the current education system is that there is a tendency of the education system to produce graduates that cannot be absorbed by the economy. This tendency, as Alamirew (2005) argues, and as the present researcher also feels, seems to be one of the causes for the loss of interest of parents to send their children to school, and of the children to attend lessons seriously. It is very common in almost every city (at the reach of the present researcher) to find university graduates whose hopes to get employed have disappeared, and as a result, have resorted to harbor their dissatisfaction under the heavens they create by taking some drugs. Looking at those jobless university graduates, many students are quitting their education and are migrating to the Middle East in search of jobs. Officials might say that these graduates are not able to create their own jobs. One might wonder where this dissatisfaction would go.

Even worse, many teachers mainly those assigned at elementary and junior secondary schools have been complaining that their salaries could not help them to fulfill even their basic survival needs. As a result, it has become very common to hear about many teachers leaving their jobs and migrating to the Middle East to live a better life, perhaps by being herdsmen. One could go to the North Wollo zone and check how many teachers are running away from their duties.

The other bottleneck in the present education system is allegedly reported to be the impact of the use of English as medium of instruction (The present researcher couldn't find any research evidence indicating the supremacy of learning in the mother tongue rather than in

an L2). Although the alleged problem of using English as a medium of instruction is said to have been understood even during the imperial period, the federal state has been criticized for not doing enough to confront the decline of the quality of education, mainly arising from the lack of proficiency in English among Ethiopian teachers.

The pressure on the government to deal with the issue of quality of education in general and the quality of English as medium of instruction on the other came not only from people outside the state such as parents, academics, journalists, but even more so from the teachers as well as the regional education bureaus. For instance, since 2003 the regional states of Oromiya and Tigray have used only Oromiffa and Tigrinya respectively as mediums of instruction in grades 7 and 8. Textbooks for second cycle primary schools (grades 7 and 8) are still written in English but subjects are taught in the regional languages. The reasons appear to be clear. The teachers working in these regions lack proficiency to teach in English. Both teachers and students found themselves in a vicious circle. The students could not follow their studies in English because their knowledge of English was poor and the teachers could not help their students since they themselves were not good at it.

On the other hand, the growth in the use of vernaculars for instruction after 1994 might have further weakened the position and status of English among teachers and students. The English language proficiency of Ethiopian students was reportedly further affected by the expansion of the secondary school sector which forced unqualified teachers to teach in English. By the way, these days, our universities are not graduating English Language teaching professionals in a bachelor degree level. What is happening is, universities are graduating students in applied disciplines, like applied English. These graduates do not take any teaching methodology courses, but they are assigned as teachers. Could they be teachers without having any training in teaching methodologies? This remains a very difficult question to be answered. The system, as what usually happens in our context, would be changed in the very near future, but those who have already been graduates of the current system would very likely remain teachers.

The Ethiopian government seems to be very well aware of the English language deficiency our students and teachers have. In a view to alleviate this problem, the government has introduced televised teaching (plasma) as a solution. Hence, since the beginning of October

2004, according to Messay (2008), Ethiopian secondary school students follow their lessons via satellite dish. All the secondary schools in the country are equipped with satellite dishes, and plasma screens are installed in each class. Almost all subjects are taught by plasma, and the teachers were no longer required to lecture or even explain in English.

However, teachers and students have been complaining about the plasma lessons because:

- The lectures are read too fast so students have no chance of listening and making notes at the same time.
- A lecture is beamed only once and is not repeated. Students who miss a lecture due to illness or some other causes have no way of listening to the lecture.
- Most of the lectures (with some exceptions) are read by people who are not themselves subject teachers.
- Plasma education is highly dependent on an uninterrupted flow of electric power. Power cuts throughout the country are so common that entire lectures are lost for ever.
- Student and teachers' guides are available on CD-ROMS. But printing and distributing student guides is too costly.
- Secondary school students have great difficulties to read, write and above all to listen to spoken English. Tekeste (2006) concludes from a sample survey he had conducted indicated strongly that the proficiency is extremely low.
- Student dissatisfaction appears to gain momentum day by day as many students find it more and more difficult to follow their studies.
- The replacement of the teacher by a televised lecture is taking place in a context where the role of the teacher is being continuously eroded.

Above all, as Messay (2008) states, Ethiopia failed to modernize because it chose to base its path on Westernization rather than on the renewal of its traditional values. He argues that modernization through Westernization has been proved to be a failure. If Westernization is a complete replacement of tradition, it could only create citizens who know more about the

West and very little about their country which may eventually lead to ‘rootlessness’ or loss of identity (Ibid).

However, the government has been taking different steps to improve the quality of education. The steps include:

- In collaboration with the public, it is constructing more schools and classes to reduce class size.
- It has allowed the construction of more private schools.
- It has tried to improve the qualification of teachers through summer in-service and distance training programmes.
- In collaboration with partners, it has introduced different English language improvement packages to improve the skill and proficiency of the teachers.

2.3. THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN ETHIOPIAN EDUCATION

It is well documented that the English language was introduced into the Ethiopian education system about a century ago with the opening of the first secular school in 1908. However, one could guess that there were people who could speak English some 50 years or so before during the reign of emperor Tewodros because during that time there were English service men in Tewodros’ palace. Later, the emperor arrested these men at Meqdela, an action which angered the British so bitterly that they came to attack Tewodros, an incident which forced him to commit suicide. Also, through out Tewodros’ reign, there were letter exchanges between Tewodros and Queen Victoria.

Starting from the opening of the first modern school, English has been used as a medium of instruction in Ethiopian schools though the grade level in which it started to function as a medium of instruction has been varied. Besides, it has been taught as a subject in its own sometimes starting from grade one and KG’s and at other times from grade three. As reports indicate (Tekeste, 2006), English, more than any other foreign language, was favored after the expulsion of the Italians in 1941. This was because the British were instrumental in the defeat of the Italians by Ethiopians.

Obviously, English plays very important roles in the day to day activities of Ethiopians and foreigners who reside in Ethiopia. It is the language of many international organizations like

the OAU. Also, it has been the medium of communication in several international meetings, political as well as business, which are hosted in Ethiopia. Moreover, it is a language of many national organizations like banks, insurances, and the Ethiopian Air Lines. Above all, as indicated earlier, it has been serving as a medium of instruction starting from, in most cases, grade seven and through higher education. This means our students' English language proficiency greatly determines their academic and professional success. Most of the reference books, journals and other pedagogic resources in our libraries are available in English. And the currently practiced education through plasma programme for preparatory school students is almost totally transferred in English. Very surprisingly, even those students who are majoring in national languages, like Amharic literature, are in most cases forced to read sources written in English. In other words, knowledge is available for us mainly in English. Finally, with the coming of the internet, we cannot help but communicate in English using our mobile phones and computers.

Although the English language is of immense importance to Ethiopians, and although the language has a relatively long history in Ethiopian education, it has been reported by several researchers that the English language proficiency of our students has been declining. The problem is reported to be serious at all levels of schooling-primary, secondary, and higher institutions. The decision to improve the proficiency of English through plasma teaching might be taken as one proof of the seriousness. A recent study on English reading skills in Ethiopian primary schools found that students at the end of the second cycle of primary education can hardly read in English. What is worse, these students are expected to continue their studies in English as English changes from a class subject to be the medium of instruction in secondary schools. It is also very widely documented that Ethiopian university level students possess very poor English proficiency in general and writing skills abilities in particular. Several studies even go to the point that many of our university students are not able to produce a single grammatically correct sentence (Tesfaye, 1995; Geremew, 1999; Italo, 1999; Alamirew, 2005; Haregewoin, 2008). Discussing this disappointingly poor English proficiency of our university students, Haregewoin (2008:25) laments as:

In spite of the fact that English was taught for three semesters [College English I, College English II, and Sophomore English] as a service course, the language proficiency of Addis Ababa University students is very disappointing.

Many English language and other subject instructors have been complaining about the deterioration of university students' ability to use English for their studies.

Italo (1999), on his part, points out that our university students are unable to express themselves in correct and clear English. According to him:

In most cases, their [our university students'] essays may have to be read again and again to make out meaning, or the teacher/reader has to put (??) on the students' essays and paragraphs to indicate to the student with that what he/she has written makes no sense or not clear the problem is serious and multifaceted(P.8).

As Italo notes, the students' writings are unsatisfactory both in content and form. Besides, the writings lack cohesion and are full of lexical and mechanical errors. Today, after a decade or so of Italo's inquiry, we are witnessing many university students who are able to hardly spell their own names in English. One may come across many students at our universities who could not name very elementary words in English (e.g., classroom furniture, family words, etc).

Researchers attribute this problem to several factors like large class size, lack and /or absence of different teaching materials, references, shortage of qualified and motivated teachers, application of traditional teaching methodologies (including traditional error correction practices), lack of background at lower grades, etc (Gebremedhin, 1993, Italo,1999; Tekeste, 2006;Haregewoin, 2008). The other reason often mentioned as a major cause for the poor English language proficiency of Ethiopian students are 'blind' reforms of the education policies, i.e., reforms undertaken simply to satisfy political and/or economic objectives, not the needs of the larger society (Tekeste, 2006). And at present, the fact that the credit hours allotted for common English courses at universities are not stable (currently the credit hours are reduced from 9 to 6) seems to have added fuel to the problem. The credit hours and the naming of the courses (including Sophomore English) are changed from year to year. This has resulted in the absence of permanent modules and textbooks for the courses, which might have largely puzzled and frustrated many English language teachers and students.

Although there is a growing concern about the decline in the English language proficiency of Ethiopian students, it still has remained to be the second official language of the country (Alamirew, 2005); in fact, English has been part of the daily activities of Ethiopians at different walks of life. Due to this, private English language training centers have become very common in several towns across the country.

Understanding the crucial role English has in the lives of Ethiopians, the government, in collaboration with its development partners, has been taking several steps to improve the English language proficiency of Ethiopian students at different levels. For example, not long ago, about 16,000 primary school English language teachers were provided with distance based English language improvement trainings. Also, English Language Improvement Centers (ELIC's) have been made functional in the universities and colleges across the country. These centers (in which the present researcher himself has served as a coordinator) offer English language improvement trainings both for instructors of different disciplines and university students. Furthermore, there was a training programme called KELT (Key English Language Trainers) which was designed to train some key English language teachers who later could train their colleagues back at schools and higher institutions, although the question of have we utilized these trainers remains to be answered.

More recently, the USAID, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education, has launched what is called Teaching English for Life Learning (TELL) which is an English language instruction improvement program aimed at training teachers in reading strategies consistent with the new English language textbooks (Smith et al, 2012). This is basically a nationwide in-service teacher-training program and has introduced new English textbooks and teacher guides. Like the KELT, the TELL program initially trained a group of master trainers who then went to each of the regions. These Trainers of Teachers then trained over 71,000 primary school teachers in the new teaching methodologies during a 4-day in-service training. Very recently, the US embassy has organized a national workshop at Ambo University involving different stake holders in a view to enhance the quality of English language teaching in Ethiopia (Institute of International Education (IIE) (2012).

However, whether all these measures were taken based on recommendations and contributions of specialists in English language teaching or they were simply politically and/or economically motivated needs to be answered. Any way, as English is of immense importance to us, we need to investigate better ways to improve the proficiency of our students in the language in general and their writing skills proficiency in particular. This is because our students' success, especially at the higher institutions, is determined by their ability to show their knowledge in writing. That was what prompted this study.

2.4. SUMMARY

In this chapter, it has been indicated that Ethiopia possesses a very long history of (as of the 4th century A.D.) traditional education which was dominated by its Orthodox Church. The medium of instruction for this traditional education has been Geez-a language which is no longer spoken today although it still is a liturgical language. The objective of this education system was mainly religious and the methodology employed for teaching and learning focused on memorization. This education system has made Ethiopia perhaps the only country in Africa which uses its own alphabets for writing. It also has helped the transmission of the country's history from generation to generation.

Later, towards the end of the 19th century, it was found that the traditional type of education could no longer serve the needs of the society at the time. There came a need of education which could involve Ethiopians from the different walks of life, gender and religion. Also, the need for education which could solve the real life problems of Ethiopians became evident. Besides, the need for educated Ethiopians who could run the bureaucracy in the country and who could help the country communicate with the outside world demanded a different education system. This led to the opening of the first secular (modern) school in Ethiopia in 1908.

The attempt to expand modern school faced different obstacles, however. The first obstacle was the opposition from the church. The other major obstacle which halted modern education in Ethiopia was the country's invasion by the Italians (1935-41). The invaders destroyed most of the schools and exterminated most of the educated Ethiopians who could have taken over the task of smoothly taking the country's education into modernization.

The task of rebuilding the damaged schools and building new ones was very challenging for the war ravaged and illiterate country. Also, the sector faced acute shortage of Ethiopian teachers which led it to be almost exclusively dependent on expatriate teachers. This made the Ethiopian education system be a copy of western practices rather than basing itself on the country's values which were at the center of the traditional education system. In addition to its inaccessibility to the majority of Ethiopians, the education system was functioning in a situation where there were no job opportunities to absorb those Ethiopians who could complete secondary schools. This had added to the dissatisfaction of many educated Ethiopians who rose to overthrow the imperial rule at beginning of the seventies.

When the military took power in 1974, it promised a lot of changes in the education system which it considered to have been feudalistic serving only the minority elites. It attempted to expand education to the rural Ethiopian society. In a view to decrease the illiteracy rate of the country (more than 90% at that time), it devised what was called an illiteracy campaign for which most of the educated Ethiopians were moved to rural areas for 2 years. .

However, the regime's effort to cleanse all the practices of the imperial rule and to replace them with new practices and ideologies was again found to be fatal for the already sickening education system. All Ethiopian children, coming from more than 80 ethnic backgrounds, were still forced to learn in Amharic. As the military was engaged in different wars, most of the country's budget was directed to the battle fields. Further, most secondary school graduates were left unemployed. Owing to all these, many educated Ethiopians rose against the regime. Faced with such an opposition, the military waged red terror which claimed the lives of tens of thousands of educated Ethiopians.

When the current federal government took power in 1991, it issued its own education and training policy. This policy, in addition to expanding education to rural Ethiopia, introduced a new agenda of allowing children to learn in their mother tongues. Besides, it expanded technical and vocational training institutions for those students who leave schools before joining universities. Moreover, in a view to fairly distribute resources, the government constructed universities in almost all the regions.

Nevertheless, like the preceding systems, the current education system has again been facing some problems. Of these problems is reported to be the decline in the quality of education. The rapid increase in student enrollment at all levels has led to shortage of teachers and classrooms, and this in turn, has resulted in a swift rise in student-teacher and teacher-classroom ratios. The other major cause for the decline in the quality of the current education is reported to be the decline of the English language proficiency of teachers and students.

Quite obviously, the English language plays very crucial roles in the lives of many Ethiopians and foreigners who live in Ethiopia: as an instructional language starting from lower grades, as an official language in many international and national organizations, as a language of scholarship and study abroad, as a language through which many Ethiopians exchange information about the world through different media, as a language in which several Ethiopians lead their lives by guiding lots of international tourists, etc.

Despite the fact that English plays a very crucial role in the lives of millions of Ethiopians, and that efforts have been made to provide quality English language education, it has been reported that the English language proficiency of our students has been getting worse and worse. Different parties blame each other for this problem. Whatever the cause might be (the governments, students themselves, schools, teachers, etc), the problem is immensely serious. Therefore, what should we English teachers do to alleviate this problem? Obviously, pointing our fingers at someone has proved to be futile. Perhaps better may be conducting classroom researches and coming up with workable recommendations. Focusing on different issues related to the provision of corrective feedback, this study is hoped to contribute its own for the betterment of our English language pedagogy.

CHAPTER THREE: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, an attempt was made to review the literature related with the topic of this study. In order to address the main traits included in the title of this project, the chapter to be discussed was composed of three broad sections. In the first section, some major issues surrounding the teaching and learning of a foreign and/or foreign language writing skills were discussed. In the second section, different points central to the teaching and learning of

L2 grammar were reviewed. The last section attempted to review and discuss issues related with the provision of corrective feedback on L2 students' written grammatical errors.

3.1. The Writing Skills

This first section attempted to review some basic points related to the learning and teaching of EFL writing skills. In doing so, complexity of learning and teaching EFL writing skills, the importance of learning the EFL writing skills, historical developments in the teaching of EFL writing instruction, approaches to the teaching of EFL writing, and current trends in the teaching of EFL writing were briefly reviewed.

3.1.1. Complexity of Learning and Teaching L2 Writing Skills

It has been noted that learning to write especially in a second and/ or foreign language is an extremely daunting task. This is so because of several reasons. As Leki (2001) and Byrne (1991) note, writing is difficult because it is devoid of contextual features for immediate feedback from a reader. In addition, the fact that good writing requires knowledge of sentence construction as well as graphic representation adds to the complexity. Moreover, it is reported by many that successful written text must incorporate sophisticated structures for maintaining both cohesion and coherence so that readers can be taken smoothly from one section to the other.

That developing writing skills in a second and/or foreign language is a very complex task is indicated by Hayland & Hayland (2006) as:

L2 writers obviously work within a complex context, where language proficiency, diverse cultural expectations, new teacher-learner experiences, and different writing processes can interact in significant ways with the cognitive demands of interpreting feedback and negotiating revisions.

It is also documented that the development of writing skills, unlike speech, is culturally and educationally constrained (Harmer, 2004). Rate of development depends to a large extent on both availability of instruction and degree of practice. Because of this, it is reported that high ability in writing in L2 is achieved by only a small minority of people and only after upwards of 20 years of practice (Myles, 2002). In fact, as Harmer (2004) states, the ability to write well is not a naturally acquired skill; it is usually learned or culturally transmitted as

a set of practices in formal instructional settings or other environments. Writing skills must be practiced and learned through experience.

According to Snow (2007), the difficulty during writing lies not only in generating and organizing ideas, but also in translating these ideas into a readable text. This writer states that the skills involved in writing are highly complex; L2 writers have to simultaneously pay attention to higher level skills of planning and organizing as well as lower level skills of spelling, punctuation, word choice, and so on. The difficulty becomes even more pronounced if their language proficiency is weak.

Not only is writing complex to learn, it also is reported to be a challenging task for teachers to teach. Regarding this point, Snow (2007: 150) states, “Writing is probably the skill that local English teachers are most hesitant to teach.” This on the one hand is due to the amount of workload of going through to respond to learners’ writing and on the other to the difficulty of making a decision on whether what a student wrote is right or wrong.

Owing to these reasons, the development of writing skills needs assistance from someone who possessed a better writing proficiency than the learner. This assistance becomes more essential when it comes to the learning of L2 writing skills. The assistance is usually channeled in the form of corrective feedback-written or spoken.

3.1.2. Importance of the Writing Skills

According to Mulamba (1993), as quoted by Italo (1999:8), “Writing is a skill through which, in most cases, the student has to prove to the teacher or examiner how well he/she learnt the subject. Students’ success largely depends on their mastery over writing in academic setting.” This quotation implies that the ability of writing in a second language (especially in English) determines the fate of university students in most academic contexts.

Writing in a second language renders other multidimensional benefits (Byrne, 1991; Grami, 2005; Leki, 2001). According to Grami (2005), writing is amongst the most prominent skills that language learners need to learn as an essential component of their academic practice and later on in their professional life. It is obvious that writing does not reside only in the classroom. The need for well-organized, successful writing can be seen almost everywhere: writing a formal letter to your supervisor, a casual letter to a friend, a poem, a short

memorandum, etc are all examples of writing. In a nut shell, the need for acceptable writing is found in about all everyday life practices.

More over, most academic endeavors towards a higher hierarchy (beyond the university) require publishing in a foreign language, most often in English. It seems that being able to write in English gives a visa to get access into a global audience. It, therefore, seems a question of survival that one needs to be able to write in English as part of his/her professional career.

Above all, there are scholars who take writing as a fundamental right. Harmer (2004: 3) quotes Tribble (1997) to state that, “to be deprived of the opportunity to learn to write is to be excluded from a wide range of social roles, including those which the majority of people in industrialized societies associate with power and prestige.”

In addition to these, Krashen & Lee (in press) strongly argue that writing makes one smarter. According to these authors:

When we write something down on the page, we make a representation of our thoughts, of our cognitive structures. Once on the page, the brain finds it irresistible to come up with a better version of our cognitive structures. Improving our cognitive structures is real learning.

Likewise, the National Council of Teachers of English (2008) makes a point about the importance of writing more today than in the past by stating :

... we write more than in the past. Technological advances, changing workplace demands, and cultural shifts make writing more important than ever, especially because the way we write often predicts academic and/or job success, creates opportunities for civic participation, maintains relationships, and enhances critical thinking. (p.1).

According to this group, writing acts as a gatekeeper and weak writing skills entail failure at schools, limit job opportunities, and cripple opportunities to advance into better positions.

Crandall (2006), in a similar fashion, argues for the necessity of including writing in our EFL classes because he believes that writing is a form of output (i.e., a means of

demonstrating what we know), a means of building fluency (e.g., through writing journals, letters or e mails) , a way of developing accuracy (providing an opportunity for monitoring appropriate forms and noticing the gaps, providing opportunities for contextualized instruction, allowing for targeted feedback in grammar, vocabulary, etc.), thinking made evident, a critical skill for academic or professional success, and a source of input providing reading materials at the learners' proficiency level, etc.

So far, it has been reviewed above that: learning to write in a second and/or foreign language is a highly difficult task; the ability to write in a second language is not acquired naturally, rather it is a result of an instructional process which is basically conscious; and being able to write in an L2, particularly in English, provides several advantages. The fact that the ability to write in an L2 is developed through instruction implies that L2 teachers have a role to play in developing these writing skills. Obviously, one of the crucial contributions L2 writing teachers can render for their students is the assistance they give in the form of corrective feedback (CF). Therefore, L2 writing teachers, like the EFL writing teachers in our country, are required to possess innovative ways of providing CF.

3.1.3. Writing: The Neglected Skill

Different sources indicate that a large part of the history of language teaching had been dominated by the belief in the supremacy of the oral skills while the writing skills were used only as supplements to teach the oral skills. Until very recently, to ask someone if he/she could communicate in a certain language, the question has been, "Do you speak....?" The present researcher hasn't come across someone asking, "Do you write....?".

According to Crandall (2006), EFL teachers quite often ignore teaching the writing skills because of the pretexts that they are engaged in teaching large class sizes, that there is not enough time for writing, that beginners couldn't write anything, and that they themselves are not good writers, and thus, could not teach writing.

The National Council of Teachers of English (2008), on its part, argues that writing instruction needs to help students meet the challenges of writing effectively for many purposes. However, this council seems angry about the fact that the time devoted to writing instruction and research focusing on writing evaluation have both decreased in the last ten years though the fact on the ground shows a growing demand for good writers which

requires more time and attention devoted to writing instruction and assessment in order to prepare all students for a changing world.

In the context of our country, similar trends of relegating writing lessons have been reported by many researchers (Italo, 1999). This seems to have contributed for the prevalence of a predominantly oral society (Alamirew, 2005) which our country is having.

Given the fact that writing skills play very prominent roles for the success of students at different levels, that the ability to write in most professions is a privilege, and that, more than any other time in the past, writing has become the engine of the modern days social life, we would argue that the skill should be given equal emphasis to other skills in different language teaching scenarios.

3.1.4. Approaches to the Teaching of EFL Writing

According to Mukminatien (2008), making a historical overview of L2 writing is of immense importance to develop meaningful second language scholarship, especially for novice researchers and L2 writing practitioners. This is because as Matsuda (2003) believes, an exploration of this specialized field would help identify what issues have been discussed, what questions have been posed, what solutions have been devised, and what consequences have come of those solutions and why. Matsuda (2003), Silva (1990) and other scholars seem to agree that historical inquiry of L2 writing emerged around 1990.

According to Matsuda (2003), Silva (1990), and Tsang & Wong (1995), like what had happened for other language skills, at times, the teaching of L2 writing skills was under the orientation of traditional language teaching methods. These traditional approaches to the teaching of ESL writing have been concerned with usage, structure or accurate form of the written product. However, influenced by discussion of L1 process writing in the 1970s, some ESL writing researchers and teachers began to criticize the focus on the production of accurate grammatical sentence structures in writing. It has become to be understood that the emphasis on form was detrimental to the composing process. Delgado (2007) discusses this shift in theory and practice in L2 writing pedagogy as follows.

The main goal in L2 writing before the 1970's was error correction and grammar instruction as mirrored by theories of structural linguistics and behavioral psychology Then, towards the end of the 1970's, L2 researchers became highly concerned with ways in which L2 can be acquired naturally. This new turn questioned the efficacy of form-focus instruction in language acquisition. During the 1980's, L2 writing practices shifted focus from accuracy to the process of writing and the steps students go through during writing.(p.4)

As Tsang & Wong (1995) note, the shift of ESL writing pedagogies from the implementation of language-based writing classes until the 1970s to the introduction and gradual development of writing programs involving the process concept starting from the late 1970's is well documented.

Again, these new approaches to the teaching of L2 writing came under attack for some theoretical and practical reasons. And currently, eclectic approaches which combine a focus on form as well as meaning are recommended.

In an attempt to draw a historical sketch of the approaches to L2 writing instruction, Silva (1990) has come up with four most dominant approaches: (1) Controlled Composition; (2) Current-Traditional Rhetoric; (3) the Process Approach, and (4) English for Specific Purposes. All the approaches address four basic characters during writing: the writer, the reader, the text, and the context. What makes the approaches different from one another is the way they regard each of these four basic elements in L2 writing instruction.

Controlled composition had been an approach to writing when the second language pedagogy was under the influence of audiolingualism. During that time the idea was that language is speech (from structural linguistics) and that learning is habit formation (from behaviorist psychology). Thus, within this tradition, writing is regarded essentially as reinforcement for oral habits and as a secondary concern. Emphasis is given for the practice of previously learned discrete units of language (i.e., structure and vocabulary) rather than for ideas, organization and style.

In the controlled composition classroom the primary focus is on formal accuracy. The teacher employs controlled writing activities which are designed to form correct habits;

there is an attempt to avoid errors. Overall, in the controlled composition tradition, writing functions as a service activity, reinforcing other language skills.

Later, towards the middle of the 1960's, the need for an extended discourse, above the sentence level, became apparent. This dissatisfaction with sentence level writing has led to an approach known as the current-traditional rhetoric. This approach is similar to the controlled composition approach in that it also emphasizes form over the expression of ideas. However, unlike the previous approach, this later one focuses on text organization above a sentence level. As Silva (1990) observes, in this approach, writing is “a matter of arrangement” (p. 13), and students have to learn how to identify and use prescribed patterns. The basic concern in this tradition was the logical construction and arrangement of discourse forms. Of primary interest, was the paragraph, where the focus was on its elements (for example, topic sentences, supporting details, and concluding sentences). There was also an interest to instruct learners to attend to different options of paragraph development (for example, comparison and contrast, illustration, cause and effect, etc.). Because of this emphasis on different paragraph development patterns, this approach is otherwise called the paragraph pattern approach. There was also a concern for essay development, actually an extrapolation of paragraph principles to complete texts. This involved larger structural entities (for example, introductions) and organizational patterns or modes (for example, exposition, description, narration and argumentation).

The controlled composition and the current traditional rhetoric approaches to L2 writing instruction could be taken as product –oriented approaches as their emphasis is on the final correctly reproduced student writing. Formal accuracy rather than expression of ideas is the focus. In essence, they most often are limited to classroom contexts and their audiences are the writing teachers.

The process approach is a result of an attempt to reduce the emphasis on the formal aspect of writing and to enlarge the context and the audience of writing. Different from controlled composition and current-traditional rhetoric, this approach focuses on writers and the process they undergo while composing written texts. Furthermore, writing is thought to

convey meaning and is a complex, recursive, and creative process (Silva, 1990). Rather than simply focusing on accuracy, the process approach aims at developing students' composing process in a holistic fashion.

Tsang & Wong (1995) in this connection state that process-based writing pedagogies are concerned with the 'writing process' or 'the act of writing', and process approaches help students become more aware that writing is by its nature a process and that there are different processes for different kinds of writing. In process approach orientations, writing is often viewed as a process of discovery in which ideas are generated and not just transcribed.

Towards the mid 1980's, however, scholars started to question the applicability of the process concept in all kinds of writing instruction. Horowitz (1986) was one of those who criticized the process concept. Horowitz and others hold that the process approach has some basic limitations like:

- It is not able to prepare students for some kinds of academic writing tasks, for instance, examination writing.
- The approach simplifies the writing process as a set of procedures for all writing tasks with a disregard for formal aspects of writing and problem-solving skills required by different genres of writing. In this sense, a major criticism of process writing is that it does not provide sufficient guidance or support for second language students, and, therefore, does not help them develop control of the rhetorical patterns and grammatical patterns of a range of genres.

Casanave (1994), as cited by Tsang & Wong (1995), investigated the efficacy of the process approach in developing L2 proficiency and reported that there was no noticeable improvement in grammatical accuracy. One of the reasons attributed to this, as suggested in the study, was that as students became more relaxed and wrote more fluently and thoughtfully, the grammatical accuracy of the writing of some of them decreased. In other words, as ESL students may still be in the process of acquiring language skills, a totally grammarless approach can lead to the development of a broken, ungrammatical, pidginized form of the target language beyond which students rarely progress.

The dissatisfaction with the process approach to L2 writing instruction has led to the emergence of the English for specific purposes/ a genre approach/. This approach, similar to the process approach, is concerned with the production of writing within a specific context and is directed to pre-defined readers. While the former approach aims at wider contexts and audiences, the latter is characterized by specific targets: e.g., the context may be the academic or the business world, and the audience may be the members of the academic community or business people. As English for Specific Purposes aims at enabling students to produce written texts that will be accepted by experts in their fields, courses based on this approach try to have students practice genres commonly required in their future jobs.

Silva (1990) notes that none of these approaches is totally appropriate to teach writing. This is because of the fact that all of the orientations fail to encompass all four basic elements that should be integrated into any approach to writing instruction i.e., the writer, the audience, the text, and the context. As we have seen, each approach tends to emphasize a specific aspect, thus neglecting the interaction between the four elements in the L2/FL writing context.

3.1.5. Current Trends in Composition Instruction

According to the National Council of Teachers of English (2008), it is almost unrealistic to try to find a single approach to writing instruction that will be effective with every learner having diverse backgrounds and learning styles and thus responding differently to various approaches. Besides, according to this council, today's students will face varied writing demands in the future. Owing to all these, writing instructional practices, writing genres and assessments should be holistic, authentic, and varied.

Approaching writing holistically acknowledges that writing instructions should incorporate many different facets of writing that have traditionally been taught in isolation, including grammar, syntax, spelling, mechanics, and even stages in the writing process. Teaching many of these facets in context is believed to be very effective. Current research suggests that a holistic approach to instruction and assessment will give students the tools they need to develop as writers. A holistic approach sees writing as a multidirectional and multifaceted activity.

In addition, approaching writing holistically disfavors isolated grammar instruction. An exclusive focus on grammar instruction and grammar-related assessments can distract students and teachers from the entire range of features that constitute effective writing (The Council of Teachers of English, 2008). According to this council, explicit teaching of grammar using a context-based functional approach, which focuses on how words, phrases, and sentences work together, to make meaning, can help basic writers improve their writing. Besides, employers who place high value on accuracy, clarity, and usage in workplace writing greatly value rhetorical features such as persuasive appeals to a real audience. Finally, this approach acknowledges writing as a process, but as a flexible process.

Calling for an eclectic approach to writing instruction, Raimes (1983) asserts that there is no one answer to the question of how writing should be taught, and she states that teachers should implement a teaching approach which is responsive to learners' needs. In the same manner, Abismara (2003) recommends a marriage of the techniques of the product-oriented approach with the techniques of the process-oriented approach. The essence, thus, seems that we should basically use a process approach that borrows strategies and techniques which belong to the product-oriented approach.

According to Abismara (2003), writing teachers should endeavor to train their students in both skill getting (form) and skill using (function), which is one of the most challenging tasks in EFL writing instruction. According to her, our students should be helped to be effective writers who own their writing; teachers should train their students in the different processes of writing including editing.

In general, researchers have recently recognized language form as an important component of L2 writing instruction. It is recommended that when engaging students in the process of composing, ESL composition teachers should not adopt strategies that disregard students' linguistic competencies. To balance what students should learn in a writing class, important features of writing such as syntax, vocabulary, and rhetorical form should be taught as means with which to express one's meaning in a better way. The trend is, therefore, that L2 writers need to enrich their knowledge of linguistic resources in L2. There should thus be a two-fold aim for the teaching of L2 composition: improvement of writing strategies and expansion of linguistic knowledge in L2 (Snow, 2007; Tsang & Wong, 1995).

3.2. TEACHING L₂ GRAMMAR

The Free Online Encyclopaedia defines grammar as, “description of the structure of a language, consisting of the sounds; the meaningful combinations of these sounds into words or parts of words, called morphemes; and the arrangement of the morphemes into phrases and sentences, called syntax.” Crystal (2004) as cited by Nordquist (2013), on his part, defines grammar as the structural foundation of our ability to express ourselves. As to Crystal:

The more we are aware of how it[grammar] works, the more we can monitor the meaning and effectiveness of the way we and others use language. It can help foster precision, detect ambiguity, and exploit the richness of expression available in English. And it can help everyone--not only teachers of English, but teachers of anything, for all teaching is ultimately a matter of getting to grips with meaning (Online).

The present study, from its conception, has taken this central role of grammar as one of its motives. Having this in mind, in this section, an attempt was made to review some points regarding the teaching of L₂ grammar. The section provides a brief review of historical developments about the teaching of L₂ grammar, arguments on the teaching of L₂ grammar, and approaches to the teaching of L₂ grammar.

3.2.1. The Arguments on Grammar Teaching

Along the history of second language teaching, the role of grammar has been an issue of controversy, and according to some writers, it has been the most controversial (Mukminatien, 2008). It is documented that no other issue has so preoccupied theorists and practitioners as the grammar debate. It is also evident that the debate has brought about an extreme split of attitudes, namely, those who hold that grammar should receive a central attention in language teaching and those who hold that grammar should not be taught at all.

The argument by supporters of the grammar should be taught position is that grammar knowledge offers the learner the means for potentially unlimited linguistic creativity (which is termed as the sentence-making machine function). Since grammar is a description of the

regularities in language, knowledge of these regularities can function as a machine to generate a potentially enormous number of sentences.

In addition to this sentence-making machine argument, many scholars argue that knowledge of grammar is also important because it can function as an advance organizer. Advance organizer is reported to play a crucial role in the process of acquisition because the learners with grammar knowledge will consciously organize and notice the input exposed to them. This does not happen to the learners with no grammar knowledge. Items being more noticeable seem to stick and, otherwise, will be gone unnoticed. For this reason, they confirm that noticing is prerequisite for acquisition since it can make the exposed input stay better and accelerate the process of acquisition. Conscious grammar knowledge, according to this argument, not only functions to monitor the speakers' own utterances, but also to notice the language input exposed to them.

Wang (2010) argues that language in general is a sum total of grammar because it is the different features of grammar which make a language meaningful. According to Wang:

.... contemporary linguists all agree that language consists of sound, lexicon and grammar, and these three elements influence each other, have interaction and constitute the material basis of the whole language system, i.e., the content of language can be expressed through sound, while sound has to use lexicon and grammar to achieve its function; grammar is the sound, structure, and meaning system of language, and only through the grammar can sound and lexicon form meaningful language system (p.78).

Because of this fact, linguists seem to argue that grammar is a very important part in a language system. A complete language system cannot be constituted without grammar. Wang (2010) takes grammar analogous with a frame of a house; as good materials and building blocks without a frame cannot constitute a good house, language without grammar would be chaotic, “countless words without the indispensable guidelines for how they can be ordered and modified.” (p.78). For Chomsky (1965), as cited by Wang (2010), grammar can be thought of as a theory of a language. Thus, for foreign language teachers, grammar is an indispensable part in language teaching.

Wang (2010) argues that we should teach L2 grammar because of many reasons. To begin with, language is a sum total of its components. In addition, grammar is the standard through which people can exhibit their mastery of the target language. Further, foreign language learning environments (unlike second language learning environments) necessitate the teaching of grammar. Above all, linguistic competence is part of the requirements for communicative competence.

As to Wang (2010), linguistics is the basis of foreign language teaching. The formulation of the principles of foreign language teaching, the design of teaching methods and the choice of teaching methods should be associated with the feature of language.

Proponents of the against-grammar position, on the other hand, argue that the goal of language learning is to develop the communication skills. Like other skills, language skills should also be mastered through experiential learning or learning by doing, instead of cognitive learning. This, called the knowledge-how argument, is in line with the argument of the acquisition process. Krashen (1985) introduced two distinct processes of language-rule accomplishment- conscious learning process and subconscious acquisition process. Based on Krashen's hypothesis, consciously-learned grammar can only function as monitoring, instead of productive ability. Productive ability, like speaking, can only be accomplished through natural exposure to comprehensible inputs. As to this hypothesis, monitoring overuse will only disturb the flow of production. Consequently, this group holds that formal and conscious study of grammar should be rejected if the objective of learning the language is productive competence. Krashen (2004) contends even to the extent that conscious learning of rules might result in temporary gains, which might disappear after about two months.

In general, most scholars in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) seem to have come to an agreement about the crucial role grammar plays in second and/or foreign language teaching and learning. In fact, Krashen's argument for a zero grammar language classrooms seems a bit irrational as it doesn't consider actual L2 classrooms with constrained input. Also, this position seems to consider L2 learning to be identical with L1 acquisition. More over, many L2 learners usually start learning the L2 after they pass what

Krashen himself calls the critical period for language learning. As a result, the argument these days may no more be on whether to teach grammar but on how to teach it.

3.2.2. The Importance of Grammar in Different Language Teaching Methods

Regarding to the emphasis they give for grammar teaching, the Grammar Translation Method and Natural Approach fall on the end of opposite poles, while some other methods are somewhere in between. The Grammar Translation Method places a heavy emphasis on grammar teaching, while the Natural Approach preaches the zero grammar position. There has been a paradigm shift in the teaching of grammar from the totally implicit (zero grammar) to explicit teaching (conscious grammar teaching). The Grammar Translation Method used grammar as the starting point for instruction. The class under this method began with explicit grammar rules presentation, followed by practices involving translation into and out of the students' mother tongue. The syllabus used was structural syllabus (Richards & Rodgers, 1986).

In between the two poles, the Direct Method emerged to challenge the way Grammar Translation Method focused exclusively on written language. This method prioritized oral skills, and, although using structural syllabus, rejected explicit grammar teaching. Students were supposed to acquire grammar simply by being immersed in the language (Larsen-Freeman, 1997).

Similar to the Direct Method, the Audiolingual Method also believed in the primacy of oral skills, and was reported to be even stricter in its rejection to explicit grammar teaching. The students in the Audiolingual Method classroom were supposed to acquire grammar through mechanical drills. The syllabus followed by this method consisted of a graded list of sentence patterns, and thus was a structural syllabus.

Natural Approach and the strong version of Communicative Language Teaching reject explicit grammar instruction. The proponents of the two approaches hold that grammar knowledge should be acquired subconsciously through direct exposure to language in use. In these approaches, the syllabus is not structural but more functional. As different sources indicate, for some time, the notion of communicative competence became synonymous with

a disregard for grammatical accuracy. In the classroom, as a consequence, the emphasis of teaching a second language began to shift away from the teachings of grammar.

However, later some educators began to advise teachers not to see communicative competence as distinct from grammatical competence; for this group of scholars, grammatical competence is one of the pillars which build communicative competence. Canale and Swain (1980), for example, defined communicative competence as consisting of grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence. Furthermore, Wilkins (1976) noted that linguistic forms provide a means to an end and that end is communication. This scholar argues that our knowledge of grammatical systems of language provides us with a means to structure language learning and teaching in a more systematic way.

In addition to that, grammatical competence, as Poniah (2009) states, can have potential contributions to improve the students' productive skills as grammar constitutes a description of the regularities in language which can provide the learners with the means to generate a potentially enormous number of original sentences. As pointed out above, grammar is a kind of sentence-making machine. Poniah cites Thornbury (2000) and states that learners who receive no grammar instruction seem to be at risk of fossilizing sooner than those who do receive instruction.

As a result, in a later development, a weak version of Communicative Language Teaching emerged because of the view that grammar was too important to ignore. This method did not reject grammar teaching. Although functional syllabus was used in this method, grammar was reported to be the main component of the syllabus, even if it was dressed up in functional labels.

To sum, the trend these days is that both accuracy (grammar) and fluency (communicating message) are important in language learning and teaching. Which one to emphasize more might depend on a host of factors like the stage of a lesson (e.g., introduction of a new language item versus using that item for communication), the age and learning style of a learner, the type of language skill being taught, and the objectives of a task, etc. A totally grammarless lesson would, otherwise, be incomplete and lifeless. One could easily judge the

importance of grammar in academic writing classes where both content and form are invariably vital for students' successful accomplishment. Above all, attempting to teach a language without teaching its distinctive features, its structures, would simply be a myth. Now, the question still remains to be not whether to teach grammar or not but how to do it.

3.2.3. Approaches to Grammar Teaching

Methodologists in ELT have noted that there are different approaches to teaching grammar. These include the deductive approach, the inductive approach, the guided discovery approach, the synthesis approach, the covert approach, the overt approach etc. All these could be included under either deductive or inductive approaches. Therefore, this section attempts to review approaches to grammar teaching under two sub-headings: deductive and inductive.

3.2.3.1. Deductive Approach to Grammar Teaching

The deductive approach to grammar teaching, which is often called rule-driven learning, according to Poniah (2009), starts with presentation of rules and is followed with examples. Put another way, this approach, in essence, represents a more traditional style of teaching in that the grammatical structures or rules are dictated to the students first. Thus, the students learn the rule and apply it only after they have been introduced to the rule. The deductive method is said to rely on reasoning, analysing and comparing. It begins with presentation of an example, followed by explanation, and then, the students practice (producing sentences) with given prompts. This approach had been very dominantly used in Grammar Translation Method where teaching begins with presentation of grammar rules and proceeds to practice of the rules involving the translation into and out of the students' first language.

This method has long been abandoned since it has some marked weaknesses like: grammar is taught in an isolated way; little attention is paid to meaning; the practice is often mechanical; it ignores the oral aspect of communication, while putting too heavy emphasis on written language, and it has reportedly made students too exhausted with overwhelming grammatical terms and explanation intended to give the students opportunities to internalize the structure rules just presented to receive and produce language.

However, this approach also has its own merits like: it could be very successful with some motivated students; it could save time when students are confronted with a grammar rule which is complex but which has to be learned; and it may help to increase student's confidence in those examinations which are written with accuracy as the main criterion of success.

Nevertheless, as Ellis (1994) reported, there has not been convincing empirical verification as well as theoretical validation that the acquisition of grammar structures involves the process of learning the rules and practicing them through gradual automatization of production. Krashen (1985) also argues that declarative knowledge (conscious learning) does not come to play a major part in actual communication; it only serves as a monitor. The same line of argument is held by Truscott (1996, 1999, and 2007) as he argues that conscious grammar teaching might simply result in 'pseudo learning'.

However, unlike Ellis (1994), some scholars believe that language learning usually proceeds from declarative to procedural knowledge. These scholars argue that knowledge is first available to the learner in a declarative form, and it later is automatized through continuous exposure and practice accompanied by feedback. This is the pillar of the Skill Acquisition Theory which holds that learning is a result of the interaction of input, the learner's cognitive system and his/her motor system.

In general, it seems that the deductive approach to grammar teaching has received less support than inductive approach (to be reviewed below). Even so, as indicated above, this approach has an advantage of time-saving. Many grammatical rules can be more simply and quickly explained than elicited from examples. In addition, some grammatical items might be more effectively taught using the deductive approach than the inductive one.

3.2.3.2. Inductive Approach to Grammar Teaching

In contrast to deductive approach, inductive approach, which is otherwise called discovery learning, starts with examples from which a rule is inferred (Thornburry, 2001, as cited by Poniah, 2009). In other words, the inductive approach represents a more 'modern' style of teaching where the new grammatical structures or rules are presented to the students in a real language context. The students learn the use of the structure through practice of the

language in context, and later realize the rule from the practical examples. The procedure is similar to the process of children acquiring their mother tongue. First, learners are exposed to comprehensible language input (examples) and they will acquire the system of the rules subconsciously without any form of explicit explanation. This approach assumes learners will acquire language naturally through the process of hypothesis testing cycle.

Brown (1994) says that in most contexts, inductive approach is more appropriate because of several reasons. First, it approximates natural language acquisition, and hence, doesn't disturb process of interlanguage development. Second, it makes learners feel as if they were involved in actual communication by using the target language and builds more intrinsic motivation through discovery learning.

Nevertheless, even though the inductive approach is believed to possess several advantages, it is obvious that it will work well only in contexts where there is sufficient language input. In the context of English as a foreign language like in Ethiopia, where English is not used outside the English class setting, providing sufficient comprehensible input constitutes a hard challenge. Thus, a totally inductive approach might not be a reality.

As indicated above, both the deductive and inductive approaches have their own strengths and limitations; the question on which approach to choose is hard to answer. What is clear is that there are certain grammar items which are very essential to know in order that the learners can communicate meaning successfully. Without the knowledge of these grammar items, it is difficult to make comprehensible sentences. Such linguistic items should be carefully identified which will obviously include basic verb forms, interrogative and negative structures, modal auxiliaries, and the main tenses. However, the list is said to be debatable.

From the above explanation, it is reasonable to infer that grammar items may also determine which approach is appropriate. Some grammar items are more basic than the others and need deductive presentation. Errors on these items will seriously impede the meaning. On the other hand, items which are less basic and have fewer disturbances on communication are more appropriately acquired subconsciously or inductively. In the context of EFL, the two approaches, inductive and deductive can have their own proper place.

3.2.4. Integrating the Teaching of L2 Grammar and Writing

It has been explained above that it is simply a failure to try to teach writing skills in a given language without incorporating the structure of that language in the process. On the other hand, writing is also a very important tool to teach grammar. Writing skills and grammar can be interwoven by employing different mechanisms.

For Chin (2000), sentence combining is one very important facet of grammar which could contribute for the development of writing skills. As students engage in sentence-combining activities, they learn how to vary sentence structure in order to change meaning and style. Hillocks (1986) also shows that the use of sentence combining is an effective method for improving students' writing. The value of sentence combining is most evident as students recognize the effect of sentence variety in their own writing.

Hillocks (1986:150) states, "Sentence combining practice provides writers with systematic knowledge of syntactic possibilities, the access to which allows them to sort through alternatives in their heads as well as on paper and to choose those which are most apt". Research also shows that sentence combining is more effective than free writing in enhancing the quality of student writing.

Studies show that systematic practice in sentence combining can increase students' knowledge of syntactic structures as well as improve the quality of their sentences, particularly when stylistic effects are discussed as well. Hillocks (1986) reports that in many studies, sentence-combining exercises produce significant increases in students' sentence-writing maturity. These exercises also help students develop fluency and variety in their own writing style. Students can explore sentence variety, length, parallelism, and other syntactic devices by comparing their sentences with sentences from other writers.

Teachers can design their own sentence-combining activities by using short sentences from student writing or other appropriate sources. By participating in sentence-combining activities, students better understand the ways in which sentence structure, usage, and punctuation affect meaning. Besides, these kinds of exercises help students identify choppy sentences in their own writing and combine their ideas in more fluid and sophisticated ways.

One other important strategy to incorporate grammar in the writing instruction is to train students to revise and edit their drafts for different aspects. Teachers, for example, can help students edit from passive voice to active voice by presenting a mini-lessons. Another important strategy to integrate grammar and writing instruction is obviously a reactive focus on form by employing different corrective feedback strategies.

3.3. CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK (CF)

In this section, it was attempted to review some issues which are central to the literature of corrective feedback in L2 or FL writing instruction. In doing so, the arguments surrounding corrective feedback, theoretical developments on the study of language learners' errors, the different decisions teachers are expected to make when providing corrective feedback, problems related to teacher written CF, conditions for good CF, measures of accuracy in students' writing, categorization of linguistic errors in students' writings, challenges facing CF studies were discussed in detail. At the end of this section, it was tried to present the theoretical framework of the study.

3.3.1. Attitudes towards L2 Learners' Errors

It has been well documented that educators' attitudes towards errors committed by second and/or foreign language learners have been shifting from time to time. Earlier, there were times at which L2 learners' errors were considered undesirable, and hence, efforts were made to avoid them at any cost. Later, there came scholars who believed that the focus of language teaching should entirely be communication, and thus, errors should be ignored. And more recently, there is a tendency of considering errors as inevitable parts of learning. At the same time, this later view considers correction as an important part of teaching.

3.3.1.1. Errors as Signs of Failure

Throughout the 1950's and the early 1960's, the foreign or second language pedagogy was under the influence of the audiolingual teaching methodology. This methodology, based on the behaviorist learning theory, considered language learning as a formation of correct habits (Wilkins, 1976; Hendrickson, 1978; Brown, 1994; Choon, 1997). To fix correct habits in learners' memory, drills and dialogues were dominantly employed. Language learners were, then, expected to memorize the drills, and then, to reproduce them correctly. According to

proponents of this methodology, errors were seen as indicators of failure, and, “there is a great effort to get students to produce error free utterances,” says Brown (1994:71). It seems that, during that time, errors were considered as ‘crime’, and learners were punished for them.

3.3.1.2. Errors as Signs of Learning

However, towards the late 1960’s, studies in Cognitive Psychology influenced language teaching to become more humanistic (Brown, 1994). As Choon (1997) in this regard states, “Language learning was finally acknowledged to be based on active mental involvement and not new habit formation.” Language learning, according to this Cognitive view, is a creative process involving formulation of hypotheses about language based on some language data already available in the learner’s mind, testing these hypotheses, and then modifying them (Brown, 1994). Here, the process of hypotheses formation and testing may usually be accompanied by the making of errors, and these deviations/errors became to be regarded as natural and necessary parts of learning (Choon, 1997).

The importance of errors for successful second and/ or foreign language learning is acknowledged by Corder (1967), Hendrickson (1978), Norrish (1983), Brown (1994) and Choon (1997).According to Corder (1967), learners’ errors can be important in three ways.

1. They provide the teacher with information about how the learner has learned.
2. They provide the researcher with evidence of how language is learned.
3. They serve as devices by which the learner discovers the rules of the target language.

Similarly, regarding the importance of errors, Choon(1997) states that errors are necessary because:

.....they provide us with relevant information about a learner’s progress. This information might be vital for helping learners with problem, or for making necessary adjustments in the teaching techniques and materials. The learners will also benefit from the various forms of feedback they receive (P.2)

It is very likely that this shift in attitude towards errors made by language learners has brought some changes on the ways teachers react to those errors.

3.3.2. Theoretical Developments around the Study of L2 Learners’ Errors

Before we talk about corrective feedback proper, it seems advisable that, as EFL teachers, we should be aware of what has been going on in the field of the EFL pedagogy and keep a keen eye on different language learning and teaching theories and classroom practices prevailed. Of the theories and practices, it is felt important to say something about Contrastive Analysis (CA) and Error Analysis (EA). A retrospective exploration of these theories is hoped to enhance our understanding of learners' errors. Consequently, we can employ more flexible strategies in error correction and make more contributions to the EFL classroom teaching and learning.

3.3.2.1. Contrastive Analysis (CA)

It is well documented that in the 1950s, some scholars attempted to study L₂ learners' errors systematically and developed a theory about errors called Contrastive Analysis (Fang & Xue-Mei (2007). Miroslaw (2002:1) defines CA as, "... the systematic study of a pair of languages with a view to identifying their structural differences and similarities. Historically it has been used to establish language genealogies." According to the Contrastive Analysis (CA) hypothesis, the principal barrier to second language acquisition is the interference of the first language system with the second language system and that a scientific, structural comparison of the two languages in question would enable people to predict and describe which are problems are and which are not. Deeply rooted in behaviorism as a learning theory and structuralism as a linguistic theory, CA theorists held that human language learning was to change old habits (of the learner's L₁) and to build new habits (of the target language). There was a belief that errors occur when learners could not respond correctly to a particular stimulus in the second language. A major principle of the CA is that an error may serve as a negative stimulus which reinforces bad habits; it should, therefore, not be allowed to occur. So, classroom teaching practices were dominated by mechanical pattern drills, and attempts were made to correct any errors or mistakes wherever there were.

However, it was later understood that Contrastive Analysis has basic limitations. The major weakness of CA is that it overemphasized L₁ interference as a source of L₂ learners' errors, but the language learners themselves were neglected. Looking at this weakness, Selinker (1972) devised a term called interlanguage, which aims to explore learning strategies based on the learners' errors. Interlanguage (IL) insists on the separateness of a second language learners' system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and target language learners. As Fang & Xue-Mei (2007) state, different scholars have coined different names for an L₂ learner's language system. For instance, Corder in (1971) used the term "idiosyncratic dialect" and later in 1978, he interchangeably used idiosyncratic dialect and "language learners' language", while Nemser (1971) called it "approximate system". According to the notion of interlanguage, second language learners are forming their own self-contained independent linguistic systems. This is neither the system of the native language nor the system of the target language, but falls between the two.

Fang & Xue-Mei (2007:2) point out the most salient features of the interlanguage as:

.... it has its own legitimate system where learners are no longer looked on as producers of malformed, imperfect language replete with mistakes, but as intelligent and creative beings proceeding through logical, systematic stages of acquisition creatively acting upon their linguistic environment. this system is dynamic and it is based on the best attempt of learners to produce order and structure to the linguistic stimuli surrounding them..... it is a linguistic system which reflects the psychological process of foreign language learning.

3.3.2.2. Error Analysis

The weakness of the Contrastive Analysis theory and the acceptance of the notion of interlanguage has led to the emergence of another more scientific way of analyzing L₂ learners' errors- Error Analysis. According to Choon (1997), Fang & Xue-Mei (2007), EA is a systematic analysis of L₂ learners' language errors by following some basic procedures. First, one has to identify the errors. To do this, one has to differentiate lapses (mistakes) from genuine errors of competence. Then, the errors are classified according to categories or sub-categories like semantic errors (wrong word, wrong form, poor choice of word, slang or colloquialism), and syntactic errors (tense, preposition, article, spelling, word order, subject-

verb agreement). Errors can also be classified as global errors or local errors. It is forwarded that the system of classifying errors should be flexible and one should let the error determine the category. And then, an explanation may be provided as to why the errors have been made. Examples of sources and causes of errors are mother tongue interference, loan words, overgeneralization of rules, inherent difficulties of the target language and medium transfer. At last, the errors are evaluated to determine how much they deviate from the target language norm, to what extent they affect communication and which method of correction can be most effectively meted out.

Regarding sources of L2 learners' errors, Abismara (2003), Choon (1997), Fang & Xue-Mei (2007), and Mirosław (2002) note that L2 learners' errors might be resulted from interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, and cultural transfer. Abismara's review of sources of errors is more comprehensive. She cites Richards & Simson (1974) to enumerate sources of errors as interlingual transfer (from the learner's L₁), intralingual errors (which include overgeneralization errors, ignorance of rule restrictions: i.e. applying rules to contexts to which they do not apply, incomplete application of rules), sociolinguistic factors like, motivation, settings for language learning, age (learning capacities vary with age), universal hierarchy of difficulty (It seems generally accepted that some phonological, syntactic, or semantic items or structures are inherently difficult for human beings to acquire. Some forms may be inherently difficult to learn no matter what the background of the learner.)

EA is reported to have some advantages. Abismara (2003), Choon (1997), and Fang & Xue-Mei (2007) have enumerated the following as significances of Error Analysis.

- By error analysis, teachers will get an overall knowledge about the students' errors. Foreign language learning is a process of hypothesis and trial and error occurrence is inevitable. So the teacher should learn to tolerate some errors, especially some local errors.
- Errors can tell the teacher how far towards the goal the learner has progressed, and consequently, what remains for him or her to learn. So students' errors are valuable feedbacks for teachers. Teachers can do some remedial teaching based on their students' errors.

- Errors are indispensable to the learners themselves, for we can regard the making of mistakes as a device the learner employs in order to learn.

It is generally acknowledged that Error Analysis has contributed its own for the enrichment of the second language learning theory; because of the EA movement, success in learning is viewed to come by profiting from mistakes and by using mistakes to obtain feedback from the environment. With the feedback they receive, learners make new attempts to achieve the more closely approximate desired goals. As Choon (1997) notes, errors are both diagnostic and prognostic in that: first, errors are informative of what problems the learners have, and second, they are helpful in orienting curriculum designers. The insight into language learning problems is useful to the teacher because it provides information on common trouble-spots in language learning which can be used in the preparation of effective teaching materials. Also, by being able to predict errors to a certain extent, teachers can be well-equipped to help students minimize or overcome their learning problems.

Certainly, EA is significant, but it also has limitations. First, there is a danger in too much attention to learners' errors, and in the classroom teachers tend to become so preoccupied with noticing errors that the correct utterance in the second language will go unnoticed. While the diminishing of errors is an important criterion for increasing language proficiency, the ultimate goal of second language learning is the attainment of communicative fluency in a language.

Another shortcoming in error analysis is the overstressing of production data, and neglect of comprehension data. Scholars suggest that language comprehension is as important as production in developing an understanding of the process of language acquisition (See Krashen, 2004 and Swain, 1995 for comprehension and production).

Third, EA fails to account for the strategy of avoidance. It is reported that learners may be avoiding a structure that poses difficulty for them. A learner who for one reason or another avoids a particular sound, word, structure, or discourse category may be assumed incorrectly to have no difficulty therewith.

Finally, there may be a danger that error analysis can keep one too closely focused on specific languages rather than viewing universal aspects of language.

In general, both CA and EA, though each has its own weaknesses, have contributed their own for designing L2 syllabi and influenced classroom practices. It is advisable that L2 teachers should have some knowhow on these theories so that they could utilize the strengths of each during their error treatment practices.

3.3.3. Decisions Teachers Need to Make when Providing CF

It has been attempted to point out above that CF is one of the most controversial issues of debate among scholars in second language acquisition (SLA). This on the one hand is due to the presence of competing SLA theories and on the other to the inconclusive and sometimes conflicting empirical evidences available. Apart from this, classroom responsibilities and students' needs for some CF compel teachers to make difficult decisions. One would not suggest that teachers should be reserved from providing CF until a unanimously agreed up on recommendation is forwarded. Rather, L2 teachers are forced to make difficult choices from among the different suggestions.

The following sub sections try to discuss some of the recommendations accumulated in the CF literature, albeit conflicting they may be. What L2 teachers should do might best be choosing those recommendations based on the contexts in which they function.

3.3.3.1. Unfocused/Comprehensive versus Focused/Selective Corrective Feedback

As indicated in section 2.2 above, language teachers are in dilemma to choose between focused (selective) and unfocused (comprehensive) corrective feedback because they are provided with contradictory suggestions. Many scholars (Ferris, 2004, 2010; Hendrickson, 1980; Ellis, 2009; Sheen, 2009) believe that selective correction is more beneficial than comprehensive (traditional) correction for the fact that:

- It doesn't threaten students' self esteem
- It doesn't bring information overload on students
- It is economical in terms of teacher time and energy

- It goes in line with the teachability hypothesis.

According to Hendrickson (1980), when teachers tolerate some student errors, students often feel more confident about using the target language than if all their errors are corrected. This group holds that if a teacher is a perfectionist and tends to be too critical of every small error, the learners may perceive the task as an impossible one.

Researchers tuned to focused CF face two major problems. The first is the difficulty of deciding which errors to focus on. Different scholars come up with their own suggestions. Corder (1967), for example, makes a distinction between mistakes and errors, and he suggests that CF should focus on errors rather than mistakes. Many other scholars make a distinction between global and local errors and recommend that global errors, rather than local ones, should be the candidates for correction. Ferris (2004), on her part, categorizes errors into treatable and untreatable, and calls for a focus on treatable errors rather than untreatable ones. There are also scholars who suggest that CF should target at errors which happen most frequently in students' compositions and at errors which are likely to stigmatize a speaker or writer from the point of view of an audience. The final suggestion regarding which linguistic errors to target for correction says that CF should focus on errors which break major grammatical rules rather than exceptionalities.

As Ellis (2009), Ferris (2004), and Bitchener &Knock (2009, 2010) state, all these proposals might not work effectively in different contexts. Rather, teachers are advised to employ some or most of these suggestions depending on the contexts in which they operate.

The other challenge researchers face when conducting focused CF is the dilemma of whether to focus on larger or smaller error categories. Like other issues related to CF, scholars split regarding this question. Some, e.g., Lane &Lange (1999) and Raimes(1992) as cited by Ferris (2004) cover 15 and 21 error categories respectively, while some others 5 to 6 categories covering larger issues. Polio (1997) employed a very detailed categorization of linguistic errors (about 40), while Liu (2008) has used 3 broad categories of errors. In this regard, teachers may mark verb errors, a larger category, or break the treatment of verbs into several smaller categories such as verb tense, verb form, and subject verb agreement. One

may also talk about noun errors or about discrete errors in forming the plural or possessive, use of articles and other determiners, and pronoun-referent agreement.

Scholars like Ferris (2004) seem to suggest that a focus on small but broad categories is likely to be more beneficial, for:

- It can allow students to focus on a more limited range of forms and rules when learning about a specific error type, and hence, it doesn't overwhelm students by using 15 to 20 different terms or symbols to label errors.
- The distinctions among error categories are not always as precise as we may think.
- Often smaller errors have the same underlying cause. If a student omits an article or a plural marker when it is required, both errors may have the same root: a fundamental misunderstanding about the nature of nouns.

The use of larger error categories is thus preferable because it is easier for both teachers and students to deal with and because it may more accurately capture students' developing knowledge systems.

On the other hand, scholars like Lalande (1982) argue that comprehensive CF is more fruitful than selective CF. Lalande considers selective correction as traditional and illogical especially in writing because:

- It fails to take into account the fundamental linguistic and pedagogic differences underlying the two language systems.
- The suggestion that the correction of written errors involves public embarrassment is not true as correction of written errors is generally a private, confidential transaction between the instructor and the student.
- Neutral or positive responses to student efforts do not necessarily destroy motivation for learning the foreign language. As long as the affective quality of the feedback students receive is predominantly positive, any negative content is not likely to do any harm .
- Leaving written errors uncorrected reinforces incorrect grammatical structures.

- Unless students receive comprehensive feedback on the quality of their writing in a foreign language, their attainment of linguistic competence may be seriously inhibited.

This group argues that teachers have an obligation to provide honest and comprehensive error correction.

Studies conducted on the effectiveness of focused and unfocused CF have come up with mixed results. Some indicate that selective correction is more fruitful (Bitchener et al, 2005; Bitchener & Knock, 2008; Sheen et al, 2007). Other researchers (Ellis, 2009; Rouhi & Salmani, 2010) have found that there is no significant difference in efficacy between these two forms of feedback. Still, a more recent study by Van Beuningen (2011) has revealed that comprehensive correction has resulted in long-term learning.

3.3.3.2. Indirect versus Direct Corrective Feedback

When using an indirect feedback, one might indicate an error through circling, underlining, or marking it at its location using a code, and asking students to make corrections themselves. This kind of feedback is claimed to force students to be more reflective and analytical about their errors (Bitchener & Knock, 2009; Ferris, 2004). Since the students are required by indirect feedback to take more responsibility for their errors, they are likely to learn more from the process; to acquire the troublesome structures; and to make long-term progress in finding, correcting, and eventually avoiding errors.

However, indirect feedback might not work all the time; there are some circumstances (Ferris, 2004) in which teachers should consider the utilization of direct feedback. These circumstances include: when students are at beginning levels of English language proficiency and do not have the linguistic knowledge to self-correct their errors, when errors are 'non-treatable' i.e., for which there is no rule to which students can turn to self correct an error when it is pointed out to them, and when the teacher wishes to focus student attention on particular error patterns but not others.

3.3.3.3. Error Location versus Error Identification

Another decision teachers need to make in marking student papers is whether to simply locate the presence of an error (by circling it, highlighting it, or putting a checkmark in the margin) or to identify the types of errors that have been made using symbols. These are different forms of indirect CF. Error location is favored by some scholars for the fact that it places maximum responsibility on the student writer to figure out both the nature of the problem and its solution. On the other hand, some other scholars prefer error identification because it provides more information to students so that they can call upon their prior knowledge or use resources such as grammar handbooks to understand or remember the rule and figure out how to apply it.

It is reported that error identification can be cumbersome for the teacher and confusing for the student, and there may be possibilities of misidentification. Because of this, many teachers prefer to use error location. On the other hand, error location could also be more demanding from a student's perspective.

Due to these inherent weaknesses of error identification and error location, a combination of the two seems more fruitful.

3.3.3.4. CF with Grade or without Grade

The other decision teachers need to consider when providing CF on their students' written grammatical errors is whether they should combine CF with grades. Most often, there is a tendency among language teachers of providing CF with grades. Scholars again debate this practice.

Some specialists in L2 education support the practice of combining CF with grades, but teachers should be careful of the fact that the grades should be reflections of the amount of CF provided. It is very likely that a written piece with fewer corrections but a lower mark will lead a student to frustration.

Many other scholars, on the other hand, oppose the practice of combining grades with CF. Underwood & Tregido (2004:18) are among these. Their justification is that:

It has been shown that when overall grades are presented, students focus on comparing their scores to their peers' scores, and do not focus on feedback

that is included for purposes of improvement. That is, when a grade is given, the impetus to revise is gone. Teachers should consider not presenting an overall grade along with feedback.

However, in our context, it seems that teachers would be forced to provide CF and marks together. This is because, in most cases, they are assigned to teach terribly many classes which are very crowded; hence, they will not have enough time to deal with CF and grades separately. Also, many teachers might not have the orientation regarding the danger of mixing CF and marks.

3.3.4. Problems with Teacher Written Corrective Feedback

As indicated above, ESL students greatly appreciate feedback; nevertheless, the contribution of this feedback for their writing development has been questionable. In general, there is a controversy among L2 writing researchers about whether teachers should provide any grammar correction at all to student writers and if the feedback has any value to improving the students writing. Some scholars like Truscott (1996; 2007) argues for a correction free approach to teaching ESL. For Truscott, students revise their essays based on teachers' comments but lack the understanding of why it was wrong in the first place. He further states that students change their writing, and thus, original ideas are lost rather than clarified. Besides, as Zamel (1985) states, students often find teacher comments unclear, confusing and inconsistent or vague.

Similarly, Hyland and Hyland (2006: 84) criticize the quality of teacher written feedback by stating it to be “frequently misunderstood, vague, inconsistent and authoritarian, overly concerned with error and often functioning to appropriate, or take over, student texts by being too directive.”

According to Kontinen (2009), the other problematic issue in teacher written feedback is:

... the choice of the feedback focus, i.e. teachers have to decide whether to emphasize form or content and whether to focus on the writing process or the significance of a correct final draft . Teachers have to first of all be aware of this complexity and the key to overcoming this complexity and providing useful feedback is maintaining the balance of these different elements.(p.7)

Kontinen quotes Ferris (2007) to note that teachers are often concerned about the amount of work and difficult decision-making involved in providing teacher written feedback and are terrified of becoming “composition slaves”. Kontinen, therefore, concludes that, “not only is the teacher written feedback and its usefulness debatable from the students’ point of view but it is also a complicated and demanding process for the teachers.” (Ibid). Sommers (1982), on her part, mentions some problems which teacher written feedback possesses. These are:

1. Students think some changes are unnecessary for their paper; they make changes just because the changes are suggested by the teacher. This may result in a paper that presents what the teacher requires the student to say rather than demonstrating the student’s own words.
2. Teacher feedback is not always clear. As a result, the student sometimes cannot distinguish the most important problems from the less important problems in his/her paper.
3. Many teachers’ comments are not specific for a particular text. It is recommended by many that teacher feedback could be more helpful when it is specific to the task it is dealing with.
4. Most teacher feedbacks are not explicit and directive enough.

Therefore, any attempt to provide corrective feedback on students’ composition errors should be aware of these potential problems and should take the necessary precaution to minimize their negative impact.

3.3.5. Conditions for Good CF

It has been established that feedback is important, but there are some conditions under which feedback supports learning. Different writers summarize the following as conditions for good feedback:

1. Feedback needs to be formative which communicates information to the learner that is intended to modify the learner’s thinking or behavior for the purpose of improving learning. It must not focus on marks but instead focus on teaching (Mack, 2009).

2. This formative feedback must be attended to by the students, and acted on to improve performance (Mack, 2009).
3. Feedback should be timely. Feedback must be given back to the students not long after they have written the assignment (Jing, 2010; Mack, 2009). It seems generally accepted that feedback ought to be given as soon as possible after the writing takes place. Jing (2010:15) quotes Freeman & Lewis (1998) to warn that, “The greater the delay, the less likely it is that the students will find it useful or be able or inclined to act on it. On the other hand, it is also advised that feedback should not be offered too early.” The crux of the matter here seems that feedback given too early before students have had an opportunity to work on it can be similarly unproductive.
4. Feedback needs to draw attention to the error. There is still a debate about whether the feedback should be direct or indirect. A combination of direct and indirect feedback is reported to be more beneficial in addressing the needs of students of differing proficiency.
5. Teachers should avoid appropriation and line by line correcting a text. Mostly, indirect feedback is preferable because it forces the student to engage in problem solving and avoid appropriation. It also builds their skills as self-editors (Ferris, 2006), as cited in Mack (2009).
6. Teachers should vary feedback approaches for treatable and untreatable error types.
7. Teachers should use a relatively small number of error categories when providing feedback.
8. It is advised to use rubrics and an established set of criteria for providing feedback. The rubric allows for standardized evaluation according to the specific criteria such as, grammar, organization, or cohesive links. A rubric, or criteria guide helps teachers “apply consistent standards to judge each task performance fairly.
9. Besides, teachers should routinely talk to students about the quality of the feedback given to them. This could involve identification of examples of helpful or unhelpful feedback. This assures the students of the importance of considering and using feedback.
10. Another important condition for teacher feedback is that it should relate to the planned learning goals, be clear in meaning, and indicate the next steps needed for students.

To sum, corrective feedback is reported to be more likely to be of a desired effect if: teachers are systematic and consistent in their provision of CF; it is clear enough to be perceived as such; the techniques employed allow for time and opportunity for self repair

and modified output; it focuses on one error at a time over a period of time, i.e., the feedback provided should be consistent and intensive in nature; and if it takes learner's developmental readiness to process the feedback provided into consideration.

3.4. Measures of Grammatical Accuracy in L2 Compositions

It has been reported (Polio, 1997, Hatrshorn, 2008; Pongsirwet, 2001) that measuring accuracy in students' written work is very complex because of several factors causing disagreement between and among raters, thus bringing low inter-rater reliability. Because of this, different researchers on the efficacy of grammar error correction have been forced to use their own accuracy measures. This has resulted in difficulties in other researchers' attempts to replicate such studies. Besides, mainly because of these differences in accuracy measures, researches conducted at different contexts have come up with differing (sometimes contradicting) results which have made the topic of corrective feedback highly controversial.

To give readers some insight on how accuracy will be measured in the current study, the following sub-sections will be devoted to presenting a review of the common assessment procedures used to measure written production.

3.4.1. Holistic Scoring

One approach to writing assessment is holistic scoring, which aims to rate the overall proficiency level reflected in a given sample of student writing. In a typical holistic scoring session, each writing sample is read quickly and then judged against a rating scale, or scoring rubric, that outlines the scoring criteria. Holistic scoring rubrics generally consist of different levels or bands, each of which corresponds to a score and a set of descriptors.

Holistic scoring is reported to be economical regarding time since readers are required to make only one decision (i.e., a single score) for each writing sample. Besides, researchers in L2 writing generally agree that holistic scoring is reliable, provided guidelines pertaining to rater training and rating session administration are faithfully adhered to (Polio, 1997). For this reason, holistic scoring is commonly used in large-scale assessment of writing. However, it has some serious disadvantages for the fact that the single score, which gives

useful ranking information, doesn't give details. That is, holistic scoring cannot provide useful diagnostic information about a person's writing ability, as a single score does not allow raters to distinguish between various aspects of writing such as control of syntax, depth of vocabulary, organization, and so on.

3.4.2. Analytic Scoring

Analytic scoring procedures involve the separation of the various features of a composition into components for scoring purposes. Depending on the purpose of the assessment, texts might be rated on such features as content, organization, cohesion, register, vocabulary, grammar, or mechanics. Because of this, analytic scoring schemes provide more detailed information about a test taker's performance in different aspects of writing.

Generally, it has been reported that analytic scoring is preferred over holistic schemes by many writing specialists for a number of reasons. To start with, it provides more useful diagnostic information about students' writing abilities. That is, it provides more information about the strengths and weaknesses of students, and thus allows instructors and curriculum developers to tailor instruction more closely to the needs of their students. In addition, analytic scoring is particularly useful for L₂ learners, who are usually heterogeneous in their abilities at different aspects of writing (e.g., some L₂ learners may have excellent writing skills in terms of content and organization, but may have much lower grammatical control; others may have an excellent control of sentence structure, but may not know how to organize their writing in a logical way). Moreover, it is easier to train raters (especially inexperienced ones) to use analytic scoring schemes as they may find it easier to work with explicit and specific textual features. Finally, the explicitness of analytic scoring guides offers teachers a potentially valuable tool for providing writers with consistent and direct feedback.

Nevertheless, analytic scoring is also reported to have some limitations. For instance, it takes longer than holistic scoring. Besides, measuring based on sub skill scores might diminish the interconnectedness of written discourse (Hillocks, 1986). Furthermore, sometimes, scorers find it difficult to assign numerical scores based on certain descriptors

(Hamp-Lyons, 1989, as cited by Polio, 1997). Thus, qualitative judgments about coherence, style, and so on are not always easily accommodated by analytic scoring methods.

3.4.3. Error Counts

In an attempt to arrive at a more objective assessment of the linguistic accuracy of the writings in their studies, several researchers have utilized error counting as a measure of accuracy. The researchers in this regard have followed two lines. In the first line, Robb et al (1986), Kepner (1991), and Hartshorn (2008) employed error-free T- units/total number of T-units as measurements of accuracy. (A T-unit is defined as an independent clause and all dependent clauses attached to it).And, in the second line, many other researchers like Kroll (1990) have employed error counts per number of total words in a written product. Similarly, more recently, Erel & Bullut (2007) and Liu (2008) also employed total number of errors/ 100 words in a written text as a measure of linguistic accuracy.

For researchers who are interested to employ total number of errors/ total number of words in a text, Polio provides some guidelines to count errors. These are:

- a) *Do not count spelling errors(including word changes like there/their)*
- b) *Be conservative about counting comma errors; don't count missing commas between clauses, or after prepositional phrases. Comma errors related to restrictive/nonrestrictive clauses should be counted. Extraneous commas should also be considered errors.*
- c) *Base tense or reference errors on preceding discourses; do not look at the sentence in isolation.*
- d) *Don't count errors in capitalization*
- e) *Disregard an unfinished sentence at the end of the essay*

Polio further gives some guidelines for counting words. These are:

- a) *Count contractions as one word whether correct or wrong.*
- b) *Count numbers as one word.*
- c) *Count proper nouns in English.... as they are written.*
- d) *Do not count hyphenated words as single words (e.g., well-written=2 words).*
- e) *Don't include essay titles in word counts.*
- f) *Count words as they are written, even if they are incorrect (e.g., alot=1 word).*

In the present research, the ratio of total number of grammatical errors produced by students in each group (focused and unfocused CF groups) to the total number of words written by each group was employed to measure the change in accuracy brought by the two corrective

feedback types, for this kind of measurement was believed to be more appropriate to address the major objective of the study. This, what is termed as the adjusted mean of the grammatical errors, was multiplied by 100 in order to make further analysis more convenient. In doing so, most of the guidelines provided by Polio were adopted except the last guideline (i.e., ‘f’ above). In this study, words were not counted as they were written; rather, they were counted on the basis of what they should be when written correctly, so constructions like ‘alot’ were counted as two words.

3.5. Categorization of Grammatical Errors

Categorizing L2 learners’ linguistic errors into some groups has been found extremely complex. Because of this fact, different researchers have utilized different error categorizing schemes based on the research contexts in which they operate. In this section, an attempt is made to present some of the error categorizations employed so far.

Polio (1997) presents an error categorization system which is basically a modified form of Kroll (1990). While Kroll has used 33 categories of errors, Polio has used 38 categories by adding more.

The table in the following page presents Polio’s categorization of grammatical errors exhibited in students’ compositions.

Table 1: Polio’s Categorization of Linguistic Errors

No.	Type of error	No.	Type of Error
1	Whole sentence or clause obscured	20	Lexical/ phrase choice (including so/so that)
2	Subject formation(including missing subject and existential, but not wrong case)	21	Wrong noun phrase morphology, but not word form
3	Verb missing, not including auxiliary	22	Punctuation (missing, extra, wrong - do not include capitalization)
4	Verb complement, object complement	23	Two word verb (separation problem, incorrect practice)
5	Ambiguous/ unacceptable reference	24	Subject-verb agreement
6	Voice shift	25	Wrong case
7	Idiom	26	Word form
8	Wrong comparative formation	27	Preposition (incorrect, missing, extra)
9	Singular for plural	28	Plural for singular
10	Quantity words(few/ a few, many kinds of, all/the whole	29	Negation (never/ever, any/some, either/neither, misplaced negator)
11	Quantifier-noun agreement (much/many, this/these)	30	Epenthetic pronoun (resumptive pronoun in relative clause, pronominal copy)
12	Voice (incorrect voice, not incorrect formation)	31	Noun-pronoun agreement(including wrong relative pronoun)
13	Missing word (not including preposition, article, verb, subject, relative pronoun	32	Verb formation (including no auxiliary verb, lack of ‘to’ with infinitive, participle misformation, gerund/infinitive problem)
14	Relative clause formation (not including wrong or missing relative pronoun)	33	Extraneous words (not included elsewhere in descriptors)
15	Parallel structure	34	Wrong modal
16	Run on sentence including comma splice	35	Tense/ aspect(incorrect tense, not incorrect formation)
17	Sentence fragment	36	Gapping error
18	Dangling/misplaced modifier	37	Word order
19	missing/ miss used’s,	38	article (missing, extra, incorrect)

Hartshorn (2008), on her part used the following error categories to track the occurrence or disappearance of different grammatical errors in different student compositions. Hartshorn’s categorization of linguistic errors is provided in table 3.2 (next page)

Table 2: Hartshorn’s Categorization of Linguistic Errors

Grammatical Error Family	Lexical Error Family	Mechanical Error Family
Determiner Errors 1. Articles 2. Possessive nouns/Pronouns 3. Numbers 4. Indefinite pronouns 5. Demonstrative pronouns	Vocabulary Errors 1. Word Choice (spelled correctly but wrong word) 2. Word Form (spelled correctly but wrong form of an appropriate word) 3. Prepositions (spelled correctly but wrong preposition)	Mechanical Errors 1. Spelling 2. Capitalization 3. New paragraph 4. Non-sentence level punctuation
Verb Errors 1. Subject-verb 2. Verb tense 3. Other verb form problems		
Numeric Shift Errors 1. Count-non-count 2. Single-plural		
Semantic Errors 1. Unclear Meaning 2. Awkwardness 3. Word order 4. Insertion/omission		

Liu (2008), on the other hand, employed only three broad grammatical error categories as a procedure for marking student compositions. These are:

Morphological errors: all errors in verb tense or form; plural or possessive ending incorrect, omitted, or unnecessary; subject-verb agreement errors; article or other determiner incorrect, omitted, or unnecessary.

Semantic errors: errors in word choice, including preposition and pronoun errors; omitted words or phrases, unnecessary words or phrases. Spelling errors included only if the (apparent) misspelling resulted in an actual English word. For example:

Syntactic errors: errors in sentence/clause boundaries (run-ons, fragments, comma splices), word order, other ungrammatical sentence constructions.

Jia & Benglan(2010), on their part, employed the following 6 error categories to assess the errors in their subjects’ compositions. The categories include errors of organization and

coherence. Relevant for the present study are the remaining 4 categories as they deal with form.

The discourse organization	The logic coherence between paragraphs; the way a text makes sense to the readers through the organization of its content, and the relevance and clarity of its concepts and ideas.
The sentence's coherence	The coherences between sentences; the grammatical, lexical and logical relationship between different sentences.
The grammatical errors	Verb errors, noun ending errors, article errors, preposition errors, wrong form, word order, subject-verb agreement, pronoun errors.
Word choice	Redundancy, repetitions, inaccurate words, over-general word, unidiomatic use.
Sentence pattern	Errors in sentence/clause boundaries (run-ons, fragments, unidiomatic sentence construction).
Punctuations, capitalization, spelling	Comma splices, title capitalization, the first-letter capitalization, wrong word form, word division.

Erel & Bullut (2007) have categorized the errors in the students' compositions in to 18 categories as :punctuation, capitalization, spelling, word formation, singular-plural form, subject-verb agreement, tense, missing, article usage, connector, preposition, pronouns, possessive's, extra wording , inappropriate word, rewrite the underlined part ,unclear expression, and word order.

The above discussion about measures of linguistic accuracy and ways of categorizing grammatical errors is meant to inform readers that different researchers use varied measures and categorizations. A researcher may use one of these, a combination of these, or a modification of these, or he/she may devise his/her own measure and categorization based on the context he/she is operating in. The researchers mentioned above report that their error categorization was modified from different previous researchers.

Considering the strengths and weaknesses of the accuracy measures indicated above, the present study has employed an error count method to measure linguistic accuracy. In other

words, as indicated above, to analyze the occurrence or disappearance of linguistic errors, the proportion of total number of grammatical errors/ total number of words X 100 was utilized as this is reported to be a more specific and objective measure of grammatical accuracy. Regarding the categorization of linguistic errors, the current study has used a modified version of the error categories utilized by the researchers mentioned above.

3.6. Challenges Facing Studies on the Effectiveness of CF

As one might deduce from the review part above, researchers undertaking the effectiveness of corrective feedback in actual classroom settings face several challenges. These include:

- Controlling different confounding variables will be difficult as the subjects simultaneously take different courses in English in addition to the target course. Besides, there will certainly be chances for the subjects to get some additional language inputs from different sources outside the school.
- Different earlier researchers have utilized their own assessment criteria to measure accuracy; as a result, this might have confused researchers regarding which measurement to utilize.
- Categorizing errors into different linguistic categories has also been a big challenge as different scholars employed their own categories, and these differ very greatly.
- Using intact classes for an effectiveness study might also pose another challenge- feedback intermingled with grading. Several scholars suggest that CF should not be provided together with grades as the subjects will focus on grades and overlook the CF provided (Guenette, 2007).
- A difficulty of determining how many and which grammatical errors to target on is the other challenge facing effectiveness studies.
- CF addresses different issues like content, organization and forms. The question of whether we should deal with these aspects simultaneously or individually is still in debate. This entails that CF studies focusing on effectiveness will be seen skeptically.
- The other major challenge facing written CF studies, which has very seriously challenged this research project, is the problem of achieving inter-rater reliability because raters may perceive errors differently.

In short, corrective feedback as a research agenda is a thorny issue surrounded by several theoretical and practical challenges. And yet, CF is a very crucial area of research in foreign

and/or second language instruction because of the fact that CF is believed to be one of the most important determinants of language learning in such contexts. That was why, although well aware of these challenges, the present researcher decided to pick up CF as his research topic.

3.7. Theoretical Framework of the Study

In this section, the theoretical assumptions around which discussions about corrective feedback revolve are pinpointed. In doing so, an attempt is made to draw the theoretical framework on which the present study will be based.

For ages, there have been several competing theories regarding the importance and/or place of corrective feedback in second or foreign language acquisition (Mory, 2010). Feedback has been incorporated in many paradigms of learning, from the early views of behaviorism to cognitivism through more recent models of constructivism. While behaviorist theories gave great importance for the environment (stimulus-response relationship through which correct habits are formed and incorrect ones avoided), innatist perspectives, driven by the notion of Universal Grammar, gave less importance for the environment and corrective feedback. For the later perspective (Krashen, 1998; 2004; Truscott, 1996; 2007), languages are learned without recourse to corrective feedback.

Before we move to talk about the theoretical paradigms which favour corrective feedback, a brief discussion of some of the views which oppose the notion of corrective feedback is felt necessary. At the forefront of such views is Krashen's Input/ Comprehension Hypothesis, which claims that we acquire language when we receive comprehensible input slightly ahead of the current level of understanding, accompanied by a low affective filter (Krashen, 1998; 2004; Poniah, 2009; Truscott, 1996; 1998; 2007). According to this hypothesis, conscious attempts to teach linguistic items, like grammatical explanation and error correction have no contribution for language acquisition. Proponents of this view recommend a noninterventionist L2 teaching pedagogy where learners are provided with positive evidence alone. These theoretical and practical arguments against CF are well voiced by Truscott (1996;2007) as he holds that:

- Interlanguage development is a gradual and complex process, which could not be affected by error correction as a simple transfer of information;
- It is impossible for any single form of CF to be effective across the very differently acquired domains of morphology, syntax, and lexis, particularly with respect to grammatical features that are integral parts of a complex system;
- There is a likelihood that any proven benefits of CF might be related to the development of explicit declarative knowledge but not implicit procedural knowledge, which is all-important for acquisition; thus, CF would promote “pseudo-learning” or at best self-editing and revision skills, without fostering true accuracy development; and
- It is impractical to tailor CF to each learner’s current level of L2 development, i.e., learners might not be equally ready to acquire a certain linguistic form exactly at the same time.

However, more recently, several counter arguments have been aired against the Input Hypothesis. Researchers advocating the cognitivist/ developmental position attribute greater importance to the environment than to an innate knowledge of language (Lightbown and Spada 2007). In the eyes of the present researcher, these group of SLA researchers are felt to be most valuable to second and/or foreign language teachers and learners, so the works of these researchers constitute a part of the theoretical basis upon which this research project is based.

Cognitive/ developmental researchers emphasize cognitive efforts on the part of the learners and their ability to learn something. The cognitive view is substantiated by different portions of Information Processing theories such as the Output Hypothesis, the Interaction Hypothesis, and the Noticing Hypothesis. These theoretical views hold that positive evidence alone doesn’t suffice, and thus, learners will have to be reminded from time to time what the correct forms are and what they will have to avoid. Scholars like Doughty & Williams (1998), as cited in Delgado (2007), reject the noninterventionist view because it does not provide any solution or explanation to the lack of accuracy of adult L2 learners.

Researchers in the cognitive/developmental line totally agree with the importance of input; what they reject is the dependence only on positive evidence as a sufficient source of input. Recent L2 learning theories emphasize the importance of negative evidence in what is called reactive input, provided through interlocutor responses to forms and features that are incorrectly used by L2 learners. The pioneer scholar in this regard, Long (1990), in his Interaction Hypothesis, has distinguished between input that provides positive evidence of forms and features that comply with those of the L2, and input that supplies negative evidence on forms and features that are used by learners. Long argues that both positive and negative evidence can be made available through formal rule instruction, corrective feedback and other related resources.

According to Long (1990), positive L2 evidence is found in utterances and texts available in input to learners during their interaction with interlocutors. Samples of input can occur in their authentic, unaltered state or they can be modified when they cannot be understood by the learner. When positive evidence is not understood by the people involved in communication, interlocutors modify their input (modified input) through different means. These kinds of adjustments, according to the Interaction Hypothesis, assist learners in their comprehension of L2 input, and allow them additional, more focused, opportunities to attend to L2 forms. Nevertheless, Long (1990) argues that such positive input is an insufficient source of evidence for learners since they may not notice L2 forms and features that are complex and they might not notice the difference between target versions of L2 forms and their own erroneous interlanguage versions. In such instances, learners should be provided with negative evidence regarding what is not possible or grammatical.

The other theoretical support for corrective feedback or negative evidence comes from Schmidt's (1990) Noticing Hypothesis. In the eyes of this hypothesis, to help learners access, and eventually internalize, target versions of L2 forms, negative evidence about what is not correct or appropriate in the L2 can be especially useful. Schmidt argues that such evidence can help learners notice differences between developmental features of their interlanguage and target features of the L2. According to Schmidt, learners must consciously

notice forms from input for acquisition/intake to occur. Learning without attention, as Schmidt concludes, is not possible.

Related closely with the Interaction and Input Hypotheses is Swain's Output Hypothesis (Swain, 2010). The Output Hypothesis claims that the act of producing language (speaking or writing) constitutes, under certain circumstances, part of the process of second language learning. After looking at the grammatical incompetence of immersion students, Swain (2010) states that these students did not talk as fluently and accurately as they were expected and claimed to. Swain observed that the teachers did not push the students to talk in the target language (French) in a manner that was grammatically accurate or sociolinguistically appropriate. This incident forced Swain to state that L2 learners should be pushed (by using mechanisms like corrective feedback) to compare and contrast what they produce with what is appropriate or correct in that language. She calls this as the Comprehensible Output Hypothesis (CO), against Krashen's Comprehensible Input Hypothesis.

Swain believes that output has three functions. First, output could have a noticing/triggering function. Swain (2010) argues that while attempting to produce the target language (vocally or silently), learners may notice that they do not know how to say (or write) precisely the meaning they wish to convey. In other words, most often, the activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to recognize consciously some of their linguistic problems. (Swain, 2010).

The second function of output Swain claims is the hypothesis testing function. The claim here is that, "output may sometimes be, from the learner's perspective, a "trial run" reflecting their hypothesis of how to say (or write) their intent." She continues to note:

If learners were not testing hypotheses, then changes in their output would not be expected following feedback. However, research has shown that learners do modify their output in response to such conversational moves as clarification requests or confirmation checks (Online).

The third function Swain credits for output is that output may have a metalinguistic (reflective) function. Here, Swain claims that using language to reflect on language produced by others or the self, mediates second language learning.

As Swain argues, for output to successfully fulfill these functions, it should be accompanied by different forms of corrective feedback.

These developmental/ cognitive approaches are taken as transition theories for the fact that they focus more on the mechanisms by which L2 learners progress through various stages of interlanguage. The present study follows this line because throughout the study, developments or changes brought about as a result of the corrective feedback moves are investigated. In this sense, it acknowledges the view that errors are natural parts of learning, and at the same time, it is conceived that corrective feedback plays a role in reducing these errors. Above all, this study is well aware that writing is basically a cognitive process where different instructional procedures including corrective feedback are important to mediate input and learning.

3.8. Empirical Review of Studies on CF

It is believed that making a review of previous researches conducted on different issues related to the current research is necessary, for it will help readers understand what has been going on in this area. For an identical reason, in the sub-sections below, attempts were made to review and summarize the results of researches conducted on written corrective feedback in different contexts.

3.8.1. Foreign Research Work

Because the fact that corrective feedback has been perceived to have a huge value for language learning, it has been seen as a legitimate object of a number of inquiries into classroom teaching and learning (Samar, 2009). One field of research in error feedback seeks to find out which correction methods could result in improvement in L2 learners' language proficiency: direct/explicit or indirect/implicit. In a study investigating university ESL students' abilities to self-edit their writing across two feedback conditions: (1) direct correction with the correct form provided by the teacher; (2) indirect correction indicating that an error exists but without providing the correction, Liu (2008) found that both types of feedback helped students self-edit their texts. However, this study indicated that although

direct correction is important to improve accuracy in immediate student revisions, its long term effect is not significant.

Following a similar line of inquiry, Chandler (2003) compared four types of feedback: direct correction, underlining with description, description only, and underlining only. In her study, Chandler found both direct correction and underlining to be more effective than describing the type of error in reducing students' written errors. She also noted that direct correction worked best for producing accurate revision. She specifically stated that teachers' feedback on students' grammatical and lexical errors resulted in a significant improvement in both accuracy and fluency in subsequent writings of the same type over the same semester. In this study, it is stated that there was no significant difference between direct correction and underlining of errors.

Likewise, Ferris (2002), as cited in Bitchener & Knock (2008), investigated the effects of different direct and indirect treatment conditions on both text revisions and new pieces of writing and reported that direct error correction led to more correct revisions (88%) than indirect error feedback (77%). However, this study also revealed that as time goes on, students who received indirect feedback reduced their error frequency ratios substantially more than those who received direct feedback. More recently, Erel & Bullut (2007) investigated the effectiveness of indirect feedback in the form coding (error identification) and direct correction and found that the group which received coded feedback improved in accuracy more than the direct feedback group.

On the other hand, some studies focused only on the efficacy of different forms of indirect correction. For instance, Lee (1997) studied the effectiveness of two indirect feedback modes and found a significant effect for the group whose errors were underlined, compared with the groups who received no corrective feedback or only a marginal check. In a similar vein, Ferris and Roberts (2001) examined the effects of two different indirect feedback treatments (errors marked with codes; errors underlined but not marked or labeled; no error feedback) and found that both error feedback groups significantly outperformed the no feedback control group, but, there were no significant differences between the group given coded feedback and the group whose errors were simply underlined (as reported by Liu,

2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008). However, other researchers report that they found no difference in efficacy between these two treatment conditions (E.g., Robb et al, 1986).

The other research line in the area of corrective feedback in L2 classrooms, which is the focus of the present study, is that of focused error feedback (selective) and unfocused (comprehensive) error feedback. Like other issues related to corrective feedback, the issue of whether to employ focused or unfocused corrective feedback is still an area of debate among scholars (Lalande, 1982; Van Beuningen, 2011; Robb et al, 1986). Generally, the literature on error correction seems to favor selective rather than comprehensive type of correction. According to Robb et al (1986), writers can assimilate only a small proportion of corrective feedback into their current grammatical system; therefore, it is important for teachers to be selective in addressing students' written errors. As indicated earlier, many scholars suggest that writing teachers should select three types of errors for correction: errors that impair communication significantly, errors that have highly stigmatizing effect on the reader, and errors that occur frequently in students' writing (Ferris, 2004, 2010).

Among the studies conducted following this line, Bitchener et al (2005) compared two direct types of feedback groups: direct written feedback combined with oral conference feedback, and direct written feedback only, and a control group (no corrective feedback) on three types of errors (prepositions, the past simple tense, and the definite article). The study found a significant effect of the combination of written and oral feedback in the use of the past simple tense and the definite article in new pieces of writing. The findings were confirmed by a recent study by Bitchener & Knoch (2008) who compared three types of direct corrective feedback: a combination of direct feedback, written and oral meta-linguistic explanation; direct feedback and written meta-linguistic explanation; and direct feedback only. It was found that the accuracy of students who received feedback in the immediate post-test outperformed those in the control group who received no corrective feedback in the use of a target grammatical item (the English article system).

In a similar route, Ellis et al (2008) have investigated the effectiveness of focused and unfocused written error correction on improving accuracy in students' use of articles in subsequent writings. In this study, the subjects were divided into three: where one group received correction only on article usage, the second group received corrective feedback on

article usage together with other errors, while the third group (control group) received no corrective feedback at all. A pre-test, an immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test were employed to check the effectiveness of the treatment type. The results indicate that the two experimental groups outperformed the control group in improving accuracy from the pre-test to the post-test. However, it is also indicated that the two corrective feedback types, i.e., focused and unfocused, are equally effective.

Focusing on five grammatical structures (article use, preposition use, copular 'be', irregular past, and regular past), Sheen et al (2009) on the other hand, investigated the differential effects of focused and unfocused corrective feedback (CF) on improving accuracy in adult ESL learners' compositions. After employing a series of ANNOVA's, they found that the focused feedback group (FG) achieved the highest level of accuracy on the targeted grammatical structures, while Unfocused CF has very little value.

3.8.2. Local Research Work

As far as the reading boundaries of the present researcher, there are only a few studies conducted on written corrective feedback in the context of Ethiopia. Even these few studies, except Tesfaye's (1995) and Italo's (1999) do not attempt to investigate the effectiveness of corrective feedback. They explore the practices of CF in our schools and universities and do not attempt to investigate whether our practices are effective. Given below is a brief discussion of corrective feedback studies in the context of teaching EFL writing Ethiopia.

Getinet (1983) investigated the responding behavior of Sophomore English instructors at Addis Ababa University and found that the teachers' corrections focused mainly on low order concerns (grammar, spelling, vocabulary and punctuation). He also found that the most dominant error treatment method used in the writing class was teacher correction.

In a study comparing the effectiveness of self versus teacher correction, Tesfaye (1995), on his part, reported that self correction was more effective in helping learners than teacher correction. However, like Getinet (1983), he also found that what was dominantly employed to respond to students' written errors was teacher correction.

Italo (1999) made a comparative study on the effectiveness of teacher versus peer feedback methods on students' writing revisions and found that although both the correction types under investigation resulted in significant improvements on students' writing revisions, there was no significant difference between the two types of feedback.

Another study by Mesfin (2004) assessed the level of effectiveness of peer versus self correction on high school students' writing performance. The results showed that both types of correction under investigation were equally important in improving student writing. The result from students' and teachers' questionnaire indicated a discrepancy between what students prefer to have and what the teachers believe to be effective.

Temesgen (2008) investigated the effect of peer feedback on writing performance and anxiety of EFL students at a university. His results showed that there was no significant difference between the two groups (the one given training on peer feedback, while the other not given) in their writing performance. However, he states that the experimental group students showed more improvement in low order features of writing. These students also exhibited low writing anxiety level, and had positive attitude towards peer feedback.

From this survey of related research, it seems possible to summarize that:

- Results from corrective feedback studies are mixed, i.e., some studies indicate no positive effect for corrective feedback in improving linguistic accuracy, while other more recent studies have come up with positive effects.
- Most studies on focused written corrective feedback have targeted on very limited number of error categories (2 or 3), and this form of feedback has not been studied in our context.
- Most of the written corrective feedback studies have attempted to investigate improvements in students' revisions rather than in new pieces of writing.
- Focused corrective feedback is more of a recently introduced variable in the feedback research.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

As indicated earlier, the main objective of this research project was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused written corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of university level first year EFL learners' writing. In this chapter,

the research methodology underpinning the study, its design, the research setting, methods of data gathering and techniques to analyze these data are discussed.

4.1. Research Methodology

The literature tells us that early forms of research believed in quantitative and observable research procedures. However, later, the need of researches to understand human interaction made it clear that many issues in the social environment could not be quantified. This paved the way for the emergence of qualitative research methods. Nevertheless, like the quantitative methodology, the qualitative one was also found to possess some weaknesses. Because of the perceived weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research approaches, an approach which combines the strong sides of each of these approaches is recommended. This method, called a mixed research approach or triangulation, (Spratt et al, 2004), attempts to avoid research bias by using several data sources. As Spratt et al (2004: 6) note:

Combining quantitative and qualitative methods sounds like a good idea. Using multiple approaches can capitalize on the strengths of each approach and offset their different weaknesses. It could also provide more comprehensive answers to research questions, going beyond the limitations of a single approach.

Convinced of these advantages, the present research used a mixed research methodology where both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered using different tools and these were analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. To this effect, quantitative data were gathered through close ended questionnaire items and grammatical error counts, while qualitative data were generated through open ended questionnaire items. And quite obviously, there was no other option than the power of words to qualitatively describe the data which were gathered in numbers.

4.2. Subjects and Samples of the Study

This study was conducted in two phases: a pilot and a main phase. The two phases had their own respective subjects.

4.2.1. Subjects and Samples of the Pilot Study

The subjects of the pilot study were first year students who were taking the course Basic Writing Skills/Sophomore English at Woldiya University in the second semester of the 2011/12 academic year and instructors who were offering the writing course at the university.

Of the students who were enrolled for the course under different faculties, the Natural Sciences faculty was selected randomly. Then, from the different departments under this faculty, the Mathematics department was selected again randomly. The department at that time consisted of 33 students. All these students were made samples of the study on which the research tools were piloted.

As to the instructors, those who were offering the writing course during the semester under study and those who have ever taught writing courses were comprehensively made subjects for the pilot study.

4.2.2. Subjects and Samples of the Main Study

Like what happened with the pilot study, the data necessary for the main phase of this study came from two groups of subjects: first year students at Wollo university who were taking Basic Writing Skills/ Sophomore English in the first semester of the 2012/13 academic year and their instructors for this EFL writing course.

During the semester under study, students in the College of Business & Economics, college of Agriculture, College of Medicine, School of Veterinary Medicine, Institute of Technology, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, and Institute of Pedagogical & Behavioral Sciences were taking the aforementioned writing course.

As it was practically impossible to include all the students in these faculties , colleges and schools, it was inevitable to take samples. Because the data from students was to come from two different sources (i.e., questionnaire and writing tasks), it was tried to have two different sampling techniques.

For the questionnaire survey, 60 students in 6 sections who were offered the writing course by 6 different instructors were made to respond. As the questionnaires were distributed and filled in classes, the instructors' volunteeines to set some time aside was checked before

going to the classes. Then, in each class, 10 questionnaire papers were distributed randomly. To minimize the confounding effect of the researcher's CF intervention, students who were receiving the CF were not made to respond to the questionnaire.

For the writing tasks, first, the Natural Sciences faculty was selected as a target stratum. This was done purposely because the faculty was randomly made to be the target faculty during the pilot phase. Students enrolled under the department of Biology (2 sections), Chemistry (2 sections), Mathematics (1 section), and Physics (1 section) were taking the writing course during the semester. From these, the Chemistry department was selected again purposely because of some basic reasons.

- The need to include more students in the treatment necessitated the taking up of a department with more student population.
- The two section students were offered the writing course by the same instructor, and hence, this was used as an advantage to minimize instructor related variables.
- The instructor who was offering the writing course for these students volunteered to cooperate with the researcher.

As it was practically difficult to include all the students (# 104) in the Chemistry department in the corrective intervention process, only half of them (# 52) were selected by using systematic random sampling.

Apart from the students, all the instructors (# 11) who were offering the writing course were made to respond to a questionnaire.

4.3. Research Design

This study was a quasi-experimental design. Looking at the title of the study, one might feel that it was going to be experimental. However, because the study was conducted in an intact classroom setting, it was practically impossible to have a true control group which was not provided with CF. In essence, the study attempted to investigate the causal relationship between different corrective feedback conditions and students' writing accuracy by incorporating two experimental groups.

In addition, this study was designed to have a longitudinal nature basically because it was believed that language learning happens as a gradual process, and hence, it requires a continual follow up. It is reported that one-shot studies could not demonstrate actual progress in language learning.

Readers could easily infer that this study focuses on investigating changes in the writing accuracy of the subjects within a given period of time. As changes in writing accuracy are exhibited only through time, it was obligatory to approach the issue longitudinally measuring the changes in accuracy from one writing occasion to another.

4.4. Research Methods

4.4.1. Procedures for the Formation of the Treatment Groups and Treatment Conditions

As indicted earlier, the primary objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused and indirect unfocused corrective feedback strategies on improving the accuracy of EFL university level first year students' compositions. To achieve this objective, the sample subjects had to be grouped into 2 groups- focused corrective feedback group and unfocused corrective feedback group. What follows is a note of the procedures of how the groups were formed.

4.4.1.1. Formation of the Treatment Groups during the Pilot Study

After the sample department was selected by lot, the researcher contacted the instructor of the writing course for that students and made some arrangements. Before the commencement of the CF interventions, we agreed that the instructor had to complete offering lessons on the introductory parts of the course. These parts of the course dealt with sentence level notes and activities and preparatory lessons to write paragraphs.

After these introductory lessons were completed, the researcher in consultation with the instructor, made an arrangement to make students write their first paragraph which was used as a pre-test. Ahead of the pre-test writing, the researcher and the instructor made selection of writing topics from a collection of topics which were taken from Snow (2007).

During the pre-test writing, 28 students availed themselves. To form the 2 treatment groups, the students were listed from 1-28. Then, the odd-numbered students formed one group while the even-numbered ones made another. Then, a lot was drawn to determine the group to be a focused CF group and the group to be an unfocused CF group. The lot determined the odd-numbered students to be in the focused CF group and the even-numbered ones to be in the unfocused CF group.

After the groups were formed, they were put under 2 different corrective treatment conditions. That is, the focused CF group received indirect CF only on targeted grammatical errors while the unfocused CF group students were made to receive indirect CF on virtually all or most of their grammar errors.

4.4.1.2. Formation of the Treatment Groups during the Main Study

The procedure followed to form the treatment groups during the main study was almost a replica of what was used during the pilot study. However, in the later case, the 52 sample students had been selected prior to the production of the pre-test writing.

To form the two treatment groups in the main study, the sample students were listed randomly from 1-52. Then, the even-numbered students were made to form one group, while the odd-numbered students made up of the other group. Finally, a lot was drawn to decide one of the groups to be the FCFG and the other to be the UFCFG. The lot, coincidentally, determined the odd-numbered students to form the FCFG and the even-numbered ones the UFCFG.

After the students were grouped into 2, both in the pilot and main studies, they were provided with different corrective treatment conditions (indirect unfocused corrective feedback (IDUFCF) and indirect focused corrective feedback (IDFCF)).

In the treatment process, indirect corrective feedback was provided in the form of the researcher underlining and writing a symbol (code) for each grammatical error. The reason to use both error location and error identification was on the one hand to give the students responsibility to correct their errors and on the other to help them to call upon their prior

knowledge or use resources such as grammar handbooks to understand or remember the rule and figure out how to apply it.

4.4.2. Determining Errors to Target on

Regarding which student errors to focus on when providing corrective feedback, different scholars have forwarded their own suggestions. Corder (1967) advises that teachers should try to correct errors, but not mistakes. Burt (1975), as cited by Ellis (2004) has distinguished between global errors (errors that affect overall sentence organization, e.g., wrong word order, missing or wrongly placed sentence connectors, and syntactic overgeneralizations) and local errors (errors that affect single elements in a sentence, e.g., errors in morphology or grammatical functors), and suggested that corrective attempts should focus on global errors rather than local errors. Krashen (1982), on his part, advises teachers to limit corrective feedback to features that are simple and portable. Similarly, Ferris (2010) suggests that teachers should direct written corrective feedback at treatable errors (i.e. errors relating to features that occur in a patterned, rule-governed way. Hendrickson (1978), on the other hand, suggests that teachers should consider the degree to which the error compromises the intelligibility of the learner's message, the frequency of the error in a learner's production, the grammatical structures being taught in class, and the generalizability of the grammatical rule.

However, all these proposals might not work well at all contexts, and hence, error correction guidelines should be suggestive, not prescriptive. In general, different scholars seem to agree that providing corrective feedback on students' grammatical errors depends on the teacher's own judgment. The teacher, however, should take into account the learner's language development level, the prevalence of the error type, the communicative value of the error type, and the teacher's specific goals in terms of language development. The present research applied some of these suggestions to determine the grammatical errors to focus on during the CF intervention.

4.4.2.1. Grammatical Errors Targeted during the Pilot Study

During the pilot study, the errors made candidates of the focused CF were word choice (WC), sentence fragment (Frag), punctuation (PU), preposition (Prep), word formation (WF) and verb formation (VF). These were the 6 grammatical errors which happened most frequently during the students' pre-test compositions.

4.4.2.2. Grammatical Errors Targeted during the Main Study

During the main study, on the other hand, the focused CF group was provided with indirect corrective feedback targeting sentence fragment, punctuation, preposition, word formation, and verb formation errors. These errors were selected because they were again found to be the most frequent grammatical errors in the students' pre-test compositions.

As readers could see, some modifications were made on the errors to target during the main study. Word choice errors were made out of focus at this time because of the lessons obtained from the upgrading defense session. One of the comments at that session was it might be too much to focus on 6 types of grammatical errors.

Most of the previous studies in this line have targeted only on 1-3 error types, with almost all of these studies focusing on the English article system. Ferris (2010) criticizes this trend to be too narrow. Understanding this shortcoming, the present study tried to target on 6/5 error categories. On the other hand, like what happened with the pilot study, the unfocused corrective feedback group students were offered with indirect error feedback on other grammatical errors in addition to the ones targeted for the focused CF group.

4.4.3. Duration of the Treatment and the Timing of the Writing Tasks

According to Li (2010), post-test writing tasks could be classified into 3 based on the time elapsed between a writing task and the return of that task with CF. Li (ibid) classifies post tests as:

- Immediate post tests if it is taken within 7 days after the treatment.
- A short term (moderately)delayed post test if it is administered 8-29 days after the treatment
- A long term delayed post test if it happens 30 days or later after the treatment.

The timing of the writing tasks in the present study was scheduled by borrowing Li's categorization of writing tasks which is depicted above.

4.4.3.1. Duration of the Treatment during the Pilot Study

The CF treatment during the pilot study covered 25 days. During this period, the students in the target department (N=24) wrote 3 paragraphs: a pre-test which was returned to the students at the 7th day of its production, an immediate post-test which was produced 4 days after the return of the pre-test with CF and returned at the 7th day of its production, and a moderately delayed post-test which was written 14 days after the return of the immediate post-test composition. In other words, there was a 25 days gap between the production of the immediate post-test and the moderately delayed post-test. All the 3 paragraphs were written by following an exemplification/ expository/ paragraph development pattern. The timing of the writing tests during the pilot study is presented in table 4.1 below.

Table 3: Timing of the Writing Tasks during the Pilot Study

Writing	Written	Returned
Pre-test		The 7 th day after its production
Immediate Post-test	4 days after the return of the pre-test	The 7 th day after its production
Moderately delayed post-test	14 days after the return of the immediate post-test	Not returned

4.4.3.2. Duration of the Treatment during the Main Study

The CF treatment for the main study, on the other hand, covered 43 days through which the students (N=52) were required to produce 3 paragraphs: a pre-test, an immediate post-test, and a delayed post-test paragraphs. Originally, it was decided to make the students write 4 paragraphs: a pre-test, an immediate post-test, a moderately delayed post-test, and a delayed post-test writing. However, different classroom constraints did not allow the plan to proceed as scheduled. Because of this, the moderately delayed post-test writing was cancelled. These paragraphs were written by following an exemplification/ expository paragraph development pattern as was the case during the pilot study. As these paragraphs were written only for the purpose of the study, they were not marked. Between these paragraphs, the

students undertook other writing activities on which they were provided with marks and feedback on other issues like content and organization. The students were advised to study and utilize the feedback on the target (research) compositions in their subsequent writings.

The timing of the writing tasks during the main study is summarized in table 4.2 below.

Table 4: Timing of the Writing Tasks during the Main Study

Writing	Written	Returned
Pre-test composition	Tah.15&16	The 7 th day after its production
Immediate Post-test composition	8/7 days after the return of the pre-test	The 6 th / 7 th day of its production
Delayed post-test composition	28 days after the return of the immediate post-test	Not returned

After each writing task was completed, the papers were collected and placed into their respective CF categories, and the errors in them were recorded according to the error categories identified from the pre-test. All the compositions (of the pilot and main study), except the delayed post-test paragraphs, were photocopied for future reference and continuous check up.

4.5. Data Gathering Tools for the Study

4.5.1. Questionnaire for Students

According to Dornyei (2007), questionnaires are reported to yield mainly three types of data about the respondent. These include factual questions which are designed to find out certain facts about the respondents such as demographic characteristics, socioeconomic status, language learning history etc. The other data about respondents could be gathered by employing behavioral questions which are used to find out what the respondents are doing or have done in the past, focusing on actions, life styles, habits and personal history. More importantly, there are attitudinal questions which are devised to find out what people think, including their attitudes, opinions, beliefs, interests and values.

In the current research project, a questionnaire was designed for the target students who were enrolled for the course Basic Writing Skills both during the pilot and main studies. The questionnaire consisted of both open and close-ended items. The close-ended items were used to gather quantitative data, while the open-ended items generated qualitative data. Some of the items in the students' questionnaire were behavioral while others were attitudinal. The purposes of this questionnaire were to gather data from the students regarding:

- their opinions about the value of written corrective feedback on the accuracy of their writings,
- their preferences for direct and indirect corrective feedback methods and the reasons for their preferences,
- their preferences for focused and unfocused CF and the reasons for their preferences,
- their experiences of direct and indirect CF,
- their experiences of focused and unfocused CF,
- the strategies they take when they receive their compositions back with corrective feedback, their preferences for focused or unfocused feedback, and
- the problems they face (if any) when they receive their compositions back with CF from their teachers.

Many items in the students' questionnaire were modified based on the lessons learned from the pilot study. For example:

- Many items in the students' questionnaire were modified so that they could be clear. This was because it was found out that the students had difficulties understanding the items as desired.(See Appendices I and VI).
- The time frequency scales in students' questionnaire (which had only 3 scales "Always", "Sometimes", and "Never" were subject to modification based on the comments received from the upgrading defense. Hence, for the main study, the scales were raised into 5 by inserting a "Usually" and "Rarely" options.
- An item was cancelled because it was not responded to by any student during the pilot study.

4.5.2. Questionnaire for writing instructors

All the instructors who were offering the course Basic Writing Skills / Sophomore English for the target students at Woldiya and Wollo universities, during the pilot and main studies respectively, were requested to fill in a questionnaire. The teachers' questionnaire was used to:

- Collect factual information about the teachers' qualifications and teaching experiences,
- Gather data from the teachers pertaining to their opinions regarding the value they attach with CF on improving the accuracy of their students' writing,
- Find out behavioral information from the teachers about what CF strategies (direct or indirect) they employ on their students' written grammatical errors and their reasons for doing so,
- Collect information from the teachers regarding whether they most of the time employ focused or unfocused CF and their justification for utilizing either of these,
- Find out whether the teachers face any problems while providing written CF, and
- Find out if the teachers ever tried to identify their students' most frequent grammatical errors, and if they did so, what these errors were.

Like what was done with the students' questionnaire, some modifications were made on the teachers' questionnaire before it was administered to the teachers in the main study. For example:

- Some items in the teachers' questionnaire were modified for clarity. For instance, as many of the writing teachers commented that focused and unfocused CF should be defined, and as it was found that some of them were confused focused/unfocused CF with direct/indirect CF, the items were modified accordingly.
- The frequency scales in the teachers' questionnaire were modified as what was done with the students' questionnaire.

4.5.3. Students' Compositions

It is recalled that the major objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused CF in improving the writing accuracy of EFL students. One could easily judge that the most viable data gathering tools for this purpose are students' writings. From the variety of writing activities, the present research used paragraph writing as a data gathering tool.

Paragraph writing was selected as a tool in this study because of some practical reasons. Some researchers in this area (e.g., Italo, 1999) have used essay writing, but this seems impractical in our case these days because many English language instructors have been reporting that most of our university students are so poor in their language proficiency that they cannot even produce a single grammatically correct sentence. If that is the case, asking students to write essays is simply impractical. Other researchers (e.g, Tesfaye, 1995) have employed sentence level writing and translation to gather data. The present researcher feels that sentence level activities do not clearly exhibit a student's writing ability because they are decontextualized. Regarding this, Polio (1997) suggests that we have to base many errors like tense or reference errors on preceding discourse and not to look at sentences in isolation. As for translation activities, it currently seems almost totally implausible as we have university students who are coming from extremely heterogeneous L₁ backgrounds some of whom could not communicate in a language other than their mother tongue.

Having this in mind, the target students were made to write 3 different paragraphs: a pre-test, an immediate post-test and a delayed post-test writing activities.

The pre-test writing task was used to:

- Find out how long the students would take to write exemplification paragraphs,
- Determine the students' level of grammatical accuracy against which to make comparisons to see the students' progress in accuracy in the forthcoming writing activities,
- Identify the types of grammatical errors exhibited in the students' compositions,
- Categorize the grammatical errors identified from the students' compositions,
- Determine the most frequent grammatical errors to target on in the study,
- Form the two CF groups, and
- Start to provide the students with CF.

In short, the pre-test writing task was used as a springboard to proceed with the next steps of the research.

To determine the types of grammatical errors in the students' paragraphs, the error categorization schemes employed by Polio(1997), Hartshorn (2008), Erel & Bullut(2007) and Jia & Binglan (2010) were thoroughly gone through.

The immediate post-test and the delayed post-test writing tasks were, on the other hand, used to see:

- Whether the writing tasks could consistently elicit similar grammatical errors from the students,
- Compare the effects of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused CF moves on the students' writing accuracy, and
- Check whether the error categorization could work consistently across the writing tasks.

4.6. Reliability and Validity of Data

Although reliability and validity have been at the center of scientific research literature, different scholars have come up with their own interpretations of these terms. In this study, the very recent understandings of the terms are followed.

4.6.1. Reliability

Dornyei (2007:44) defines reliability as a measurement term which:

.....refers to the consistencies of data, scores or observations obtained using elicitation instruments.... In other words, reliability indicates the extent to which our measurement instruments and procedures produce consistent results in a given population in different circumstances.

Unlike what was believed in the past, reliability now is seen not as a characteristic of an instrument, rather it being a property of the scores of a measurement tool.

In the present research, an attempt was made to adhere to this current notion of reliability. To this effect, it was tried to collect data as reliably as possible by employing the following strategies.

Regarding the items of both the questionnaires:

- It was attempted to crosscheck the reliability of responses by including different items which focused on each theme.
- Where discrepancies in responses were found during the pilot phase, items were modified for clarity and simplicity before they were distributed to the subjects of the main study.

On the other hand, concerning the reliability of the data gathered from the writing tasks:

- From the onset of the study, it was determined that all the writing tasks which the students were made to produce had to be of a single genre type i.e., exemplification (expository) paragraph writing. This was done for the purpose of making the students write in similar obligatory contexts which would invite them to utilize similar grammatical forms thereby eliciting similar kinds of grammatical errors across compositions. This was hoped to serve as a test-retest mechanism.
- The data collection from every paragraph was checked rigorously for many times by the researcher.
- Furthermore, the linguistic accuracy was measured by utilizing the proportion of total number of errors committed by each student to the total number of words written by the students in a group. This measurement of linguistic accuracy has been reported to yield high inter-rater reliability (Erel & Bullut, 2007; Hartshorn, 2008; Liu, 2008) although it is known that an instrument reliable at a certain context might not necessarily be reliable at other contexts.
- During the main study, it was attempted to analyze as many sample paragraphs as possible by taking as many sample students as possible.
- In addition, taking the feedback from the upgrading session, in the main study, samples of students' paragraphs (8 paragraphs) were randomly selected from the pre-test writing and were distributed to 4 writing instructors to identify and categorize the grammatical errors in each paragraph. From the 4 instructors, 2 instructors who were found to have a better error identification agreement with the researcher during the pre-test writing were made to mark the 8 paragraphs which were selected from each of the post-test writing task. To this effect, the instructors were given operationalizations of the different grammar error categories (Appendix III). However, because the scoring agreement between the researcher and the instructors

was at the beginning found to be relatively low, detailed discussions were made with them before they marked the sample paragraphs from the immediate post-test. This included having a look at of some sample grammatical errors extracted from paragraphs written by subjects of the pilot study (*Appendix III*).

4.6.2. Validity

The earlier definition of validity reads, a test is valid if it measures what it is supposed to measure. However, through the ages, conceptions about the term validity have undergone several changes, and currently validity, “..... is a property of the conclusions, interpretations or inferences that we draw from the assessment instruments and procedures, not the instruments and procedures themselves,” states Dornyei (2007:45).

Following this notion of validity, in the present research, different attempts were made to arrive at valid conclusions by employing valid research instruments. For example:

- The items both in the students’ and teachers’ questionnaire were adapted from prominent researchers in this area. They had also been used by different researchers for decades. Therefore, it could be claimed that their validity is already established.
- The items in the questionnaires were commented on by the researcher’s supervisor and colleagues for their content and face validity. Necessary modifications were made based on these comments before the tools were tried out.
- In addition, the researcher’s experience as an EFL instructor at different universities across different disciplines and levels for more than a decade is that the writing tasks are among the common tasks which university students undertake. This indicates that the writing tests are content valid. Besides, these forms of writing were reported (Geremew, 1999) to be among the writing tasks common to university level natural science students.
- Also, attempts were made to control different variables (for example, the students were offered the writing course by the same instructor; no grammar lessons were given once the CF process commenced). Therefore, it is hoped that the differences in the writing accuracies of the two groups would be because of the corrective treatment rather than of other variables.

- Furthermore, the data analysis techniques which were used to analyze and interpret the data were hoped to be appropriate for the data gathered, hence possessing measurement validity.
- The writing tasks were among those tasks included in the module designed for the course under study. They were also believed to be tasks which are among the subjects' authentic written communication.
- Paragraph level writing rather than essay level seemed more realistic provided the subjects' poor writing skills proficiency. Besides, rather than sentence level writing, paragraph writing was assumed to be more valid to actually measure the students' linguistic proficiency.

4.7. Techniques of Data Analysis

The data gathered through the different tools were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The data from the questionnaire were analyzed by using percentage and qualitative description. On the other hand, to analyze the data from students' compositions, different statistical techniques like percentages, means, an independent t-test, a paired t-test and a repeated measures ANOVA were used.

- Students' and teachers' responses to the close ended items in their questionnaire were presented and reported in tables and percentages.
- The subjects' (teachers' and students') responses to the open ended questionnaire items were analyzed qualitatively.
- Means were employed several times because in order to measure the writing accuracy of the subjects, the ratio of total number of linguistic errors to the total number of words was used. Also, the average number of errors committed by the subjects in each writing occasion was calculated.
- Paired t-tests were used at different points to test the difference in adjusted means of grammatical errors between two writing occasions within groups (i.e., within the IFCFG and within the IUFCFG).

- Independent samples t-tests were employed during the formation of the two CF groups in order to see whether there was no significant difference in the means of the writing accuracy of the groups.
- The ANOVA, on the other hand, was used to test whether the differences between the three means of each group (i.e., across the three writing occasions) were statistically significant.
- These statistical data analysis techniques were also substantiated with qualitative discussions where necessary.

CHAPTER FIVE: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

5.1. Introduction

This chapter attempted to address the major as well as specific objectives of the current research. As indicated several times earlier, the major objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused CF in improving the writing accuracy of university level EFL students. The study also tried to meet some specific objectives which were related to the major objective in one way or another. These specific objectives were to:

1. Find out teachers' and students' beliefs about the value of CF in improving writing accuracy,
2. Explore students' and teachers' preferences for different CF types and techniques,
3. Survey students' and teachers' experiences of receiving and providing CF on written grammatical errors,

4. Assess what problems (if any) the students and their writing teachers face when receiving and providing CF on written grammar errors, and
5. Investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused CF in reducing grammatical errors in subsequent exemplification paragraphs written by first year EFL university level students.

In an attempt to help readers create a linkage between the pilot and the main studies, a summary of the major findings of the pilot study and the lessons absorbed from that study are presented below before going directly to the presentation and analysis of data from the main study.

5.2. Summary of Findings from the Pilot Study

It is recalled that this study was piloted at Woldiya university in the second semester of the 2012/13 academic year. The subjects of the pilot study were first year students who were enrolled for the course Basic Writing Skills/ Sophomore English/ and instructors who were offering the writing course. A class of students randomly selected from those who were taking the course were made samples of the study. Then, these students were made to react to two data collection tools: a questionnaire and writing tasks. On the other hand, all the teachers who were offering the writing course were made to respond to their version of a questionnaire. The major findings obtained from the pilot study are summarized below.

5.2.1. Results from Students' Questionnaire

The students in one class (N=33) were made to fill in a questionnaire consisting of 19 items 8 of which were open-ended and the remaining close-ended (See *Appendix I*). The questionnaire had items aiming at finding out: students' views about the value of CF in improving the accuracy of their writing, students' experiences of receiving written CF, their

preferences for different written CF types, the problems (if any) they faced while receiving written CF from their writing teacher, and the strategies they used when receiving their compositions back with CF from their writing teacher.

The results from the students' questionnaire indicated that:

- Almost all the students (except 1) were found to believe that CF provided by their writing teacher on their written grammar errors was (very) important for improving the accuracy of their written work.
- The majority of the students said that the CF type most frequently applied on their written grammar errors was direct correction.
- Most of the students said that their writing teacher most often employed focused CF.
- The majority of the students (60%) preferred to have a combination of direct and indirect CF, while none of them showed a preference for indirect CF alone.
- From among the different direct CF techniques, most students preferred to have grammatical explanation by their teacher.
- The majority of the students (about 86%) preferred to have focused CF.
- A larger percentage of students indicated that they have not faced any problems when receiving CF from their writing teachers.
- Regarding they did when they received their papers with CF from their teacher, the majority of the students said that they rewrote their compositions by incorporating the corrections provided by their writing teachers. Asking friends for help and consulting a grammar book were reported to be the second and third most frequently used strategies by the students.

5.2.2. Results from Teachers' Questionnaire

A questionnaire consisting of 23 items, 11 open and 12 close-ended, was distributed to the 7 teachers who were offering the course Basic Writing Skills/ Sophomore English during the semester in which the pilot study was conducted. The teachers' questionnaire was comprised of items aiming at exploring: the teachers' qualification and teaching experience, their views on the value of CF in improving students' writing accuracy, their experiences of providing

CF on their students' written grammar errors, their perceptions of effective CF types, the problems (if any) they faced when providing CF on their students' written errors, and the most frequent grammar errors they identified (if they tried to do so) from their students' written pieces.

From the teachers' questionnaire, it was found out that:

- Most of them (except 1) were of the view that CF was (very) useful for their students' writing accuracy improvement. CF, according to them, was important to avoid making similar errors, to refer to more sources for more learning, and to help them express messages clearly.
- Half of them employed indirect CF alone while the other half employed a combination of direct and indirect CF. Here, there seems to be a bit of discrepancy between what students said to prefer and what the teachers said to employ most. We have tried to indicate above that most students preferred to have direct CF.
- The majority of the teachers tended to use focused CF, and this seems to agree with the students' preferences.
- All the writing teachers tried to identify their students' most common grammatical errors. From their responses, we could see that their students' most common written grammar errors were tense, spelling, subject-verb agreement, and punctuation.
- When asked whether they faced problems when they were providing CF on their students' written grammar errors, all of them reported that they faced problems. Among the problems they faced were: students' need for immediate CF which would be practically difficult, some students' feeling of uneasiness about correction, the fact that their students' written pieces were full of errors and were usually difficult to understand and thus difficult to provide CF, and the students continued to commit the same errors despite being corrected.
- Most of the teachers believed that indirect CF could be more effective; this seems to contradict with what they said to have actually practiced. It seems that most of them believe in the fact that indirect CF has a more learning value; it makes students independent learners, and this form of CF encourages cooperative learning. However,

may be because of their own different reasons, they reported that they most often used a combination of direct and indirect CF.

- Most of the teachers believed that focused CF could be more fruitful than unfocused CF. This seems to go inline with what the students preferred to have.

5.2.3. Results from Students' Compositions

The students (N=28) who availed themselves at the pre-test writing task were listed from 1 to 28. Then, the even-numbered students formed one group while the odd-numbered students made another group. As one of these groups had to be either a focused or an unfocused CF group, it was decided to draw a lot which determined the odd-numbered students to be in the focused CF group. Then, the students in the focused CF group were provided with indirect CF (underlining grammar errors + writing codes for that errors) focusing only on 6 grammar errors while the students in the unfocused CF group received this type of indirect CF on all or most of their written grammar errors.

The students were made to write 3 expository paragraphs: a pre-test, an immediate post-test and a moderately delayed post-test writing activities. The effects of the CF interventions were, then, investigated by using a paired samples t-test statistical procedure. The writing tasks were also used to: see the amount of time the students would take to write expository paragraphs (on the given topics), to identify and categorize the grammatical errors exhibited in these paragraphs, and to determine the most frequent grammar errors to be targets of the focused CF.

From the students' compositions, it was found that:

- The students took approximately from 30 to 40 minutes to write a paragraph of exemplification/expository type.
- The students' compositions were found to be full of grammatical errors, in some cases covering up to 30% of the total words written by a student.

- The students' written grammatical errors could be categorized into 20 error categories (*Appendix XXVII*).
- The six most common grammatical errors made by the students (as far as exemplification/expository type of writing is concerned) were found to be word formation, verb formation, word choice, punctuation, preposition and sentence fragment.
- Neither the IUFCF nor the IFCF has resulted in significant gains in the accuracy levels of the students between any of the two writing instances.
- While the IFCF has resulted in a significant reduction of the TGE's between compositions 1 and 3 as well as compositions 2 and 3, the IUFCF hasn't resulted in a significant difference in the means of the TGE's by the students in the UFCFG between any of the writing occasions.

5.3. Lessons Learned from the Pilot Study

As indicated earlier, the main purpose of a pilot project was to try out the data collection instruments and the data analysis techniques to arrange clear ways for the main study. In the same principle, the following lessons were learned from this pilot study.

- Many items in the students' questionnaire were modified so that they could be clear. This was because it was found out that the students had difficulties understanding the items as desired. For example, many students had difficulties to understand what focused and unfocused CF meant (See Appendices I and VI).
- The time frequency scales in students' questionnaire (which had only 3 scales "Always", "Sometimes", and "Never" were subject to modification based on the comments received from the upgrading defense. Hence, for the main study, the scales were raised into 5 by inserting a "Usually" and "Rarely" options.
- As no student has reacted to item 19 of the questionnaire, this item was cancelled during the main study.
- The same modification was made on the frequency scales of the writing teachers' questionnaire.

- Some items in the teachers' questionnaire were modified for clarity. For instance, as many of the writing teachers commented that focused and unfocused CF should be defined, and as it was found that some of them were confused focused/unfocused CF with direct/indirect CF, the items were modified accordingly.
- It was also learned that the consistency of the researcher's rating of the subjects' grammar errors should have been tested. Having this lesson, in order to check the reliability of the researcher's identification and categorization of the subjects' written grammar errors, during the main study, 8 paragraphs were randomly selected from each writing occasion and provided to 2 raters. Then, inter-rater agreements between the raters and the researcher were computed and reported.
- In addition to the percentage, independent samples t-test, and paired t-test (matched t-test), the effects of the CF interventions across the three writing occasions should have been examined by using an ANOVA. Having this lesson, during the main study, the differences in the writing accuracy of the subjects among the three means (of the three writing occasions) were investigated by using a one way ANOVA.
- It was found difficult to clearly demarcate tense and active/passive errors from other verb formation errors because some overlaps existed between them. Therefore, the tense and active/passive errors were made part of the general verb formation error category. In addition, the 'comparative' grammar error category was found to be almost nonexistent in the students' writings as the CF intervention went on. As a result, this error category was made out of the error category list during the main study. The number of grammar error categories dealt with during the main study, thus, became to be 17 instead of 20. (The 20 grammar error categories are provided in *Appendix XXVII*).

5.4. Results of the Main Study

In the sections below, the results obtained from the different data sources of the main study are presented and analyzed. Like what was done while presenting and reporting data from the pilot study, the results of the main study are presented, analyzed and discussed under different sections

based on the data gathering tools. In doing so, first results from students' questionnaire are presented and analysed. Then, results from the teachers' questionnaire are gone through. The final and major part of this chapter deals with presentation, analysis and discussion of results from the students' compositions.

It should be recalled at this juncture that all the instruments of data gathering were tried out during the pilot study. However, as indicated above, for the main study, some modifications were made on the instruments based on lessons learned from the pilot study and on comments received during the upgrading defense.

5.4.1. Results from Students' Questionnaire

During the main study, the students (N=60) were requested to fill in a questionnaire consisting of 18 items out of which 7 were open ended and the remaining close ended. The students, as indicated above, were randomly selected from six sections (10 from each section) offered the writing course by six different instructors. All the sample students, except 1, filled and returned the questionnaire. The questionnaire was a revised version of the one used during the pilot study. The objectives of this questionnaire were to gather data from students regarding:

- Their beliefs on the importance of corrective feedback on improving accuracy in their writing,
- Their preferences for either direct or indirect corrective feedback and the reasons for their preferences,
- Their preferences for either focused or unfocused corrective feedback types and the reasons for their preferences,
- Their experiences of receiving corrective corrective feedback on their grammatical errors (direct versus indirect, focused versus unfocused, etc.),
- What strategies they used when they were provided with corrective feedback, and
- If they faced problems while they were receiving corrective feedback on their grammatical errors, what these problems were.

Like what was done during the analysis of data from the pilot study, the results of the students' questionnaire in the main study were presented and discussed thematically under different sections: students' views on the value of CF, students' experiences of receiving CF,

their preferences for different types of CF, the problems (if any) they face while receiving CF, and the strategies they take when they receive their compositions with CF from their instructors.

5.4.1.1. Students' Views on the Value of CF

Items which dealt with this theme were item numbers 1, 2, and 3. The results were presented and analyzed based on the information in table 5 below.

Table 5: Students' rating of the importance of CF on their grammatical errors

Q.1.	Options	No.	%
	A. Very important	46	77.97
	B. Important	13	22.03
	C. Not important	0	0
	D. I don't know	0	0
Total		59	100.00

As one could see from the above table, all the students believed that the corrective feedback they received from their writing teacher was (very) important to improve their grammatical accuracy. This result concurs with results from many studies in different contexts, and it disproves the fear of some scholars that corrective attempts will result in student demotivation and in establishment of what Truscott (1999) calls a cognitive block which will hamper learning.

In Item 2, the students were requested to show their reasons for believing that CF on their written grammatical errors was important. Of the many reasons forwarded by the students, the most pronounced ones were the belief that teacher correction could help students learn from their previous errors, that correcting grammar errors might help students in their academic lives, that teachers are the main sources of knowledge, that correct grammar knowledge is very essential to be proficient in the language, that correction is important to avoid errors, and that correct grammar knowledge is a base for developing writing skills. In addition, many students believed that the writing teacher, more than anybody else, better understands their errors and is the best and responsible party to provide clear and vital CF. That CF shapes student behavior appropriately was the other justification indicated by some

students. Even, a few students indicated that it is impossible to develop writing and grammar knowledge without teacher CF. Finally, some students pointed out that CF was important to develop creative thinking. (The students' responses for this item and the other open-ended items were presented in *Appendix VI*).

In general, these reactions of students seem to revolve around some very crucial issues. Among these issues are:

- students believe that errors are inevitable parts of learning, and these errors are opportunities for further learning provided that teachers provide corrections on these errors, and that the students are allowed for more trial and error scenarios;
- students give a big value for grammar knowledge which they believe is the basis for effective written communication;
- teacher correction of grammatical errors at this level is believed to be very important for students' further academic endeavors;
- teachers are believed to be very important sources of knowledge for students; eventually students aim for error free communication;
- more than any form of corrective feedback, teacher feedback is believed to be understandable;
- unless teachers give corrective feedback, they are not considered as true teachers;
- developing writing skills and avoiding grammar errors are believed to be impossible goals without teacher corrective feedback;
- more than any other body, the teacher is believed to better understand students' errors;
- corrective feedback is believed to push students to think further, and
- without corrective feedback, students believe that they would commit the same errors again and again.

So, who dares to avoid teacher correction from the foreign and/ or second language teaching/ learning arena like ours? Ignoring all these crucial assumptions which students deeply hold about CF would have negative implications for effective language learning.

5.4.1.2. Students' Experiences of Receiving CF

In this sub-section, the information gathered from the students' questionnaire regarding their experiences of receiving CF from their writing instructors is presented. In doing so, first, the data gathered about their experiences on direct and indirect CF techniques are dealt with.

Then, the information regarding the students' experiences of focused and unfocused CF is treated.

5.4.1.2.1. Students' Experiences of Direct, Indirect CF and a Combination of these Two

Items dealing with this theme are item number 4, 5, 6, and 13. The students' responses for these items are presented and analyzed based on the data provided in table 6 below.

Table 6: Students' response on the frequency of different CF techniques

Q.4	Options	Always	usually	Some times	Rarely	Never	Tot
	A. (DCF)	26= 45.61%	16= 28.07%	11= 19.3%	2= 3.51%	2= 3.51%	57
	B. (IDCF)	4= 7.41%	12= 22.22%	18= 33.33%	7= 12.96%	13= 24.07%	54
	C. (DCF+IDCF)	15= 27.27%	16= 29.09%	18= 32.73%	4= 7.27%	2= 3.64%	55

- DCF=Direct Corrective Feedback
- IDCF=Indirect Corrective Feedback

As the data in table 6 show, of the 57 students who replied corresponding to direct corrective feedback, 26 or about 45.61% said that their writing teachers always employed this form of feedback, while 16 of them or about 28.07% responded that their writing teachers usually practiced DCF. On the other hand, when we see the indirect corrective feedback row, we could understand that only 4 out of the 54 students (i.e., about 7.41%) who replied corresponding to this CF said that their writing teachers always employed IDCF, while 18 of them (about 33.33%) reported that their writing teachers sometimes utilized this type of CF. When we look at the last row of the table, we could understand that out of the 55 students who replied to this row, 15 or about 27.27 % said that their writing teachers always employed a combination of DCF and IDCF techniques, while about 29.09 % of them replied that their writing teachers usually employed this type of correction. Finally, when we see the first (the always) column of the table, we could witness that 45 students replied to this column i.e., 26 for DCF, 4 for IDCF, and 15 for a combination of DCF and IDCF. When we analyze the data in the table from this perspective, we could see that the majority of the writing teachers were reported to always practice direct corrective feedback while the indirect corrective feedback seems to be the least applied type of feedback.

In general, it appears from the students' responses to item 4 that the most frequently applied corrective feedback technique was direct correction which is followed by a combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback. This result agrees with what was found during the pilot study. In addition, the finding is basically in congruence with what some previous researchers in our country e.g., Getinet (1993) reported.

In Item number 5, the students were requested to tell the type of direct corrective feedback (DCF) most frequently applied in their compositions. The results from students' responses to this item are presented in the table below.

Table 7: Students' response regarding the most frequently used direct CF type

Q.5	Direct CF type	Alws	Usly	Som e times	Rarly	Nevr	Tot
	Providing the correct form near the error	22= 37.29%	17= 28.81%	13 =22.03	2= 3.39%	5= 8.45%	59
	Conducting a conference session	13= 23.21%	5= 8.93%	25= 44.64%	5= 8.93%	8= 14.29%	56
	Providing grammar explanation	36= 61.02%	11= 18.84%	6= 10.17%	2= 2.39%	4= 6.78%	59

As the data in table 7 indicate, out of the 59 students who replied to the row corresponding to provision of the correct form of an error, 22 (or about 37.81 %) said that their writing teachers always used this form of direct CF while 17 of them (about or 28.81%) reported that their writing teachers usually employed provision of the correct form near their written grammatical errors. On the other hand, the data in the middle row (conferencing) reveal that out of the 56 students who reacted to this option, 13 (or about 23.21%) replied that their writing teachers always used this type of direct CF where as 5 of them (about 8.93%) said that their writing teachers usually utilized conferencing. At last, looking at the data in the row parallel to 'provision of grammatical explanation', we could observe that out of the 59 students who reacted to this option, 36 (about 61.02%) reported that their writing teachers always employed this form of direct CF while 11 (i.e., about 18.84 %) of them said that their writing teachers usually practiced this type of direct CF.

When we specifically examine the always column, we could see that 61 students reacted to this column. (Readers could see that this number exceeds the sample number. This is because some students replied that their writing teachers always used both provision of correct answer and provision of grammatical explanation). As the number of students who ticked the always column differs greatly for the 3 DCF types, it is believed that the overlap in the responses didn't affect the result. Having this in mind, we could see that out of the 61 students, 36 (about 59.02 %) said that their writing teachers always employed provision of grammar explanation, and 22 (i.e., about 36.07%) of them reported that provision of the correct form near the error was the DCF type which their writing instructors always employed. And, looking at the never column, we could see that a total of 17 students reacted to this option. Out of these, 8 students (about 47.06%) said that their writing teachers never employed conferencing.

From the data, we could generalize that the DCF type most frequently employed by the writing teachers was provision of grammatical explanation followed by provision of the correct answer near the error. It also appears from the above data that conferencing was the least practiced type of DCF. This result again goes in line with what was found during the pilot study.

In Item 6, the students were requested to show the IDCF type which was most frequently applied by their writing teachers. The data from this item are provided in table 8 below.

Table 8: Students' response regarding the most frequently used indirect CF type

6	IDCF type	Alws	Usly	Some times	Rarly	Never	Tot
	Underlining	24= 45.28%	17= 32.06%	9= 16.98%	2= 3.77%	1= 1.87%	53
	Writing codes	12= 22.22%	10= 18.52%	12= 22.22%	11= 20.4%	9= 16.7%	54
	Underlining and writing codes	13= 25.49%	16= 31.37%	14= 27.45%	2= 3.92%	6= 11.8%	51
	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins	10= 18.52%	11= 20.37%	13= 24.07%	10= 18.5%	10= 18.5%	54
	Writing codes on the margins	7= 13.21%	13= 24.53%	15= 28.30%	12= 22.6%	6= 11.3%	53
	Writing comments	17= 31.48%	15= 27.78%	10= 18.52%	5= 9.26%	7= 12.9%	54

As the data in table 8 reveal, out of the 53 students who replied against the underlining row, 24 or about 45.28% said that their writing teachers always used this type of indirect CF, and 32 % of these students indicated that their writing teachers usually applied this type of IDCF when responding to their written grammatical errors. From the information in the table, we could understand that underlining was the most frequent type of IDCF employed by the writing teachers while responding to their students' written grammatical errors. The data in the table further depict that the 2nd most frequent type of IDCF employed by the writing teachers was writing comments which was reported to be the most frequent type of IDCF by about 31.48% of the students who replied parallel to the option 'writing comments'. The data on the table also show that writing codes on the margins parallel to the lines where the errors occurred was the least frequent type of IDCF followed by writing numbers or tallies on the margins parallel to the lines where the errors occurred.

5.4.1.2.2. Students' Experiences of Focused and Unfocused CF

Item number 13 requested the students to indicate whether their writing teachers most frequently employed focused or unfocused corrective feedback when responding to their written linguistic errors. Results of the students' responses are presented in table 9 next page.

Table 9: Students' responses on whether their writing teachers most frequently used focused or unfocused CF when responding to their linguistic errors

Q.13.		Number	%
	A .Focused CF	25	45.46
	B. Unfocused CF	30	54.55
Total		55	100.01

As the data from the above table show, a majority of the students (about 54.55%) said that their writing instructors most frequently employed unfocused CF, while the remaining 45.46% indicated that the most frequently employed type of CF practiced by their writing teachers was focused CF.

Based on the students' responses to the items in this category (i.e., items 4, 5, 6, 13), it is possible to make some conclusion. First, the most frequently applied form of CF on

students' written linguistic errors seemed to be direct CF, and this CF happened in the form of the teacher providing oral and written grammatical explanation followed by provision of the correct form near the grammatical error. Second, it appears that, regarding the practice of indirect CF, the writing teachers were inclined to employ underlining and writing comments more often than the other indirect CF types. Finally, it seems that the writing teachers most often practiced an unfocused CF type. In short, these results seem to imply that the writing teachers most often employed direct unfocused CF.

In the next sub-section, an attempt was made to present results from the students' responses to items in the questionnaire which were designed to find out their preferences for different CF interventions.

5.4.1.3. Students' Preferences for Different CF Types

This sub-section tries to present and analyze the data gathered from most of the items in the students' questionnaire. The section first deals with treatment of the data which revolve around students' preferences for direct and indirect CF strategies. It, then, attempts to present and analyze the information regarding the students' preferences for either focused or unfocused CF types. Most importantly, the section also encompasses a presentation and discussion of the students' reasons for preferring certain CF interventions more than others.

5.4.1.3.1. Students' Preferences regarding Direct and Indirect CF

The items which aimed at finding out about students' preferences for different CF interventions were item numbers 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15. Item number 7 requested the students to show their preferences for direct CF, indirect CF, or a combination of these. The results are presented in the table below.

Table 10: Students' Preferences for either Direct or Indirect CF

Q.7.	Options	No.	%
	Direct Corrective Feedback	26	44.83
	Indirect Corrective Feedback	6	10.35
	A combination of direct and indirect CF	26	44.83
Total		58	100.01

As the data in table 10 shows, equal number of students preferred to have direct corrective feedback and a combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback. On the other hand, out of the 58 students who replied for this item, 6 students (i.e., about 10.35%) preferred their writing teachers to employ indirect corrective feedback when responding to their written grammatical errors.

In Item 8, the students were requested to indicate their justifications for preferring DCF, IDCF, or a combination of DCF+IDCF. Those who preferred to have DCF justified that DCF avoids information distortion and that if the CF were not clear, it would result in misunderstanding between the teacher and students. (See **Appendix VI** for more detail).

Those students who preferred to have IDCF on their part justified that IDCF encourages students to self-correct their errors where as direct CF might make them afraid of trial and error and of making mistakes. These students also believed that IDCF is beneficial as it urges them to read more.

The students who preferred to have a combination of DCF and IDCF, on the other hand, had their own reasons. First, they believed that DCF could be more beneficial when they are involved in discussions in the classroom while IDCF might be better when they are writing. Second, they reflected that some errors are difficult for them to self-correct and thus need DCF, where as the errors which they considered to be simple should be indicated by using IDCF and be left for them to self-correct. Third, some students indicated that their writing teachers should employ DCF only if they requested him/her to do so. Finally, a few of these students reported that a combination of DCF and IDCF is more preferable because they could utilize what is given in the DCF to work out what is indicated indirectly.

In all, it could be seen that students have their own reasons for preferring a certain CF technique more than others. These statements might suggest that when we are employing a certain CF technique, we are doing it for the benefit of some students while at the same time we are harming others. Being at the middle of these differing and sometimes contrasting views and preferences, what should we teachers do? Should we wait for research findings with a conclusive result? May be, no, for classroom life continues without stoppage, and for

our students gravely demand our corrective feedback. Therefore, the question remains to be which type of CF we should employ rather than whether to employ one.

Item 9 requested the students to rank order different types of DCF according to their preference from 1st to 3rd. The results of students' responses are given in the table below.

Table 11: Students' rankings of their preferences of the different DCF techniques

Q. 9.		Providing the correct form		Conferencing		Grammatical explanation	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	1 st	18	43.90	14	35.90	21	51.22
	2 nd	16	39.02	11	28.21	13	31.71
	3 rd	7	17.07	14	35.90	7	17.07
Total		41		39		41	100

As the data in table 11 reveal, out of the 41 students who reacted for 'provision of the correct form', 18 students (about 43.90%) preferred to have this type of DCF as their 1st choice. When we see the students' response to 'conferencing', we could understand that 14 out of the 39 students who reacted for this option (i.e., about 35.90 %) preferred to have it as their first choice. When we finally look at the students' responses for the 'grammatical explanation' option, we could see that out of the 41 students who reacted to this option, 21 or about 51.22% preferred to have this type of DCF as their first choice. In other words, the data from the table show that more students seemed to prefer grammatical explanation first, followed by provision of the correct form, and then, by conferencing.

In Item 10, the students were asked to show their reasons for preferring to have a certain DCF type first and another type 3rd. The students were largely reserved from forwarding their reasons. From the very few reasons, those who preferred grammatical explanation first justified that this type of DCF was easy to understand (St.44). From the students who preferred to have conferencing 1st, a student said, "We contact face to face and discuss with the reason for understanding the exact one. In addition, it creates opportunities for questioning and answering through discussion" (St.46). On the other hand, from the students who preferred to have provision of correct forms 1st, a student said that this type of DCF will not be forgotten (St. 12). In addition, another student who preferred this DCF type first had

the following reason to say. “I want to know the correct form near to my error. Because this leads me to know my error easily.” (St.6).

These differing interests of students indicate how challenging a task providing corrective feedback on students’ grammatical errors is. Besides, the fact that several students preferred to have conferencing 1st seems to be a challenging homework for us because many teachers have been complaining about dealing with too many students in a classroom. At the same time, many teachers have been bitterly showing their disgust of the fact that they are overloaded teaching many credit hours everyday.

In Item 11, the students were asked to rank order different IDCF techniques according to their preference. The results from this item are presented in table 12 below.

Table 12: Students’ rankings of their preferences of the different indirect CF techniques

IDCF type	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	Tot
Underlining	6	8	2	2	3	2	23
Writing codes	3	2	9	3	3	4	24
Underlining + writing codes	8	9	3	1	2	1	24
Numbers or tallies on the margins	1	2	1	7	0	12	23
Writing codes on the margins	0	2	4	7	9	2	24
Writing comments	5	2	5	3	5	2	22

The data on the above table depict that of the students who replied to this item, underlining and writing codes was chosen by 8 students (i.e. about 33.33%) as a first choice from the different IDCF types. The second most preferred IDCF seemed to be underlining which was ranked by 6 students (about 26.09 %) as their first choice IDCF, and the third most preferred IDCF type appeared to be writing comments which was ranked 1st by 5 students (about 22.73%) of the students. On the other hand, the least preferred IDCF types were found to be writing codes on the margins (chosen by no student as a first choice) and writing numbers or tallies on the margins (chosen only by one student as a first choice and by 12 students as a 6th choice).

As a matter of coincidence, the IDCF technique employed in this present research matched with what more students preferred to have as their first choice.

In Item 12, the students were asked to show their reasons for preferring a certain IDCF type 1st and another IDCF type 6th. Again, almost all the students kept their pens silent. From the very few students who attempted to react to this item, a student reasoned out for preferring underlining and writing codes 1st as, “If the mistake is underlined and writing codes, I have gotten my correction easily and without wastage of time.” (St. 14). A student who preferred to have writing comments 1st, on the other hand, justified that, “...it [writing comments] is more understandable than others....Writing codes cannot be easy to understand what the feedback is,” (St.4).

5.4.1.3.2. Students’ Preferences for either Focused or Unfocused CF

Items in the students’ questionnaire which deal with this issue were item number 14 and 15. Item 14 requested students to show their preferences on whether their writing teachers should employ focused or unfocused CF when responding to their written grammar errors. The results for this item are presented in table 13 below.

Table 13: Students’ preferences for either focused or unfocused CF

Q.14.	Options	No.	%
	A. Focused CF	20	39.22
	B. Unfocused CF	31	60.78
Total		51	100

As one could easily see from the data in table 13, a majority of the students (about 60.78%) preferred their writing teachers to employ unfocused CF while responding to their written grammatical errors. This result contradicted greatly with the result obtained from the pilot study. However, it was indicated when reporting the findings of the pilot study that the students at that time had misunderstood the item. . On the other hand, the students in the main study understood the item’s intent very well as could be seen below from their response for Item 15.

In Item 15, the students were requested to show their reasons for preferring either focused or unfocused CF more.

The students who preferred focused CF primarily reasoned out that the teacher might not have enough time to correct all errors which are committed by many students in a class. Their second justification was the belief that unfocused CF would force them to lose interest in the course and the teacher. Further, some students indicated that not all errors are equally important for correction. The other justification forwarded by students in this group was that focused CF would help them develop independent learning as they could utilize the CF provided to them on some errors to correct the remaining ones. (See the detailed students' responses on *Appendix VI*).

Those students who preferred to have unfocused CF, on their part, reasoned out that:

- when the teacher corrects only some of the errors, they would continue to commit the uncorrected ones,
- they wanted to be correct in all aspects of grammar,
- if the teacher corrected only some of the errors, they would wrongly assume that they have not made other errors,
- focused CF would be confusing, and
- correcting all errors helps students to have a broad grammar knowledge. (See all the detailed students' responses in *Appendix VI*).

We could see from the above statements that both sides have their own convincing reasons. Indeed, this is how proponents of selective and comprehensive corrective feedback moves defend themselves both in the practical and theoretical battle grounds surrounding corrective feedback. Amid this debate, where should we language teachers place ourselves?

The next sub-section tried to find out the problems (if any) the students faced when receiving corrective feedback on their written grammatical errors.

5.4.1.4. Problems (if any) Students Face when Receiving CF from their Writing Teachers

Items dealing with this issue are Item number 16 and 17. In item 16, the students were asked to tell if they face any problem when they are provided with CF on their written grammatical errors. The students' responses for this item are presented in table 14 below.

Table 14: Students' responses on whether they faced problems when receiving CF

Q. 16.	Options	No	%
	A. Yes	20	38.46
	B. No	32	61.54
Total		52	100

As the data from the above table show, a majority of the students (about 61.54%) replied that they did not face any problem when they were provided CF on their written grammatical errors by their writing teachers. However, the remaining students, a large proportion indeed, said that they faced problems of some kind when they were provided with CF on their written grammar errors.

In Item 17, those students who said that they faced problems when they were provided with CF by their writing teacher were asked to tell what problems they faced. Among the problems mentioned by the students were:

- difficulty of understanding what the corrections were,
- lack of willingness from teachers to clarify to the students when they wanted to know what their errors were, and
- teachers' taking of the students' poor handwritings as though they were carrying grammar errors. (Their responses were summarized in *Appendix VI*).

From the students' responses, we could deduce some serious weaknesses our corrective feedback moves possess. One of the problems indicated was that, at times, our corrective feedback efforts were not effectively communicated to the students. In other words, the students may not notice our corrections. It has been noted by proponents of CF that CF functions as a modified input which could be understood more easily than the unmodified original input. If our CF is not clear, this hypothesis for CF may not work. The other problem shown by the students was a problem of what scholars call appropriation where the teachers may not understand the students' intentions and take something mistakenly as

wrong although, at least from the students' perspective, that may not be wrong. Still, some students indicated that they hated teachers who provided them with CF, thereby, may develop hatred towards the course these teachers offered. The other problem the students raised regarding teacher written CF was that, sometimes, the students were not convinced of the fact that what their teachers told them as errors were really errors. And when students wanted to know what their errors were, some teachers did not volunteer to do so. Still some students indicated that they faced many problems, but, due to their own reasons, didn't want to tell what the problems actually were.

If our corrections are not clear for the target students, if we demotivate students by telling them that what they produced is wrong, though it may not be actually wrong, if we offer the CF to students who resent it, if we do not help students when they ask us about their errors, if we could not convince our students about their errors, etc, how could we expect our CF efforts to be effective?

The last sub-section of the analysis of the students' responses to the questionnaire deals with finding out what strategies the students take when they receive their papers back with CF.

5.4.1.5. Strategies Students Take when they are Provided with Written CF

The last item, Item 18, of the students' questionnaire was designed to find out what they do when they receive their compositions back with corrections from their writing teachers. The students' responses to this item were summarized in the table below.

Table 15: Students' responses on what they do with the CF provided on their written pieces

Q.18		Always	Usually	Some times	Rarely	Never	Tot
	Rewriting the composition	18= 33.33%	19= 35.19%	12=22 .22%	4= 7.41%	1= 1.85%	54
	Keeping a mental note	18= 34.62%	21= 40.39%	8= 15.39%	5= 9.62%	0	52
	Asking friends for help	12= 22.22%	20= 37.04%	18= 33.33%	2= 3.70%	2= 3.70%	54
	Consulting a grammar book	15= 27.78%	20= 37.04%	13= 24.07%	4= 7.41%	2= 3.70%	54

			37.04%				
	Doing nothing	8=	10=	4=	4=	29=	54
		14.82%	18.52%	7.41%	7.41%	53.70	

As the data in table 15 show, out of the 54 students who responded parallel to the rewriting strategy, 18 students (about 33.33%) said that they ‘always’ used this strategy while 19 of them (well over 35%) reported that they utilized this strategy ‘usually’. On the other hand, when we see the ‘keeping a mental note’ row, we could understand that out of the 52 students who responded parallel to this strategy, 18 students (about 34.62%) said that they ‘always’ practiced this strategy whereas 21 of them (about 40.39 %) responded that they ‘usually’ kept a mental note of their errors indicated by their teacher. And looking at the ‘consulting a grammar book’ row, we could see that out of the 54 students who replied corresponding to this strategy, 15 of them (about 27.78%) said to ‘always’ employ it while 20 of them (about 37.04%) reported that they utilized this strategy ‘usually’.

Generally, it appears from the data in the above table that many students were always inclined to employ the ‘keeping a mental note’ strategy followed by the ‘rewriting the composition’, and then by the ‘consulting a grammar book’ strategy. The data also revealed that few students did nothing about the CF they got. If the students actually took the strategies they said to take, it would mean that they have attended to the CF provided to them, and if they have done so, it would possibly imply that they have benefited from it.

5.4.1.6. Possible Implications of Students’ Responses to their Questionnaire

The students’ responses to their questionnaire seem to have some implications for how we EFL teachers in general and writing teachers in particular should devise our classroom teaching practices. The major implications of the results from the students’ questionnaire could be summarized as follows.

5.4.1.6.1. Students’ Views on the Value of Written Grammar CF versus the Views of Scholars who Oppose this Type of CF

The data from the students’ questionnaire revealed that almost all of them viewed CF on their written grammar errors as an invaluable tool for effectively developing writing skills.

This might mean that most EFL students are not affectively endangered by the CF they receive from their writing teachers. The data further indicated that many students deemed the development of L2 writing skills without teacher CF almost impossible. Above all, several students remarked that one of the responsibilities of an EFL writing teachers is the provision of CF for their students.

On the other hand, there are some scholars who oppose the provision of grammar CF (Truscott, 1996; 1999; 2007; Krashen, 1982; 2004; 2009). According to this group of scholars, CF on L2 learners' grammar errors would create a cognitive block on students, and hence, would derail the process of L2 development.

Nevertheless, as our students overwhelmingly valued written grammar CF, we would reasonably doubt the views of those scholars who oppose CF for fear that CF would have a demotivating effect. Rather, it could be argued that students in our context would consider teachers who do not offer CF as irresponsible which might in turn erode the students' trust on their teachers.

5.4.1.6.2. Students' Experiences of versus their Preferences for Receiving CF on their Written Grammar Errors

The data from the students' questionnaire revealed that the writing teachers most often employed direct CF, and this was followed by a combination of direct and indirect CF. From the different direct CF types, the students had more experiences of receiving grammar explanation, followed by provision of the correct form, and then by conferencing. On the other hand, from the different indirect CF types, many students seemed to have had experiences of receiving their compositions with errors underlined, comments written about the errors, and underlining errors + writing codes in descending order. The data further showed that a majority of the students had experience of unfocused rather than focused CF.

When we see the students' preferences for receiving CF on their written grammar errors, we could understand that there were no marked mismatches. However, it could be seen that the number of students who preferred to have conferencing was by far larger than the number of

students who said to always experience this type of direct CF. Besides, the student preference data regarding the different indirect CF types showed that the indirect CF types most preferred by the students were in descending order underlining + writing codes, underlining, and comments written about their errors. This seems to contradict sharply with what the students reported to experience.

This result might suggest that teachers should include conferencing sessions in which they would discuss face to face with their students regarding the grammar errors committed. It is also implied that many students preferred to have the clearer possible type of indirect CF (i.e., underlining errors + writing codes for that errors) rather than the more demanding and unspecific indirect CF types of underlining and writing comments.

5.4.2. Results from Teachers' Questionnaire

All the writing teachers who were offering the course Basic Writing and those who have ever offered writing courses at a university/college (N=11) were asked to fill in a questionnaire. The objectives of the teachers' questionnaire were to:

- Find out about their views regarding the value of CF on students' written grammatical errors,
- Investigate what types of written CF they practice when responding to their students' written grammar errors (i.e., direct, indirect, focused, unfocused),
- Explore their beliefs about what effective CF practices are,
- Assess whether they face problems when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors, if they face, what these problems are, and
- Find out their experiences about most frequent grammatical errors they encounter when responding to their students' compositions.

The teachers' questionnaire consisted of 24 items, of which 13 were close-ended, while 11 were open-ended. Results from the teachers' questionnaire, like what was done with the students' responses to their questionnaire, were presented under different subsections: their education and teaching background, their beliefs about the value of CF, their experiences of utilizing different CF types and techniques, their beliefs regarding the most effective CF types, their experiences regarding the most common grammatical errors they find in their

students' compositions, and the problems they encounter (if any) when responding to their students' written grammatical errors.

5.4.2.1. The Writing Teachers' Qualification and Teaching Experience

Items in the teachers' questionnaire which focused on finding out information about this issue were item numbers 22, 23, and 24. Results from these items are presented in the following table.

Table 16: The writing teachers' education background and teaching experience

Qualification	Level	No.
	BA/B.ED	0
	MA/M.ED	11
	Ph. D	0
Total		11
Experience in teaching English	Years	No.
	1-2	1
	2-5	2
	6-10	4
	10-20	3
	Unspecified	1
Total		11

As we could see from the table, all the writing teachers are Maters' degree holders. Most of them (8) indicated that their qualification is in TEFL, while some of them, because of their own personal reasons, did not indicate their qualifications. When we see their experience, it seems that the staff is a combination of both less experienced and well experienced teachers. The less experienced teachers replied that all their teaching experience is at a university level. On the other hand, the most experienced teachers who have taught English for more than 10 years have taught in secondary schools in addition to the years of experience they have had at a university level. It seems that most of them have had their second degrees within the last two years which might indicate the fact that they have readings of the current SLA (second language acquisition) literature regarding CF and other pedagogical issues.

5.4.2.2. The Writing Teachers' Views of the Value of CF on Students' Written Grammatical Errors

Item numbers 1, 2, and 3 were designed to find out the writing teachers' views on the importance of CF on their students' grammatical errors. Results of the teachers' responses are presented in table 17 below.

Table 17: Teachers' responses regarding the value of written grammar CF

Q.1.	Options	No. of teachers
	A. Very useful	9
	B. Useful	2
	C. Not useful	0
	D. Difficult to decide	0

As the data in the table above show, all the writing instructors said that CF on students' written grammatical errors was (very) useful. This might mean that the teachers, in one way or another, have been practicing this pedagogical intervention.

In Item 2, these teachers were requested to indicate their reasons for believing that CF was (very) important to improve the accuracy of their students' writings. Among their responses were:

- CF could help students improve their writing skills;
- unless told in some way, students can't understand their limitations;
- accuracy is as much important as fluency, so grammar should not be neglected;
- if not corrected, grammar errors would change meanings of sentences;
- it would be difficult to convey messages without having grammatical knowledge;
- if not corrected, the students would gradually internalize the same errors as if they were correct, and
- CF is the chance by which teachers show the gaps their students have. (See the teachers' detailed responses in *Appendix VII*).

In short, it appears from the teachers' responses that, in many teachers' views, grammatical inaccuracy might lead to communication breakdown, and therefore, it is important that students should be provided with CF on their written grammar errors. Another thing we could deduce from the teachers' responses is, similar to what the students said above, that teachers believed that their students might not understand their errors unless they were shown in some way. Thus, the tradition that teachers are the sources of knowledge seems to be perpetuated not only by the students but also by the teachers. We could further infer from the teachers' responses that teachers were worried about the fact that their students might fossilize erroneous forms if they were not corrected. The issue of balancing accuracy and fluency was also indicated by some teachers as one reason for providing written grammar

CF. Finally, the teachers seemed to hold the belief that CF was a chance by which students' gaps in grammatical inaccuracy could be remedied.

5.4.2. 3. The Writing Teachers' Experiences of Employing Different Types of Corrective Feedback

In this sub-section, the teachers' responses for questionnaire items which were designed to find out information about their practices of utilizing different types of CF are presented and analysed. In doing so, first the teachers' responses regarding their utilization of direct and indirect CF are dealt with. Then, the items that were geared towards finding out about their practices of focused and unfocused CF are gone through.

5.4.2.3.1. The Writing Teachers' Experiences of Employing Direct, Indirect or a Combination of Direct and Indirect CF Types

Items dealing with this theme were Item numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Item number 4 requested the writing teachers to show whether they employ direct CF, indirect CF, or a combination of direct and indirect CF most frequently when responding to their students' written grammatical errors. Results of the teachers' responses to this item are presented in table 18 below.

Table 18: Teachers' responses on whether they most often use direct CF, indirect CF, or a combination of these

Q.4	Options	No. of teachers
	A. Direct correction	3
	B. Indirect correction	2
	C. A combination of direct and indirect correction	6

As the data on table 18 show, a majority of the writing instructors (6 out of 10) said that they most frequently employed a combination of direct and indirect CF. On the other hand, 3 of them replied that their most commonly employed CF was direct CF. The data further

indicate that the writing instructors were generally reserved from employing indirect CF alone.

In Item 5, the writing teachers were asked to show their reasons for most frequently employing either of the CF types in item 4.

Those teachers who said that they most frequently employed direct corrective feedback (DCF) justified that students must clearly see the errors and corrections so that they would not repeat them, that if the students' errors were not exactly corrected, they would not know what their errors are, and that the rules teachers provide in the form of DCF would help students as a guide for their next writing.

The teachers who replied to most frequently use indirect corrective feedback (IDCF) on their part reasoned out that this type of CF could be important to push students to identify and correct their own errors rather than waiting everything from their teachers.

On the other hand, those teachers who said that they most often employed a combination of direct and indirect CF had different reasons for doing so. The most commonly mentioned reason for combining DCF and IDCF was the belief that some grammar errors are simple and could be corrected by students if they are indicated indirectly while some errors are difficult for students to self-correct; such errors need to be corrected by the teacher. The other reason mentioned by these teachers was their assumption that a combination of DCF and IDCF would introduce some variety into classroom practices there by making the teaching learning process attractive. That students are different in their abilities of understanding CF was a further reason indicated by a teacher. For this teacher, high proficiency students could benefit more from IDCF while low proficiency students may get DCF more beneficial. (See the teachers' detailed responses in *Appendix VII*).

From the teachers' responses, it would be possible to generalize that a majority of them most often employed a combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques. Still, a good deal of the teachers utilized direct correction alone any time they provided CF on their students' written grammatical errors. Besides, some writing teachers seemed to most commonly employ indirect CF alone.

From the teachers' responses to item 5, we could see that every writing teacher might have his/her own philosophies regarding how to handle written grammatical errors. In general, most of the teachers seemed to believe that some grammatical errors are beyond the students' ability to identify and correct, and thus, need to be corrected by the teacher, whereas, some grammatical errors are simple, so if the students' attention is directed towards those errors in some way, they could correct them. In all, this group of teachers seems to be very well aware of the learning value of indirect corrective feedback by making learners self-reliant for themselves. What is not clear here is what criteria the teachers use to identify some grammar errors as serious and some others as simple.

On the other side of the argument are those teachers who most frequently employed direct correction. These teachers seemed to believe that indirect corrective feedback moves might pass unnoticed by the students. In addition, the teachers in this category were inclined to believe that DCF was the best way to prevent errors from happening again and again.

What all this shows us is the fact that students taking the same writing course, and perhaps committing the same grammatical errors, might receive quite different corrective treatments by their writing teachers. The difference between and among teachers in the way they treat grammatical errors might have some connection with the teachers' own learning experiences. The effect of this differential error treatment practices might mean that students at different sections would develop different approaches to deal with grammatical errors.

In Item 6, those writing teachers who said to most frequently employ direct corrective feedback were asked to tell the DCF type which they most and least frequently apply. Their answers are given in table 19 below.

Table 19: Teachers' responses on how often they employed different direct CF types

Q.6	DCF type	Always	Usually	Some times	Rarely	Never	Tot
	Giving grammar explanation	1		3			4
	Providing the correct form	2	2	2			6
	Conducting a conference session					3	3

It was shown above that 3 out of the 11 writing teachers most often employed direct corrective feedback. And, as the data in table 5:15 show, 2 of these writing teachers always employed ‘provision of the correct form’ as a technique. This was followed by ‘provision of grammar explanation’, while none of them utilized conferencing.

Item 7 requested those teachers who responded for item 6 to tell their reasons for employing a certain DCF technique most often. Among their responses, a teacher (T.6) who replied to always employ provision of grammar explanation and provision of the correct form stated, “Some students do not have adequate background knowledge.” Another teacher who said to always employ ‘provision of the correct form’, on his part, stated, he always provided the correct answer because he believed that the students could learn immediately from their errors. Similarly, the other teacher (T.7) who replied to always employ ‘provision of the correct form’ justified, “It is difficult (takes time and energy) to always explain. Instead, I prefer to correct directly and if they repeat the same mistake in different parts of the same paragraph, I give the explanation. No time for conducting a conference session.”

In Item 8, the writing teachers who said to most frequently employ indirect corrective feedback were asked to indicate the IDCF type which they always practice and the one which they practice very less or not at all. As the data from table 20 next page show, ‘underlining’ was the most frequently employed IDCF type followed by ‘underlining and writing codes.’

Table 20: Teachers’ responses on how often they employed different indirect CF types

Q		Always	Usually	Some times	Rarely	Never	T o t a l
8	Underlining	3					3
	Writing codes		1	1			2
	Underlining and writing codes	1		1			2
	Writing codes in the margins		1		1		2
	Writing numbers in the margins					2	2
	Writing comments			2			2

In Item 9, the teachers who responded to item 8 were asked to tell their reasons for employing a certain IDCF technique most often. A teacher who said to always employ

underlining said, “Some students are curious to know the problems by themselves and this experience is expected to be unforgettable.” And, another teacher who also employed underlining always pointed out, “I always use the technique underlining to tell the presence of the error and to give chances for students to correct it by themselves, but I never indicate the number of errors in the lines on one’s writing.” The teacher who replied to always use underlining and writing codes stated that this technique would help the students to identify the specific errors.

In the following sub-section, the writing teachers’ responses to the items in the questionnaire which were designed to find out about their experiences regarding focused and unfocused CF were presented and analyzed.

5.4.2.3.2. The Writing Teachers’ Experiences of Employing Focused and Unfocused CF Types

The items which dealt with this sub-theme were Item numbers 12, 13, 14 and 15. Item 12 requested the teachers to indicate whether they most often employ focused or unfocused CF. The teachers’ responses to this item are provided in the following table.

Table 21: Teachers’ responses on whether they mostly used focused or unfocused CF

Q.12	Options	No. of teachers
.	A. Focused CF	9
.	B. Unfocused CF	2

The data in table 21 depicts that a majority of the writing teachers most often used focused corrective feedback while a few of them very often practiced unfocused corrective feedback.

In Item 13, those teachers who said to most often employ focused CF were requested to state their reasons for doing so. They, accordingly, reasoned out that:

- it was impossible to give feedback to each and every error that students made given the large class size they were dealing with and the overwhelmingly many number of errors by each student,

- grammar knowledge could be best learned if students were taught grammatical items one at a time,
- teachers should focus only on major errors which distort communication, and
- focused CF could help students develop an independent learning behavior. (See *Appendix VII* for more detail).

In short, we could generalize from the teachers' responses to item 13 that time was a major factor which dictated the teachers to employ focused CF. The fact that the students' writings were full of errors doubled with the large class size in which the teachers were working seemed to have made the time factor very serious. The other major reason for the teachers to practice focused CF was the belief they had about the fact that focused CF would encourage learner autonomy and independent learning. Still, some teachers held that CF should be focused only on some errors which were assumed to be serious and could result in communication breakdown.

In Item 14, these teachers were requested to tell what kind of grammar errors they focused on when providing CF on their students' compositions. Among the grammatical errors the teachers reported to focus on were errors in agreement, tense use, punctuation, sentence fragment, spelling, and capitalization. (See the teachers' responses in *Appendix VII*).

As one could understand from the teachers' direct responses in *Appendix VII*, they focused on errors which could cause distortion of meaning. The teachers' responses are supported by the literature on corrective feedback. For example, Hendrickson (1980) suggests that corrective attempts should focus on global errors. The question is do the teachers actually have the criteria to label a certain grammar error as more serious and another as less serious. For instance, do capitalization errors, as indicated by teacher 7, really cause communication breakdown? What about spelling and punctuation errors? What kind of spelling and punctuation errors are the teachers considering serious? What about subject-verb agreement errors? Do these really result in misunderstanding? These and other questions regarding the teachers' categorization of some grammatical errors as serious remain unanswered in this research.

Item 15 requested the teachers who said to always employ unfocused CF to indicate their reasons for always employing such CF. One of these teachers reasoned out that students

should be told about every error they produce so that they would avoid making errors in the future. The other teacher, on his part, was of the belief that many students (especially these days) do not know what grammar means; therefore, they need to be told everything by the teachers.

This later group, in general, seems to aim at perfection expecting that errors could be avoided if corrected thoroughly.

The following sub-section attempts to find out if the writing teachers have ever tried to find out their students' most common grammatical errors, and if they have done so, what these grammatical errors have been.

5.4.2.4. Teachers' Identification of their Students' Most Common Grammar Errors

Items which dealt with this issue were item number 10 and 11. In item 10, the writing teachers were asked to tell if they have ever tried to identify their students' most common written grammatical errors. In response to this item, all the writing teachers reported that they have tried to identify their students' grammatical errors. In item 11, the teachers were requested to list down what their students' most common written grammatical errors have been. The grammatical errors most of the writing teachers reported to be common in their students' writings were errors in subject-verb agreement, tense use, punctuation, passive construction, capitalization, and number. (See the detail in *Appendix VII*).

In general, it appears from the teachers' responses that verb related errors like tense, voice, subject-verb agreement were the common errors in their students' compositions. The second most common errors seemed to be punctuation errors. Implied in punctuation errors are fragments, run-ons, and comma splices. As we would see later, some of the teachers' identifications of the students' errors matched with what was identified from students' compositions by the researcher. Besides, this result seems to go in line with the teachers' saying that, when they provide CF on their students' linguistic errors, they target on errors which happen frequently in their student' writings.

5.4.2.5. Problems (if any) Teachers Faced when Providing CF on their Students' Written Grammar Errors

Items in the teachers' questionnaire which dealt with this theme were item numbers 16 and 17. In item 16, the teachers were requested to tell if they faced any problem when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors. All the writing teachers replied that they have faced problems when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors. In item 17, the teachers were asked to indicate the problem they faced. Their responses include:

- Some students' resistance to accept corrective feedback positively.
- The students' continuing of making the same errors again and again despite corrections.
- Students' writing (almost every sentence) was full of errors to the extent that it doesn't convey any message. This has made it difficult for many teachers even to start providing CF.
- Due to the fact that students' writings were full of grammar errors, trying to correct these errors would be too much time consuming. This was painfully indicated by one teacher as, "Sometimes, correcting or editing others' work is time consumer than doing it by myself. I prefer writing than editing because it is complicated," (T.7).
- The majority of the students in a class might not understand, even the corrections.
- Some students were observed disappointed when looking at their errors marked by the teachers and this would make them develop fear of making mistakes.

(Detailed teachers' responses in *Appendix VII*).

Totally, the major problem the writing teachers face while providing CF on their students' written errors seems that they are overwhelmed by the fact that their students' written pieces are full of errors to the extent that it is difficult to grasp any message out of them. (This, as could be seen from the presentation of the data from students' compositions, was proved to be true by the present researcher). Because of this, it seems that they are in a problem of deciding which errors to correct and which ones to skip. Closely related with this problem is the worry the teachers have that, owing to the serious language deficiency, their students may not understand the corrections offered. Because of this, some teachers are scared of even starting to offer CF. What this might mean is that as teachers do not see any hope of improvement in their students' writing, they may not try to offer CF at all. An informal discussion of this issue with the head of the English department at Wollo University confirmed the fact that there were some writing teachers who never provided any form of CF throughout the 16-weeks semester.

Different sources indicate that it is difficult, if impossible, to develop writing skills without some external assistance. The situation in our country (of the deterioration of the English language proficiency of our students) seems to worsen if teachers continue to breach their responsibilities. It seems that we are complaining about the deteriorating language proficiency of our students where as we, ourselves, are not living up to our responsibilities.

5.4.2.6. Teachers' Perceptions of the Importance of Different CF Types

In this section, the writing teachers' views regarding the values of different corrective feedback types were surveyed. In doing so, first, their views about the importance of direct and indirect CF were assessed, and then, their beliefs about the benefits of focused and unfocused CF were investigated.

5.4.2.6.1. Teachers' Perceptions about the Value of Direct and Indirect CF

The items which were designed to find out information regarding this issue were Item numbers 18 and 19. In Item 18, the writing teachers were requested to tell their views regarding whether direct or indirect CF was more fruitful in improving the accuracy of their students' written work. The results of the teachers' responses were presented in table 22 below.

Table 22: Teachers’ beliefs regarding whether direct or indirect CF was more effective

Q. 18	Options	No. of teachers
	A. Direct CF	5
	B. Indirect CF	5

As the data in the above table show, half of the writing teachers who replied to this item indicated that they believed indirect CF to be more effective than direct CF while the other half favored indirect CF. In item 19, the teachers were asked to tell their reasons for perceiving either of the CF techniques to be more effective than the other.

Those who believed DCF to be more effective reasoned out that their students these days have been becoming so careless and reluctant that they would not utilize opportunities to self-correct their errors, and that as IDCF doesn’t provide students with detailed explanation about their errors, this would lead the students and teachers to unnecessary disputes. (These teachers’ actual words are provided in *Appendix VII*).

Those teachers who believed IDCF to be more effective, on their part, stated that:

- IDCF minimizes students’ dependency on teachers and encourages independent learning which would result in a more permanent learning;
- IDCF might help students search for their mistakes by themselves and correct them there by improving their writing, and
- IDCF pushes students to exert efforts to correct their own errors; this trial and error would teach them more than teachers. (See the details of the teachers’ responses in *Appendix VII*).

To recap, we could see from the teachers’ responses to item 19 that those teachers who believed in the supremacy of DCF held that their students were so careless that they would not deliver any effort to utilize what so ever was indicated indirectly. Those teachers who gave more credit for IDCF, on the other hand, argued that this kind of CF could encourage independent learning which they think results in more permanent learning than what would

be learnt through direct correction. The problem here is the fact that the teachers are greatly divided in their perception of the two CF techniques which again might lead them to practice these CF techniques differently.

The last sub-section of the analysis of the writing teachers' responses to their questionnaire deals with their perceptions of the values of focused and unfocused CF.

5.4.2.6.2. Teachers' Beliefs about the Value of Focused and Unfocused CF

The items dealing with this issue were Item numbers 20 and 21. In item 20, the teachers were asked to show their opinions about whether focused or unfocused CF is more fruitful in improving accuracy in their students' written work. Results of the teachers' responses to this item are presented in table 23 in the following page.

Table 23: Teachers' beliefs regarding whether focused or unfocused CF was more effective

Q. 20.	Options	No. of teaches
	A. Focused CF	7
	B. Unfocused CF	2

As the data in table 23 shows, 7 out of the 9 writing teachers who responded to this item said that they believed focused CF to be more effective than unfocused CF. In item 21, the teachers were asked to reason out why they believed either of these CF types to be more effective than the other.

Those teachers who believed in the supremacy of focused CF stated that FCF was more likely to push students to correct their own errors by looking at the CF provided to them on some of their errors. Besides, this group felt that FCF provides teachers with a chance to effectively deal with some serious problems. In addition, most of the teachers in this group were of the opinion that FCF would be a more realistic option for teachers as they were obliged to teach in classrooms where the number of students was very large, and thus, it was

terribly difficult to offer CF on every error committed by the students. The other argument these teachers held was their fear of the fact that if provided with too many corrections, it would be difficult for the students to attend to all the corrections, and because of this, the students might give up hope and lose confidence. (See the teachers' complete responses in *Appendix VII*).

In short, it could be seen from the teachers' responses to Items 20 and 21 that most of the teachers believed in the supremacy of focused CF in improving the writing accuracy of their students. They generally thought that focused CF allows teachers to have more time to effectively deal with more serious errors and leave the minor ones for students to self-correct. These teachers further felt that comprehensive correction of all errors might erode the students' confidence and might force them to lose hope. In all, the teachers seemed to believe that focused CF could be more beneficial as it gives some responsibility for students for their own learning.

5.4.2.7. Implications of the Teachers' Responses for Classroom Teaching

The teachers' responses to the items in the questionnaire are believed to have important implications for the teaching and learning of EFL writing skills in our country in general and at Wollo university in particular. These implications could be broadly summarized as follows. The researcher believes that readers of this thesis could draw more implications from the teachers' responses to the questionnaire.

5.4.2.7.1. Teachers' Views about the Value of Grammar CF in Improving Writing Accuracy

Results from the writing teachers' questionnaire indicated that all of them viewed CF on students' written grammar errors as an essential tool for the development of writing skills. As to them, CF is the best way through which students are informed about the weaknesses they have. In addition, the teachers largely believed that if students were not informed in one way or another regarding their written grammar errors, there would be a danger of fossilizing these errors.

This might mean that what ever suggestions L₂ writing teachers are provided to exclude grammar CF from their teaching practices, they would only continue to practice it one way or another. This implies that rather than preaching teachers to avoid CF from their daily routines, it

would be advisable to provide them with empirically proven ways of providing CF which could be applicable to specific contexts.

5.4.2.7.2. Teachers' Preferences for versus Practices of Providing CF on their Students' Written Grammar Errors

The data from the teachers' questionnaire demonstrated that the writing teachers by and large practiced the written CF strategies which they felt to be more effective. However, there were marked divergences in the practice of different CF techniques and types. Put another way, while more teachers tended to use a combination of direct and indirect CF, there were also several of them who said to employ either direct or indirect CF alone. Further, although most of the teachers tended to employ focused CF very often, there were, at the same time, some teachers who said to more dominantly practice unfocused CF.

This division between the writing teachers in the practice of different CF types could very possibly meant that students at different classes who were taking the same writing course were receiving different CF although the type and amount of grammar errors they produced might be similar. This, as indicated above, might mean that students who were taking the same writing course were developing their writing skills differently, some, quite possibly, advantaged while others might be disadvantaged. This would imply that English departments at different universities should develop some guidelines which writing teachers might follow while providing CF on their students' written grammar errors.

5.4.2.7.3. Problems the Teachers Faced while Providing Written Grammar CF

As discussed above, all the writing teachers said that they have encountered different problems when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors. The most pronounced problem in this regard was the fact that students' written pieces were full of errors, and this was becoming worse from time to time. Because the students' compositions were full of errors, this had forced some teachers to refrain from having their pens to touch any written error.

In the eyes of the present researcher, the fact that students' written pieces are becoming full of grammar errors does not mean that writing teachers have to neglect one of their crucial pedagogical practices-providing CF on their students' errors. Rather, the occurrence of a

multitude of errors in the students' writings seems to call for CF interventions which different researches in our context have found to be more effective. In other words, the present researcher feels that the more grammar errors students commit in their writings, the more teacher CF interventions are required.

5.4.2.8. Implications of Results from Students' Questionnaire versus Results from Teachers' Questionnaire

When we look at the results from the students' questionnaire in light of the teachers' responses to their questionnaire, we could detect some basic discrepancies. To begin with, the students reported to have had an experience of receiving direct CF, a combination of direct and indirect CF, and indirect CF in descending order. On the other hand, the writing teachers said to have practiced a combination of direct and indirect CF most often, which is followed by direct CF, and then by indirect CF. Moreover, a majority of the students indicated to have had more experience of receiving unfocused CF while most of the teachers said to most often employ focused CF.

When we look at the preference data, we could again see some mismatch between what the students said to prefer and what the teachers perceived to be more fruitful. For example, where as most of the students perceived unfocused CF to be more important for their accuracy development, most of the writing teachers believed in the supremacy of focused CF.

What all this tells us is that there is some contradiction between what the students believed to have been practiced and what the teachers said to have actually practiced. Besides, what students perceived as more valuable CF strategies appeared to contradict with what the teachers perceived as such. This might imply that the teachers have been practicing what the students might have resented. To avoid or at least minimize this mismatch, teachers need to have discussions with their students regarding the CF practices which they are going to practice and the reasons for doing so. If this was done before hand, it would be possible for the students and teachers to have a common understanding to work for a common goal.

5.4.3. Results from Students' Compositions

This section attempted to answer the major question of the study by investigating the effects of indirect focused and unfocused CF moves in improving the accuracy of EFL students' writings. In doing so, first the effects of indirect focused CF on the writing accuracy of the students in the FCFG were assessed. Then, the effects of the indirect unfocused CF on the students' writing accuracy of the students in the UFCFG were investigated step by step.

5.4.3.1. The Effects of Indirect Focused CF on the Accuracy of the Students in the IFCFG

In this section, an attempt was made to investigate the effectiveness of the indirect focused corrective feedback on improving the accuracy of the students in the focused corrective feedback group. To do so, the effects of this type of CF on the students' accuracy were turn by turn investigated under different sub sections, i.e., between compositions 1&2, 1&3, 2&3, and the 3 compositions together.

5.4.3.1.1: The Effects of IFCF between Compositions 1 and 2

The students in the FCFG (N=26) wrote a total of about 2,784 words during the pre-test writing. These students committed about 658 grammatical errors during this writing occasion. The proportion of total number of errors by the students in this group to the total number of words by the group in composition 1 X 100 (i.e., the adjusted mean of the grammatical errors) was about 23.636. On the other hand, the students in this group (N=25) wrote about 2,464 words during the immediate post-test writing in which they produced about 491 grammatical errors. This, when adjusted, became about 19.923. This indicated that the students in this group have shown improvement in the level of their grammatical accuracy (i.e., from 23.636 to 19.923).

A paired t-test was run to test if the improvement brought by the IFCF between compositions 1 and 2 was really significant. The t-test was computed by putting the data provided in *Appendix XII* into SPSS. The result of the t-test with N(25) df (24), was $t=1.362$

which was significant at $P=0.186$, but not significant at the set alpha level $P=0.05$, critical value (2.064), two tailed.

5.4.3.1.2: The Effects of IFCF between Compositions 1 and 3

During the delayed post-test writing, the students in the FCFG ($N=26$) produced about 2,342 words in which there were about 402 grammatical errors. This, when adjusted, becomes about 17.164. It was shown above that, during the pre-test writing, the adjusted mean of the grammatical errors written by these students was about 23.636. This shows that the IFCF has resulted in a big difference in the adjusted means of the grammatical errors between the two writing occasions (i.e., from about 23.636 to about 17.164).

A paired t-test was run again by using the data in *Appendix XII* to test whether the change brought about by the IFCF between compositions 1 and 3 was significant. The result of the t-test with $N(26)$, $df(25)$, critical value (2.060) was $t=3.200$ which was significant at $P=0.004$. This indicates that this kind of CF has resulted in significant gains in the writing accuracy of the students in the FCFG at the determined alpha level $P=0.05$.

5.4.3.1.3: The Effects of IFCF between Compositions 2 and 3

The sub-section tries to investigate if the IFCF has brought about significant improvement in the writing accuracy of the students in the FCFG the immediate post-test and the delayed post-test writing activities. As has already been indicated above, the level of grammatical accuracy of the students during the immediate post-test writing was about 19.923, while it became to be about 17.164 during the delayed post-test writing. Between these two writing occasions, the students brought a difference in the adjusted means of their written grammar errors from about 19.923 to about 17.164.

In order to see whether this reduction of grammatical errors was significant, a paired t-test was run based on the data in *Appendix XII*. The result of the t-test with $N=25$, $df(24)$, critical value (2.064) was $t= 2.232$ which was significant at $P=0.035$, two tailed which is less than the set level of significance $P=0.05$.

5.4.3.1.4. The Effects of IFCF across the 3 Compositions

In addition to looking at the effects of the IFCF between two writing occasions, it was attempted to investigate the effects of this CF type throughout the three writing tasks. To do this, a repeated measures ANOVA was run the results of which are presented in table 24 below.

Table 24: ANOVA test results of the effects of IFCF of students in the FCFG across the three writing occasions

Multivariate Tests ^b							
Effect of IFCF		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
factor1	Pillai's Trace	.290	4.708 ^a	2.000	23.000	.019	.290
	Wilks' Lambda	.710	4.708 ^a	2.000	23.000	.019	.290
	Hotelling's Trace	.409	4.708 ^a	2.000	23.000	.019	.290
	Roy's Largest Root	.409	4.708 ^a	2.000	23.000	.019	.290

Within Subjects Design: factor1

As the data in table 24 show, the result of the Repeated measures ANOVA was $F=4.798$ which was significant at $\alpha=0.019$. This, in other words, means the indirect focused CF has led the students in this group to bring significant improvements in their writing accuracy level across the 3 writing occasions at $P<0.05$. In addition, this kind of CF has resulted in a large effect size partial eta squared =.290

To wrap up the results of the IFCF on the writing accuracy level of the students in this group, it seems possible to generalize that the IFCF has not led to a significant improvement in the writing accuracy of these students in the short-run (between compositions 1 and 2). However, it was found that this type of CF has resulted in a significant improvement in the writing accuracy of the students in the group in the long-run i.e., between compositions 1 and 3 as well as between compositions 2 and 3. The ANOVA

test result, on its part, revealed that the IFCF has led to a significant reduction of linguistic errors committed by the students in the FCFG throughout the CF intervention period.

In the section below, the effects of the indirect unfocused corrective feedback (IUFC) on the writing accuracy of the students in the indirect unfocused corrective feedback group (IUFCG) were investigated.

5.4.3.2. The Effects of IUCF on the Accuracy of the Students in the IUFCFG

Like what was done above with the IFCF, the effects of the IUFCF were presented and analyzed under different sub-sections. In doing so, first the effects of the IUFCF in the short-run (between compositions 1 and 2) were assessed, followed by an assessment of the effects of this kind of CF in the long-run (between compositions 1 and 3). Then, the effects of the IUFCF between compositions 2 and 3 were investigated. Finally, it was tried to see the effects of the IUFCF across the 3 writing occasions.

5.4.3.2.1. The Effects of IUFCF between Compositions 1 and 2

During the pre-test writing, the students in the IUFCFG (N=26) produced about 3,016 words which carried about 718 grammatical errors. This, when adjusted, becomes about 23.808. On the other hand, during the immediate post-test writing, the students in this group (N=24) wrote about 2,573 words in which there were about 602 grammatical errors. The adjusted mean of the grammatical errors at this occasion became to be 23.400. This result indicates that the IUFCF has led to a reduction of grammatical errors written by this group between the two writing occasions (i.e., from about 23.808 to about 23.400).

The data in *Appendix XVI* was fed into an SPSS to run a paired t-test in order to see whether the change in accuracy brought by the IUFCF between these writing activities was significant. The result of the t-test ($t=-0.542$) was significant at $P=0.593$ which is greater than the determined significance level $P=0.05$ level of significance, with $N(24)$, $df(23)$, critical value 2.069, two tailed.

What about in the long-run? Has the IUFCF led to a significant reduction of the grammatical errors exhibited in the compositions of the students in this group between the pre-test and the delayed post-test writing? The following sub-section tried to answer this question.

5.4.3.2.2. **The Effects of IUFCF between Compositions 1 and 3**

It was shown above that, during the pre-test writing, the level of grammatical accuracy of the students in the UFCFG was about 23.808. On the other hand, during the delayed post-test writing, the students in this group (N=24) wrote about 2,314 words in which there were about 549 grammatical errors which, when adjusted, becomes about 23.725. This shows that the students in this group have brought some difference in their writing accuracy between the two writing occasions.

This difference was tested by using a paired t-test if it were significant with N(24), df (23), critical value (2.069). The t-test which was computed by using the data in **Appendix XVI** produced a t-value of -1.288 which was significant at P=0.210. This, like what happened above, is not significant at a 0.05 level of significance.

5.4.3.2.3. **The Effects of IUFCF between Compositions 2 and 3**

We have seen above that, during the immediate post-test writing, the adjusted mean of the grammatical errors in the compositions written by the students in the UFCFG was about 23.400. On the other hand, the adjusted mean of the grammatical errors by this group in the delayed post-test composition was about 23.725. This shows that the number of grammatical errors written by the group has shown an increase from the second to the third writing occasion (i.e., from 23.400 to 23.725).

Here again, the same statistical procedure was used to test whether the difference in the writing accuracy level between the two writing occasions was significant. The t-test run again by using the data in **Appendix XVI** with N(23), df(22), produced a t-value of -0.487, sig. P=0.631, which was not significant at P=0.05, critical value (2.070) two tailed.

5.4.3.2.4. **The Effects of IUFCF Across the 3 Compositions**

Like what was done with the effects of the IDCF and FCF, whether the UFCF has resulted in significant written accuracy gains of the students in the UFCFG throughout the CF intervention process was investigated by using a respected measures ANOVA. The results from the ANOVA test, as revealed in table 25 below, with F=0.610, sig.at P=0.055, show

that the IUFCF has not led the students in this group to achieve significant accuracy gains at a P=0.05 level of significance.

Table 25: ANOVA test results of the effects of IUFCF of students in the UFCFG across the three writing occasions

Multivariate Tests ^b							
Effect of IUFCF		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
factor2	Pillai's Trace	.055	.610 ^a	2.000	21.000	.553	.055
	Wilks' Lambda	.945	.610 ^a	2.000	21.000	.553	.055
	Hotelling's Trace	.058	.610 ^a	2.000	21.000	.553	.055
	Roy's Largest Root	.058	.610 ^a	2.000	21.000	.553	.055

Within Subjects Design: factor2

To sum, the analysis of the results from the IUFCF on the writing accuracy level of the students in this group shows that this kind of CF might not be effective in reducing grammatical errors from students' compositions. The results seem to indicate that IUFCF in the form of underlining errors and writing codes for that errors might have negative consequences on the students' writing accuracy, though this negative consequence seemed to decrease from composition 2 to composition 3.

5.4.3.3. The Effects of the Two CF Types on Targeted Grammatical Errors (TGE's)

In the sections below, it was attempted to investigate the effects of the two CF interventions on the errors belonging to targeted grammatical error categories (TGE's). In doing so, first, the effects of the IFCF on TGE's committed by the students in the FCFG were examined. Next, the effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's were investigated.

5.4.3.3.1. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's

The investigation into the effects of the IFCF on the TGE's by the FCFG was made based on the data provided in *Appendix XXI*.

5.4.3.3.1.1. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 1 and 2

As the data in *Appendix XXI* indicate, the students in the FCFG (N=26) committed about 440 grammatical errors belonging to the TGE's during the pre-test writing. On the other hand, the students in this group (N=25) produced about 377 TGE's during the immediate post-test. The adjusted means of the TGE's were about 15.804 and 15.423 during the pre-test and the immediate post-test writings respectively.

To test whether the difference in the two means was significant, the proportion of TGE's by each student in the FCFG to the total number of words by the group in the two writing occasions (i.e., *Appendix XXI*) was fed into an SPSS and a paired t-test was computed. The result of the t-test was $t=-0.258$, sig. at $P=0.799$ which showed that the IFCF has not resulted in a significant difference in the TGE's between the two writing occasions at 0.05 level of significance with $N(25)$, $df(24)$.

5.4.3.3.1.2. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 1 and 3

The data in *Appendix XXI* again show that the students in the FCFG committed about 440 TGE's during the pre-test writing. Also indicated in the same appendix is that the students in this group produced about 277 TGE's during the delayed post-test composition. The data further depict that the adjusted means of the TGE's by the group were about 15.804 and 11.827 at the pre-test and delayed post-test respectively.

Again, the proportion of the TGE's to the total number of words presented in *Appendix XXI* were entered into an SPSS, and a paired t-test was run to see if the difference in the two means was significant. The output from the t-test $t=2.950$ indicated that the IFCF has led to a significant reduction in the means of the TGE's at a 0.07 level of significance with $N(26)$, $df(25)$ between the pre-test and the immediate post-test compositions.

5.4.3.3.1.3. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 2 and 3

Referring to the data in *Appendix XXI*, we could see that the adjusted mean of the TGE's by the students in the FCFG during the immediate post-test writing was about 15.423, while during the

delayed post-test the mean of the TGE's became to be about 11.827. This shows that there was a considerable reduction in the mean of the TGE's from the immediate to the delayed post-test.

Like what has been done above, to check whether the difference between the two means was significant within the group, the data in *Appendix XXI* was used to compute a paired t-test. The result of the t-test $t=3.218$ indicates that the IFCF has resulted in significant gains in writing accuracy between the two writing activities at $p=0.004$ level of significance with $N(25)$, $df(24)$ when the TGE's were taken into consideration.

5.4.3.3.1.4. The Effects of the IFCF on the TGE's Across the 3 Compositions

It was indicated above that the IFCF has resulted in a significant reduction of the TGE's committed by the students in the FCFG between compositions 2&3 as well as 1&3 when the adjusted means of the linguistic errors of the two writing occasions were compared by using a paired t-test. In this sub-section, the effects of the IFCF on the TGE's by the same group of students throughout the CF intervention process are investigated. To do so, a repeated measures ANOVA statistical procedure is used. The results of the ANOVA are provided in table 26 in the following page.

Table 26: ANOVA test results of the effects of IFCF on TGE's across the three compositions

Multivariate Tests ^b						
Effect of IFCF on TGE's	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
factor1 Pillai's Trace	.354	6.299 ^a	2.000	23.000	.007	.354
Wilks' Lambda	.646	6.299 ^a	2.000	23.000	.007	.354
Hotelling's Trace	.548	6.299 ^a	2.000	23.000	.007	.354
Roy's Largest Root	.548	6.299 ^a	2.000	23.000	.007	.354

As one could observe from table 26, the result of the ANOVA ($F=6.299$) was significant at $P<0.005$ which indicates that the IFCF has resulted in a significant reduction in the number of

TGE's produced by the students in the FCFG throughout the CF intervention process. Also, the partial eta squared data (.354) indicates that the IFCF has resulted in a large effect.

To wrap, it could be seen that the IFCF hasn't led to a significant reduction in the adjusted means of the TGE's in the short-run (between compositions 1 and 2). Nevertheless, as the time for the corrective treatment went on, it was observed that the IFCF has led to a significant reduction in the means of the TGE's both between compositions 2 and 3 and between compositions 1 and 3. Moreover, a comparison of the 3 means of the 3 writing tasks together by using a repeated measures ANOVA has revealed that this type of CF has helped the students in this group to bring a big reduction in the number of TGE's which was strongly significant.

5.4.3.3.2. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's

In this last sub-section, the effects of the IUFCF on TGE's were investigated. The investigation was made based on the data in **Appendix XXII**.

5.4.3.3.2.1. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's between Compositions

1 and 2

As we could see from the data in **Appendix XXII**, the students in the IUFCFG have committed about 483 grammatical errors belonging to the targeted error categories during the pre-test writing when the students produced a total of about 3,016 words. This means, the adjusted mean of the TGE's at that time was about 16.017. During the immediate post-test, on the other hand, the students wrote about 2,573 words which carried about 361 TGE's. The adjusted mean of the TGE's at this time, thus, became to be about 14.036.

To check whether the difference between the two means was significant, the proportion of TGE's to the total number of words by the IUFCFG during the two writing occasions (in **Appendix XXIII**) was fed into an SPSS and a paired t-test was run. The result of the t-test with $N(24)$, $df(23)$, critical value(2.069) was $t=0.774$. This was significant at $P=0.447$. This means, the IUFCF has not resulted in significant differences in the means of the TGE's between the pre-test and the immediate post-test writing activities.

5.4.3.3.2.2. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 1 and 3

As the data in *Appendix XXII* again show, the students in the IUFCFG wrote a total of about 2,314 words during the delayed post-test writing in which there were about 340 grammatical errors of the targeted categories. This was an adjusted mean of about 14.740. It was indicated above that the adjusted mean of the TGE's by these students during the pre-test was about 16.017.

Again, the data in *Appendix XXII* was used to compute a paired t-test so that it could be possible to infer whether the difference between the two means was significant. The output from the paired t-test with $N(24)$, $df(23)$ was $t = -0.151$ indicated that the IUFCF has not led to a significant difference in the means of the TGE's by the students in this group between the pre-test and the delayed post-test compositions at 0.05 level of significance.

5.4.3.3.2.3. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's between Compositions 2 and 3

The data in *appendix XXII* further show that the adjusted means of TGE's by the students in the IUFCFG were about 14.030 and 14.740 during the immediate and delayed post-test writing occasions respectively.

The difference in the two means of the TGE's within the group was tested for significance by using a paired samples t-test. The result from the t-test with $N(23)$, $df(22)$ was $t = -0.785$ which was again found to be insignificant at $P = 0.05$.

What about throughout the 6 weeks' CF endeavor? The next sub-section attempts to examine if the IUFCF has any significant effect on the magnitude of the TGE's by the students in the IUFCFG across the 3 writing occasions.

5.4.3.3.2.4. The Effects of the IUFCF on the TGE's Across the 3 Writing Tasks

Like what was done when examining the overall effects of the IFCF on TGE's, the effects of the IUFCF on TGE's by the students in the UFCFG throughout the 3 writing occasions were investigated by using a repeated measures ANOVA test. The results of the ANOVA, as depicted in table 27 below, was $F = 0.400$ which was significant at $P = 0.675$. This indicates that this type of CF did not bring a significant reduction in the number of TGE's by the students in this group at

P=0.05. The partial eta squared data (0.037) also shows that the IUFCF has resulted in a very small effect size.

Table 27: ANOVA test results of the effects of IUFCF on TGE’s by the students in the UFCFG across the three compositions

Multivariate Tests ^b							
Effect of IUFCF on TGE's	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	
factor2	Pillai's Trace	.037	.400 ^a	2.000	21.000	.675	.037
	Wilks' Lambda	.963	.400 ^a	2.000	21.000	.675	.037
	Hotelling's Trace	.038	.400 ^a	2.000	21.000	.675	.037
	Roy's Largest Root	.038	.400 ^a	2.000	21.000	.675	.037

Within Subjects Design: factor2

Generally, the investigation into the effects of the IUFCF on the TGE’s produced by the students in the IUFCFG has revealed that this type of CF has not led to significant differences in the means of the TGE’s between any of the writing occasions as well as throughout the CF intervention.

To recap, it could be inferred from the above sub-sections that employing an IFCF might be more effective than utilizing an IUFCF in improving writing accuracy in general and TGE’s in particular. This finding is in congruence with what many scholars recommend to be practiced (Bitchener & Knock, 2008, 2009, 2010; Ferris, 2004, 2010; Evans et al, 2010).

5.5. Inter-Rater Correlation during the Main Study

As indicated earlier, in a view to check whether the error identification of the researcher was consistent, samples of students’ paragraphs (8 from each writing occasion) were distributed to 2 raters. The raters were provided with operationalizations of the different error categories which is presented in *Appendix III*. Because the inter-rater correlation between the raters tended to be low during the pre-test, example instances of students’ errors (the same appendix) which were gathered from the pilot paragraphs were thoroughly discussed with the raters before they went over the immediate post-test paragraphs.

The errors identified in each grammar category from the sample paragraphs by the researcher and the two raters were presented in *Appendices XXIII, XXIV, and XXV*. For the sake of simplicity, these results were summarized in table 28 below.

Table 28: Identification of Errors by the Researcher and the Two Raters in the 3 Compositions

Errr Cata g-	Composition1			Composition 2			Composition3		
	My ratg	Rate r1	Rate r2	My Rati n	Rate r1	Rate r2	My rati ng	Rate r1	Rat er2
WC	8	1	30	16	10	16	5	11	3
FR	14	1	0	7	6	0	6	5	2
PR E	14	6	5	8	4	2	8	8	3
Pun	34	14	29	13	17	32	12	10	24
SP	5	3	23	3	5	8	1	1	9
AR	16	6	4	5	3	3	8	3	8
Con	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	3	0
Qu n	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PO S	2	0	2	5	5	1	3	2	1
UN	10	1	9	5	7	11	2	3	13
OM	6	0	18	2	4	11	2	0	7
WF	45	12	22	23	17	15	20	12	12
VF	48	8	20	23	25	19	29	27	18
Prn	9	6	5	12	14	4	3	4	0
WO	4	2	9	4	1	0	2	1	0
Awk	2	16	6	1	9	0	0	4	0
Parl	1	2	5	1	2	0	1	3	0

Correlations in Composition 1

- Between the researcher & rater 1=.550 (Sig. at 0.05, 2-tailed)
- Between the researcher and rater 2=.503 (Sig. at 0.05, 2-tailed)
- Between rater 1& rater 2=.315 (Not significant at 0.05)

Correlations in Composition2

- Between the researcher & rater 1=.879 (Sig. at 0.01, 2-tailed)
- Between the researcher and rater 2=.666 (Sig. at 0.01, 2-tailed)
- Between rater 1& rater 2=.733(Sig. at 0.01, 2-tailed)

Correlations in Composition3

- Between the researcher & rater 1=.904 (Sig. at 0.01, 2-tailed)

- Between the researcher and rater 2=0.635 (Sig. at 0.01, 2-tailed)
- Between rater 1& rater 2=0.572 (Sig. at 0.05, 2-tailed)

Correlation across the 3 compositions

- Between the researcher and rater 1=.882 (Sig. at 0.01, two tailed)
- Between the researcher and rater 2=.674(Sig. at 0.01, two tailed)
- Between rater 1 and rater 2=.664(Sig. at 0.01, two tailed)

As the data in table 28 show, the number of word choice (WC) errors identified from the 8 sample paragraphs during the pre-test writing was 8 by the researcher, 1 by rater 1 and 21 by rater 2. The number of WC errors identified from the 8 sample paragraphs during the immediate post-test writing was 16 by the researcher, 5 by rater 1 and 13 by rater 2 while this number became 5 by the researcher, 8 by rater 1 and 2 by rater 2. (It is hoped that readers would do the same analysis with the other grammar error types).

The data in table 28 was fed in to an SPSS and the correlation between the raters and the researcher was computed. The results of the correlation statistics indicated that during the pre-test, the correlation in identifying grammar errors was not stronger. This, as indicated above, necessitated an arrangement of a briefing session with the raters regarding the error categorization. However, during the immediate and delayed post-test writing, a strong correlation was observed both between the researcher and each rater as well as between the raters themselves. Moreover, the overall correlation between the researcher and the two raters as well as the raters themselves was found to be stronger when the linguistic errors they identified from the 24 sample compositions were summed and fed into an SPSS.

This might most possibly mean that the error identification by the researcher was consistent across the writing occasions.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter of the current research project tries to summarize the findings obtained from the different research tools, discuss the conclusions reached, and forward some recommendations regarding the problem under study.

6.1. SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

It has been explained several times in the preceding chapters of this project that the main objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused and indirect unfocused corrective feedback on improving the writing accuracy of university level EFL students taking the course Basic Writing Skills/ Sophomore English. The study also tried to:

- find out about students' views on the value of written corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of their writing,
- explore the writing teachers' views on the value of written grammar corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of their students' writing,
- survey students' experiences of receiving corrective feedback on their written grammar errors,
- assess the writing teachers' practices of providing CF on their students' written grammar errors,
- find out students' preferences for receiving different CF types
- explore the writing teachers' perceptions of what CF types might be more useful in improving the accuracy of their students' writing,
- find out what problems (if any) students encounter when receiving written grammar CF from their writing teachers, and
- assess what problems (if any) the writing teachers face when providing CF on their students' grammar errors.

To achieve the major objective, data were gathered from about 150 paragraphs written by the sample students (N=52) within a 43 days' time. Supplementary data aiming at addressing the other objectives of the study were also gathered through questionnaires for students (N=60) and for their writing teachers (N=11).

The major findings from the different data sources are summarized below.

6.1.1. The Students' Questionnaire

One of the objectives of the students' questionnaire was geared to finding out about their beliefs regarding the value of CF in improving the accuracy of their writings. According to the data from the students' questionnaire, most of them (77.97%) believed that CF was very important, and the remaining (22.03%) students were of the belief that CF was important to improve the accuracy of their writings. This result concurs with many other research findings from contexts outside Ethiopia. The students seemed to largely believe that correct grammar usage would determine their future academic success, that the teacher is the major source of knowledge, that grammar is a very crucially important skill, that CF would guide them to learn better, that teacher CF would help them understand their errors/mistakes better, that it is a teacher's actual duty to provide CF on his/her students' grammar errors, that CF encourages learners think deeper, and that CF helps students to learn from errors and not to commit similar errors again and again.

Another batch of items in the students' questionnaire aimed at finding out their experiences of receiving CF on their written grammatical errors. The students in this case were made to react to two broad issues: one dealing with their experience with direct and indirect CF and the other with focused and unfocused CF.

Regarding their experience with direct and indirect CF, about 45.61% of the students replied that their writing teachers always employed direct CF, while about 27.27% of them said that the CF technique always used by their writing teachers was a combination of direct and indirect CF. On the other hand, about 7.41% of the students indicated that their writing teachers always employ indirect CF. Asked to indicate the most frequently applied direct CF in item number 5, about 61.02% of the students responded that their writing teachers always employed 'provision of grammatical explanation', while about 37.29% of them said that the most frequently employed direct CF on their compositions was 'provision of the correct form near the error'.

Concerning the students' experiences with focused and unfocused CF, just over half of the students (about 54.55%) responded that their writing teachers always employed unfocused CF when responding to their written grammatical errors, while the remaining 45.46% of them indicated that the CF type most frequently used by their writing teachers was unfocused CF.

The survey also consisted of questions which were geared towards investigating students' preferences for different types of CF. These items were also directed at two broad areas: one geared towards finding out about students' preferences for direct and indirect CF and the other one towards exploring their preference for focused and unfocused CF.

The data from item 7 of the students' questionnaire revealed that exactly the same percentage of the students (about 44.83% each) preferred their writing teachers to most often employ direct CF and a combination of direct and indirect CF on their written grammatical errors while the remaining 10.35% showed a preference for indirect CF alone.

Those who preferred to have direct CF reasoned out that this type of CF is clear and thus avoids information distortion and that it is easily understandable. Those who preferred their writing teachers to most frequently employ a combination of direct and indirect CF, on their part, justified that they sometimes need to take responsibility for their own learning, that some errors are difficult to self-correct by the students and require teacher assistance, that the contexts (in- class versus out-class writing) in which they are involved in writing might require either direct or indirect CF, that their writing teachers should provide them with direct CF when the students ask them for help, and that when the teachers combine direct and indirect CF, the students would utilize the direct CF to work out the indirectly indicated errors by themselves. Those students who showed a preference for indirect CF alone, on the other hand, said that this type of CF encourages them to work hard by themselves and that direct CF would discourage them and might make them develop a fear of making mistakes.

Regarding the DCF type the students preferred most, it was found that 21 of them preferred to have grammatical explanation as their first choice. On the other hand, 18 of the students primarily preferred to have provision of the correct form near their written grammar errors while 14 of them preferred to have conferencing as their first choice DCF.

When we see the students' preferences from among the different indirect CF techniques, although very few of them responded to this point, 8 students preferred to have 'underlining and writing codes' as their first choice, 6 students showed a preference for 'underlining' as their primary choice, while 5 students preferred to have 'writing comments' first. The results

also show that ‘writing numbers or tallies’ on the margins was the least preferred type of IDCF.

Asked to show their preference for either focused or unfocused CF, most of the students (about 60.78%) preferred their writing teachers to employ unfocused CF when providing them with CF on their written grammar errors. The remaining 39.22% of the students preferred to have focused CF more than unfocused CF.

Those students who preferred to have unfocused CF reasoned out that:

- if some grammatical errors were left uncorrected by the teachers, they would continue to commit those errors in other subsequent writing occasions,
- comprehensive CF would help them be correct in all aspects,
- selective CF might make them develop false perception about themselves that they would consider the other part of their work free of errors,
- unfocused CF might help them be perfect,
- focused/selective CF might be confusing, and
- total correction would help them be effective writers in the future.

Those students who preferred their writing teachers to most often employ focused CF, on their part, justified that:

- unfocused/comprehensive CF is too time consuming for the teachers because they are working with too many students in a class,
- all errors committed by the students are not equally important; some errors are not as important for correction,
- selective/focused CF encourages students to research for themselves based on the correction provided to them on selected errors, and
- unfocused CF might let them lose interest towards the course.

The questionnaire for the students also included a part which aimed at finding out the problems (if any) they face while receiving CF from their writing teachers. Most of the students (about 61.54% of them) indicated that they do not face any problem while they are provided with CF on their written grammar errors. However, about 38.46% of the students replied that they face some problems when they receive their compositions back with CF from their writing teachers.

Among the problems the students mentioned were: at times, they were not convinced of what the teachers told them as errors; the teachers sometimes considered something in their writing as wrong simply because their handwriting was not good; some of the corrections provided were difficult to understand; writing teachers sometimes develop negative attitudes towards students who want to know what their errors are, and the teachers' CF might affect their approach to the course.

The last portion of the students' questionnaire was designed to find out what strategies the students took when they received their compositions back with CF on their grammar errors. According to the results, 18 students said that they always 'keep a mental note' of their errors, 18 students reported that they always 'rewrite their compositions' by incorporating the CF, 15 students responded that they always 'consult a grammar book' to unravel the CF on their papers, and 12 students replied that they always employed the 'asking friends for help' strategy.

6.1.2. The Teachers' Questionnaire

All the writing teachers who were offering the course Basic Writing and those who have ever offered writing courses at a university/college (N=11) were asked to fill in a questionnaire. The objectives of the teachers' questionnaire, as indicated above, were to find out about their views regarding the value of CF on students' written grammatical errors, investigate what types of written CF they practice when responding to their students' written grammar errors, explore their beliefs about effective CF practices, assess whether they face problems when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors, if there are, what these problems are, and find out their experiences about most frequent grammatical errors they encounter, when responding to their students' compositions.

Requested to tell their beliefs about the value of CF on written grammar errors to improve the accuracy of their students' writing, 9 of the writing teachers responded that CF on students' written grammar errors is 'very important', and 2 of them replied that CF on students' written grammar errors is 'important'.

The teachers reasoned out that unless students are told by their teachers, they might not understand their errors, that accuracy is as important as fluency, that grammatical inaccuracy

might result in communication break down and that if errors are left uncorrected, they will be fossilized.

Like what was done with students, the exploration into the writing teachers' experience of providing CF was centered around two basic issues- their experience of direct versus indirect CF and of focused and unfocused CF.

Regarding the first issue, it was found that 6 of the writing teachers most often used a combination of direct and indirect CF, 3 of them most frequently employed direct CF , and 2 of them most often used indirect CF alone.

Those teachers who most frequently employed direct CF were of the opinion that:

- unless their students were told the correction explicitly, they would repeat the same mistakes in the next tasks,
- it would be difficult for students to understand their own errors if they were not told, and
- the rules teachers provide for the students in the form of direct CF would help the students as a guide in their future endeavor.

Those teachers who most often practiced a combination of direct and indirect CF, on their part, generally believed that utilizing direct CF alone would be too mechanical making students passive, but indirect CF alone might also be too difficult for students because there are some grammatical errors which are beyond the students' reach of self-correction. Therefore, this latter group seemed to employ direct CF when they thought the errors were difficult for students to self-correct, where as they used indirect CF when they considered the errors as simple.

Concerning the second point of inquiry, i.e., the teachers' experience with focused and unfocused CF, it was found that most of them (9 out of 11 teachers) said to most often employ focused CF .

The major reason for these teachers to most often employ focused CF was a time factor. It was understood from teachers' responses that they were dealing with too many students in a class who, in turn, commit too many grammatical errors. This seems to have made it practically impossible for the teachers to provide CF on each and every error. The other

reason held by these teachers was the belief that focused CF might make their students active in that they would be involved in correcting their uncorrected errors based on the correction they are given on some errors. Still, some teachers opined that it would be difficult for students to handle all the correction provided to them on each grammar error they have made.

Asked to indicate what kind of grammatical errors they focused on when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors, most of the teachers reported that they focused on errors that cause distortion of meaning, and thus, hamper communication. Of such errors indicated by the teachers were agreement, punctuation, spelling, capitalization, tense, and sentence fragment.

On the other hand, the 2 teachers who said to most frequently employ unfocused CF justified that they did so because they feared that if they did not correct all the errors made by their students, those errors left uncorrected would continue to occur. Also, these teachers seemed to have concluded that many of their students were so improficient in the language that they did not even have any knowhow about grammar.

The other piece of data from the teachers' questionnaire indicated that all the writing teachers tried to identify their students' most common written grammar errors. The most common grammatical errors, according to the teachers, were tense use (indicated by 8 of the teachers), subject-verb agreement errors (indicated by 7 teachers), (passive) voice construction (2 teachers), capitalization (2 teachers), and punctuation (2 teachers). Quite surprisingly, none of the writing teachers made a mention of errors like word choice, preposition, article use, pronoun use, and connector use which were found by the researcher to be very common in the students' written pieces.

The teachers' questionnaire also included items which were designed to find out if they have ever faced problems when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors. All the writing teachers replied that they have faced different problems when they were providing CF on their students' compositions.

One of the most disturbing problems the teachers faced while providing CF was the fact that their students' writings were so full of grammatical errors that they were afraid even to start

to offer the CF. That might be the reason for some teachers to prefer to write paragraphs themselves rather than providing CF. What is worse, the teachers indicated that after investing a lot of time and energy on offering CF, the students continued to commit the same errors. This, according to some teachers, may be due to the fact that the students do not have the ability and motivation to understand and utilize the CF. The other problem mentioned by the writing teachers was that, at times, their students are not convinced of the fact that what is indicated as errors are really errors. Still, some teachers, who seemed to be practicing focused CF, said that, when they skip some errors, their students consider that they have not made other errors, i.e., other than the ones corrected by the teachers.

The other piece of information determined to be gathered from the teachers' questionnaire was their perception regarding the benefits of different CF types. Like the inquiry into their experiences, this again centered around two points-their perceptions of the values of direct versus indirect CF and of focused versus unfocused CF.

Regarding the first issue, 5 of the writing teachers had the perception that indirect CF was more fruitful than direct CF in improving accuracy in students' writings, while 5 of the teachers perceived direct CF to be more effective.

Those teachers who perceived IDCF to be more fruitful justified that this kind of CF could encourage independent learning and minimize students' dependency on their teachers. They believed that when students contribute their efforts for their own learning, this will result in long-lasting learning. They also thought that the trial and error the students undergo when self-correcting their errors would be more beneficial.

Those teachers who believed DCF to be superior, on the other hand, reasoned out that their students, except some, were so careless and reluctant that they might not even see the corrections on their compositions; they did not show the interest to refer to different sources which could help them to correct their errors. They further indicated that unless the students were told explicitly about their errors, they would go into argument with the teachers regarding why a certain production was indicated as an error.

Concerning the teachers' perceptions about the values of focused and unfocused CF, it was found that most of the teachers (7 out of the 9 teachers who reacted to this issue) believed

that focused CF could be more fruitful than unfocused CF in improving the writing accuracy of their students. These teachers said that focused CF would help teachers have more time to effectively deal with some errors which deserve correction. They also believed that unfocused CF may not work because it would be beyond the students' attentional capacity to grasp all the corrections. As to these teachers, a focused approach of CF would make students contribute their own for the teaching learning process.

6.1.3. The Students' Compositions

It has been indicated earlier that the major aim of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of indirect focused versus indirect unfocused corrective feedback in improving the accuracy of university level EFL students' writings. To achieve this objective, the students (N=52) were made to write 3 compositions- a pre-test, an immediate post-test and a delayed post-test expository paragraph writing tasks. The major findings from the students' compositions were summarized as follows.

6.1.3.1. The Effects of the IFCF on the Students' Writing Accuracy

When we see the effects of the IFCF in the short-run, we could learn that, during the pre-test writing, the students in the FCFG (N=26) wrote about 2,784 words which carried about 658 grammatical errors. In other words, the writing accuracy level of the students was 23.636. On the other hand, during the immediate post-test writing, the students in this group (N=25) produced about 2,464 words in which there were about 491 grammatical errors. This, when adjusted, became to be about 19.923. The proportion of errors to words by each student in the two compositions provided in *Appendix XV* was entered into an SPSS and a paired t-test was run with N(25), df(24) to test if the difference in the students' accuracy between the two compositions was significant. The result of the t-test ($t=1.362$) showed that the FCF hasn't led the students in this group to bring significant improvement in their writing accuracy between the two compositions.

Coming to the effects of the IFCF on the students' writing accuracy between compositions 1 and 3, we could understand that the baseline level of writing accuracy of the students was about 23.636. On the other hand, during the delayed post-test, the students in the FCFG (N=26) wrote about 2,342 words in which about 402 grammatical errors occurred. This was

equivalent to about 17.164. The paired t-test computed by again using the data in *Appendix XV* with $N(26)$, $df(25)$ was $t=3.200$ indicating that the FCF has resulted in significant gains in the writing accuracy of the students in this group in the long-run.

Now, borrowing the data in the preceding paragraphs, we could summarize the effects of the FCF on the writing accuracy of the students between the immediate and the delayed post-test compositions. As indicated above, during the immediate post-test writing, the level of grammatical accuracy of the FCFG students was about 19.923, which during the delayed post-test writing has become 17.164. The paired t-test computed by using the data in *Appendix XV* resulted in an output of ($t=2.232$) which means the FCF has again resulted in significant gains in the writing accuracy of the students in this group between compositions 2 and 3.

Moreover, the ANOVA test result which was calculated based on the data in *Appendix XV* showed that the IFCF has resulted in an overall significant gain in the writing accuracy of the students in the FCFG when the 3 mean accuracy levels of the students during the 3 writing occasions were compared at the same time.

6.1.3.2. The Effects of the IUFCF on the Students' Writing Accuracy

Turning to a summary of the results on the effects of the IUFCF on the writing accuracy level of the students in this group, it was indicated above that during the pre-test composition, the students in the UFCFG ($N=26$) produced about 3,016 words in which there were about 718 grammatical errors. The proportion of the total number of grammatical errors to the total number of words X 100 (i.e., the baseline accuracy level of the students) during that time was about 23.808. On the other hand, during the immediate post-test the students in this group ($N=24$) wrote about 2,573 words which carried about 602 grammatical errors. This, when adjusted became to be about 23.400. During the delayed post-test, the students in the UFCFG ($N=24$) produced about 2,314 words in which there were about 549 grammatical errors the proportion of which became to be about 23.725.

The proportions of grammatical errors by each student to the total number of words written by the group in each composition which are provided in *Appendix XVI* were put into an SPSS and a paired t-test was computed by pairing compositions 1&2, 1&3, and 2&3 with N(24), N(24) and N(23) respectively. The results of the t-test $t=-0.542$, $t=-1.288$, and $t=-0.487$ respectively indicated that the IUFCE hasn't resulted in significant changes in the writing grammatical accuracy level of the students in this group. In addition, it was found that this type of CF hasn't brought significant improvements in the writing accuracy of the students throughout the 3 writing activities.

6.1.3.3. The Effects of the Two CF Types on TGE's

As the major objective of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of focused versus unfocused corrective feedback in improving the writing accuracy of EFL student, it was necessary to examine the effects of these CF types on the grammatical error categories which were targeted during the course of the study. It is recalled that the grammatical errors which were targeted by the focused CF were sentence fragment, preposition, punctuation, verb formation, and word formation errors. The investigation into the effects of the different CF types on the TGE's committed by each student revealed the following findings.

The analysis of the data from the compositions written by the students (*Appendix XXI*) in the focused CF group (FCFG) showed that the adjusted means of the TGE's by the group were 15.804, 15.423, and 11.827 during the pre, immediate, and delayed post-test writings. The paired t-test computed to see if the differences in these means were significant indicated that the IFCF, though it hasn't led to a significant difference in the TGE's in the short-run, has resulted in very significant reductions in the production of the TGE's by this group between compositions 1 and 3 as well as between compositions 2 and 3. Further, the ANNOVA test result computed by using the data in the same appendix revealed that the overall effect of the IFCF on the TGE's of the students in the FCFG was significant.

On the other hand, the data from the compositions written by the students in the unfocused CF group (UFCFG) in *Appendix XXII* indicated that the adjusted means of the TGE's by this group were about 16.017, 14.030, and 14.740 during the pre, immediate, and delayed post-test writings. The paired t-test computed to test the differences in these means revealed

that the IUFCF hasn't led to a significant difference in the TGE'S by the UFCFG students between any of the writing occasions. The ANNOVA test result didn't indicate any significant difference in the means of the TGE's by this group throughout the CF intervention process either.

6.2. CONCLUSIONS

In this section, some conclusions are drawn based on the major findings of the study.

Results from the students' questionnaire indicated that EFL students generally give a very important place for corrective feedback, especially CF that is provided on linguistic/grammar errors. It appears that errors are inevitable in language learning, and if exploited wisely, they are golden chances for learning. As teachers are believed to be the sources of knowledge for their students, they are expected to provide the necessary support. It seems clear that unless the students are told by their teachers that they have made errors, it would be difficult for them to know whether they have committed errors. It is assumed that teachers better know their students' errors. Above all, it is considered a teacher's responsibility to give CF. What is more, corrective feedback is believed to shape students' behavior by helping them in avoiding repetition of errors. Finally, it is believed to be impossible to develop writing skills without CF.

From the students' perspective, the most frequently practiced corrective feedback appears to be direct correction, followed by a combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques, while indirect CF alone happens very rarely. The most commonly applied type of direct CF was reported to be provision of grammar explanation followed by provision of the correct form near the error. On the other hand, the most commonly employed indirect CF techniques were in descending order underlining, writing comments, underlining and writing codes, followed by writing codes.

Regarding the practice of focused versus unfocused CF, it seems, from the majority of the students' point of view, that unfocused CF was practiced by their writing teachers most often.

Coming to the students' preferences to different CF techniques, students largely favored direct CF and a combination of direct and indirect CF, while indirect CF alone was preferred only by a few students.

Direct CF was preferred by many students because it was perceived as explicit and clear and, therefore, could be easily understandable. On the other hand, an equally larger portion of the students preferred to have a combination of direct and indirect CF. According to this later group, students should contribute for the teaching learning process by working out some errors which were considered simple to self correct, while errors which were deemed difficult would require direct CF by the teacher. It also seemed that contexts could determine students' preferences to have either direct or indirect CF – direct CF while discussions are going on in class, and indirect CF when students are working on their own outside the class.

It is clear that the most preferred direct CF type was grammar explanation followed by provision of the correct form near the error. Still, many students showed a preference for conferencing. On the other hand, of the different indirect CF techniques, underlining and writing codes, underlining, and writing comments were preferred by many students in descending order.

Regarding students' preference for either focused or unfocused CF, it appeared that a majority of the students preferred unfocused CF.

The students who have shown a preference for unfocused CF seemed to largely believe that, unless all their errors were corrected, they would continue to repeat the uncorrected errors. Besides, these students would like to develop all round knowledge and be perfect in all aspects. To the eyes of these students, focused CF might be confusing for them as they will consider the skipped errors as correct.

It also appears that many students have faced problems with the CF they received from their writing teachers. The major problem was a problem of understanding the CF. The other problem was that some teachers would frown at students who asked for clarification about their errors. Also, some students indicated that the CF provided by their teachers would negatively affect the students' approach to the course and to the teachers. Still, some students pointed out that they were punished simply because their handwritings were bad. In

all, students seemed to hold that they were not convinced of what their teachers indicated to them as ‘errors’.

Regarding the strategies they used when they received their compositions back from their writing teachers with CF, it was found that many students kept a mental note of the errors, while some other students rewrote their compositions by incorporating the CF. Still, few students used consulting a grammar book as a strategy to deal with the CF provided by their teacher.

When we see students’ experiences versus their preferences of different CF interventions, it appears that there were no big mismatches. For example, it could be seen that the students’ preferences for either direct, indirect, or a combination of direct and indirect CF techniques went in line with what was reported to be most frequently practiced although some students who said direct CF was most frequent seemed to have joined those students who preferred a combination of DCF and IDCF. In addition, of the different DCF types, many of the students showed a preference for having grammar explanation first followed by those who preferred to be provided the correct forms near their errors. This has matched with what was said to be actually practiced though the number of students who preferred to have conferencing most often has become larger. On the other hand, although the number of students who preferred to have IDCF most often was small, those few preferred underlining plus writing codes, underlining, and writing comments in descending order, while most of these said underlining was most frequently employed, followed by writing comments, then by underlining and writing codes, and then by writing codes. This shows a bit of a mismatch between the IDCF types most students said to be practiced by the writing teacher and the ones they preferred to have most often. Finally, unfocused CF was said to be the most frequently employed CF type, and this again went in line with what most students preferred to have.

Turning to the writing teachers’ response to the questionnaire, it could be generalized that all of them gave a huge value to CF in improving the accuracy of their students’ writings. There was a commonly held belief that it is difficult (if not impossible) to convey messages without grammatical knowledge. In essence, it appears that, grammatical errors might interfere in communication. Moreover, there is a very strong belief that, if not corrected in

some way, errors will be fossilized. Corrective feedback was, thus, considered as a very crucial tool for teachers to show the gaps their students have. In short, accuracy was viewed as important as fluency, indicating that grammar should not be neglected in the EFL teaching learning process.

Regarding the teachers' experiences of practicing different CF techniques (i.e., DCF, IDCF, or DCF+IDCF) on their students' written grammar errors, it was learned that a majority of them used a combination of DCF+IDCF most frequently, followed by many teachers who most commonly employed DCF alone. (Still, there were teachers who said to most often employ IDCF alone).

From the teachers who said to most frequently employ a combination of DCF and IDCF, it was found out that they would use DCF with errors which they considered very difficult for students to self-correct. On the other hand, they used IDCF with errors which they considered as simple, and if the students' attentions were directed, they would correct them. There was an assumption on the part of these teachers that employing DCF alone would make students passive. This seems to be supported by the literature. The problem is what kind of yardsticks the teachers utilize to consider some errors as difficult and others as simple.

Those teachers who said to most frequently practice DCF believed that this type of CF was a good medicine to avoid repetition of errors and to facilitate quick learning. There was a commonly held belief that some students did not have adequate grammar knowledge. As a result, these teachers thought that unless students were directly told what their errors were, they would not understand even whether they have committed errors. From the different DCF techniques, what appeared to be most frequently used by more teachers was provision of the correct form followed by provision of grammar explanation, while conferencing has never been used by any of the teachers.

Concerning the teachers' practices of either focused or unfocused CF, it was learned that most of the teachers most frequently applied focused CF while some of them used unfocused CF most often.

For the perspective of the teachers who reported to most often employ FCF, it was impossible to give CF on every error. It seemed that these days, more than ever, students' sentences are full of errors. Besides, the teachers are operating in large class size contexts. What is more, some teachers believed that students better learn grammar items one at a time. The other major reason for these teachers to most frequently employ FCF was the belief they had that this kind of CF would help their students develop independent learning.

As to what kind of errors they focused when they provided CF on their students' written linguistic errors, the teachers generally reported that they selected errors which they thought would cause communication breakdown. This is supported by the literature. Of those errors mentioned by the teachers were subject verb agreement, tense, spelling, punctuation, fragment, and capitalization. The question is do these errors actually result in communication failure?

It also appeared from the teachers' responses to their questionnaire that all of them did try to identify their students' most common written grammar errors. Among these errors, in descending order, were subject-verb disagreement, tenses, voce construction, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling errors. Generally, it was evidenced that verb related errors were the most common grammatical errors which the writing teachers most often faced.

It could also be concluded that the teachers have been facing multi-dimensional problems when providing CF on their students' written grammar errors. The major problem was the fact that students' compositions were full of errors, and thus, dealing with all these was a big challenge for the teachers. At times, teachers are overwhelmed by the many number of errors in their students' compositions which might have obliged them to be discouraged even to start giving CF. The other problem was the fact that students were so poor in their proficiency of the language that they might not understand even the correction itself. In addition to these, students were reported to continue to repeat the same errors despite being corrected again and again. Still, some teachers, seemingly practitioners of FCF, indicated that, when they skipped some of their students' errors, the students considered that they had not made errors other than the corrected ones.

Owing to all these problems, it seems that many of the teachers might be erasing the issue of providing CF from their daily routines. If this was the case, it might mean that students are forced to develop their writing skills without sufficient negative feedback from their writing teachers. Nevertheless, many sources indicate that both positive and negative evidences are necessary for foreign or second language learning in general and for learning writing skills in particular.

The results from the teachers' questionnaire also showed that writing teachers are divided in their perceptions of the benefits of direct and indirect CF techniques; half of them favored IDCF, while the other half valued the DCF one.

Those teachers who considered DCF to be more effective generally believed that their students were so careless that they would not work out the CF if it were not direct. In other words, the students would not go home or to a library in order to unravel the IDCF. Consequently, these teachers seemed to be engaged in providing the correct form for the students' grammar errors.

On the other hand, the teachers who attached more value to IDCF seemed to believe that this kind of CF would help students develop an independent learning behavior and self-correction. They also thought that IDCF involves students in trial and error which they believed to lead to a more permanent learning.

In general, it could be concluded that the writing teachers were largely divided in their perceptions of the values of direct and indirect CF which might have led them to practice these CF techniques differently in their classrooms.

Finally, it appears that most of the teachers believed in the supremacy of focused CF in improving the accuracy of their students' writings. This was because they thought that FCF could allow them more time to deal with more important errors, and it could also encourage students to reduce their dependency on teachers.

In all, it could be generalized that what the teachers said to practice go in line with what they perceived to be effective. Put another way, the teachers have largely been practicing what

they believed to be more effective although some teachers reported that the low proficiency and carelessness of the students forced them to employ DCF, which they believed would not be as effective as IDCF.

When we see students' perceptions of what their teachers practiced most often against the teachers' own most common practices, as indicated above, most of the students said that the most frequently practiced CF technique was DCF followed by a combination of DCF and IDCF, whereas a majority of the writing teachers said that what they most often practiced was a combination of DCF and IDCF followed by DCF. Besides, many of the students said that the most frequently applied types of DCF were provision of grammar explanation followed by provision of the correct answer near the errors. On the other hand, the teachers said to most frequently use provision of the correct form followed by provision of grammar explanation. Further more, of the different IDCF techniques, the most frequently applied, from the students' point of view, were underlining, writing comments, underlining + writing codes, and writing codes despite the teachers said to most frequently employ underlining followed by underlining + writing codes. We could see some sort of discrepancy between what the students believed were most frequently applied on their compositions and what the writing teachers reported to practice most often.

In addition, regarding the question of whether focused CF or unfocused CF was most commonly practiced, most of the students said that unfocused CF was the most frequently applied type of CF on their written grammar errors. On the other hand, most teachers reported that they most often employed focused CF. Here, again there is a mismatch.

When we see what the students preferred to have on their compositions, and what the writing teachers believed to be more effective, we could again witness some mismatches, particularly regarding focused and unfocused CF. While most students preferred to have unfocused CF on their compositions, most teachers believed that focused CF could be more effective.

From the students' compositions and from the CF interventions experimented, the following conclusions could be drawn.

The students' compositions were found to be full of grammatical errors, sometimes the grammatical errors covering well over 45% of the words written by a student. (Remember that errors like capitalization, gapping, merging, and a lot of issues of content and organization were not counted in this research. We could imagine the percentage of errors to total words written by the students if these issues were included).

The different grammatical errors exhibited in the students' compositions were categorized into 17. The 5 most frequent grammatical errors in the students' pre-test compositions, which were targeted in the FCF, were verb formation, word formation, punctuation, preposition, and sentence fragment.

The baseline written grammatical accuracy level of the students in the FCFG was about 23.636 during the pre-test writing. This has become about 19.923 during the immediate post-test writing and about 17.164 during the delayed post-test composition.

The IFCF has not led the students in the FCFG to significant gains in their writing accuracy between compositions 1&2 (with $t=1.362$, $df(24)$, critical value (2.064), two tailed while this CF intervention has led the students in this treatment group to significant gains in their writing accuracy between compositions 1&3 (with $t=3.200$, $df(25)$, critical value (2.060), two tailed. Besides, the IFCF has led to significant gains in the writing accuracy of the students in the FCFG between compositions 2 & 3 (with $t=2.232$, $df(24)$, critical value (2.064), two tailed. On top of this, the IFCF has resulted in an overall gain in the writing accuracy of the students in this group when the differences between the 3 means in accuracy were compared by using ANOVA.

On the other hand, the baseline written grammatical accuracy level of the students in the UFCFG was about 23.808 during the pre-test composition. This has become about 23.400 and about 23.725 during the composition 2 and 3 respectively.

The findings from this study also showed that the IUFCF has not resulted in significant changes in the accuracy of the students in the UFCFG between compositions 1& 2 (with $t=-0.542$, $df(23)$, critical value (2.069), between compositions 1 & 3 (with $t=-1.288$, $df(23)$,

between compositions 2 &3 (with $t=-0.487$, $df(22)$, critical value (2.074). Above all, the IUFCF has not brought about significant gains in the aggregate writing accuracy levels of the students in this group when the 3 means in accuracy were compared.

From the investigation into the effects of the two CF types on the targeted grammatical errors (TGE's), it could be concluded that:

1. The IFCF has not resulted in a significant difference in the adjusted means of the TGE'S by the students in the FCFG between compositions 1 and 2. However, this type of IDCF has resulted in significant differences in the means of the TGE's between compositions 1 and 3 as well as between compositions 2 and 3. This might be the reason for the students in this group to bring significant improvements in their overall writing accuracies between compositions 1 and 3 as well as between compositions 2 and 3. In addition, this type of CF was found to result in an overall significant reduction of the TGE's throughout the CF intervention process.
2. The IUFCF has not resulted in significant differences in the means of the TGE's by the students in the UFCFG between any of the writing occasions.

6.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations were forwarded.

1. The data from the students' questionnaire indicated that most of the students believed that direct CF was more effective than indirect CF moves which happen in the form of grammatical explanation. This indicates the perpetuation of "the teacher knows all" tradition. This seems to call for frequent orientations of students that this type of CF might not help them be successful language learners.
2. It was also shown that a majority of the students preferred unfocused/comprehensive CF to be employed on their written grammar errors. This indicates the presence of a belief on the part of the students that if all of their errors were corrected, they would not commit those errors again. This again indicates that teachers have to conduct discussions with

their students about the fact that comprehensive CF is not an effective way to improve written grammar errors.

3. Many students have indicated that they have faced different problems when they were provided with CF from their writing teachers. The most serious problem the students are facing appears to be a difficulty of understanding the CF. We, as teachers, should learn from this and communicate our corrective moves as clearly as possible. This might include a discussion session with our students on the meaning of the codes which we use when providing CF and using these codes consistently.
4. The writing teachers were largely divided in their practices of direct and indirect CF as well as focused and unfocused CF. This, as indicated several times before, might lead students in different classrooms to have differing beliefs regarding errors and the value of CF on improving their written grammar errors. Therefore, teachers should have discussions with their colleagues regarding their CF practices so that they could narrow their differences. ELIC/ELIP scenarios might be good opportunities to create a common understanding between teachers.
5. There were some mismatches between what the students perceived to be most frequently practiced on their written grammar errors and the teachers' actual practices. For example, a majority of the students said that the CF type most frequently applied on their written grammar errors was unfocused CF, while most of the writing teachers reported that they most often employed focused CF. This suggests that we, teachers, should communicate with our students regarding what we are practicing and why we are doing that. If we did so, we and our students would work towards a common goal.
6. Most of the writing teachers said that they most often employ focused CF. However, when asked to tell what kinds of grammatical errors they focused on, it appeared that they were highly divided. In addition, many of the teachers said that they focused on spelling, punctuation, and capitalization errors which they believed to interfere in communication. Whether and what kind of these errors would cause communication breakdown remains a question. However, this seems to call for continuous training programs for teachers regarding CF practices which are supported by contemporary theory and research.

7. That the students' compositions were full of grammar errors might mean that grammar teaching is not either given due attention or it is handled improperly. Therefore, grammar should not be neglected from the language teaching arena.
8. Finally, it seems that students are joining universities without having the necessary preparation for the very demanding university life the success of which is very highly dependent on one's ability to write in English. It seems that writing skills are not given due attention in elementary and secondary school classrooms. It, therefore, appears that the teaching of writing should be properly handled starting from the very early stages of schooling.

6.4. Further Research

Before winding the overall journey of this research, the researcher would like to underline a few points.

First, as the research was conducted at a specific university context in Ethiopia, the findings might not reflect what would happen if the study were replicated in other universities.

Second, because the research (especially, the quasi experiment) was conducted on a specific group of students whose number was felt to be small, the generalizability of the findings should be taken with caution.

Third, to arrive at a reasonable level of generalization, such researches should be conducted in different university contexts in our country. Particularly, focused CF studies which target fewer grammar error categories than the ones targeted in this study are felt necessary. In addition, studies employing other techniques of indirect CF (e.g., underlining alone, writing codes alone, writing comments, etc) might be worth pursuing. Finally, as CF is a very vast and complex area of research, future researchers are suggested to pick up topics which focus on specific CF practices like comparing CF with versus without grade, comparing the effects of IDCF versus DCF, or investigating the effects of different DCF types.

REFERENCES

- Abismara, N. (2003). "An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speakers' English Writings." (Online). Retrieved on Dec. 12, 2010, from [http// ninabismara. articles](http://ninabismara.articles)
- Alhazo, M .)2009). " The Effects of Teachers' Error Feedback on Al-Hussien Bin Talal University Students' Self Correction Ability." European Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 142-159.
- Altman. D, et al (2006). "Why do a Pilot Study". National Centre for the Replacement, Replacement and Reduction of Animals in Research. London.
- Anusenie L. et al. (2009). "Classroom Practice: Error Correction at the Tertiary Level." Studies about Languages. Issue, 14.
- Aridah, D.(2003). "The Role of Feedback in the Teaching and Learning of Writing." Celt. Vol.3. No. 2. Pp. 105-114
- Asres Nigus (2005). "An Exploration of the Written Error Treatment Practices of the Intermediate Writing Skills Instructors of Bahir Dar University." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Bitchener, J. & Knok, U. (2010). "The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: a ten month investigation." Applied Linguistics. Vol. 31, No.2. pp. 193-214.
- _____ (2009). "The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback." ELT Journal. Vol. 63, No. 3. Pp. 204-211.
- _____.(2008). "The Relative Effectiveness of Different Types of Direct Feedback." System. Vol. 37, No. 2. Pp. 322-329
- Bitchener, J. et al. (2005). "The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 14. Pp. 191-205
- Brown , D. (1994). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Byrne, D. (1991). Teaching Writing Skills. Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." Applied Linguistics. Vol. 1, No. 1. Pp. 1-47.
- Chandler, J. (2003). "The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 12. PP. 267-296.

- Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Choon, G. (1997). "Error Analysis(EA) and Correction (EC) of Written Work in the Classroom." The English Teacher. Vol.XXII.
- Cohen, L. et al. (2000). Research Methods in Education. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Corder, S.P. (1967). "The Significance of Learners' Errors." International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. Vol. 4
- Crandall, J. (2006). "The Power of Writing: The Importance of Writing in EFL." TESOL Arabia. (Ppt.). Retrieved on April, 11, 2010 from crandall@umbc.edu
- Cresswell, (2003). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. London: Sage Publications.
- Dabaghi, A. (2008). "A Comparison of the Effects of Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback on Learners' Performance in Tailor- Made Tests." Journal of Applied Sciences. Vol.8, No.1. pp. 1-13
- Delgado, R. (2006). "Effects of Different Error Feedback Approaches in Students' Ability to Self-Edit their Writing." Divergencia, Revista de estadeos linguisticos y literarios. Vol. 4, No. 2. Pp. 3-16
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies. Oxford University Press
- Dyer, B. (1996). " L1 and L2 Composition Theories: Hillock's Environmental Mode and Task Based Language Teaching." ELT Journal. Vol. 50, No. 4. pp. 312-317
- Elghazo, M. et al. (2009). "The Effect of Teachers' Error Feedback on Al-Hussein Bin Talal University Students' Self Correction Ability." European Journal of Social Studies. Vol. 12, No. 1
- Ellis, R. (2010). "Cognitive, Social, and Psychological Dimensions of Corrective Feedback." (Ppt. Online). Retrieved on Sep. 20, 2010 from www. Ujaen. Es/...ppt.
- _____. (2009). "Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development." L2 Journal. Vol.1, No. 1. Pp. 3-18
- _____. (2008). "A typology of written corrective feedback types." ELT Journal . Vol. 63, No. 2. PP. 97- 107.

- _____. (2005). "Principles of instructed language learning." System . Vol. 33, No. 2. Pp. 209-224.
- _____. (2004). "The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge." Language Learning . Vol. 54, No. 2. pp. 227-275.
- _____. (2003). "Focusing on Form in the Classroom." Keynote address presented at the 21st World Congress of the World Federation of modern Language Associations from July 2-5. South Africa.
- _____. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: OUP.
- Ellis, R. et al (2008). "The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Context." System. Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 353-371.
- Ellis , R. et al (2006). " Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar." SSLA. Vol. 28. PP. 339-368.
- Erel, S. & Bullut, D. (2007). "Error Treatment in L2 Writing: A Comparative Study of Direct and Indirect Coded Feedback." Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Sayı . Vol. 22 No.1 pp. 397-415
- Evans et al. (2010). " Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy." Language Teaching Research. Vol. 14, No. 4. PP.445-463
- Fang, X. & Xue-Mei, J .(Sep. 2007). "Error analysis and the EFL classroom teaching." US-China Education Review. Vol. 4, No.9
- Ferris, D. (2010). "Second Language Writing Research and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA." Studies in Second Language Acquisition. Vol., 32 , pp.181– 201 .
- _____. (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 mean Time...)" Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 14. Pp.49-62
- Ferris D. & Roberts, (2001). "Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be?" Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.10. PP. 161–184
- Foong, K.(1994). " Providing Feedback on Students' writing to Stimulate Thinking." Teaching and Learning. Vol. 17, No. 1. pp. 96-105
- Gebremedhin Simon(1993). "Individualized Reading for EAP for Social Science First Year Students in Addis Ababa University: A Study of a Possible Approach for Teaching Reading in EFL." AAU: Ph.D. Thesis.

- Geremew Lemu. (1999). "A Study of the Requirements in Writing for Academic Purposes at AAU." AAU. Ph. D. Thesis
- Getinet Tizazu(1993). "The Responding Behavior of Sophomore English Instructors." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Girma Gezahegn(2005). "A Study of Secondary School English Language Teachers' Implementation of Methodological Innovations: The Teaching of Grammar in Focus." AAU: Ph. D. Thesis.
- Glover, C. & Brown, E. (2006). "Written Feedback for Students: too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective?" (Online). Retrieved on 10 Nov, 2010 from: The Formative Assessment in Science Teaching (FAST project, <http://www.open.ac.uk/science/fdtl/>)
- Grami, M. (2005). "The Effect of Teachers' Written Feedback on ESL Students' Perception: A Study in a Saudi University-level Context." Annul Review of Education, Communication, and Language Studies. Vol. 2
- Guennettee, (2007). "Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.16, PP. 40–53
- Haregewoin Abate (2008). "The Effect of Communicative Grammar on the Grammatical Accuracy of Students' Academic Writing: An Integrated Approach to TEFL." AAU: Ph. D. Thesis
- Harmer, J. (2004). How to Teach Writing. Longman
- Hartshorn, J. (2008). "The Effects of Manageable Corrective Feedback on ESL Writing Accuracy." Bergham Young University. Ph. D. Thesis
- Haswell, R.(2010). "The Complexities of Responding to Student Writing; or, Looking for Shortcuts via the Road of Excess." Across the Disciplines. (Online). Retrieved on June 8, 2010, from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/haswell2006.cfm>
- Hendrickson, J. (1978). "Error Correction in Second Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research and Practice." Modern Language Journal. Vol. 63, No. 8. Pp. 216-221
- _____. (1980). "The Treatment of Error in Written Work. Modern Language Journal. Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 216-221.
- Hyland, K. & Hyaland, F. (2006). Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues for Feedback in Second Language Writing. Cambridge University Press.

- Institute of International Education (2012). "Enhancing the Quality of English Language Education in Ethiopia." Report on a Future Search Conference Conducted at Ambo University (March 22-24) in Collaboration with the US Embassy and MOE..
- Italo Berisso(1999). "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Teacher versus Peer Feedback on AAU Students' Writing Revisions." AAU. Ph. D. Thesis
- Jia. C. & Binglan, Z. (2010). "The Impact of Teacher Feedback on the Long-term Improvement in the Accuracy of EFL Student Writing." Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. Vol. 33, No. 2.
- Jing, H.(2010). "Influence of Teacher Feedback on ESL Students' Writing." University of Wisconsin. M.A. Thesis.
- Kepner, G. (1991). "An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills." Modern Language Journal, Vol. 75, No. 3. pp. 305-313.
- Kim, J. (2006). "Issues of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition." Working Papers on TESOL & Applied Linguistics. Vol. 4, No. 2
- Kontinen, M.(2009). "The Reality of Teacher Written Feedback: A Quantitative Study." University of Jyväskylä . Unpublished MA Thesis
- Krashen, S. (2009). "The Comprehension Hypothesis and its Rivals." Selected Papers from the Seventh International Symposium on English Teaching . 4th Pan- Asian Conference. Taipei.
- _____ (2004). "Applying the Comprehension Hypothesis: Some Suggestions." A Paper Presented at the 13th International Symposium and Book Fair on Language Teaching (English Teachers Association of the Republic of China), Taipei, Taiwan
- _____ (1985). The input hypothesis: issues and implications. New York: Longman.
- _____ (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon
- Krashen, F. Lee, J. (in press). Literacy across cultures
- Kroll, B. (1990). What does buy? ESL Student Performance on Home versus Class Compositions. In B. Kroll(Ed.), Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumar, V. & Kumar, M. (2009). "Recursion and Noticing in Written Feedback." European Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 12, No. pp. 97-102

- Lalande, J. (1982). "Reducing composition errors: An experiment." Modern Language Journal. Vol. 66, PP. 140–149.
- Lam, C. (2009). "Quest for Effective Error Correction." IELTS Online journal
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). "Grammar and Its Teaching: Challenging the Myths." ERIC Digest. Pp. 1-7.
- Lee, I. (1997). "ESL Learners' Performance in Error Correction in Writing: Some Implications for College-level Teaching." System, Vol. 25, pp. 456-477.
- Leki, I. (2001). "Material, Educational, and Ideological Challenges of Teaching EFL Writing at the Turn of the Century." International Journal of English Studies. Vol. 1, No.2. pp. 197-209
- Li, S. (2010). "The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta Analysis." Language Learning. Vol. 60, No.2. PP. 309-365.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (2007). How Languages are Learned. New York: OUP.
- Liu, Y. (2008). "The Effect of Error Feedback in Second Language Writing." Arizona Working Papers in SLA and Teaching. Vol. 15. Pp. 65-79
- Long, H. (1990). "The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 24, pp. 649–66.
- Mack, L. (Feb,2009). "Issues and Dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL Learners?" Polyglossia .Vol. 16.
- Mammo Kifle (1981). "Classification and Exploratory Analysis of Students' Errors in Advanced Composition II (1979-1980)." AAU. M.A Thesis
- Matsuda, P. (2003). "Process and Post Process: A Discursive History." Journal of Second Language Writing. Issue 12. PP. 65-83
- Mesfin Abera (2004). "An Investigation of the Level of Effectiveness of Peer Correction versus Self Correction." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Mesay Kebede (2008). "The Roots and Fallouts of Haile Sillassie's Educational Policy". UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper. No.10.
- Micceli, T. (2006). "Foreign Language Students' Perceptions of a Reflective Approach to Text Correction." Flinders University Language Group Online Review. Vol. 3, Issue,1.

- Mirowslaw, P.(2002). "Error Correction Practices of Polish and American Teachers." International Review of English Studies.
- Ministry of Education of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (1994). Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa.
- Mory, H.(2010). Feedback Research Revisited. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mukminatien, F. (2008). "The Place of Grammar in Language Teaching: An Attempt towards a Synthesis of its Teaching Approaches." BAHASA DAN SENI, Vol. 36, No. 1
- Myles, J. (2002). "Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts." TESL-EJ. Vol. 6, No. 2
- Naeni, J. (2008). "Error Correction as an Indication of Consciousness Raising." Novitas-Royal. Vol. 2 No.2. PP. 120-137.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). "Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar." Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. CUP.
- Nordquist, R. (2013). "What is Grammar?" (Online). Retrieved on March 12, 2013 from: grammar.about.com. Grammar Questions & Answers
- Norrish, J. (1985). Language Learners and their Errors. Longman. MacMillan
- Norouzian, R & Faraan, A. (Jan.2012). "Written Error Feedback from Perception to Practice: A Feedback on Feedback." Journal of Language Teaching and Research. Vol.3. No. 1. PP.11-22
- Pashazadeh,A. & Marefat, H. (2010). "The Long-Term Effect of Selective Written Grammar Feedback on EFL Learners' Acquisition of Articles." University of Tehran. MA. Thesis.
- Polio, C. (1997). "Measures of Linguistic Accuracy in Second Language Writing Research." Language Learning. Vol.47, No. 1. PP.101-143
- Pongsirwet,C. (2001). "Relationships Among Grammatical Accuracy, Discourse Features, and the Quality of Second Language Writing: The Case of Thai EFL Learners." University of West Virginia. Ph. D. Thesis.
- Poniah, J(2009). "Form-focused instruction and the learning experience of adult ESL students." MJAL. Vol. 1. No. 6. Pp. 382-391

- Raimes, A. (1985). "What Unskilled ESL Writers Do as they Write: A Classroom Study of Composing." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 19, No. 2. Pp. 229-258.
- _____ (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robb, T. et al (1986). "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 20, No. 1. PP. 83-107
- Rouhi, A. & Samiei, M. (2010). "The Effect of Focused and Unfocused Indirect Feedback on Accuracy in EFL Writing." The Social Sciences. Vol. 5, No. 6. Pp. 481-485
- Ryan, J. (2010). "A Review of the Role of Output in Second Language Acquisition with anecdotal examples from a Japanese learner's experience." (Online). Retrieved on Feb. 2, 2010 from <http://ryan/articles.SLA>
- Samar, R. (2009). "Corrective Feedback in EFL Classrooms: Learner Negotiation Strategies and Uptake ." Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning. No. 212
- Schmidt, R. (1990) . "The role of consciousness in second language learning." Applied Linguistics. Vol. 11. No.2. PP. 17-46.
- Seidel, K & Moritz, |J. (2009). "Changes in Ethiopia's Language and Education Policy- Pioneering Reforms." In Edge, S et al Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies. Trondheim.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). "The Role of Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA." Studies in Second Language Acquisition , Vol. 32. Pp. 169– 179 .
- _____ (2007). "The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 255-283.
- _____ (2004). " Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings." Language Teaching Research . Vol.8, No. 3. pp. 263–300
- Sheen , Y. et al. (2009). "Differential Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Correction on the Accurate Use of Grammatical Forms by Adult ESL Learners." Washington Dc: Elsevier Ltd.

- Silva, T. (1990). "Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues and Directions in ESL." In: B. Kroll (Ed.) Second language writing: research insights for the classroom. Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 162-169.
- Smith, C. et al (2012). "Ethiopia Teaching English for Life Learning (TELL) Programme." A Field Study Report. Addis Ababa: American Institutes for Research.
- Snow, D. (2007). From Language Learner to Language Teachers: An Introduction to Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Sommers, N. (1982). "Responding to Student Writing." College Composition and Communication, Vol. 33, No. 2. , pp. 148-156.
- Spada, N. (2009). "The Isolation and Integration of Form-Focused Instruction: Views from ESL and EFL Teachers and Learners."
- Spratt, C. et al (2004). Mixed Research Methods. Cambridge: Common Wealth of Learning.
- Swain, M. (2010). "The Output Hypothesis: Its History and its Future." On line. Retrieved on Nov.12,2010 from: <http://Swain.Output.en>.
- _____ (1995). "Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.) Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taye Chefo (2005). "The Effect of Written Feedback on Promoting Students' Writing Skills in English." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Tekeste Negash. (2006). "Education in Ethiopia: From Crisis to the Brink of Collapse." nordiska afrikainstitutet, uppsala
- Temesgen Chibsa (2008). "The Effect of Peer Feedback On the EFL Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Tesfaye Solomon(1995). " The Effectiveness of Learner Self-Correction of Written Errors in the EFL Classroom." AAU. M.' . Thesis
- The Free Online Encyclopedia (2013). "Grammar" (nline). Retrieved on March 24,2013 from: encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Grammar

- The World Bank (2005). *Education in Ethiopia: Strengthening the Foundation for Sustainable Progress*. Washington DC.
- Truscott, J. (2007). "The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately" Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 16. PP. 255–272
- _____ (1999). "The Case for "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes": A Response to Ferris." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.2. PP. 111-122
- _____ (1998). Noticing in second language acquisition: a critical review. Second Language Research. Vol. 14, No.2. PP.103-135
- _____ (1996). "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes." Language Learning. Vol.46. No.2. pp. 327-369
- Tsang, W. & Wong, M.(1995). Giving grammar the place it deserves in process writing. JALT Journal. Vol.3.
- Underwood, J.& Tregidgo, A.(2002). "Improving Student Writing Through Effective Feedback: Best Practices and Recommendations." Journal of Teaching Writing. Vol. 22, No.2
- Van Beuningen, C. (2011). "Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Insights, and Future Directions. International Journal of English Studies (IJES). Vol. 10, No. 2. pp. 1-27
- VanPatten , B. (1992). " Second Language Acquisition Research and Foreign Language Teaching, Part 2." ADFL Bulletin. Vol. 23, No. 3. Pp. 23-37
- Vengadesamy, (2002). "Responding to Student Writing: Motivate, Not Criticize." JEMA Online Journal of Language Studies. Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Wang, F.(2010). "The Necessity of Grammar Teaching." English Language Teaching. Vol. 3. No. 2.
- Wikipedia . (2013). "Demographics of Ethiopia.: (Online). Retrieved on February 25, 2013 from: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethiopia
- Wikipedia . (2013). "Geography of Ethiopia." (Online). Retrieved on February 25, 2013 from: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethiopa
- Wilkins, J. (1976). Linguistics and Language Teaching. Australia; Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Zamel, V. 1985. "Responding to student writing." TESOL Quarterly. Vol.19, No. 1. Pp. 79-101.

Appendices

Appendix I

Questionnaire for students (Pilot)

Dear student,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving EFL Students’ Writing Accuracy**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items which basically aim at finding out about your belief and perception of the importance of corrective feedback on your written grammatical errors , your preferences for receiving corrective feedback on these errors, your experiences of receiving corrective feedback, and what problems you face when receiving such feedback.

Thank you.

1. How important do you think is the corrective feedback you receive from your writing teachers on your grammar errors
A. Very important B. important C. not important D. don’t know
2. If your answer for Qun. 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for Qun. 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your grammar errors, how often does he employ the following feedback methods?

		alway s	sometime s	neve r
A	Direct correction(where the teacher gives you the correct form)			
B	Indirect correction(where he teacher only indicates the presence of an error, but doesn’t offer you the correct form)			

C	A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback			
---	--	--	--	--

5. If your writing teacher often uses direct correction, how often does he/she employ the following direct correction types?

		alway s	sometime s	neve r
A	Providing you the correct form near the error			
B	Conducting a conference session with you			
C	Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)			

6. If your writing teacher often uses indirect corrective feedback, how often does he/she employ the following indirect feedback types?

	Indirect CF Types	alway s	sometime s	neve r
A	Underlining your errors			
B	Writing codes (like T for tense errors)			
C	Underlining and writing codes			
D	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line			
E	Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are			
F	Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)			

7. Which of the following corrective feedback types do you prefer to have on your written grammar errors?

- A. Direct corrective feedback
- B. Indirect corrective feedback
- C. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

8. What is/are your reason/s for preferring one of the feedback methods in Qun. 7 ?

9. If your answer for Qun. 7 is A, which of the following direct corrective feedback methods do you prefer most and which one do you prefer least? Please show your preference by ranking them 1st, 2nd, or 3rd.

Your ranking	Direct corrective feedback types
	Providing you the correct form near the error
	Conducting a conference session with you
	Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)

10. Could you please explain the reason/s for your ranking one of the above direct feedback types as 1st and the other as 3rd?

11. If your answer for Qun. 7 is B, which of the following indirect feedback types do you prefer most and which ones least? Please rank your preference by starting with 1 as the one you prefer most and 6 the one you prefer least.

Your ranking	Indirect corrective feedback types
	Underlining your errors
	Writing codes (like T for tense errors)
	Underlining and writing codes
	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line
	Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are
	Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)

12. Could you please justify why you prefer a certain indirect feedback type (from Qun. 11) most and the other as least?

13. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your written grammar errors, which of the following corrective feedback types does he/she employ most?

- A. Focused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF focusing only some of your errors
 - B. Unfocused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF covering all or most of your errors.
14. Which of the corrective feedback types mentioned in Qun. 13 (focused versus unfocused) do you prefer your writing teacher to employ on your written grammar errors?
- A. Focused CF
 - B. Unfocused CF
15. Could you explain the reason/s why you prefer either A or B in Qun. 14?

16. When your writing teacher provides you corrective feedback on your grammatical errors, do you face any problem?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
17. If your answer for Qun. 16 is A, what kind of problem/s do you face?

18. What do you do with your compositions when you receive them back with corrective feedback from your writing teachers? Please show by ticking () in the following table regarding how often you take the following actions?

	always	sometimes	never
Rewriting your composition by incorporating the corrections			
Keeping a mental note of your errors			
Asking your friend/s for help			
Consulting a dictionary			
Doing nothing (simply you look at your marks)			

19. If you take some other action/s , please list them.

Appendix II

Questionnaire for EFL Writing Instructors (Pilot)

Dear instructor,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving EFL Students’ Writing Accuracy**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items which basically aim at finding out about your preferences for offering feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, your practices of offering such feedback, and your opinions of effective feedback practices.

Thank you.

1. How useful is it to point out grammatical errors in your students’ written work?
a. Very useful b. useful c. not useful d. difficult to decide
2. If your answer for Qun. 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for Qun. 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When you are providing corrective feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you use most often?
A. Direct correction (where you provide the correct form for the student)
B. Indirect correction (where you only indicate the presence of an error for the student)
C. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

5. What is/are your reason/s for using either A or B or C above?

6. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is A, which of the following types of direct correction do you employ most?

Direct CF type	Always	Sometime	Rarely	Not at all
----------------	--------	----------	--------	------------

		s		
a. Giving grammar explanation				
b. Providing the correct answer				
c. Conducting a conference session				

7. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is B, which of the following indirect feedback types do you employ most often?

Indirect CF type	Always	Sometime s	Rarely	Not at all
a. Underlining the error				
b. Writing a code (e.g., T for tense)				
c. Underlining and writing a code				
d. Writing code/s in the margin of the line where the error happens				
e. Writing numbers in the margin indicating the number of errors in that line				
f. Writing comments at the end				

8. Could you please explain the reason/s why you employ a certain indirect corrective feedback type (in Qun. 7 above) always and the other not at all.

9. Have you ever tried to identify your students' common grammatical errors as reflected in their writing? A.Yes B. No

10. If your answer for Qun. 3 is Yes, what are the most common grammatical errors you find in your students' compositions?

11. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, which one of the following do you employ most?

A. Focused corrective feedback B. Unfocused corrective feedback

12. If your answer for Qun. 11 is A, what is/are your reason/s for employing focused corrective feedback?

13. If your answer for Qun. 11 is A, what kind of errors do you focus on and why?

14. If your answer for Qun. 11 above is B, what is/are your reason/s for employing unfocused corrective feedback?

15. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, do you face problems? A. Yes B. No

16. If your answer for Qun 15 is Yes, what problem/s do you face?

17. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you think are more fruitful in improving the accuracy of your students' written work?"

A. Direct Corrective Feedback B. Indirect Corrective Feedback

18. Could you please explain your reason/s for selecting either A or B above(Qun.17).

19. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback types do you think is more fruitful in improving accuracy in your students' composition?

A. Focused (selective)Corrective Feedback
B. Unfocused (comprehensive) Corrective Feedback

20. Could you please explain your reason/s for your choice of either A or B above?

-
-
-
21. Your Qualification A. BA/BED B. MA/MED C. Ph. D
22. For how long have you taught English? _____
23. At what level have you taught English?
- a) Elementary school _____ years
 - b) Secondary school _____ years
 - c) College/university _____ years

Appendix III

Operationalization of Error Categories and Example Instances

Dear instructor, given below are operational definitions of the common grammatical errors found in students' compositions. After each definition, you are provided with example instances of each error category. These examples were collected from the students' pre-test compositions in the pilot study.

Read the definition of each error category and the examples very carefully. Then, go through the paragraphs attached herewith and then:

- Identify the grammatical errors in each composition,
- Provide corrective feedback on each students' paragraphs (by focusing only on grammar/form errors) by using your usual corrective feedback practices,
- Write the number of errors you have identified in each grammar error category.

1. **Word Choice Errors:** When a student fails to use a word or a phrase appropriate to a given context.

Examples:

1. Modern technology is used to Globalization of the country as well as the person(St. 14)
2. It [modern technology] uses for time consuming....(Student 16)
3.where you understand in rural area farmers easily getting advantages by modern science and technology. Means the last 10 or five years the farmers was expand their energy (Student 18)
4. ...science and technology started to be modernize because of helping people and also the environment (Student 15)
5. The last 10 or five years the farmers was expand their energy and wast many time for producing crops. But at the time, they can produced their crops by using protractors cars (Student 18)
6. But at the time, they can produced their crops by using protractors cars. These is used to control their crops from different disadvantages like....(Student 18)
7. For example, it [modern technology] create air population (Student 23).
8. So the day [the present time] is civilization day no poverty of information (Student 27).
9. Modern science and technology has also an other advantage, so it changes the life style's of the society by extracting modern education and they change their life style's of the family (Student 12).

2. **Sentence Fragment:** Where a subject or predicate or both are missing from a string of words. Also, a construction which has a subject and predicate but introduced with a subordinator is taken as a fragment when it is happening on its own without any independent clause attached to it.

Examples:

1. Not only our country, but also all over the world (Student 9,1)
2. Such advantages are exercised in different areas of the country. Such that; industry, medicine, factory, plastic factory (Student 12,1)
3. Modern science is used to change any backward thoughts for the human being. To creates a civilized person, to develop our country by using different methods...(Student14,1)
4. To day modernization and use of technology is spread all over the world. because, it has so many advantages and uses (Student 16,1)
5. In general modern science and technology $\hat{=}$ the keys of development(Student 16,1)
6. It's [modern science and technology's] uses $\hat{=}$ very wide(Student 16)
7. In the world $\hat{=}$ have widest distribution of modern science and technology(Student 18,1)
8. In this time with out science and technology our world is meaningless. Because it $\hat{=}$ the engin of the activity of human being(Student 19,1)
9. Neither people can remember our culture nor can do (Student 21)

3. Preposition Errors: Where a preposition is missing, wrongly used, or unnecessarily used.

Examples:

1. Science more advantages $\hat{=}$ human beings (Student 2)
2. The world developed in higher level by modern science and technology(Student5)
3. On the modern science civilization increase $\hat{=}$ time to time (Student5)
4. ...different things are changed $\hat{=}$ old style to new style (Student 5)
5. It [modern science and technology] is used to transfer informations, datas, and different ideas among country to country (Student 9)
6. Modern technology is used to Globalization of the country as well as the person(St. 14)
7. $\hat{=}$ The last 10 or five years, the farmers was expand their energy and wast many time (Student 18)
8. In this time with out science and technology our world is meaningless (Student 19)
9. Modern science is a science that impact of our environment (Student 20).
10. Modern science and technology is have many disadvantage of one country development (Student 23)
11. Nowadays importance of modern science in the world is very high because of, science is the way to get knowledge (Student 24)

4. Article Errors: When an article is missed where necessary, used where it is unnecessary, or a wrong article is used.

Examples

1. The modern science and technology is the (article wrong) advantage of world civilization (Student 5)
2. It[modern science and technology] have an infinite advantage in the complex world (Student 6)
3. Technology and modern science are a very useful things for this world (Student 13)

4. In Generally advantages of modern science and technology is the backbone of the developing country (Student 18).
5. The modern science and technology is easily affected the health of one country development (Student 23).
6. Technology is very important to go with △ developed world (Student 24).

5. Punctuation Errors: Where a wrong punctuation mark is used, a punctuation mark is unnecessarily used, or not used where necessary.

Examples:

1. When we see teaching and learning, science are give a very big advantage △so science is....(Student 3).
2. Modern science is one of the cornerstone of one country to create good citizen △ that is △ it is used to improve the knowledge of citizens (Student 11).
3. In addition to these; modern science and technology have many vast advantages (St. 6)
4. Modern science is many advantages these are to reduce over population... (Student 14)
5. ...also they try to say it is disturbing their lives △ however △ they use it △ even when they want to transmit their idea △ they use internet (Student 15).
6. The other, _ use of modern science is to thing critically △ mens that It answering so many questions like.... (Student 10).
7.where we see in our country, the advantage of modern science and technology is can be describe as follows, _ modern science and technology used to saving time, money... (Student 18)
8. Modern science describes only the fashionable aspects, but, not its faithful content (S20).
9. In the past time science and technology are not birth △ the world civilization is not increase because peoples not use modern science and technology result (St. 5)

6. Verb Formation Errors: This grammatical category was operationalized to encompass several errors in word formation including:

- Errors in auxiliary verb usage (where an auxiliary verb is omitted, unnecessarily used, or an incorrect one is used).
- Errors in subject-verb agreement
- Errors in the use of a wrong verb
- Errors in –ing, infinitive, simple past or past participle formation
- Errors in tense usage
- Errors in voice construction

Examples:

1. Therefore modern science and technology are (a wrong verb) more advantage (St. 6).
2. It [science and technology] have an infinite advantage (Student 6).
3. It [science and technology] (an auxiliary verb is omitted) used to develop the knowledge of every citizen (Student 11).
4. The family of literate person's live a normal life by earned money from education (St.12).
5. Moreover our life is (auxiliary verb unnecessary) depends on technology (Student 13).
6. All that we eat, wear, drinks are result of technology (Student 13).
7. However, It's [modern technology] have some disadvantages (Student 13). [*This student has committed two verb formation related errors in this sentence: the auxiliary verb in "It's" is unnecessary and the subject and the verb do not agree.*]
8. Science and technology started to be modernize because of helping people and also the environment (Student 15).
9. It [modern technology] (auxiliary verb missing) answering so many questions like.... (Student 16).
10. The advantages of science and technology can be describes in many ways (Student 18).
11.where we see in our country, the advantage of modern science and technology is (auxiliary verb unnecessary) can be describe (error in verb three formation) as follows (Student 18).
12. ...where you understand in rural area farmers (auxiliary verb missing) easily getting advantage by modern technology (Student 18).
13. But at the time, they [farmers] can produced (auxiliary and the main verb form do not go together) their crops by using protractors cars (Student 18).
14. Science and technology is (auxiliary verb unnecessary) to gives (wrong as well as unnecessary infinitive formation) us many values (Student 19).
15. ..as a result our culture before the modern science is forgot (error in verb three formation) (Student 21)
16. At this time any thing ^ done by a computer (Student 22).
17. In the past time science and technology are not birth the world civilization is not increase because peoples ^ not use modern science and technology result (Student 5)
18. [In the past] the world is not developed (Student 5)
19. Nowadays our world reached the high level of modernization (Student 13).
20. If one person or individual in modernize technology he/ she have planned for the future, he get many informations through the media...(Student 24).
21. At the past 30 or 40 years technology is not use Ethiopians people. (Student 27).
22. When we see the use of modernization and technology, It uses for time consuming... (Student 16)
23. The modern science and technology is easily affected the health of one country development (Student 23).

- 7. Word Formation Errors:** These are errors which happen when students fail to use the appropriate form of words in different contexts. These include errors in plural, noun, adverb, and adjective formation.

Examples:

1. Modern science and technology has many advantage (Student 21)
2. Now there are many industry in our country(Student 21)
3. Therefore modern science and technology are many advantage but some disadvantage (Student 5)
4. Modern science is one of the corner stone of one country to create good citizen (St. 11)
5. In addition to these; modern science and technology have many vast advantage (St. 6)
6. Such advantages are exercised in different area of the country (Student 12)
7. Nowaday many process are done by computers (Student 13)
8. We can say that modern science and technology is advantages because it makes things easy (Student 15).
9. In Generally advantages of modern science and technology is the backbone of the developing country (Student 18).
10. For example, there are not fabricas, machines, we cant gat many using materials (St. 19).
11. In the past time science and technology are not birth the world civilization is not increase because peoples not use modern science and technology result (Student 5)
12. Nowaday importance of modern science in the world is very high because of, science is the way to get knowledge, the way to know how can one person life (Student 24).

8. Spelling Errors:

The researcher counted only those spelling errors which:

- Resulted in change of an actual word.
- The students were expected to have mastery of at very elementary levels of schooling.

This was because many of a student's words were incorrectly spelt and indicating all of them would have demoralized the students. In addition, it was assumed that many of the spelling errors would not interfere in the students' effort to communicate through writing.

Examples:

1. Science our world reach the right level, modern science advantages (Student 2).
2. Science is very very will (Student 4).
3. Nevertheless its [modern technology's] roll is greater than its harm (Student 13)
4. The hole world can be meet and share from far and far away by a result of technology (Student 13).
5. The other use of modern science is to thing critically (Student 6).

6. Let as take example (Student 19).
7. So Internet is one of the most nessary thing with technology (Student 22).
8. ...there is bad ting and good ting [of modern technology]

9. Errors in Pronoun Use: Where a pronoun is used unnecessarily, a pronoun is not used where necessary, a wrong pronoun is used, or where a pronoun that doesn't agree with its antecedent is used.

Examples:

1. When we see America, she is very active because our countries work is any time depend on science (Student 3).
2. This things make our job fast and easy (Student 15).
3. Generally modern science and technology is their advantages (Student 14).
4. A person who use a computer and Internet he can communicate different peoples (Student 22).
5. Modern science and technology has also an other advantage, so it changes the life style's of the society by extracting modern education and they change their life style's of the family (Student 12).
6. If one person or individual in modernize technology he/ she have planned for the future, he get many informations through the media...(Student 24).
7. Human being before of this time your life style not similar in this time... (Student 25).

10. Unnecessary: Where a word or a phrase which is not necessary to complete the meaning of a sentence is used. This basically included errors of unnecessary repetition of words and phrases.

Examples:

1. For example, some advantages of science and technology are; special transport service.... (Student 6).
2. When technology brodn up there are many problems are raised in our word (Student 13)
3. Nevertheless its advantage roll is greater than its harm (Student 13)
4.to reduce over population by using family planning method, by using contraceptive method, pills etc (Student 14)
5. also and they try to say it is disturbing their lives (Student 15)
6. The advantage of science and technology is used to produced modern clothe, shoes, building house, etc (Student 18)
7. But at the time, they [farmers] can produced their crops by using protractors cars (St. 18)
8. In other ways If the modern science and technology is wide, many people can depend on modern science and technology (Student 21).

11. Omission Errors: These are errors where a word (excluding a subject, a predicate, an article, a preposition, a pronoun), a phrase, or a clause which is necessary to complete a sentence is missing.

Examples:

1. Special transport service, e-mail, internet etc are the most ^advantages of modern science and technology (Student 5)
2. The hole world can be meet and share ^ from far and far away by....technology (St. 13)
3. The ^ advantage of modern science is to examine anything by using any mechanism (Student 14). *Because this student has mentioned some advantages of modern technology in the preceding sentences, she should have used an expression to indicate an additional advantage.*
4. as a result our culture ^ before the modern science is forgot (Student 21).
5. Our educational ^ is by science (Student 25).
6. Human being before of this time your life style not similar ^ in this time (Student 25)

12. Errors in Quantifier Use: Where a student uses a quantifier which does not go with the noun to be quantified. This included errors in using quantifiers of countable nouns for uncountable ones and vice versa.

Examples:

1. ...the last 10 or five years the farmers was expand their energy and wast many time for producing crops.
2. If one person or individual in modernize technology he/ she have planned for the future, he get many informations through the media...(Student 24).

13. Faulty Parallelism

Examples:

1. We can say that modern science and technology is advantages because it makes things easy, fast, perfect, safety effective and etc (Student 15)
2. It[modern technology] uses for time consuming, save efforts, to have more pure quality, to simplify the process of doing (Student 16). *Errors of parallel construction in preposition and verb use.*
3. The advantage of science and technology is used to produced modern cloth, shoes, building house etc (Student 18). *Errors in parallel construction of verb use as well as inconsistency in noun use.*

14. Errors in Connector Use: Where a connector necessary to link ideas is not used or where a wrong connector is used.

Example:

1. In this time modern science and technology are widespread because all the world people mostly use modern science and technology (Student 5)
2. Moreover, modern science and technology is the most essential material for different purposes; As a result, without modern science and technology our life is empty (Student 9). *As this sentence is the last sentence of the paragraph, and as the essence of the sentence itself indicates, the transitional device should have been one of indicators of conclusion, e.g., in general.*
3. Modern science and technology has also another advantage, so it changes the life style's of society (Student 12)
4. Fore example, ^ there are not fabricas, machines, we cant get many using materials like home, office... (Student 19). *Two errors of connection. First, the device "fore example" is unnecessary. Second, the sentence needs a subordinator to indicate condition, e.g., "if" at the beginning of the first clause.*
5. ...when the disadvantage of world civilization is to change environmental condition (Student 5).

15. Errors in the Use of Possessive's

Examples:

1. ...it [modern science and technology] change the life style's of the society (Student 12).
2. The family of literate person's live a normal life (Student 12).
3. It's [modern science and technology's] uses very wide (Student 16).
4. Modern science and technology is have many disadvantage of one country development (Student 23).
5. The modern science and technology is easily affected the health of one country development (Student 23).
6.when we see America she is very active because our countries work is any time depend on science (Student 2).

16. Word Order Errors

Examples:

1. Nowadays importance of modern science in the world is very high because of, science is the way to get knowledge, the way to know how can one person life (Student 24).
2. Human being before of this time your life style not similar in this time (Student 25).
3. So science is an as this time our country give a very big advantages (Student 2).
4. So these advantage is students get easy any information from the area of the world solve problems without any tired and outcome (Student 27)

17. Awkward/Unclear: A word, phrase, clause, or sentence which is unclear from the point of view of the context in which a student is composing.

Example:

1. So these advantage is students get easy any information from the area of the world solve problems without any tired and outcome (Student 27)
2. As you know at this time the +ve side of modern science let in school (Student 27).
3. B/c the modern science is the backbone of the country even if the people in all interest of human beings (Student 27).
4. In the other side all things not only meaning technology(Student 17)

Appendix IV

Questionnaire for students (Main)

Dear student,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving EFL Students’ Writing Accuracy**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to all the questions. Your genuine response is very important to solve some of the problems in our writing classes. Your response is required simply for research purpose, so respond freely and genuinely with no fear of any consequences.

Thank you.

1. How important do you think is the corrective feedback (CF) you receive from your writing teacher on your grammar errors
 A. Very important B. important C. not important D. don’t know
2. If your answer for question 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for question 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your grammar errors, how often does he employ the following feedback methods? Please tick (√) in the boxes in front of each correction type to show the frequency at which your teacher applies that CF.

	Corrective feedback type	always	usuall y	sometime s	rarel y	never
A	Direct correction(where the teacher gives you the correct form)					

B	Indirect correction (where the teacher only indicates the presence of an error, but doesn't offer you the correct form)					
C	A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback					

5. If your writing teacher often uses direct correction (i.e., A in question 4 above), how often does he/she employ the following direct correction types? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each direct CF type to show the frequency at which your teacher uses that CF type.

	Direct CF type	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
A	Providing you the correct form near the error					
B	Conducting a conference session with you					
C	Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)					

6. If your writing teacher often uses indirect corrective feedback (i.e., B in question 4 above), how often does he/she employ the following indirect feedback types? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each indirect CF type to show the frequency of the CF type applied by your teacher.

	Indirect correction type	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
A	Underlining your errors					
B	Writing codes (like T for tense errors)					
C	Underlining and writing codes					
D	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line					
E	Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are					
F	Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)					

7. Which of the following corrective feedback types do you prefer your writing teacher to use on your written grammar errors?

- D. Direct corrective feedback (where he/she provides you the correct form of your error)
- E. Indirect corrective feedback (where he/she simply indicates the presences of an error without telling you the correct answer)
- F. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

8. What is/are your reason/s for preferring either A, or B, or C in question 7 above?

9. If your answer for question 7 is A (i.e., direct correction), which of the following direct corrective feedback methods do you prefer most and which one do you prefer least? Please show your preference by ticking (✓) in the boxes in front of each correction type to show whether that CF type is your 1st, 2nd or 3rd choice or preference.

Direct corrective feedback types	1^s t	2ⁿ d	3^r d
Providing you the correct form near the error			
Conducting a conference session with you			
Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)			

10. Could you please explain the reason/s for your ranking one of the above direct feedback types as 1st and the other as 3rd in question 9 above?

11. If your answer for question 7 above is B (i.e., if you prefer indirect correction), which of the following indirect feedback types do you prefer most and which ones least? Please rank your preference by writing 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 in front of each indirect CF type starting with 1 for the indirect CF type you prefer most and writing 6 for the one you prefer least.

Indirect corrective feedback types	Your preference (rank)
Underlining your errors	
Writing codes (e.g., T for tense errors)	
Underlining and writing codes	
Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line	
Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are	
Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)	

12. Could you please tell your reason/s why you prefer a certain indirect corrective feedback type in question 11 most and the other indirect correction type as least?

13. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your written grammar errors, which of the following corrective feedback types does he/she employ most?

- C. Focused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF focusing only some of your errors
- D. Unfocused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF covering all or most of your errors.

14. Which of the following corrective feedback types do you prefer your writing teacher to employ on your written grammar errors?

- B. Focused CF (where your teacher corrects only some of your grammar errors, not all your errors)
- C. Unfocused CF (where your writing teacher corrects all of your grammar errors)

15. Could you please explain the reason/s why you prefer either A or B in question 14 above?

16. When your writing teacher provides you corrective feedback on your grammatical errors, do you face any problem?

- B. Yes
- B. No

17. If your answer for question 16 is A, what kind of problem/s do you face?

18. What do you do with your paragraphs when you receive them back with corrective feedback from your writing teachers? How often do you do the following activities when you receive your paragraphs with corrections from your teacher? Please show by ticking (√) in the boxes in front of each activity regarding how often you do it.

	Actions	always	usuall y	sometime s	rarely	never
A	Rewriting your composition by incorporating the corrections					
B	Keeping a mental note of your errors					
C	Asking your friend/s for help					
D	Consulting a grammar book					
E	Doing nothing (simply you look at your marks and throw the paper)					

Appendix V

Questionnaire for EFL Writing Instructors (Main)

Dear instructor,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving the Accuracy of EFL Students’ Writing**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items which basically aim at finding out about your preferences for offering feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, your practices of offering such feedback, and your opinions of effective feedback practices.

Thank you.

1. How useful is it to point out grammatical errors in your students’ written work?
b. Very useful b. useful c. not useful d. difficult to decide
2. If your answer for question 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for question 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When you are providing corrective feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you use most often?

- A. Direct correction (where you provide the correct form for the student)
- B. Indirect correction (where you only indicate the presence of an error for the student)
- C. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

5. What is/are your reason/s for most frequently using either A or B or C above?

6. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is A, which of the following types of direct correction do you employ most? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each direct CF type to indicate how frequently you apply that CF type.

Direct CF type	Always	usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
d. Giving grammar explanation					
e. Providing the correct answer					
f. Conducting a conference session					

7. What is/are your reason/s for employing a certain direct CF type always and another direct CF one rarely or never?

8. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is B (i.e., indirect CF type), which of the following indirect feedback types do you employ most often? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each indirect CF type to show how frequently you employ that indirect CF type.

Indirect CF type	Always	Usually	Sometime s	Rarely	Never
g. Underlining the error					
h. Writing a code (e.g., T for tense)					
i. Underlining and writing a code					
j. Writing code/s in the margin of the line where the error happens					
k. Writing numbers in the margin indicating the number of errors in that line					
l. Writing comments at the end					

9. Could you please explain the reason/s why you employ a certain indirect CF type (in Qun. 8 above) always and another indirect CF type rarely or never?

10. Have you ever tried to identify your students' common grammatical errors as reflected in their writing? A. Yes B. No

11. If your answer for question 10 is Yes, what are the most common grammatical errors you find in your students' compositions?

12. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, which one of the following do you employ most?

- A. Focused/selective corrective feedback (where you provide CF only on some of your students' grammar errors)
- B. Unfocused/ comprehensive corrective feedback (where you try to provide CF on all of your students' grammar errors)

13. If your answer for question 12 is A, what is/are your reason/s for employing focused corrective feedback?

14. If your answer for question 12 is A, what kind of errors do you focus on and why?

15. If your answer for question 12 above is B, what is/are your reason/s for employing unfocused corrective feedback?

16. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, do you face problems? A. Yes B. No
17. If your answer for question 16 is Yes, what problem/s do you face?

18. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you think are more fruitful in improving the accuracy of your students' written work?"
- A. Direct Corrective Feedback (where you provide the correct answers for grammar errors)
B. Indirect Corrective Feedback (where you simply indicate the presence of errors)
19. Could you please explain your reason/s for selecting either A or B above (Qun.18).

20. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback types do you think is more fruitful in improving accuracy in your students' composition?
- C. Focused (selective)Corrective Feedback (where you correct only some of your students' grammar errors)
D. Unfocused (comprehensive) Corrective Feedback (where you provide correction on all of your students' grammar errors)
21. Could you please explain your reason/s for your choice of either A or B in question 20 above?

22. Your Qualification
- A. BA/BED in _____
B. MA/MED in _____
C. Ph. D in _____
23. For how long have you taught English? _____
24. At what level have you taught English?
- d) Elementary school _____ years
e) Secondary school _____ years
f) College/university _____ years

Appendix VI

Extracts from Students' Responses to Open-ended Items in their Questionnaire (Main)

Item 2: Students' Reasons for Believing that CF was Important in Improving their Writing Accuracy

- Corrective feedback is very important because students could correct themselves by understanding the previous wrongness (St.49).
- Because if someone made an error while he/she used grammatical rule, he/she needs corrections. After correction, he/she become the proper grammar user (St. 48).
- Those corrective errors are important for my writing on my whole academic process (St. 47).
- Because my teacher is one of the main source of my knowledge, It guides me my future work to be exact (St.46).
- Because having grammar skill is the most necessary skill to develop an English language. This skill is not realized once a time rather it is realized by continuous trying and learning from the mistake. Means that when the teacher show me my mistake, I lean from it (St.44).
- To avoid my grammar errors (St. 42).
- Because for improves some weakness (St. 40).
- Because it is an important things for avoiding error or mistake or it is the best learning mechanisms (St. 38).
- He give us very important knowledge about grammar and writing skill (St, 36).
- Since we are learners of writing skill it is important to know the grammar errors we made. If we improve our writing skill by using the teacher feedback it is advantageous for our next education stage (St. 35).
- Because it can improve my writing skill (St. 34).

- Because during writing our paragraph I made mistake that may in punctuation, capitalization and grammar. hence to correct this error the teachers are played important role (St.33).
-to be familiar with those grammars (St. 32).
- It is easy to know your mistake when the teacher gives you feedback (St. 31).
- To know grammar rules and to write correct paragraphs (St.30).
- ...to improve or to correct my errors for the future (St. 25).
- To improve writing skill (St. 24).
- Unless our teacher corrects our grammar, it is not truth value (St. 23).
- ...because it shapes students (St. 19).
-to know our mistakes and to correct (St. 22).
- Because negative feedback helps us to improve our weakness for another action (St. 17).
- Because it s impossible to develop our writing and grammar errors without feedback (St. 15).
- Because it is important to how to use grammar form in any type of writing (St. 13).
-to learn from our mistakes (St.11).
-it makes us a perfect writer (St. 6).
- Because the teacher better understands my error and I understand when the teacher corrects me (St. 4).
- ...because CF is one of the basic fundamental of writing.....to think more and more (St. 3)
-to know our grammatical problems and to write paragraph correctly (St. 7).
- ...to learn the mistakes (St.1).
-to learn from the past error and be good for the future (St. 43).
- We are educated from our error because learning from error is knowing everything (St. 26).
- ...not to repeat past mistakes (St. 14).
- If not corrected, I will make that mistake in the equation (St. 12).

Item 8: Students' Reasons for Preferring DCF

- Because it avoid information distortion (St. 38).
- Because if the feedback is not clear for me, I will ask the teacher directly what the error in my writing is (St. 44).
- Because if he tells the error and tells the correction we know our errors and takes the correct ones (St.2).
- Because I can know my error directly and it enables me refer where my error occur and internalize it for my future work correctly (St. 46).
- Because we can easily understand direct CF(St. 22).
- Because direct CF helps to be more effective in the next time (St. 7).

Item 8: Reasons of students for Preferring a combination of DCF and IDCF

- Because sometime we need to do something by ourselves and that helps us to dig more (St. 31).
- The teacher uses direct CF during lecture time and conversation, and indirect CF when we are writing (St. 32).
- From the errors some are difficult to correct by the student level. Such errors must be correct by the teacher. The simplest ones should be correct by student (St.47).
- Indirect CF like underlining errors might be good for tasks we do outside class. Direct CF might be important while we are working in class (St. 4).
- If we ask what our errors are, the teacher should directly tell us, but if the errors are simple, indirect CF is better (St. 11).
- Because some persons are aggressive when being commented (St.1).
- ...the combination is good to refer so many books and to ask others (St.10).
- ...if the teacher use both methods, students strive to answer the indirect one by using the example that given directly (St. 48).

Item 15 Students' Reasons for Preferring Focused CF

From the responses, the students who preferred focused CF had the following to say.

- Because they may not have a time to correct all of our errors (St.3)
- ...if the teacher uses unfocused CF, I will lose interest on the subject matter (St.14).
- Because the number of students is several, the teacher cannot correct all errors (St.4).
- Because all of the errors that revolves around us is not important (St. 15).
- Because it saves time (St. 43).
- Because by exempling the given example, students strive to answer the rest question, then in researching the answer for the question, they develop the ability to... (St, 48).

Item 15: Students' Reasons for Preferring Unfocused CF

- Because when the teacher corrects some of student errors, the students repeat their grammatical error, therefore they should correct all errors (St. 5).
- ...when the teacher shows me all of my errors, I will not repeat such error, but if he shows me some of them, I will repeat the remain error on other days (St.44).
- Because it help me to be corrected in all ways of grammar usage. If the teacher correct me based on some part of errors in my writing, I cannot improve my problem in all aspects (St.17).

- I prefer B because when the teacher left some of the errors without correcting them I might be take them as they were correct. (May I missed to correct them). (St. 47).
- Because it makes me all round perfection (St. 46).
- Because it helps me to solve all of my problem on writing. If the teacher focused only some of my errors I can't understand why I am not correct in the other of my errors (St. 35).
- One by one correction of grammar rules helps to have broad knowledge about correct grammar (St. 30).
- The writing teacher shall correct all of the grammar which the students are incorrect. Because it enables the students effective writers for the future (St. 49).

Item 17: Problems Students Said Face when Provided with CF by their Writing Teachers

- A problem of accepting my error as an error (St. 35).
- My handwriting is not good, so even if I didn't make a grammatical error, my teacher considered as I made an error in grammar (St. 47).
- The correction may be difficult to understand (St.57).
- When I ask the teacher what my errors are, he is no ok (St. 2).
- I tell you the truth in my mind create some "tilacha" [hatred] for the teacher and it also affect my reading style and I say I don't read this subject because it is meaningless (St. 14).
- Understanding problem (St. 54).
- Misunderstanding of idea (St. 55).
- Many reasons (St. 52)

Appendix VII

Extracts of Teachers' Responses to the Open-ended Items in the Questionnaire (Main)

Item 2: Teachers' Reasons for Believing that CF was Important to Improve the Accuracy of their Students' Writing

- I believe that students must get CF because it helps them improve their skills (T.2).
- Students can't understand their limitations (T.1).
- I consider accuracy as much important as fluency (T.3).
- Since the meaning of a sentence will be changed, it is essential to correct and focus on the students' grammatical errors (T.4).
- Because it would be difficult to convey messages without having grammatical knowledge (T.5).

- It is because unless we show them their errors from their written work, they will gradually internalize the same errors as if they are correct and use them in the future (T.6).
- Sometimes they [grammatical errors] change the meaning of sentences (T.7).
- It helps me to show the gaps students have in their writings. Grammatical errors can hinder communication, and students should be given some feedback (T.8).
- In order to write meaningful sentences, students should have some knowledge of grammar (T.9).
- The students need to identify correct grammar forms. It should not be neglected (T.10)

Item 5: Teachers' Reasons for Employing a Combination of DCF and IDCF

- When I feel students may not correct their mistakes and if I feel that students' mistakes will remain unchecked, I use direct correction. But if I feel that it is easy for them if I show their incorrectness, I use indirect correction (T.9)
- For I feel that indirect correction promotes self-learning, and sometimes direct correction may be needed when students fail to correct their own mistakes (T. T.8).
- Explicit grammar teaching makes the learning process mechanical. Hence, we should let the students recognize their grammatical errors (T.10).
- If I think the mistake made is grave and blocks the intended message, I provide the alternative. However, if it is a simple mistake, I try to indicate its presence by underlining it so that the student would give his/her attention to it (T. 3).
- If the error is quite easy and students can correct by themselves, I usually use indirect correction. If the error is a difficult one, I usually correct the error on the spot (T.1).
- Using a combination sounds good because there are students who may not understand teachers when they only indicate the errors. Giving direct feedback at all is not good as students always expect such corrections (T.2).

Item 13: Reasons of teachers for most often employing FCF

- Because it is impossible to give feedback to each and every errors that students create either knowingly or unknowingly (T.2).
- Their writings are most of the time full of errors. To correct all these errors it takes time....in one class there are around 70 students. Therefore, it is too difficult to see all students' grammatical errors one by one (T.7).

- It is important that they learn something one at a time (T.3).
- As the number of students is too many in one class, it is very difficult to correct all errors that all the students commit, so.... (T.4).
- I feel that teachers need to focus on major errors ...which distort communication (T.8).
- ...showing only some errors ...will help my students point out other mistakes (T.9).
- Because I want my students develop independent learning (T.10).
- Because some are errors and others mistakes. Some are not serious (I use error gravity as a parameter) which one is more serious is a question (T.1).

Item 14: Grammatical Errors which the writing Teachers Said to Focus on

- Agreement, spelling, tense, fragment, punctuation. These errors are serious errors ... would bring change in meaning (T.1).
- I focus on grammars that cause communication breakdown (T.10).
- I focus on grammar errors which cause meaning difference (T.9).
- Subject-verb errors, faulty sentences, spelling errors, capitalization and punctuation (T.7).
- I focus on the semantic aspect of the grammar error -if it is not clear what kind of message the student is trying to express (T.3).
- Faulty sentences-as it changes meaning of the sentence (T.2).

Item 11: Grammatical Errors the Teachers Identified to be Common in their Students' Writings

- Subject-verb agreement error (T.7).
- Dangling modifiers, misplaced modifiers, subject-verb disagreement, pronoun antecedent disagreement, comma splice, run-ons, non-parallel structure (T.5).
- Subject-verb agreement, tense usage, punctuation (T.2).
- Subject-verb agreement, passive construction, verb tense (T.3).
- Tense, subject-verb agreement, and this alters the meaning of the sentence (T.4).
- Subject-verb disagreement, tense and number related errors (T.8).
- Tense, capitalization, punctuation (T.9).
- Grammar errors, capitalization errors, tense errors, spelling errors, etc (T.6).
- My students use the grammar of their native language which doesn't correspond to English (T.10).
- Agreement errors, tense, voice (T.1).

Item 17: Problems the Writing Teachers Reported to Face while Providing CF

- Some students do not accept corrective feedback positively. Some students do not internalize the feedback. They repeatedly commit the same error (T.1).
- When I skip some errors, the students assume that they have produced written work with little errors (T.10).

- Sometimes, I find students' work totally difficult to even start giving feedback as some students' work is totally full of errors and has nothing to convey (T.9).
- The majority of the class may not understand, even the corrections (T.8).
- As the students see their work corrected, they may feel that disappointed because they consider as if their writing was good (T.4).
- Sometimes, correcting or editing others' work is time consumer than doing it by myself. I prefer writing than editing because it is complicated (T.7).
- Some students are unable to understand the feedback, it might be because of the language problem...If I give feedback, they always look for it instead of looking their effort (T.2).
- The student will give up trying to write in fear of making grammatical errors (T.6).
- Correcting all their sentences as all of their sentences are always full of errors (T.5).
- Sometimes a student's grammatical error could be many and the ideas may be incoherent. These make it difficult to provide even sentence feedback (T.3).

Item 19: Teachers' Reasons for Believing that DCF was more fruitful than IDCF

- Personally, I believe using IDCF is good, but students are reluctant to address some of the limitation of their work. They do not want to see their work again, so DCF is effective for this reason (T.1).
- The students may ask the teacher why the answer for this is just like in this way. They need further explanation from their teacher why it is so (T.4).
- Nowadays, if I indicate them their mistakes, they do not try to correct the error by themselves; they don't worry about except some students (T.7).
- They have to be told everything directly. If you don't, I don't think they will go home or to the library to refer to books to know about their mistakes (T.5).

Item 19: Teachers' Responses for Believing that IDCF was more effective than DCF

- I need to minimize the tendency of teacher dependency. The students should learn on their own so that they can gain knowledge and skill which can be retained (T.10).
- This will help students to search for their mistakes by themselves and improve their writing (T.9).
- It promotes self-learning. Students can identify their own problems ...and self-correct (T.8).
- DCF is spoon feeding, but we should expect more efforts from our students. They should try to correct themselves because trial and error teaches them more than teachers (T. 2).

- I feel that IDCF is better because it lets the student to think of the error and correct it by himself rather than always depending on the teacher (T.6).

Item 21: Teachers' Reasons for Believing that FCF was more Beneficial than UFCF

- We should let our students to correct their writing errors after they observe similar corrections by the teacher (T. 6).
- I have to focus on serious problems than minor errors (T.2).
- When I correct some of the errors and underline the others, they can correct the others based on the corrected ones (T.7).
- Due to the presence of many students in a CR, it is so tiresome to give a feedback for the whole class so that I should rely on giving the feedback for some students and I ask them to discuss with the rest students about the errors that the whole students have got mistaken (T.4).
- It enables teachers to attack grammatical errors that are serious and distort communication; besides students may not grab all the corrections when we apply the unfocused one (T. 8).
- Students should work out some of the mistakes by themselves (T.9).
- Pointing out all the mistakes a student makes may not be effective in improving accuracy...Depending on the number of mistakes, the student may either give up hope and lose confidence, so on my part, I prefer selective feedback (T.3).

Appendix VIII: Data from the 3 compositions by all students (Main)

No	Comp.1			No	Comp.2			No	Comp.3		
	ER	WD	Prop		ER	WD	Prop		ER	WD	Prop
1	27	130	0.466	1	15	71	0.298	1	20	92	0.430
2	21	130	0.362	2	12	144	0.238	2	17	95	0.365
3	34	148	0.586	3	19	123	0.377	3	9	66	0.193
4	38	176	0.655	4	24	103	0.477	4	30	139	0.644
5	31	115	0.535	5	24	73	0.477	5	16	57	0.344
6	52	130	0.897	6	32	116	0.635	6	34	90	0.730
7	19	128	0.328	7	14	131	0.278	7	14	120	0.301
8	25	117	0.431	8	35	119	0.695	8	27	99	0.560
9	32	114	0.552	9	--	--	--	9	16	72	0.344
10	38	169	0.655	10	25	132	0.496	10	15	100	0.322
11	32	76	0.552	11	11	113	0.218	11	22	78	0.473
12	21	117	0.362	12	23	92	0.457	12	29	104	0.623
13	32	100	0.552	13	16	48	0.318	13	17	62	0.365
14	32	113	0.552	14	--	--	--	14	--	--	--
15	34	105	0.586	15	23	76	0.457	15	5	72	0.107
16	35	102	0.604	16	40	81	0.794	16	33	91	0.709
17	20	99	0.345	17	21	110	0.417	17	16	86	0.344
18	17	92	0.293	18	14	88	0.278	18	8	104	0.172
19	49	151	0.845	19	39	139	0.774	19	17	87	0.365
20	27	115	0.466	20	25	100	0.496	20	20	80	0.430
21	25	117	0.431	21	21	77	0.417	21	19	65	0.408
22	13	99	0.224	22	30	107	0.596	22	5	64	0.107
23	13	104	0.224	23	23	103	0.457	23	18	122	0.387
24	40	137	0.690	24	32	144	0.635	24	--	--	--
25	16	105	0.276	25	11	82	0.218	25	14	79	0.301
26	46	156	0.793	26	30	140	0.596	26	34	127	0.730
27	11	61	0.190	27	16	103	0.318	27	15	96	0.322
28	10	118	0.172	28	16	104	0.318	28	13	82	0.279
29	18	99	0.310	29	34	113	0.675	29	17	118	0.365
30	18	85	0.310	30	24	105	0.477	30	22	93	0.473
31	37	109	0.638	31	14	98	0.278	31	16	118	0.344
32	17	77	0.293	32	16	82	0.318	32	22	89	0.473
33	30	138	0.517	33	15	99	0.298	33	12	90	0.258
34	35	169	0.604	34	29	121	0.576	34	22	84	0.473
35	20	94	0.345	35	22	93	0.437	35	13	60	0.279
36	18	91	0.310	36	38	124	0.754	36	31	81	0.666
37	16	79	0.276	37	12	72	0.238	37	12	92	0.258
38	43	120	0.741	38	20	81	0.397	38	25	83	0.537
39	15	104	0.259	39	23	106	0.457	39	21	173	0.451
40	18	89	0.310	40	31	129	0.616	40	17	68	0.365
41	19	103	0.328	41	15	94	0.298	41	9	96	0.193
42	22	71	0.379	42	15	54	0.298	42	29	87	0.623
43	27	119	0.466	43	21	121	0.417	43	13	102	0.279
44	13	112	0.224	44	--	--	--	44	17	135	0.365
45	29	75	0.500	45	19	57	0.377	45	23	70	0.494
46	15	98	0.259	46	18	127	0.357	46	15	117	0.322
47	38	137	0.655	47	20	144	0.397	47	12	101	0.258
48	29	94	0.500	48	29	103	0.576	48	38	98	0.816
49	20	82	0.345	49	20	93	0.397	49	19	101	0.408
50	50	150	0.862	50	27	100	0.536	50	25	103	0.537
51	14	92	0.241	51	23	125	0.457	51	17	67	0.365
52	25	89	0.431	52	17	77	0.338	52	21	101	0.451
	1,376	5,800	23.727		1,093	5,037	21.704		951	4,656	20.408

grammatical errors committed by each student

- WD= Number of words written by each student
- Prop= Proportion of No. of gram. Errors by each student to Tot. No. of words written by all the Sts X 100

• E
R
=n
u
m
b
e
r
o
f

APPENDIX IX

No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp.1 (main)

	WC	FR	PR	PU	SP	AR	CN	QU	PS	UN	O M	VF	WF	Pm	W O	AW	Prl	
1	2	4	6					1		1	1	5	7					27
2	2	1	2	2			1			1		6	6					21
3	3	4		8	3		4			3		6	3					34
4	4	2	2	6		1			3	4		6	7	1	1	1		38
5		4	3	1	1	2					2	8	7	1	1	1		31
6	2	5	3	10	3	2	1		1	1	1	11	9	2	1			52
7		1	1	2		2	2		1			4	6					19
8		2	3	1		1		1		3		5	7		1		1	25
9	3	2	2	9	1		3				2	6	2			2		32
10	2	3	3	5			1		1	4		12	5	1	1			38
11	1	3	5		3	1	1			4	1	4	7		1	1		32
12	2	2	3	2			1			1	1		9					21
13			3	4	2	3	2	1		2		7	3	3	1	1		32
14		2	2	9	1	1	1	1		4	1	6	1	1	1	1		32
15	2	3	3	4		4				1	3	7	5	1	1			34
16	1	2	2	1	2	2	1			4	4	4	9	1		2		35
17		1	3	3		1				2	1	3	5	1				20
18	4	5	1	1							1		4				1	17
19	1	2	9	5		3	1			3	8	5	6	3	2		1	49
20		1	4	5							1	4	10	1	1			27
21	2	3	1	6		1	1			2		3	3		1	1	1	25
22	3	1	3	3								2	1					13
23		2		1		1					1	3	3	1	1			13
24	4	1	6	7					4	2	2	7	4	1	1		1	40
25	2			4	1	1	1					3	3	1				16
26	3	1	3	8	2	2	1			5	3	6	11	1				46
27				2								4	5					11
28		1		3	1							2	1	2				10
29	2		1	3	1	1		1	1	1	1	3	2		1			18
30	2	3	3	1		1				1	3	2	2					18
31	1	3	3			1	2		1	1	2	4	14	1	4			37
32		3	1	5			1			1	1	4		1				17
33	1			5		3		1		2	1	8	7	2				30
34	2	1	3	7		2	2	2	1	1		7	4	1		2		35
35	2			3	1						3	6	4	1				20
36	3	1	5	1		1						4	3					18
37	1	1				1	1				1	3	6			1	1	16
38		1	5	5		3	1	1		1	4	12	7	2	1			43
39		2		1		2						4	6					15
40	1		1	1	2			2	3	1		1	6					18
41	1	1	3	4	1		1			1		4		2	1			19
42		2	1	5		2	3			2	2	3	1	1				22
43		1	2	7		6		1			1	4	5					27
44	1	1	1	3		1			1	1	1	3						13
45	1			10	5	3						4	6					29
46	2		1	6								3	3					15
47	2	3	6	8			1			1		4	7	5	1			38
48	1	3	4	4		4	1					4	2		4	2		29
49		3	3	3			1			1		2	4			2	1	20
50	3	2	4	14		3	1			4	3	5	9	2				50
51	1			6				1		2		2	2					14
52		1	2	11	4		1			2		1	1	2				25
	70	90	122	225	34	62	38	13	17	70	56	236	250	42	27	17	7	1,376

APPENDIX X

No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp. 2 (main)

	WC	FR	PR	PU	SP	AR	CN	QU	PS	UN	O M	VF	WF	Prn	W O	AW	Prl	
1	1	1	1	2		1						4	4		1			15
2	1		1	1		1				1		2	3	1	1			12
3		1		1						1		8	7	1				19
4	2	1		1		2	1		4	4		4	4		1			24
5	1	3	1	1	1	1			1			8	6	1				24
6		3	4	3	2	2	3		3			5	4		1	2		32
7	1		2	2	1				1	1	1	2	1	1	1			14
8	1	2		6	1	1	2				1	12	3	5		1		35
9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10		1	2	4			1		5	2		5	2	1	1	1		25
11			1	7								2	1					11
12	3	1	2	5		1				1		2	7	1				23
13	2	3		2						1	1	2	3	2				16
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15		7		1		2				2		4	4	1	1		1	23
16		3	7	1	7		2		3	4		6	4	2	1			40
17				2	1	4	1		1	1		9	1	1				21
18	6			1	1							4	1	1				14
19	2	2	9	4			1			2	1	7	9	2				39
20		2	4	5		4				1	1	2	3	2	1			25
21	1	2	1	4								2	8	2		1		21
22	2	2	6	5		2	1		1	1	1	7	1	1				30
23	3	5	1	2		1				1		2	7			1		23
24	1	3	3	3		1			1	4	2	6	6	1	1			32
25				1	1					1		6	2					11
26	1	2	1	3		4	3			1		9	2		2	2		30
27	1		1	3		1				1		4	3	2				16
28	1		1	3		2			1	1		1	3	2	1			16
29			3	4	1	3	2			1		3	16	1				34
30	3		1	1		2	1			1	1	8	1	4	1			24
31		1	1	2		1	1					3	3	2				14
32	1	1							2			3	4	3	2			16
33	2	1	1	3						1		3	3	1				15
34	2	1		4		2		1		2	2	8	7					29
35	1		2	1							1	8	9					22
36	1	3	6	3	1	1	1					8	2	4	6	2		38
37		2		2		1		1				3	3					12
38	3	1	2	4							1	4	4	1				20
39	3		1	2		2						7	8					23
40	2	1	2	4	2	2	2		2	2	1	6	3	1	1			31
41	1			1		1			2		1	3	2	4				15
42	3	2	1	4	2	1	1									1		15
43	1		5	1		1	1					6	6					21
44	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
45	1			3	2		1				1	4	5	2				19
46	1		3	3	1	1				1		4	2	1			1	18
47	1	2		7			1			1		2	2	4				20
48	2	1	1	3	1		1			2	1	5	8	3			1	29
49			1	3	1		1				1	7	3	2		1		20
50		1	1	2	1	4				1		5	10	2				27
51				8		1			1			7	3	3				23
52	3	1	1	4		2						1	5					17
	61	62	80	142	27	55	28	2	28	43	18	233	208	68	23	12	3	1093

APPENDIX: XI

No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp. 3 (main)

St	WC	FR	PR	PU	SP	AR	CN	QU	PS	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	W O	AW	Prl	
1			1	2		1	1		1	1		8	1	2	2			20
2	2	1	3		1	1						2	6		1			17
3	1	2	1				1				2	2						9
4	3	1	3	5		3	2			1		6	3	1		2		30
5	1	2	1	1		1	2				1	4	2		1			16
6	1	3	2	7			4	1		1	2	8	3	1		1		34
7	1			8		1	1			1		1	1					14
8	2		1	3		4	1			2	1	5	7				1	27
9		3	3	4			2					3	1					16
10		1		2		3	1		1	1		3	1	1	1			15
11		2	2	4		3	3			2		3	3					22
12			2	6		1	2			1	3	5	6	3				29
13	1	2	1	2			2					2	4	1	2			17
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15	1											1	1	1	1			5
16	2	2	3	2		4	3			1	1	4	3	1	3	4		33
17	2	1	1	1		1					1	5	2	1			1	16
18				4							1	2	1					8
19		1	1	2			1	1		1	2	5	2	1				17
20		3	2	3			2			2	1	2	2		1	2		20
21		2		2	1		1				1	5	3	3			1	19
22			1									1	1	2				5
23	1	3	3	2		1	1				1	4	1	1				18
24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
25			2	2					1			2	6	1				14
26		3	2	1			5			8	3	3	5	1	2	1		34
27		1		2	2							6	3	1			0	15
28	1	1		3			4					3	1					13
29				3		2	1			3		6	1				1	17
30		1	1	10			1	2		1		2	3			1		22
31		2	1			1	3	1				7	1					16
32		2	1	7		1				2		7			2			22
33	2			4						1		3	1	1				12
34	1	2		6						2	1	4	5	1				22
35			1	3		2	1					2	4					13
36		6	1	3		3	5			2		6	3		1	1		31
37						2	1			2		5	2					12
38	2		2	7	1	2	2	1		1	1	2	3	1				25
39		1		6		2						7	4	1				21
40	1	1		2		2	1			1		4	5					17
41		1			1							7						9
42	4	4	1	2	3	2	3		1		5	2	2					29
43				1		4						7	1					13
44		3	1	2	1	1					1	2	5		1			17
45		3	1	4	4					2	1	2	5	1				23
46	1		3			1			2			4	4					15
47		2	1	2							2	1	3	1				12
48		2	4	6	1	2	3		1	3	2	9	1		2	2		38
49			5	2	2		1	1		1	1	3	2	1				19
50	1	2		4		1	1			1	2	4	5	2	1	1		25
51			1	4			1			2		3	4	1			1	17
52		3	3	2			2					7	4					21
	31	69	62	148	17	52	65	7	6	47	36	201	137	32	21	15	5	951

APPENDIX: XII

Number and proportion of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in the 3 Compositions (Main)

No.	Composition 1		Composition 2		Composition3	
	No. of errors	Prop. of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in Comp. 1 to total No. of words by the group in Comp.1 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in Comp. 2 to total No. of words by the group in Comp.2 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in Comp. 3 to total No. of words by the group in Comp.3 X 100
1	27	0.970	15	0.609	20	0.854
3	34	1.221	19	0.771	9	0.384
5	31	1.114	24	0.974	16	0.683
7	19	0.683	14	0.568	14	0.598
9	32	1.149	--	--	16	0.683
11	32	1.149	11	0.446	22	0.939
13	32	1.149	16	0.649	17	0.726
15	34	1.221	23	0.933	5	0.214
17	20	0.718	21	0.852	16	0.683
19	49	1.760	39	1.582	17	0.726
21	25	0.898	21	0.852	19	0.811
23	13	0.467	23	0.933	18	0.769
25	16	0.575	11	0.446	14	0.598
27	11	0.395	16	0.649	15	0.641
29	18	0.647	34	1.380	17	0.726
31	37	1.329	14	0.568	16	0.683
33	30	1.078	15	0.609	12	0.512
35	20	0.718	22	0.893	13	0.555
37	16	0.575	12	0.487	12	0.512
39	15	0.539	23	0.933	21	0.897
41	19	0.683	15	0.609	9	0.384
43	27	0.970	21	0.852	13	0.555
45	29	1.042	19	0.771	23	0.982
47	38	1.365	20	0.812	12	0.512
49	20	0.718	20	0.812	19	0.811
51	14	0.503	23	0.933	17	0.726
	658	23.636	491	19.923	402	17.164

APPENDIX XIII

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp.1, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
1	2	4	6					1		1	1	5	7					27
3	3	4		8	3		4			3		6	3					34
5		4	3	1	1	2				2		8	7	1	1	1		31
7		1	1	2		2	2		1			4	6					19
9	3	2	2	9	1		3				2	6	2			2		32
11	1	3	5		3	1	1			4	1	4	7		1	1		32
13			3	4	2	3	2	1		2		7	3	3	1	1		32
15	2	3	3	4		4				1	3	7	5	1	1			34
17		1	3	3		1				2	1	3	5	1				20
19	1	2	9	5		3	1			3	8	5	6	3	2		1	49
21	2	3	1	6		1	1			2		3	3		1	1	1	25
23		2		1		1					1	3	3	1	1			13
25	2			4	1	1	1					3	3	1				16
27				2								4	5					11
29	2		1	3	1	1		1	1	1	1	3	2		1			18
31	1	3	3			1	2		1	1	2	4	14	1	4			37
33	1			5		3		1		2	1	8	7	2				30
35	2			3	1						3	6	4	1				20
37	1	1				1	1				1	3	6			1	1	16
39		2		1		2						4	6					15
41	1	1	3	4	1		1			1		4		2	1			19
43		1	2	7		6		1			1	4	5					27
45	1			10	5	3						4	6					29
47	2	3	6	8			1			1		4	7	5	1			38
49		3	3	3			1			1		2	4			2	1	20
51	1			6				1		2		2	2					14
	28	43	54	99	19	36	21	6	3	27	28	116	128	22	15	9	4	658
%	1.00	1.54	1.94	3.55	.	1.29	.754	.	.108	.970	1.00	4.16	4.59	.790	.539	.323	.	23.635
	6	5	0	7	682	3		216			6	7	8				144	

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 1=2,784
- Number of errors by the FCFG students in composition 1=658
- Proportion of total number of errors by the FCFG students to total number of words by the FCFG=23.635

APPENDIX XIV

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp.2, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
1	1	1	1	2		1						4	4		1			15
3		1		1						1		8	7	1				19
5	1	3	1	1	1	1			1			8	6	1				24
7	1		2	2	1				1	1	1	2	1	1	1			14
9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
11			1	7								2	1					11
13	2	3		2						1	1	2	3	2				16
15		7		1		2				2		4	4	1	1		1	23
17				2	1	4	1		1	1		9	1	1				21
19	2	2	9	4			1			2	1	7	9	2				39
21	1	2	1	4								2	8	2		1		21
23	3	5	1	2		1				1		2	7			1		23
25				1	1					1		6	2					11
27	1		1	3		1				1		4	3	2				16
29			3	4	1	3	2			1		3	16	1				34
31		1	1	2		1	1					3	3	2				14
33	2	1	1	3						1		3	3	1				15
35	1		2	1							1	8	9					22
37		2		2		1		1				3	3					12
39	3		1	2		2						7	8					23
41	1			1		1			2		1	3	2	4				15
43	1		5	1		1	1					6	6					21
45	1			3	2		1				1	4	5	2				19
47	1	2		7			1			1		2	2	4				20
49			1	3	1		1				1	7	3	2		1		20
51				8		1			1			7	3	3				23
%	22	30	31	69	8	20	9	1	6	14	7	116	119	32	3	3	1	491

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 2=2, 464
- Number of errors by the FCFG students in composition 2=491
- Proportion of total number of errors by the FCFG students to total number of words by the FCFG=19.927

APPENDIX XV

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp. 3, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
1			1	2		1	1		1	1		8	1	2	2			20
3	1	2	1				1				2	2						9
5	1	2	1	1		1	2				1	4	2		1			16
7	1			8		1	1			1		1	1					14
9		3	3	4			2					3	1					16
11		2	2	4		3	3			2		3	3					22
13	1	2	1	2			2					2	4	1	2			17
15	1											1	1	1	1			5
17	2	1	1	1		1					1	5	2	1			1	16
19		1	1	2			1	1		1	2	5	2	1				17
21		2		2	1		1				1	5	3	3			1	19
23	1	3	3	2		1	1				1	4	1	1				18
25			2	2						1		2	6	1				14
27		1		2	2							6	3	1			0	15
29				3		2	1			3		6	1				1	17
31		2	1			1	3	1				7	1					16
33	2			4						1		3	1	1				12
35			1	3		2	1					2	4					13
37						2	1			2		5	2					12
39		1		6		2						7	4	1				21
41		1			1							7						9
43				1		4						7	1					13
45		3	1	4	4					2	1	2	5	1				23
47		2	1	2							2	1	3	1				12
49			5	2	2		1	1		1	1	3	2	1				19
51			1	4			1			2		3	4	1			1	17
	10	28	26	61	10	21	23	3	1	17	12	104	58	18	6	0	4	402
%	0.42	1.19	1.110	2.60	.	.897	.982	.128	.043	.726	.512	4.44	2.47	.769	.256	0	.	17.16
	7	6		5	427							1	7				159	

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 3=2, 342
- Number of errors by the FCFG students in composition 3=402
- Proportion of total number of errors by the FCFG students to total number of words by the FCFG=17.164

Appendix XVI

Number and proportion of grammar errors and words by the students in the UFCFG in the 3 Compositions (Main)

No.	Composition 1		Composition 2		Composition 3	
	No. of errors	Prop. Of no. of grammar errors by each student in the UFCFG in Comp. 1 to the total no. of words by this group in Comp.2 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. Of no. of grammar errors by each student in the UFCFG in Comp. 2 to the total no. of words by this group in Comp.2 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. Of no. of grammar errors by each student in the UFCFG in Comp. 3 to the total no. of words by this group in Comp.3 X 100
2	21	0.696	12	0.466	17	0.735
4	38	1.260	24	0.933	30	1.297
6	52	1.724	32	1.244	34	1.470
8	25	0.829	35	1.361	27	1.167
10	38	1.260	25	0.972	15	0.648
12	21	0.696	23	0.894	29	1.253
14	32	1.061	--	--	--	--
16	35	1.161	40	1.555	33	1.426
18	17	0.564	14	0.544	8	0.346
20	27	0.895	25	0.972	20	0.864
22	13	0.431	30	1.166	5	0.216
24	40	1.326	32	1.244	--	--
26	46	1.525	30	1.166	34	1.470
28	10	0.332	16	0.622	13	0.562
30	18	0.597	24	0.933	22	0.951
32	17	0.564	16	0.622	22	0.951
34	35	1.161	29	1.127	22	0.951
36	18	0.597	38	1.477	31	1.340
38	43	1.426	20	0.777	25	1.080
40	18	0.597	31	1.205	17	0.735
42	22	0.729	15	0.583	29	1.253
44	13	0.431	--	--	17	0.735
46	15	0.497	18	0.700	15	0.648
48	29	0.962	29	1.127	38	1.642
50	50	1.658	27	1.049	25	1.080
52	25	0.829	17	0.661	21	0.906
	718	23.808	602	23.400	549	23.726

APPENDIX XVII

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.1, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
2	2	1	2	2			1			1		6	6					21
4	4	2	2	6		1			3	4		6	7	1	1	1		38
6	2	5	3	10	3	2	1		1	1	1	11	9	2	1			52
8		2	3	1		1		1		3		5	7		1		1	25
10	2	3	3	5			1		1	4		12	5	1	1			38
12	2	2	3	2			1			1	1		9					21
14		2	2	9	1	1	1	1		4	1	6	1	1	1	1		32
16	1	2	2	1	2	2	1			4	4	4	9	1		2		35
18	4	5	1	1							1		4				1	17
20		1	4	5							1	4	10	1	1			27
22	3	1	3	3								2	1					13
24	4	1	6	7					4	2	2	7	4	1	1		1	40
26	3	1	3	8	2	2	1			5	3	6	11	1				46
28		1		3	1							2	1	2				10
30	2	3	3	1		1				1	3	2	2					18
32		3	1	5			1			1	1	4		1				17
34	2	1	3	7		2	2	2	1	1		7	4	1		2		35
36	3	1	5	1		1						4	3					18
38		1	5	5		3	1	1		1	4	12	7	2	1			43
40	1		1	1	2			2	3	1		1	6					18
42		2	1	5		2	3			2	2	3	1	1				22
44	1	1	1	3		1			1	1	1	3						13
46	2		1	6								3	3					15
48	1	3	4	4		4	1					4	2		4	2		29
50	3	2	4	14		3	1			4	3	5	9	2				50
52		1	2	11	4		1			2		1	1	2				25
	42	47	68	126	15	26	17	7	14	43	28	120	122	20	12	8	3	718
%	1.39	1.55	2.25	4.17	.	.862	.564	.232	.464	1.42	.928	3.97	4.04	.663	.398	.265	.	0.100
	3	8	5	8	497					6		9	5					

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 1=3,016
- Number of errors by the UFCG students in composition 1=718
- Proportion of total number of errors by the students in the UFCFG to the total number of words produced by the students in this group=.23.806

APPENDIX XVIII

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.2, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
2	1		1	1		1				1		2	3	1	1			12
4	2	1		1		2	1		4	4		4	4		1			24
6		3	4	3	2	2	3		3			5	4		1	2		32
8	1	2		6	1	1	2				1	12	3	5		1		35
10		1	2	4			1		5	2		5	2	1	1	1		25
12	3	1	2	5		1				1		2	7	1				23
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16		3	7	1	7		2		3	4		6	4	2	1			40
18	6			1	1							4	1	1				14
20		2	4	5		4				1	1	2	3	2	1			25
22	2	2	6	5		2	1		1	1	1	7	1	1				30
24	1	3	3	3		1			1	4	2	6	6	1	1			32
26	1	2	1	3		4	3			1		9	2		2	2		30
28	1		1	3		2			1	1		1	3	2	1			16
30	3		1	1		2	1			1	1	8	1	4	1			24
32	1	1							2			3	4	3	2			16
34	2	1		4		2		1		2	2	8	7					29
36	1	3	6	3	1	1	1					8	2	4	6	2		38
38	3	1	2	4							1	4	4	1				20
40	2	1	2	4	2	2	2		2	2	1	6	3	1	1			31
42	3	2	1	4	2	1	1									1		15
44	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
46	1		3	3	1	1				1		4	2	1			1	18
48	2	1	1	3	1		1			2	1	5	8	3			1	29
50		1	1	2	1	4				1		5	10	2				27
52	3	1	1	4		2						1	5					17
39	32	49	73	19	35	19	1	22	29	11	117	89	36	20	9	2		602
%	1.51	1.24	1.90	2.83	.	1.36	.738	.039	.855	1.12	.428	4.54	3.45	1.39	.777	.350	.	
	6	4	4	8	738	0				7		7	9	9			078	

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 2=2,573
- Number of errors by the UFCG students in composition 2=602
- Proportion of total number of errors by the students in the UFCFG to the total number of words produced by the students in this group=23.400

APPENDIX: XIX

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.3, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
2	2	1	3		1	1						2	6		1			17
4	3	1	3	5		3	2			1		6	3	1		2		30
6	1	3	2	7			4	1		1	2	8	3	1		1		34
8	2		1	3		4	1			2	1	5	7				1	27
10		1		2		3	1		1	1		3	1	1	1			15
12			2	6		1	2			1	3	5	6	3				29
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16	2	2	3	2		4	3			1	1	4	3	1	3	4		33
18				4							1	2	1					8
20		3	2	3			2			2	1	2	2		1	2		20
22			1									1	1	2				5
24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
26		3	2	1			5			8	3	3	5	1	2	1		34
28	1	1		3			4					3	1					13
30		1	1	10			1	2		1		2	3			1		22
32		2	1	7		1				2		7			2			22
34	1	2		6						2	1	4	5	1				22
36		6	1	3		3	5			2		6	3		1	1		31
38	2		2	7	1	2	2	1		1	1	2	3	1				25
40	1	1		2		2	1			1		4	5					17
42	4	4	1	2	3	2	3		1		5	2	2					29
44		3	1	2	1	1					1	2	5		1			17
46	1		3			1			2			4	4					15
48		2	4	6	1	2	3		1	3	2	9	1		2	2		38
50	1	2		4		1	1			1	2	4	5	2	1	1		25
52		3	3	2			2					7	4					21
	21	41	36	87	7	31	42	4	5	30	24	97	79	14	15	15	1	549
%	.908	1.77	1.55	3.76	.	1.34	1.815	.173	.216	1.29	1.037	4.19	3.41	.605	.648	.648	.	23.725
		2	6	0	303	0				7		2	4				043	

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 3=2,314
- Number of errors by the UFCG students in composition 3=549
- Proportion of total number of errors by the students in the UFCFG to the total number of words produced by the students in this group=23.725

APPENDIX XX

Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the 3 compositions (All, Main)

No.	Comp.1		Comp.2		Comp.3	
	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion
1	22	0.379	12	0.238	12	0.258
2	17	0.293	7	0.139	12	0.258
3	21	0.362	17	0.338	5	0.107
4	23	0.396	10	0.199	18	0.387
5	23	0.396	19	0.377	10	0.215
6	38	0.655	19	0.377	23	0.494
7	14	0.241	7	0.139	10	0.215
8	18	0.310	23	0.457	16	0.344
9	21	0.362	--	--	14	0.301
10	28	0.483	14	0.278	7	0.150
11	19	0.328	11	0.218	14	0.301
12	16	0.276	17	0.338	19	0.408
13	17	0.293	10	0.199	11	0.236
14	20	0.345	--	--	--	--
15	22	0.379	16	0.318	2	0.043
16	18	0.310	21	0.417	14	0.301
17	15	0.259	12	0.238	10	0.215
18	11	0.290	6	0.119	7	0.150
19	27	0.466	31	0.616	11	0.236
20	24	0.414	16	0.318	12	0.258
21	16	0.276	17	0.338	12	0.258
22	10	0.172	21	0.417	3	0.064
23	9	0.155	17	0.338	13	0.279
24	25	0.431	21	0.417	--	--
25	10	0.172	9	0.179	12	0.258
26	29	0.500	17	0.338	14	0.301
27	11	0.290	11	0.218	12	0.258
28	7	0.121	8	0.159	8	0.172
29	9	0.155	26	0.516	10	0.215
30	11	0.290	11	0.218	17	0.365
31	24	0.414	10	0.199	11	0.236
32	13	0.224	8	0.159	17	0.365
33	20	0.345	11	0.218	8	0.172
34	22	0.379	20	0.397	17	0.365
35	13	0.224	13	0.258	10	0.215
36	14	0.241	22	0.437	19	0.408
37	10	0.172	10	0.199	7	0.150
38	30	0.517	15	0.298	14	0.301
39	13	0.224	18	0.357	18	0.387
40	9	0.155	16	0.318	12	0.258
41	12	0.207	6	0.119	8	0.172
42	12	0.207	7	0.139	11	0.236
43	19	0.328	18	0.357	9	0.193
44	8	0.138	--	--	13	0.279
45	20	0.345	12	0.238	15	0.322
46	13	0.224	12	0.238	11	0.236
47	28	0.483	13	0.258	9	0.193
48	17	0.293	18	0.357	22	0.473
49	15	0.259	14	0.278	10	0.215
50	34	0.586	19	0.377	15	0.322
51	10	0.172	18	0.357	12	0.258
52	16	0.276	12	0.238	19	0.408
	923	16.212	737	13.343	617	13.211

- Number of words by all the students in composition 1=5,800
- Number of words by all the students in composition 2=5,037
- Number of words by all the students in composition 3=4,656

APPENDIX: XXI

Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the FCFG in the 3 compositions (Main)

No	Comp.1		Comp.2		Comp.3	
	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion
1	22	0.790	12	0.487	12	0.512
3	21	0.754	17	0.690	5	0.214
5	23	0.826	19	0.771	10	0.427
7	14	0.503	19	0.771	10	0.427
9	21	0.754	--	--	14	0.598
11	19	0.683	11	0.446	14	0.598
13	17	0.611	10	0.406	11	0.470
15	22	0.790	16	0.649	2	0.085
17	15	0.539	12	0.487	10	0.427
19	27	0.970	31	1.258	11	0.470
21	16	0.575	17	0.690	12	0.512
23	9	0.323	17	0.690	13	0.555
25	10	0.359	9	0.365	12	0.512
27	11	0.395	11	0.446	12	0.512
29	9	0.323	26	1.055	10	0.427
31	24	0.862	10	0.406	11	0.470
33	20	0.718	11	0.446	8	0.342
35	13	0.467	20	0.812	10	0.427
37	10	0.359	10	0.406	7	0.299
39	13	0.467	18	0.731	18	0.769
41	12	0.431	6	0.244	8	0.342
43	19	0.683	18	0.731	9	0.384
45	20	0.718	12	0.487	15	0.640
47	28	1.006	13	0.528	9	0.384
49	15	0.539	14	0.690	12	0.512
51	10	0.359	18	0.731	12	0.512
	440	15.804	377	15.423	277	11.827

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 1=2,784
- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 2=2, 464
- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 3=2, 342

APPENDIX XXII

Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the UFCFG in the 3 compositions (Main)

No	Comp.1		Comp.2		Comp.3	
	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion
2	17	0.564	7	0.272	12	0.519
4	23	0.763	10	0.389	18	0.778
6	38	1.260	19	0.738	23	0.994
8	18	0.597	23	0.933	16	0.691
10	28	0.928	14	0.544	7	0.303
12	16	0.531	17	0.661	19	0.821
14	20	0.663	--	--	--	--
16	18	0.597	21	0.816	14	0.605
18	11	0.365	6	0.233	7	0.303
20	24	0.796	16	0.622	12	0.519
22	10	0.332	21	0.816	3	0.130
24	25	0.829	21	0.816	--	--
26	29	0.962	17	0.661	14	0.605
28	7	0.232	8	0.311	8	0.346
30	11	0.365	11	0.428	17	0.735
32	13	0.431	8	0.311	17	0.735
34	22	0.729	20	0.777	17	0.735
36	14	0.464	22	0.855	19	0.821
38	30	0.995	15	0.583	14	0.605
40	9	0.298	16	0.622	12	0.519
42	12	0.398	7	0.272	11	0.475
44	8	0.265	--	--	13	0.562
46	13	0.431	12	0.466	11	0.519
48	17	0.564	18	0.700	22	0.951
50	34	1.127	19	0.738	15	0.648
52	16	0.531	12	0.466	19	0.821
	483	16.017	361	14.030	340	14.740

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 1=3,016
- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 2=2,573
- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 3=2,314

Appendix XXIII

Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample students (Composition 1, Main)

The researcher's identification of errors

	St6	St11	St 13	St14	St26	St38	St42	St49	Tot
WC	2	2	2			1	1		8
FR	5	3	2		2		1	1	14
PRE	3	3	3	3				2	14
PUN	10	5	2	4	1	5		7	34
SP	3			2					5
ART	2			3	1	3	1	6	16
CON	1	1	1	2			1		6
QUN				1		1		1	3
POS	1	1							2
UN	1	4	1	2		2			10
OM	1		1		1	1	1	1	6
WF	7	5	9	3	3	7	6	5	45
VF	11	12		7	3	8	3	4	48
PRN	2	1		3	1	2			9
WO	1	1		1	1				4
AWK				1			1		2
PARA							1		1
Tot	50	38	21	32	13	30	16	27	

Rater 1's identification of errors

	St6	St11	St 13	St14	St26	St38	St42	49	Tot
WC								1	1
FR				1					1
PRE	1			2			1	2	6
PUN			2		1	1	1	9	14
SP	1			1			1		3
ART				1				5	6
CON									0
QUN						1		1	2
POS									0
UN						1			1
OM									0
WF	1		4			3		4	12

VF						3	2	3	8
PRN	1		3					2	6
WO	1		1						2
AWK	5	1	3	1		4		2	16
PARA	1						1		2
Tot	11	1	13	6	1	13	6	29	

Rater 2's identification of errors

	St6	St11	St 13	St14	St26	St38	St42	49	Tot
WC	9	1	6	4	1	3	3	3	30
FR									0
PRE			2	2			1		5
PUN	8	2	3	1	4	5		6	29
SP		4	2	7		2	4	4	23
ART	1			1				2	4
CON									0
QUN									0
POS		2							2
UN		6	3						9
OM	4	2	1	2	1	4		4	18
WF	5		11			6			22
VF	1	8	1	2	1		4	3	20
PRN	3						2		5
WO	2	2		2		3			9
AWK				3		3			6
PARA					2		3		5
Tot	33	27	29	24	9	26	17	22	

Appendix XXIV:

Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from 8 sample students (Composition 2, Main)

The researcher's identification of errors

	St2	St7	St 18	St23	St32	St33	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1	1	6	3	1	2	1	1	16
FR				5	1	1			7
PRE	1	2		1		1		3	8
PUN	1	2	1	2		3	1	3	13
SP		1	1					1	3
ART	1			1	1		1	1	5
CON									0
QUN									0
POS		1			2		2		5
UN	1	1		1		1		1	5
OM		1					1		2
WF	3	1	1	7	4	3	2	2	23
VF	2	2	4	2	3	3	3	4	23
PRN	1	1	1		3	1	4	1	12
WO	1	1			2				4
AWK				1					1
PARA								1	1
Tot	12	14	14	23	17	15	15	18	

Rater 1's identification of errors

	St2	St7	St 18	St23	St32	St33	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1		3	1	1	3	1		10
FR	1			5					6
PRE	2		1			1			4
PUN		5	1	5	2	1	1	2	17
SP			2		2			1	5
ART				1	2				3
CON		1							1
QUN									0
POS				1	2	2			5
UN		1		2		2		2	7

OM		3		1					4
WF	4	2	2	4	1		1	3	17
VF	2	3	4	2	5	1	5	3	25
PRN	2	1	1	1	2	1	4	2	14
WO	1								1
AWK		4	4	1					9
PARA					1	1			2
Tot	13	20	18	24	18	12	12	13	

Rater 2's identification of errors

	St2	St7	St 18	St23	St32	St33	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1	3	4	2	3	2	1		16
FR									0
PRE	1	1							2
PUN	1	5	2	9	7	5		3	32
SP		1	1	3	2		1		8
ART			1	1	1				3
CON									0
QUN									0
POS				1					1
UN	6	2	2	1					11
OM	1	2	1	6	1				11
WF	1		4	2	2	4		2	15
VF	3	1	1	2	3	3	4	2	19
PRN			1		1	1		1	4
WO									0
AWK									0
PARA									0
Tot	14	15	17	27	20	15	6	8	

Appendix XXV

Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample students (Composition 3, Main)

The researcher's identification of errors

	St5	St10	St 17	St25	St28	St35	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1		2		1			1	5
FR	2	1	1		1		1		6
PRE	1		1	2		1		3	8
PUN	1	2	1	2	3	3			12
SP							1		1
ART	1	3	1			2		1	8
CON	2	1			4	1			8
QUN									0
POS		1						2	3
UN		1		1					2
OM	1		1						2
WF	2	1	2	6	1	4		4	20
VF	4	3	4	2	3	2	7	4	29
PRN		1	1	1					3
WO	1	1							2
AWK									0
PARA			1						1
Tot	16	15	15	14	13	13	9	15	

Rater 1's identification of errors

	St5	St10	St 17	St25	St28	St35	St41	St46	Tot
WC	3	4	2		1		1		11
FR	1		1		1		2		5
PRE			2		2	2	1	1	8
PUN	1	1	1	2	4	1			10
SP							1		1
ART			2				1		3
CON					2	1			3
QUN									0

POS								2	2
UN		2				1			3
OM									0
WF	3		3	3		3			12
VF	4	2	3	1	3	1	6	7	27
PRN	1	1		1				1	4
WO		1							1
AWK			2	1		1			4
PARA		1	2						3
Tot	13	13	18	8	13	10	12	11	

Rater 2's identification of errors

	St5	St10	St 17	St25	St28	St35	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1				1		1		3
FR	1				1				2
PRE			2					1	3
PUN	2	5	4	3	5	5			24
SP	2	1			1	1	3	1	9
ART		2	4	1		1			8
CON									0
QUN									0
POS								1	1
UN		5	3	2	1		1	1	13
OM	1		1	1	1	2	1		7
WF	2	1	1	2	2	2		2	12
VF	2	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	18
PRN									0
WO									0
AWK									0
PARA									0
Tot	11	16	18	10	15	12	9	9	

Appendix XXVI

Sample Students' Paragraphs (Composition 1, Main)

Student 2

ADVANTAGES OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY

There are a lot of technologies that are produced at current time. For instance, mobile technology is one of the important and advantageous company. From these advantages, some of the following are listed below.

It is used to transfer ideas through telephoning. As a result, every society all over the world can receive currently information that conduct or happen in the world. The other point is also uses as a means of books or reference. This means by downloading the mobile that have an internet services can help us to solve questions and give precisely note. On the other hand, it can also important to send text messages in a short period of time. These are some of the advantages of mobile that can use as a profit for us.

Student 7 (Comp.1)

ADVANTAGES OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY

Technology is used for country growing. as Ethiopia is a developing country, she needs educated person and the educated person must be creative to be hard worker. Computer is one of the instrument from new technologies. it uses for many purposes. among these uses in case of teaching learning process, to communicate with peoples or exchange of information and to store data or to putting data that gathered from different sources. So peoples use such kind of works

they will get pure knowledge and they will be creative person. Then they avoid their poverty and their countries poverty.

Industry is the another types of new technologies. In industry any tools are produced by educated peoples. So people gets tools they will be hard worker and will be rich.

Sample Students' Paragraphs (Composition 2, Main)

Library Service at Wollo University (Student 2)

Library service at Wollo university in Dessie campus. There are three libraries at Dessie campus. These are social library, natural library, and the new and the largest library named as Meles library, but these libraries do no give the same service to the users. Especially, the librarian present Meles library are all fresh and they couldn't know the title of the books. As a result, so many students are made disagreement and enter to conflict with them. Except one or two librarian most of the librarian is they couldn't know the rules and regulations of the library. During the studying program, they are speaking loudly when they get one student in unnecessary activities. This disturbs the students and shouted all students. Additionally, there is alack of chairs, tables, and necessary text books and reference books in the library. This is the weakness of the academic management of Wollo University.

Library service at Wollo University (Student 7)

In Wollo university there are three known libraries. I saw the one library which is called Meles library. When I entered for the first time, I was falling in bad feeling because the library was not as I thought before; there were no books that I want to use. When I entered for the second time I was happy because I used that I want to read. the library in this cumpas is sp much good. there were enough books but the books present in the library are kind, there are no different boos , that are out of our text book. In the library there is no suitable desk for reading as I compared fro other universities library. The workers in the library are so good but they are not properly working people.

Library Service at Wollo University (Student 18)

When I saw the library service of Wollo university, It worked 6 days in te weak. In the library there is many different problems. The one that is the employer service. The employer service is the major problem to treat the students unwisly. The user fought with the employer and the students are cruwded. The book present in the library is limited by the shortage of economy . The user used time unwisly by the case of un punctual employer. Finally the service of Wollo university library is un favorable.

Library Service at Wollo university (Student 23)

Library service at Wollo university has so, many problem. Some of the limitation lack of book service, chair, and lack of servant. The servants characterestics very difficult, they are noise, for employers, and have no Enough Experieance. at Wollo university library service weakness is Greater than strength. One day I asked a servant. please give me organic text book. but she say that “there is no organic chemistry here” but organic chemistry present in library. this show that she has no any experieance about library uses. but it has it’s own strength for enstance works 24 hours and nearest students block and bed room.

Library Service in Wollo University (Student 32)

Library service in Wollo university are good in most criterias. For example, chare, tables, light, books and air condition, but it’s workers are not working properly. and students are not silent, it’s mobile are not silent their students are showtly talking, it is not many books in any subject its present maximum one or two books in one subject . but many students are reading in library. In this condition (case) Wollo university Library service are it is not available for students reading.

Library Service at Wollo university Student 33)

Libray service at Wollo univeristy is very comfortable, But there is lack of so many materials w/h is useful for student’s. for example, there is lack of Rference Book, chair and others. When we enter at 1:30 o’clock, we can not get achair and other materials. the servant who works at W.U. library does not agood behaviour, when we enter and find achair they say’s when you haven’t achair please, go out unless and otherwise give me you ID No they says. like this Behaviour is not good contacting with student.

Sample Students' Paragraphs (Composition 3, Main)

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 5)

high population have d/t disadvantage in one country. In one country can not appropriate the width of area and population come a lot of problem. That problems are deforestation, erosion, shortage of food.... In case of deforestation people attacked by disease. Because cannot get pure air. By this reason, that country can not developed and dependent.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 10)

When by the presence of high population in one country, there are so many disadvantages are occurred in that country. Some of them are, the pollution of air, the shortage of farm land, shortage of cultivated land, deforestation and shortage of rain...etc are occurred in the country. Due to this above case population's in the country are not get good health care, enough food, and all the necessary basic needs are not fulfilled. especially developing countries are affected by this matter like Ethiopia and other higher population countries. So to decrease this matter especially developing countries to be controlled our population.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 17)

High population have many disadvantages, especially in developing countries. Example, Ethiopia is one of the poorest countries in Africa and also for world. The population are increasing by double rate at this time. this increasing population have negative effect on the school, hospital and on work place and also on food is the most problem of Ethiopian population.

To solve this problem decreasing the birth rate literate unilliterate people or children, increasing building of hospital to decrease death rate and prepare the work place workless.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 18)

High population is disadvantage in one country. The civil service of the country is not fairly distributed. Because the population is high, the civil service present in the country is not balanced with the population. The air condition of the country is disturbed by different ways. First, for living place deforestation is takes place, due to this reason the temprature of the country increases by increasing the amount of carbondioxide. So, desretification is sread out in the country and soil erosion is favored. Due to this all reason the production of one country is affected. Generally high population degrade the development of one country.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 28)

High population growth have many disadvantages for the growth of one country. Population increases the farming area also increases. So the farming area increases as the same time it became deforestation. deforestation causes air pollution. But when the air polluted it causes illness for population. The other is when the population increases the number of industries also increases. This also one of the cause of air polllution. In general the result of high population is death or poorness for human being.

Student 25

Disadvantages of High Population

Obviously it is true that high population in one country or in the world have disadvantage directly or indirectly. When we see specially the high population of undeveloped country which

like with in agriculture, there is deforestation and un wisly use of land. Consquently; these follows polluted of water condition, drought and famine across the country. due to these reasons there will be hostile or conflict through the country and finally the life of human being will pass away.

Appendix XXVII:

Categorization of linguistic errors identified from students' pre-test compositions during the pilot study

No.	Error type /category	Number of errors	% of errors to total No. of words (2,512)
1	Word choice errors	46	1.831
2	Spelling errors	18	0.717
3	Sentence fragment	37	1.473
4	Errors in Preposition use	39	1.553
5	Errors in Punctuation use	40	1.592
6	Tense use errors	11	0.438
7	Unnecessary	26	1.035
8	Pronoun use errors	12	0.478
9	Word formation errors	52	2.070
10	Possessive 's	7	0.279
11	Errors in article use	21	0.836
12	Word order errors	14	0.557
13	Verb formation	57	2.269
14	Active/ passive errors	15	0.597
15	Omission errors	16	0.637
16	Errors in connector use	10	0.398
17	Faulty parallelism	7	0.279
18	Comparative formation	1	0.040
19	Unclear/awkward	8	0.319
20	Errors in quantifier use	3	0.119
	Total	440	17.517

REFERENCES

- Abismara, N. (2003). "An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speakers' English Writings." (Online). Retrieved on Dec. 12, 2010, from [http// ninabismara. articles](http://ninabismara.articles)
- Alhazo, M .)2009). " The Effects of Teachers' Error Feedback on Al-Hussien Bin Talal University Students' Self Correction Ability." European Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 142-159.
- Altman. D, et al (2006). "Why do a Pilot Study". National Centre for the Replacement, Replacement and Reduction of Animals in Research. London.
- Anusenie L. et al. (2009). "Classroom Practice: Error Correction at the Tertiary Level." Studies about Languages. Issue, 14.
- Aridah, D.(2003). "The Role of Feedback in the Teaching and Learning of Writing." Celt. Vol.3. No. 2. Pp. 105-114
- Asres Nigus (2005). "An Exploration of the Written Error Treatment Practices of the Intermediate Writing Skills Instructors of Bahir Dar University." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Bitchener, J. & Knok, U. (2010). "The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: a ten month investigation." Applied Linguistics. Vol. 31, No.2. pp. 193-214.
- _____ (2009). "The value of a focused approach to written corrective feedback." ELT Journal. Vol. 63, No. 3. Pp. 204-211.
- _____.(2008). "The Relative Effectiveness of Different Types of Direct Feedback." System. Vol. 37, No. 2. Pp. 322-329
- Bitchener, J. et al. (2005). "The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 14. Pp. 191-205
- Brown , D. (1994). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Byrne, D. (1991). Teaching Writing Skills. Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). "Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing." Applied Linguistics. Vol. 1, No. 1. Pp. 1-47.
- Chandler, J. (2003). "The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 12. PP. 267-296.

- Chaudron, C. (1988). Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Choon, G. (1997). "Error Analysis(EA) and Correction (EC) of Written Work in the Classroom." The English Teacher. Vol.XXII.
- Cohen, L. et al. (2000). Research Methods in Education. London: RoutledgeFalmer
- Corder, S.P. (1967). "The Significance of Learners' Errors." International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching. Vol. 4
- Crandall, J. (2006). "The Power of Writing: The Importance of Writing in EFL." TESOL Arabia. (Ppt.). Retrieved on April, 11, 2010 from crandall@umbc.edu
- Cresswell, (2003). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. London: Sage Publications.
- Dabaghi, A. (2008). "A Comparison of the Effects of Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback on Learners' Performance in Tailor- Made Tests." Journal of Applied Sciences. Vol.8, No.1. pp. 1-13
- Delgado, R. (2006). "Effects of Different Error Feedback Approaches in Students' Ability to Self-Edit their Writing." Divergencia, Revista de estadeos linguisticos y literarios. Vol. 4, No. 2. Pp. 3-16
- Dornyei, Z. (2007). Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methodologies. Oxford University Press
- Dyer, B. (1996). " L1 and L2 Composition Theories: Hillock's Environmental Mode and Task Based Language Teaching." ELT Journal. Vol. 50, No. 4. pp. 312-317
- Elghazo, M. et al. (2009). "The Effect of Teachers' Error Feedback on Al-Hussein Bin Talal University Students' Self Correction Ability." European Journal of Social Studies. Vol. 12, No. 1
- Ellis, R. (2010). "Cognitive, Social, and Psychological Dimensions of Corrective Feedback." (Ppt. Online). Retrieved on Sep. 20, 2010 from www. Ujaen. Es/...ppt.
- _____. (2009). "Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development." L2 Journal. Vol.1, No. 1. Pp. 3-18
- _____. (2008). "A typology of written corrective feedback types." ELT Journal . Vol. 63, No. 2. PP. 97- 107.

- _____. (2005). "Principles of instructed language learning." System . Vol. 33, No. 2. Pp. 209-224.
- _____. (2004). "The definition and measurement of L2 explicit knowledge." Language Learning . Vol. 54, No. 2. pp. 227-275.
- _____. (2003). "Focusing on Form in the Classroom." Keynote address presented at the 21st World Congress of the World Federation of modern Language Associations from July 2-5. South Africa.
- _____. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: OUP.
- Ellis, R. et al (2008). "The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Context." System. Vol. 36, No. 3, pp. 353-371.
- Ellis , R. et al (2006). " Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar." SSLA. Vol. 28. PP. 339-368.
- Erel, S. & Bullut, D. (2007). "Error Treatment in L2 Writing: A Comparative Study of Direct and Indirect Coded Feedback." Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Sayı . Vol. 22 No.1 pp. 397-415
- Evans et al. (2010). " Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy." Language Teaching Research. Vol. 14, No. 4. PP.445-463
- Fang, X. & Xue-Mei, J .(Sep. 2007). "Error analysis and the EFL classroom teaching." US-China Education Review. Vol. 4, No.9
- Ferris, D. (2010). "Second Language Writing Research and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA." Studies in Second Language Acquisition. Vol., 32 , pp.181– 201 .
- _____. (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 mean Time...)" Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 14. Pp.49-62
- Ferris D. & Roberts, (2001). "Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be?" Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.10. PP. 161–184
- Foong, K.(1994). " Providing Feedback on Students' writing to Stimulate Thinking." Teaching and Learning. Vol. 17, No. 1. pp. 96-105
- Gebremedhin Simon(1993). "Individualized Reading for EAP for Social Science First Year Students in Addis Ababa University: A Study of a Possible Approach for Teaching Reading in EFL." AAU: Ph.D. Thesis.

- Geremew Lemu. (1999). "A Study of the Requirements in Writing for Academic Purposes at AAU." AAU. Ph. D. Thesis
- Getinet Tizazu(1993). "The Responding Behavior of Sophomore English Instructors." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Girma Gezahegn(2005). "A Study of Secondary School English Language Teachers' Implementation of Methodological Innovations: The Teaching of Grammar in Focus." AAU: Ph. D. Thesis.
- Glover, C. & Brown, E. (2006). "Written Feedback for Students: too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective?" (Online). Retrieved on 10 Nov, 2010 from: The Formative Assessment in Science Teaching (FAST project, <http://www.open.ac.uk/science/fdtl/>)
- Grami, M. (2005). "The Effect of Teachers' Written Feedback on ESL Students' Perception: A Study in a Saudi University-level Context." Annul Review of Education, Communication, and Language Studies. Vol. 2
- Guennettee, (2007). "Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.16, PP. 40–53
- Haregewoin Abate (2008). "The Effect of Communicative Grammar on the Grammatical Accuracy of Students' Academic Writing: An Integrated Approach to TEFL." AAU: Ph. D. Thesis
- Harmer, J. (2004). How to Teach Writing. Longman
- Hartshorn, J. (2008). "The Effects of Manageable Corrective Feedback on ESL Writing Accuracy." Bergham Young University. Ph. D. Thesis
- Haswell, R.(2010). "The Complexities of Responding to Student Writing; or, Looking for Shortcuts via the Road of Excess." Across the Disciplines. (Online). Retrieved on June 8, 2010, from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/haswell2006.cfm>
- Hendrickson, J. (1978). "Error Correction in Second Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research and Practice." Modern Language Journal. Vol. 63, No. 8. Pp. 216-221
- _____. (1980). "The Treatment of Error in Written Work. Modern Language Journal. Vol. 64, No. 1, pp. 216-221.
- Hyland, K. & Hyaland, F. (2006). Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues for Feedback in Second Language Writing. Cambridge University Press.

- Institute of International Education (2012). "Enhancing the Quality of English Language Education in Ethiopia." Report on a Future Search Conference Conducted at Ambo University (March 22-24) in Collaboration with the US Embassy and MOE..
- Italo Berisso(1999). "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Teacher versus Peer Feedback on AAU Students' Writing Revisions." AAU. Ph. D. Thesis
- Jia. C. & Binglan, Z. (2010). "The Impact of Teacher Feedback on the Long-term Improvement in the Accuracy of EFL Student Writing." Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics. Vol. 33, No. 2.
- Jing, H.(2010). "Influence of Teacher Feedback on ESL Students' Writing." University of Wisconsin. M.A. Thesis.
- Kepner, G. (1991). "An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills." Modern Language Journal, Vol. 75, No. 3. pp. 305-313.
- Kim, J. (2006). "Issues of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition." Working Papers on TESOL & Applied Linguistics. Vol. 4, No. 2
- Kontinen, M.(2009). "The Reality of Teacher Written Feedback: A Quantitative Study." University of Jyväskylä . Unpublished MA Thesis
- Krashen, S. (2009). "The Comprehension Hypothesis and its Rivals." Selected Papers from the Seventh International Symposium on English Teaching . 4th Pan- Asian Conference. Taipei.
- _____ (2004). "Applying the Comprehension Hypothesis: Some Suggestions." A Paper Presented at the 13th International Symposium and Book Fair on Language Teaching (English Teachers Association of the Republic of China), Taipei, Taiwan
- _____ (1985). The input hypothesis: issues and implications. New York: Longman.
- _____ (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon
- Krashen, F. Lee, J. (in press). Literacy across cultures
- Kroll, B. (1990). What does buy? ESL Student Performance on Home versus Class Compositions. In B. Kroll(Ed.), Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kumar, V. & Kumar, M. (2009). "Recursion and Noticing in Written Feedback." European Journal of Social Sciences. Vol. 12, No. pp. 97-102

- Lalande, J. (1982). "Reducing composition errors: An experiment." Modern Language Journal. Vol. 66, PP. 140–149.
- Lam, C. (2009). "Quest for Effective Error Correction." IELTS Online journal
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1997). "Grammar and Its Teaching: Challenging the Myths." ERIC Digest. Pp. 1-7.
- Lee, I. (1997). "ESL Learners' Performance in Error Correction in Writing: Some Implications for College-level Teaching." System, Vol. 25, pp. 456-477.
- Leki, I. (2001). "Material, Educational, and Ideological Challenges of Teaching EFL Writing at the Turn of the Century." International Journal of English Studies. Vol. 1, No.2. pp. 197-209
- Li, S. (2010). "The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta Analysis." Language Learning. Vol. 60, No.2. PP. 309-365.
- Lightbown, P. & Spada, N. (2007). How Languages are Learned. New York: OUP.
- Liu, Y. (2008). "The Effect of Error Feedback in Second Language Writing." Arizona Working Papers in SLA and Teaching. Vol. 15. Pp. 65-79
- Long, H. (1990). "The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 24, pp. 649–66.
- Mack, L. (Feb,2009). "Issues and Dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL Learners?" Polyglossia .Vol. 16.
- Mammo Kifle (1981). "Classification and Exploratory Analysis of Students' Errors in Advanced Composition II (1979-1980)." AAU. M.A Thesis
- Matsuda, P. (2003). "Process and Post Process: A Discursive History." Journal of Second Language Writing. Issue 12. PP. 65-83
- Mesfin Abera (2004). "An Investigation of the Level of Effectiveness of Peer Correction versus Self Correction." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Mesay Kebede (2008). "The Roots and Fallouts of Haile Sillassie's Educational Policy". UNESCO Forum Occasional Paper. No.10.
- Micceli, T. (2006). "Foreign Language Students' Perceptions of a Reflective Approach to Text Correction." Flinders University Language Group Online Review. Vol. 3, Issue,1.

- Mirosław, P.(2002). "Error Correction Practices of Polish and American Teachers." International Review of English Studies.
- Ministry of Education of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. (1994). Education and Training Policy. Addis Ababa.
- Mory, H.(2010). Feedback Research Revisited. North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press.
- Mukminatien, F. (2008). "The Place of Grammar in Language Teaching: An Attempt towards a Synthesis of its Teaching Approaches." BAHASA DAN SENI, Vol. 36, No. 1
- Myles, J. (2002). "Second Language Writing and Research: The Writing Process and Error Analysis in Student Texts." TESL-EJ. Vol. 6, No. 2
- Naeni, J. (2008). "Error Correction as an Indication of Consciousness Raising." Novitas-Royal. Vol. 2 No.2. PP. 120-137.
- Nassaji, H. & Fotos, S. (2004). "Current Developments in Research on the Teaching of Grammar." Annual Review of Applied Linguistics. CUP.
- Nordquist, R. (2013). "What is Grammar?" (Online). Retrieved on March 12, 2013 from: grammar.about.com. Grammar Questions & Answers
- Norrish, J. (1985). Language Learners and their Errors. Longman. MacMillan
- Norouzian, R & Faraan, A. (Jan.2012)."Written Error Feedback from Perception to Practice: A Feedback on Feedback." Journal of Language Teaching and Research. Vol.3. No. 1. PP.11-22
- Pashazadeh,A. & Marefat, H. (2010). "The Long-Term Effect of Selective Written Grammar Feedback on EFL Learners' Acquisition of Articles." University of Tehran. MA. Thesis.
- Polio, C. (1997). "Measures of Linguistic Accuracy in Second Language Writing Research." Language Learning. Vol.47, No. 1. PP.101-143
- Pongsirwet,C. (2001). "Relationships Among Grammatical Accuracy, Discourse Features, and the Quality of Second Language Writing: The Case of Thai EFL Learners." University of West Virginia. Ph. D. Thesis.
- Poniah, J(2009). "Form-focused instruction and the learning experience of adult ESL students." MJAL. Vol. 1. No. 6. Pp. 382-391

- Raimes, A. (1985). "What Unskilled ESL Writers Do as they Write: A Classroom Study of Composing." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 19, No. 2. Pp. 229-258.
- _____ (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Robb, T. et al (1986). "Salience of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 20, No. 1. PP. 83-107
- Rouhi, A. & Samiei, M. (2010). "The Effect of Focused and Unfocused Indirect Feedback on Accuracy in EFL Writing." The Social Sciences. Vol. 5, No. 6. Pp. 481-485
- Ryan, J. (2010). "A Review of the Role of Output in Second Language Acquisition with anecdotal examples from a Japanese learner's experience." (Online). Retrieved on Feb. 2, 2010 from <http://ryan/articles.SLA>
- Samar, R. (2009). "Corrective Feedback in EFL Classrooms: Learner Negotiation Strategies and Uptake ." Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning. No. 212
- Schmidt, R. (1990) . "The role of consciousness in second language learning." Applied Linguistics. Vol. 11. No.2. PP. 17-46.
- Seidel, K & Moritz, |J. (2009). "Changes in Ethiopia's Language and Education Policy- Pioneering Reforms." In Edge, S et al Proceedings of the 16th International Conference of Ethiopian Studies. Trondheim.
- Sheen, Y. (2010). "The Role of Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA." Studies in Second Language Acquisition , Vol. 32. Pp. 169– 179 .
- _____ (2007). "The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles." TESOL Quarterly. Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 255-283.
- _____ (2004). " Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings." Language Teaching Research . Vol.8, No. 3. pp. 263–300
- Sheen , Y. et al. (2009). "Differential Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Correction on the Accurate Use of Grammatical Forms by Adult ESL Learners." Washington Dc: Elsevier Ltd.

- Silva, T. (1990). "Second Language Composition Instruction: Developments, Issues and Directions in ESL." In: B. Kroll (Ed.) Second language writing: research insights for the classroom. Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 162-169.
- Smith, C. et al (2012). "Ethiopia Teaching English for Life Learning (TELL) Programme." A Field Study Report. Addis Ababa: American Institutes for Research.
- Snow, D. (2007). From Language Learner to Language Teachers: An Introduction to Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Inc.
- Sommers, N. (1982). "Responding to Student Writing." College Composition and Communication, Vol. 33, No. 2. , pp. 148-156.
- Spada, N. (2009). "The Isolation and Integration of Form-Focused Instruction: Views from ESL and EFL Teachers and Learners."
- Spratt, C. et al (2004). Mixed Research Methods. Cambridge: Common Wealth of Learning.
- Swain, M. (2010). "The Output Hypothesis: Its History and its Future." On line. Retrieved on Nov.12,2010 from: <http://Swain.Output.en>.
- _____ (1995). "Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.) Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taye Chefo (2005). "The Effect of Written Feedback on Promoting Students' Writing Skills in English." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Tekeste Negash. (2006). "Education in Ethiopia: From Crisis to the Brink of Collapse." nordiska afrikainstitutet, uppsala
- Temesgen Chibsa (2008). "The Effect of Peer Feedback On the EFL Students' Writing Performance and Writing Anxiety." AAU. M.A. Thesis
- Tesfaye Solomon(1995). " The Effectiveness of Learner Self-Correction of Written Errors in the EFL Classroom." AAU. M.' . Thesis
- The Free Online Encyclopedia (2013). "Grammar" (nline). Retrieved on March 24,2013 from: encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Grammar

- The World Bank (2005). *Education in Ethiopia: Strengthening the Foundation for Sustainable Progress*. Washington DC.
- Truscott, J. (2007). "The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately" Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol. 16. PP. 255–272
- _____ (1999). "The Case for "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes": A Response to Ferris." Journal of Second Language Writing. Vol.2. PP. 111-122
- _____ (1998). Noticing in second language acquisition: a critical review. Second Language Research. Vol. 14, No.2. PP.103-135
- _____ (1996). "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes." Language Learning. Vol.46. No.2. pp. 327-369
- Tsang, W. & Wong, M.(1995). Giving grammar the place it deserves in process writing. JALT Journal. Vol.3.
- Underwood, J.& Tregidgo, A.(2002). "Improving Student Writing Through Effective Feedback: Best Practices and Recommendations." Journal of Teaching Writing. Vol. 22, No.2
- Van Beuningen, C. (2011). "Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Insights, and Future Directions. International Journal of English Studies (IJES). Vol. 10, No. 2. pp. 1-27
- VanPatten , B. (1992). " Second Language Acquisition Research and Foreign Language Teaching, Part 2." ADFL Bulletin. Vol. 23, No. 3. Pp. 23-37
- Vengadesamy, (2002). "Responding to Student Writing: Motivate, Not Criticize." JEMA Online Journal of Language Studies. Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Wang, F.(2010). "The Necessity of Grammar Teaching." English Language Teaching. Vol. 3. No. 2.
- Wikipedia . (2013). "Demographics of Ethiopia.: (Online). Retrieved on February 25, 2013 from: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethiopia
- Wikipedia . (2013). "Geography of Ethiopia." (Online). Retrieved on February 25, 2013 from: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ethiopa
- Wilkins, J. (1976). Linguistics and Language Teaching. Australia; Edward Arnold Ltd.
- Zamel, V. 1985. "Responding to student writing." TESOL Quarterly. Vol.19, No. 1. Pp. 79-101.

Appendices

Appendix I

Questionnaire for students (Pilot)

Dear student,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled **“The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving EFL Students’ Writing Accuracy”**. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items which basically aim at finding out about your belief and perception of the importance of corrective feedback on your written grammatical errors , your preferences for receiving corrective feedback on these errors, your experiences of receiving corrective feedback, and what problems you face when receiving such feedback.

Thank you.

1. How important do you think is the corrective feedback you receive from your writing teachers on your grammar errors
A. Very important B. important C. not important D. don’t know
2. If your answer for Qun. 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for Qun. 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your grammar errors, how often does he employ the following feedback methods?

		alway s	sometime s	neve r
A	Direct correction(where the teacher gives you the correct form)			
B	Indirect correction(where he teacher only indicates the presence of an error, but doesn’t offer you the correct form)			

C	A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback			
---	--	--	--	--

5. If your writing teacher often uses direct correction, how often does he/she employ the following direct correction types?

		alway s	sometime s	neve r
A	Providing you the correct form near the error			
B	Conducting a conference session with you			
C	Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)			

6. If your writing teacher often uses indirect corrective feedback, how often does he/she employ the following indirect feedback types?

	Indirect CF Types	alway s	sometime s	neve r
A	Underlining your errors			
B	Writing codes (like T for tense errors)			
C	Underlining and writing codes			
D	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line			
E	Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are			
F	Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)			

7. Which of the following corrective feedback types do you prefer to have on your written grammar errors?

- A. Direct corrective feedback
- B. Indirect corrective feedback
- C. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

8. What is/are your reason/s for preferring one of the feedback methods in Qun. 7 ?

9. If your answer for Qun. 7 is A, which of the following direct corrective feedback methods do you prefer most and which one do you prefer least? Please show your preference by ranking them 1st, 2nd, or 3rd.

Your ranking	Direct corrective feedback types
	Providing you the correct form near the error
	Conducting a conference session with you
	Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)

10. Could you please explain the reason/s for your ranking one of the above direct feedback types as 1st and the other as 3rd?

11. If your answer for Qun. 7 is B, which of the following indirect feedback types do you prefer most and which ones least? Please rank your preference by starting with 1 as the one you prefer most and 6 the one you prefer least.

Your ranking	Indirect corrective feedback types
	Underlining your errors
	Writing codes (like T for tense errors)
	Underlining and writing codes
	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line
	Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are
	Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)

12. Could you please justify why you prefer a certain indirect feedback type (from Qun. 11) most and the other as least?

13. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your written grammar errors, which of the following corrective feedback types does he/she employ most?

- A. Focused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF focusing only some of your errors
 - B. Unfocused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF covering all or most of your errors.
14. Which of the corrective feedback types mentioned in Qun. 13 (focused versus unfocused) do you prefer your writing teacher to employ on your written grammar errors?
- A. Focused CF
 - B. Unfocused CF
15. Could you explain the reason/s why you prefer either A or B in Qun. 14?

16. When your writing teacher provides you corrective feedback on your grammatical errors, do you face any problem?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
17. If your answer for Qun. 16 is A, what kind of problem/s do you face?

18. What do you do with your compositions when you receive them back with corrective feedback from your writing teachers? Please show by ticking () in the following table regarding how often you take the following actions?

	always	sometimes	never
Rewriting your composition by incorporating the corrections			
Keeping a mental note of your errors			
Asking your friend/s for help			
Consulting a dictionary			
Doing nothing (simply you look at your marks)			

19. If you take some other action/s , please list them.

Appendix II

Questionnaire for EFL Writing Instructors (Pilot)

Dear instructor,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving EFL Students’ Writing Accuracy**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items which basically aim at finding out about your preferences for offering feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, your practices of offering such feedback, and your opinions of effective feedback practices.

Thank you.

1. How useful is it to point out grammatical errors in your students’ written work?
a. Very useful b. useful c. not useful d. difficult to decide
2. If your answer for Qun. 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for Qun. 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When you are providing corrective feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you use most often?
A. Direct correction (where you provide the correct form for the student)
B. Indirect correction (where you only indicate the presence of an error for the student)
C. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

5. What is/are your reason/s for using either A or B or C above?

6. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is A, which of the following types of direct correction do you employ most?

Direct CF type	Always	Sometime	Rarely	Not at all
----------------	--------	----------	--------	------------

		s		
a. Giving grammar explanation				
b. Providing the correct answer				
c. Conducting a conference session				

7. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is B, which of the following indirect feedback types do you employ most often?

Indirect CF type	Always	Sometime s	Rarely	Not at all
a. Underlining the error				
b. Writing a code (e.g., T for tense)				
c. Underlining and writing a code				
d. Writing code/s in the margin of the line where the error happens				
e. Writing numbers in the margin indicating the number of errors in that line				
f. Writing comments at the end				

8. Could you please explain the reason/s why you employ a certain indirect corrective feedback type (in Qun. 7 above) always and the other not at all.

9. Have you ever tried to identify your students' common grammatical errors as reflected in their writing? A.Yes B. No

10. If your answer for Qun. 3 is Yes, what are the most common grammatical errors you find in your students' compositions?

11. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, which one of the following do you employ most?

A. Focused corrective feedback B. Unfocused corrective feedback

12. If your answer for Qun. 11 is A, what is/are your reason/s for employing focused corrective feedback?

13. If your answer for Qun. 11 is A, what kind of errors do you focus on and why?

14. If your answer for Qun. 11 above is B, what is/are your reason/s for employing unfocused corrective feedback?

15. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, do you face problems? A. Yes B. No

16. If your answer for Qun 15 is Yes, what problem/s do you face?

17. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you think are more fruitful in improving the accuracy of your students' written work?"

A. Direct Corrective Feedback B. Indirect Corrective Feedback

18. Could you please explain your reason/s for selecting either A or B above(Qun.17).

19. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback types do you think is more fruitful in improving accuracy in your students' composition?

A. Focused (selective)Corrective Feedback
B. Unfocused (comprehensive) Corrective Feedback

20. Could you please explain your reason/s for your choice of either A or B above?

-
-
-
21. Your Qualification A. BA/BED B. MA/MED C. Ph. D
22. For how long have you taught English? _____
23. At what level have you taught English?
- a) Elementary school _____ years
 - b) Secondary school _____ years
 - c) College/university _____ years

Appendix III

Operationalization of Error Categories and Example Instances

Dear instructor, given below are operational definitions of the common grammatical errors found in students' compositions. After each definition, you are provided with example instances of each error category. These examples were collected from the students' pre-test compositions in the pilot study.

Read the definition of each error category and the examples very carefully. Then, go through the paragraphs attached herewith and then:

- Identify the grammatical errors in each composition,
- Provide corrective feedback on each students' paragraphs (by focusing only on grammar/form errors) by using your usual corrective feedback practices,
- Write the number of errors you have identified in each grammar error category.

1. **Word Choice Errors:** When a student fails to use a word or a phrase appropriate to a given context.

Examples:

1. Modern technology is used to Globalization of the country as well as the person(St. 14)
2. It [modern technology] uses for time consuming....(Student 16)
3.where you understand in rural area farmers easily getting advantages by modern science and technology. Means the last 10 or five years the farmers was expand their energy (Student 18)
4. ...science and technology started to be modernize because of helping people and also the environment (Student 15)
5. The last 10 or five years the farmers was expand their energy and wast many time for producing crops. But at the time, they can produced their crops by using protractors cars (Student 18)
6. But at the time, they can produced their crops by using protractors cars. These is used to control their crops from different disadvantages like....(Student 18)
7. For example, it [modern technology] create air population (Student 23).
8. So the day [the present time] is civilization day no poverty of information (Student 27).
9. Modern science and technology has also an other advantage, so it changes the life style's of the society by extracting modern education and they change their life style's of the family (Student 12).

2. **Sentence Fragment:** Where a subject or predicate or both are missing from a string of words. Also, a construction which has a subject and predicate but introduced with a subordinator is taken as a fragment when it is happening on its own without any independent clause attached to it.

Examples:

1. Not only our country, but also all over the world (Student 9,1)
2. Such advantages are exercised in different areas of the country. Such that; industry, medicine, factory, plastic factory (Student 12,1)
3. Modern science is used to change any backward thoughts for the human being. To creates a civilized person, to develop our country by using different methods...(Student14,1)
4. To day modernization and use of technology is spread all over the world. because, it has so many advantages and uses (Student 16,1)
5. In general modern science and technology $\hat{=}$ the keys of development(Student 16,1)
6. It's [modern science and technology's] uses $\hat{=}$ very wide(Student 16)
7. In the world $\hat{=}$ have widest distribution of modern science and technology(Student 18,1)
8. In this time with out science and technology our world is meaningless. Because it $\hat{=}$ the engin of the activity of human being(Student 19,1)
9. Neither people can remember our culture nor can do (Student 21)

3. Preposition Errors: Where a preposition is missing, wrongly used, or unnecessarily used.

Examples:

1. Science more advantages $\hat{=}$ human beings (Student 2)
2. The world developed in higher level by modern science and technology(Student5)
3. On the modern science civilization increase $\hat{=}$ time to time (Student5)
4. ...different things are changed $\hat{=}$ old style to new style (Student 5)
5. It [modern science and technology] is used to transfer informations, datas, and different ideas among country to country (Student 9)
6. Modern technology is used to Globalization of the country as well as the person(St. 14)
7. $\hat{=}$ The last 10 or five years, the farmers was expand their energy and wast many time (Student 18)
8. In this time with out science and technology our world is meaningless (Student 19)
9. Modern science is a science that impact of our environment (Student 20).
10. Modern science and technology is have many disadvantage of one country development (Student 23)
11. Nowadays importance of modern science in the world is very high because of, science is the way to get knowledge (Student 24)

4. Article Errors: When an article is missed where necessary, used where it is unnecessary, or a wrong article is used.

Examples

1. The modern science and technology is the (article wrong) advantage of world civilization (Student 5)
2. It[modern science and technology] have an infinite advantage in the complex world (Student 6)
3. Technology and modern science are a very useful things for this world (Student 13)

4. In Generally advantages of modern science and technology is the backbone of the developing country (Student 18).
5. The modern science and technology is easily affected the health of one country development (Student 23).
6. Technology is very important to go with △ developed world (Student 24).

5. Punctuation Errors: Where a wrong punctuation mark is used, a punctuation mark is unnecessarily used, or not used where necessary.

Examples:

1. When we see teaching and learning, science are give a very big advantage △so science is....(Student 3).
2. Modern science is one of the cornerstone of one country to create good citizen △ that is △ it is used to improve the knowledge of citizens (Student 11).
3. In addition to these; modern science and technology have many vast advantages (St. 6)
4. Modern science is many advantages these are to reduce over population... (Student 14)
5. ...also they try to say it is disturbing their lives △ however △ they use it △ even when they want to transmit their idea △ they use internet (Student 15).
6. The other, _ use of modern science is to thing critically △ mens that It answering so many questions like.... (Student 10).
7.where we see in our country, the advantage of modern science and technology is can be describe as follows, _ modern science and technology used to saving time, money... (Student 18)
8. Modern science describes only the fashionable aspects, but, not its faithful content (S20).
9. In the past time science and technology are not birth △ the world civilization is not increase because peoples not use modern science and technology result (St. 5)

6. Verb Formation Errors: This grammatical category was operationalized to encompass several errors in word formation including:

- Errors in auxiliary verb usage (where an auxiliary verb is omitted, unnecessarily used, or an incorrect one is used).
- Errors in subject-verb agreement
- Errors in the use of a wrong verb
- Errors in –ing, infinitive, simple past or past participle formation
- Errors in tense usage
- Errors in voice construction

Examples:

1. Therefore modern science and technology are (a wrong verb) more advantage (St. 6).
2. It [science and technology] have an infinite advantage (Student 6).
3. It [science and technology] (an auxiliary verb is omitted) used to develop the knowledge of every citizen (Student 11).
4. The family of literate person's live a normal life by earned money from education (St.12).
5. Moreover our life is (auxiliary verb unnecessary) depends on technology (Student 13).
6. All that we eat, wear, drinks are result of technology (Student 13).
7. However, It's [modern technology] have some disadvantages (Student 13). [*This student has committed two verb formation related errors in this sentence: the auxiliary verb in "It's" is unnecessary and the subject and the verb do not agree.*]
8. Science and technology started to be modernize because of helping people and also the environment (Student 15).
9. It [modern technology] (auxiliary verb missing) answering so many questions like.... (Student 16).
10. The advantages of science and technology can be describes in many ways (Student 18).
11.where we see in our country, the advantage of modern science and technology is (auxiliary verb unnecessary) can be describe (error in verb three formation) as follows (Student 18).
12. ...where you understand in rural area farmers (auxiliary verb missing) easily getting advantage by modern technology (Student 18).
13. But at the time, they [farmers] can produced (auxiliary and the main verb form do not go together) their crops by using protractors cars (Student 18).
14. Science and technology is (auxiliary verb unnecessary) to gives (wrong as well as unnecessary infinitive formation) us many values (Student 19).
15. ..as a result our culture before the modern science is forgot (error in verb three formation) (Student 21)
16. At this time any thing ^ done by a computer (Student 22).
17. In the past time science and technology are not birth the world civilization is not increase because peoples ^ not use modern science and technology result (Student 5)
18. [In the past] the world is not developed (Student 5)
19. Nowadays our world reached the high level of modernization (Student 13).
20. If one person or individual in modernize technology he/ she have planned for the future, he get many informations through the media...(Student 24).
21. At the past 30 or 40 years technology is not use Ethiopians people. (Student 27).
22. When we see the use of modernization and technology, It uses for time consuming... (Student 16)
23. The modern science and technology is easily affected the health of one country development (Student 23).

- 7. Word Formation Errors:** These are errors which happen when students fail to use the appropriate form of words in different contexts. These include errors in plural, noun, adverb, and adjective formation.

Examples:

1. Modern science and technology has many advantage (Student 21)
2. Now there are many industry in our country(Student 21)
3. Therefore modern science and technology are many advantage but some disadvantage (Student 5)
4. Modern science is one of the corner stone of one country to create good citizen (St. 11)
5. In addition to these; modern science and technology have many vast advantage (St. 6)
6. Such advantages are exercised in different area of the country (Student 12)
7. Nowaday many process are done by computers (Student 13)
8. We can say that modern science and technology is advantages because it makes things easy (Student 15).
9. In Generally advantages of modern science and technology is the backbone of the developing country (Student 18).
10. For example, there are not fabricas, machines, we cant gat many using materials (St. 19).
11. In the past time science and technology are not birth the world civilization is not increase because peoples not use modern science and technology result (Student 5)
12. Nowaday importance of modern science in the world is very high because of, science is the way to get knowledge, the way to know how can one person life (Student 24).

8. Spelling Errors:

The researcher counted only those spelling errors which:

- Resulted in change of an actual word.
- The students were expected to have mastery of at very elementary levels of schooling.

This was because many of a student's words were incorrectly spelt and indicating all of them would have demoralized the students. In addition, it was assumed that many of the spelling errors would not interfere in the students' effort to communicate through writing.

Examples:

1. Science our world reach the right level, modern science advantages (Student 2).
2. Science is very very will (Student 4).
3. Nevertheless its [modern technology's] roll is greater than its harm (Student 13)
4. The hole world can be meet and share from far and far away by a result of technology (Student 13).
5. The other use of modern science is to thing critically (Student 6).

6. Let as take example (Student 19).
7. So Internet is one of the most nessary thing with technology (Student 22).
8. ...there is bad ting and good ting [of modern technology]

9. Errors in Pronoun Use: Where a pronoun is used unnecessarily, a pronoun is not used where necessary, a wrong pronoun is used, or where a pronoun that doesn't agree with its antecedent is used.

Examples:

1. When we see America, she is very active because our countries work is any time depend on science (Student 3).
2. This things make our job fast and easy (Student 15).
3. Generally modern science and technology is their advantages (Student 14).
4. A person who use a computer and Internet he can communicate different peoples (Student 22).
5. Modern science and technology has also an other advantage, so it changes the life style's of the society by extracting modern education and they change their life style's of the family (Student 12).
6. If one person or individual in modernize technology he/ she have planned for the future, he get many informations through the media...(Student 24).
7. Human being before of this time your life style not similar in this time... (Student 25).

10. Unnecessary: Where a word or a phrase which is not necessary to complete the meaning of a sentence is used. This basically included errors of unnecessary repetition of words and phrases.

Examples:

1. For example, some advantages of science and technology are; special transport service.... (Student 6).
2. When technology brodn up there are many problems are raised in our word (Student 13)
3. Nevertheless its advantage roll is greater than its harm (Student 13)
4.to reduce over population by using family planning method, by using contraceptive method, pills etc (Student 14)
5. also and they try to say it is disturbing their lives (Student 15)
6. The advantage of science and technology is used to produced modern clothe, shoes, building house, etc (Student 18)
7. But at the time, they [farmers] can produced their crops by using protractors cars (St. 18)
8. In other ways If the modern science and technology is wide, many people can depend on modern science and technology (Student 21).

11. Omission Errors: These are errors where a word (excluding a subject, a predicate, an article, a preposition, a pronoun), a phrase, or a clause which is necessary to complete a sentence is missing.

Examples:

1. Special transport service, e-mail, internet etc are the most ^advantages of modern science and technology (Student 5)
2. The hole world can be meet and share ^ from far and far away by....technology (St. 13)
3. The ^ advantage of modern science is to examine anything by using any mechanism (Student 14). *Because this student has mentioned some advantages of modern technology in the preceding sentences, she should have used an expression to indicate an additional advantage.*
4. as a result our culture ^ before the modern science is forgot (Student 21).
5. Our educational ^ is by science (Student 25).
6. Human being before of this time your life style not similar ^ in this time (Student 25)

12. Errors in Quantifier Use: Where a student uses a quantifier which does not go with the noun to be quantified. This included errors in using quantifiers of countable nouns for uncountable ones and vice versa.

Examples:

1. ...the last 10 or five years the farmers was expand their energy and wast many time for producing crops.
2. If one person or individual in modernize technology he/ she have planned for the future, he get many informations through the media...(Student 24).

13. Faulty Parallelism

Examples:

1. We can say that modern science and technology is advantages because it makes things easy, fast, perfect, safety effective and etc (Student 15)
2. It[modern technology] uses for time consuming, save efforts, to have more pure quality, to simplify the process of doing (Student 16). *Errors of parallel construction in preposition and verb use.*
3. The advantage of science and technology is used to produced modern cloth, shoes, building house etc (Student 18). *Errors in parallel construction of verb use as well as inconsistency in noun use.*

14. Errors in Connector Use: Where a connector necessary to link ideas is not used or where a wrong connector is used.

Example:

1. In this time modern science and technology are widespread because all the world people mostly use modern science and technology (Student 5)
2. Moreover, modern science and technology is the most essential material for different purposes; As a result, without modern science and technology our life is empty (Student 9). *As this sentence is the last sentence of the paragraph, and as the essence of the sentence itself indicates, the transitional device should have been one of indicators of conclusion, e.g., in general.*
3. Modern science and technology has also another advantage, so it changes the life style's of society (Student 12)
4. Fore example, ^ there are not fabricas, machines, we cant get many using materials like home, office... (Student 19). *Two errors of connection. First, the device "fore example" is unnecessary. Second, the sentence needs a subordinator to indicate condition, e.g., "if" at the beginning of the first clause.*
5. ...when the disadvantage of world civilization is to change environmental condition (Student 5).

15. Errors in the Use of Possessive's

Examples:

1. ...it [modern science and technology] change the life style's of the society (Student 12).
2. The family of literate person's live a normal life (Student 12).
3. It's [modern science and technology's] uses very wide (Student 16).
4. Modern science and technology is have many disadvantage of one country development (Student 23).
5. The modern science and technology is easily affected the health of one country development (Student 23).
6.when we see America she is very active because our countries work is any time depend on science (Student 2).

16. Word Order Errors

Examples:

1. Nowadays importance of modern science in the world is very high because of, science is the way to get knowledge, the way to know how can one person life (Student 24).
2. Human being before of this time your life style not similar in this time (Student 25).
3. So science is an as this time our country give a very big advantages (Student 2).
4. So these advantage is students get easy any information from the area of the world solve problems without any tired and outcome (Student 27)

17. Awkward/Unclear: A word, phrase, clause, or sentence which is unclear from the point of view of the context in which a student is composing.

Example:

1. So these advantage is students get easy any information from the area of the world solve problems without any tired and outcome (Student 27)
2. As you know at this time the +ve side of modern science let in school (Student 27).
3. B/c the modern science is the backbone of the country even if the people in all interest of human beings (Student 27).
4. In the other side all things not only meaning technology(Student 17)

Appendix IV

Questionnaire for students (Main)

Dear student,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving EFL Students’ Writing Accuracy**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to all the questions. Your genuine response is very important to solve some of the problems in our writing classes. Your response is required simply for research purpose, so respond freely and genuinely with no fear of any consequences.

Thank you.

1. How important do you think is the corrective feedback (CF) you receive from your writing teacher on your grammar errors
 A. Very important B. important C. not important D. don’t know
2. If your answer for question 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for question 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your grammar errors, how often does he employ the following feedback methods? Please tick (√) in the boxes in front of each correction type to show the frequency at which your teacher applies that CF.

	Corrective feedback type	always	usuall y	sometime s	rarel y	never
A	Direct correction(where the teacher gives you the correct form)					

B	Indirect correction (where the teacher only indicates the presence of an error, but doesn't offer you the correct form)					
C	A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback					

5. If your writing teacher often uses direct correction (i.e., A in question 4 above), how often does he/she employ the following direct correction types? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each direct CF type to show the frequency at which your teacher uses that CF type.

	Direct CF type	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
A	Providing you the correct form near the error					
B	Conducting a conference session with you					
C	Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)					

6. If your writing teacher often uses indirect corrective feedback (i.e., B in question 4 above), how often does he/she employ the following indirect feedback types? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each indirect CF type to show the frequency of the CF type applied by your teacher.

	Indirect correction type	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
A	Underlining your errors					
B	Writing codes (like T for tense errors)					
C	Underlining and writing codes					
D	Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line					
E	Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are					
F	Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)					

7. Which of the following corrective feedback types do you prefer your writing teacher to use on your written grammar errors?

- D. Direct corrective feedback (where he/she provides you the correct form of your error)
- E. Indirect corrective feedback (where he/she simply indicates the presences of an error without telling you the correct answer)
- F. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

8. What is/are your reason/s for preferring either A, or B, or C in question 7 above?

9. If your answer for question 7 is A (i.e., direct correction), which of the following direct corrective feedback methods do you prefer most and which one do you prefer least? Please show your preference by ticking (✓) in the boxes in front of each correction type to show whether that CF type is your 1st, 2nd or 3rd choice or preference.

Direct corrective feedback types	1^s t	2ⁿ d	3^r d
Providing you the correct form near the error			
Conducting a conference session with you			
Providing you grammar explanation (orally or in written form)			

10. Could you please explain the reason/s for your ranking one of the above direct feedback types as 1st and the other as 3rd in question 9 above?

11. If your answer for question 7 above is B (i.e., if you prefer indirect correction), which of the following indirect feedback types do you prefer most and which ones least? Please rank your preference by writing 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 in front of each indirect CF type starting with 1 for the indirect CF type you prefer most and writing 6 for the one you prefer least.

Indirect corrective feedback types	Your preference (rank)
Underlining your errors	
Writing codes (e.g., T for tense errors)	
Underlining and writing codes	
Writing numbers or tallies on the margins of your paper to indicate the number of your errors in each line	
Writing codes on the margins parallel to the line where the errors are	
Writing comments regarding your errors (including directing you to a part of a book where you could refer)	

12. Could you please tell your reason/s why you prefer a certain indirect corrective feedback type in question 11 most and the other indirect correction type as least?

13. When your writing teacher offers you corrective feedback on your written grammar errors, which of the following corrective feedback types does he/she employ most?

- C. Focused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF focusing only some of your errors
- D. Unfocused CF, where the teacher provides you with CF covering all or most of your errors.

14. Which of the following corrective feedback types do you prefer your writing teacher to employ on your written grammar errors?

- B. Focused CF (where your teacher corrects only some of your grammar errors, not all your errors)
- C. Unfocused CF (where your writing teacher corrects all of your grammar errors)

15. Could you please explain the reason/s why you prefer either A or B in question 14 above?

16. When your writing teacher provides you corrective feedback on your grammatical errors, do you face any problem?

- B. Yes
- B. No

17. If your answer for question 16 is A, what kind of problem/s do you face?

18. What do you do with your paragraphs when you receive them back with corrective feedback from your writing teachers? How often do you do the following activities when you receive your paragraphs with corrections from your teacher? Please show by ticking (√) in the boxes in front of each activity regarding how often you do it.

	Actions	always	usuall y	sometime s	rarely	never
A	Rewriting your composition by incorporating the corrections					
B	Keeping a mental note of your errors					
C	Asking your friend/s for help					
D	Consulting a grammar book					
E	Doing nothing (simply you look at your marks and throw the paper)					

Appendix V

Questionnaire for EFL Writing Instructors (Main)

Dear instructor,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data for a Ph. D. research project entitled “**The Effectiveness of Focused versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback on Improving the Accuracy of EFL Students’ Writing**”. Therefore, you are kindly requested to respond to the questionnaire items which basically aim at finding out about your preferences for offering feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, your practices of offering such feedback, and your opinions of effective feedback practices.

Thank you.

1. How useful is it to point out grammatical errors in your students’ written work?
b. Very useful b. useful c. not useful d. difficult to decide
2. If your answer for question 1 is either A or B, what is/are your reason/s?

3. If your answer for question 1 is C, what is/are your reason/s?

4. When you are providing corrective feedback on your students’ written grammatical errors, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you use most often?

- A. Direct correction (where you provide the correct form for the student)
- B. Indirect correction (where you only indicate the presence of an error for the student)
- C. A combination of direct and indirect corrective feedback

5. What is/are your reason/s for most frequently using either A or B or C above?

6. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is A, which of the following types of direct correction do you employ most? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each direct CF type to indicate how frequently you apply that CF type.

Direct CF type	Always	usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
d. Giving grammar explanation					
e. Providing the correct answer					
f. Conducting a conference session					

7. What is/are your reason/s for employing a certain direct CF type always and another direct CF one rarely or never?

8. If your answer for Qun. 4 above is B (i.e., indirect CF type), which of the following indirect feedback types do you employ most often? Please tick (✓) in the boxes in front of each indirect CF type to show how frequently you employ that indirect CF type.

Indirect CF type	Always	Usually	Sometime s	Rarely	Never
g. Underlining the error					
h. Writing a code (e.g., T for tense)					
i. Underlining and writing a code					
j. Writing code/s in the margin of the line where the error happens					
k. Writing numbers in the margin indicating the number of errors in that line					
l. Writing comments at the end					

9. Could you please explain the reason/s why you employ a certain indirect CF type (in Qun. 8 above) always and another indirect CF type rarely or never?

10. Have you ever tried to identify your students' common grammatical errors as reflected in their writing? A. Yes B. No

11. If your answer for question 10 is Yes, what are the most common grammatical errors you find in your students' compositions?

12. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, which one of the following do you employ most?

- A. Focused/selective corrective feedback (where you provide CF only on some of your students' grammar errors)
- B. Unfocused/ comprehensive corrective feedback (where you try to provide CF on all of your students' grammar errors)

13. If your answer for question 12 is A, what is/are your reason/s for employing focused corrective feedback?

14. If your answer for question 12 is A, what kind of errors do you focus on and why?

15. If your answer for question 12 above is B, what is/are your reason/s for employing unfocused corrective feedback?

16. When you provide corrective feedback on your students' grammatical errors, do you face problems? A. Yes B. No
17. If your answer for question 16 is Yes, what problem/s do you face?

18. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback methods do you think are more fruitful in improving the accuracy of your students' written work?"
- A. Direct Corrective Feedback (where you provide the correct answers for grammar errors)
B. Indirect Corrective Feedback (where you simply indicate the presence of errors)
19. Could you please explain your reason/s for selecting either A or B above (Qun.18).

20. In your opinion, which one of the following corrective feedback types do you think is more fruitful in improving accuracy in your students' composition?
- C. Focused (selective)Corrective Feedback (where you correct only some of your students' grammar errors)
D. Unfocused (comprehensive) Corrective Feedback (where you provide correction on all of your students' grammar errors)
21. Could you please explain your reason/s for your choice of either A or B in question 20 above?

22. Your Qualification
- A. BA/BED in _____
B. MA/MED in _____
C. Ph. D in _____
23. For how long have you taught English? _____
24. At what level have you taught English?
- d) Elementary school _____ years
e) Secondary school _____ years
f) College/university _____ years

Appendix VI

Extracts from Students' Responses to Open-ended Items in their Questionnaire (Main)

Item 2: Students' Reasons for Believing that CF was Important in Improving their Writing Accuracy

- Corrective feedback is very important because students could correct themselves by understanding the previous wrongness (St.49).
- Because if someone made an error while he/she used grammatical rule, he/she needs corrections. After correction, he/she become the proper grammar user (St. 48).
- Those corrective errors are important for my writing on my whole academic process (St. 47).
- Because my teacher is one of the main source of my knowledge, It guides me my future work to be exact (St.46).
- Because having grammar skill is the most necessary skill to develop an English language. This skill is not realized once a time rather it is realized by continuous trying and learning from the mistake. Means that when the teacher show me my mistake, I lean from it (St.44).
- To avoid my grammar errors (St. 42).
- Because for improves some weakness (St. 40).
- Because it is an important things for avoiding error or mistake or it is the best learning mechanisms (St. 38).
- He give us very important knowledge about grammar and writing skill (St, 36).
- Since we are learners of writing skill it is important to know the grammar errors we made. If we improve our writing skill by using the teacher feedback it is advantageous for our next education stage (St. 35).
- Because it can improve my writing skill (St. 34).

- Because during writing our paragraph I made mistake that may in punctuation, capitalization and grammar. hence to correct this error the teachers are played important role (St.33).
-to be familiar with those grammars (St. 32).
- It is easy to know your mistake when the teacher gives you feedback (St. 31).
- To know grammar rules and to write correct paragraphs (St.30).
- ...to improve or to correct my errors for the future (St. 25).
- To improve writing skill (St. 24).
- Unless our teacher corrects our grammar, it is not truth value (St. 23).
- ...because it shapes students (St. 19).
-to know our mistakes and to correct (St. 22).
- Because negative feedback helps us to improve our weakness for another action (St. 17).
- Because it s impossible to develop our writing and grammar errors without feedback (St. 15).
- Because it is important to how to use grammar form in any type of writing (St. 13).
-to learn from our mistakes (St.11).
-it makes us a perfect writer (St. 6).
- Because the teacher better understands my error and I understand when the teacher corrects me (St. 4).
- ...because CF is one of the basic fundamental of writing.....to think more and more (St. 3)
-to know our grammatical problems and to write paragraph correctly (St. 7).
- ...to learn the mistakes (St.1).
-to learn from the past error and be good for the future (St. 43).
- We are educated from our error because learning from error is knowing everything (St. 26).
- ...not to repeat past mistakes (St. 14).
- If not corrected, I will make that mistake in the equation (St. 12).

Item 8: Students' Reasons for Preferring DCF

- Because it avoid information distortion (St. 38).
- Because if the feedback is not clear for me, I will ask the teacher directly what the error in my writing is (St. 44).
- Because if he tells the error and tells the correction we know our errors and takes the correct ones (St.2).
- Because I can know my error directly and it enables me refer where my error occur and internalize it for my future work correctly (St. 46).
- Because we can easily understand direct CF(St. 22).
- Because direct CF helps to be more effective in the next time (St. 7).

Item 8: Reasons of students for Preferring a combination of DCF and IDCF

- Because sometime we need to do something by ourselves and that helps us to dig more (St. 31).
- The teacher uses direct CF during lecture time and conversation, and indirect CF when we are writing (St. 32).
- From the errors some are difficult to correct by the student level. Such errors must be correct by the teacher. The simplest ones should be correct by student (St.47).
- Indirect CF like underlining errors might be good for tasks we do outside class. Direct CF might be important while we are working in class (St. 4).
- If we ask what our errors are, the teacher should directly tell us, but if the errors are simple, indirect CF is better (St. 11).
- Because some persons are aggressive when being commented (St.1).
- ...the combination is good to refer so many books and to ask others (St.10).
- ...if the teacher use both methods, students strive to answer the indirect one by using the example that given directly (St. 48).

Item 15 Students' Reasons for Preferring Focused CF

From the responses, the students who preferred focused CF had the following to say.

- Because they may not have a time to correct all of our errors (St.3)
- ...if the teacher uses unfocused CF, I will lose interest on the subject matter (St.14).
- Because the number of students is several, the teacher cannot correct all errors (St.4).
- Because all of the errors that revolves around us is not important (St. 15).
- Because it saves time (St. 43).
- Because by exempling the given example, students strive to answer the rest question, then in researching the answer for the question, they develop the ability to... (St, 48).

Item 15: Students' Reasons for Preferring Unfocused CF

- Because when the teacher corrects some of student errors, the students repeat their grammatical error, therefore they should correct all errors (St. 5).
- ...when the teacher shows me all of my errors, I will not repeat such error, but if he shows me some of them, I will repeat the remain error on other days (St.44).
- Because it help me to be corrected in all ways of grammar usage. If the teacher correct me based on some part of errors in my writing, I cannot improve my problem in all aspects (St.17).

- I prefer B because when the teacher left some of the errors without correcting them I might be take them as they were correct. (May I missed to correct them). (St. 47).
- Because it makes me all round perfection (St. 46).
- Because it helps me to solve all of my problem on writing. If the teacher focused only some of my errors I can't understand why I am not correct in the other of my errors (St. 35).
- One by one correction of grammar rules helps to have broad knowledge about correct grammar (St. 30).
- The writing teacher shall correct all of the grammar which the students are incorrect. Because it enables the students effective writers for the future (St. 49).

Item 17: Problems Students Said Face when Provided with CF by their Writing Teachers

- A problem of accepting my error as an error (St. 35).
- My handwriting is not good, so even if I didn't make a grammatical error, my teacher considered as I made an error in grammar (St. 47).
- The correction may be difficult to understand (St.57).
- When I ask the teacher what my errors are, he is no ok (St. 2).
- I tell you the truth in my mind create some "tilacha" [hatred] for the teacher and it also affect my reading style and I say I don't read this subject because it is meaningless (St. 14).
- Understanding problem (St. 54).
- Misunderstanding of idea (St. 55).
- Many reasons (St. 52)

Appendix VII

Extracts of Teachers' Responses to the Open-ended Items in the Questionnaire (Main)

Item 2: Teachers' Reasons for Believing that CF was Important to Improve the Accuracy of their Students' Writing

- I believe that students must get CF because it helps them improve their skills (T.2).
- Students can't understand their limitations (T.1).
- I consider accuracy as much important as fluency (T.3).
- Since the meaning of a sentence will be changed, it is essential to correct and focus on the students' grammatical errors (T.4).
- Because it would be difficult to convey messages without having grammatical knowledge (T.5).

- It is because unless we show them their errors from their written work, they will gradually internalize the same errors as if they are correct and use them in the future (T.6).
- Sometimes they [grammatical errors] change the meaning of sentences (T.7).
- It helps me to show the gaps students have in their writings. Grammatical errors can hinder communication, and students should be given some feedback (T.8).
- In order to write meaningful sentences, students should have some knowledge of grammar (T.9).
- The students need to identify correct grammar forms. It should not be neglected (T.10)

Item 5: Teachers' Reasons for Employing a Combination of DCF and IDCF

- When I feel students may not correct their mistakes and if I feel that students' mistakes will remain unchecked, I use direct correction. But if I feel that it is easy for them if I show their incorrectness, I use indirect correction (T.9)
- For I feel that indirect correction promotes self-learning, and sometimes direct correction may be needed when students fail to correct their own mistakes (T. T.8).
- Explicit grammar teaching makes the learning process mechanical. Hence, we should let the students recognize their grammatical errors (T.10).
- If I think the mistake made is grave and blocks the intended message, I provide the alternative. However, if it is a simple mistake, I try to indicate its presence by underlining it so that the student would give his/her attention to it (T. 3).
- If the error is quite easy and students can correct by themselves, I usually use indirect correction. If the error is a difficult one, I usually correct the error on the spot (T.1).
- Using a combination sounds good because there are students who may not understand teachers when they only indicate the errors. Giving direct feedback at all is not good as students always expect such corrections (T.2).

Item 13: Reasons of teachers for most often employing FCF

- Because it is impossible to give feedback to each and every errors that students create either knowingly or unknowingly (T.2).
- Their writings are most of the time full of errors. To correct all these errors it takes time....in one class there are around 70 students. Therefore, it is too difficult to see all students' grammatical errors one by one (T.7).

- It is important that they learn something one at a time (T.3).
- As the number of students is too many in one class, it is very difficult to correct all errors that all the students commit, so.... (T.4).
- I feel that teachers need to focus on major errors ...which distort communication (T.8).
- ...showing only some errors ...will help my students point out other mistakes (T.9).
- Because I want my students develop independent learning (T.10).
- Because some are errors and others mistakes. Some are not serious (I use error gravity as a parameter) which one is more serious is a question (T.1).

Item 14: Grammatical Errors which the writing Teachers Said to Focus on

- Agreement, spelling, tense, fragment, punctuation. These errors are serious errors ... would bring change in meaning (T.1).
- I focus on grammars that cause communication breakdown (T.10).
- I focus on grammar errors which cause meaning difference (T.9).
- Subject-verb errors, faulty sentences, spelling errors, capitalization and punctuation (T.7).
- I focus on the semantic aspect of the grammar error -if it is not clear what kind of message the student is trying to express (T.3).
- Faulty sentences-as it changes meaning of the sentence (T.2).

Item 11: Grammatical Errors the Teachers Identified to be Common in their Students' Writings

- Subject-verb agreement error (T.7).
- Dangling modifiers, misplaced modifiers, subject-verb disagreement, pronoun antecedent disagreement, comma splice, run-ons, non-parallel structure (T.5).
- Subject-verb agreement, tense usage, punctuation (T.2).
- Subject-verb agreement, passive construction, verb tense (T.3).
- Tense, subject-verb agreement, and this alters the meaning of the sentence (T.4).
- Subject-verb disagreement, tense and number related errors (T.8).
- Tense, capitalization, punctuation (T.9).
- Grammar errors, capitalization errors, tense errors, spelling errors, etc (T.6).
- My students use the grammar of their native language which doesn't correspond to English (T.10).
- Agreement errors, tense, voice (T.1).

Item 17: Problems the Writing Teachers Reported to Face while Providing CF

- Some students do not accept corrective feedback positively. Some students do not internalize the feedback. They repeatedly commit the same error (T.1).
- When I skip some errors, the students assume that they have produced written work with little errors (T.10).

- Sometimes, I find students' work totally difficult to even start giving feedback as some students' work is totally full of errors and has nothing to convey (T.9).
- The majority of the class may not understand, even the corrections (T.8).
- As the students see their work corrected, they may feel that disappointed because they consider as if their writing was good (T.4).
- Sometimes, correcting or editing others' work is time consumer than doing it by myself. I prefer writing than editing because it is complicated (T.7).
- Some students are unable to understand the feedback, it might be because of the language problem...If I give feedback, they always look for it instead of looking their effort (T.2).
- The student will give up trying to write in fear of making grammatical errors (T.6).
- Correcting all their sentences as all of their sentences are always full of errors (T.5).
- Sometimes a student's grammatical error could be many and the ideas may be incoherent. These make it difficult to provide even sentence feedback (T.3).

Item 19: Teachers' Reasons for Believing that DCF was more fruitful than IDCF

- Personally, I believe using IDCF is good, but students are reluctant to address some of the limitation of their work. They do not want to see their work again, so DCF is effective for this reason (T.1).
- The students may ask the teacher why the answer for this is just like in this way. They need further explanation from their teacher why it is so (T.4).
- Nowadays, if I indicate them their mistakes, they do not try to correct the error by themselves; they don't worry about except some students (T.7).
- They have to be told everything directly. If you don't, I don't think they will go home or to the library to refer to books to know about their mistakes (T.5).

Item 19: Teachers' Responses for Believing that IDCF was more effective than DCF

- I need to minimize the tendency of teacher dependency. The students should learn on their own so that they can gain knowledge and skill which can be retained (T.10).
- This will help students to search for their mistakes by themselves and improve their writing (T.9).
- It promotes self-learning. Students can identify their own problems ...and self-correct (T.8).
- DCF is spoon feeding, but we should expect more efforts from our students. They should try to correct themselves because trial and error teaches them more than teachers (T. 2).

- I feel that IDCF is better because it lets the student to think of the error and correct it by himself rather than always depending on the teacher (T.6).

Item 21: Teachers' Reasons for Believing that FCF was more Beneficial than UFCF

- We should let our students to correct their writing errors after they observe similar corrections by the teacher (T. 6).
- I have to focus on serious problems than minor errors (T.2).
- When I correct some of the errors and underline the others, they can correct the others based on the corrected ones (T.7).
- Due to the presence of many students in a CR, it is so tiresome to give a feedback for the whole class so that I should rely on giving the feedback for some students and I ask them to discuss with the rest students about the errors that the whole students have got mistaken (T.4).
- It enables teachers to attack grammatical errors that are serious and distort communication; besides students may not grab all the corrections when we apply the unfocused one (T. 8).
- Students should work out some of the mistakes by themselves (T.9).
- Pointing out all the mistakes a student makes may not be effective in improving accuracy...Depending on the number of mistakes, the student may either give up hope and lose confidence, so on my part, I prefer selective feedback (T.3).

Appendix VIII: Data from the 3 compositions by all students (Main)

No	Comp.1			Comp.2			Comp.3				
	ER	WD	Prop	No	ER	WD	Prop	No	ER	WD	Prop
1	27	130	0.466	1	15	71	0.298	1	20	92	0.430
2	21	130	0.362	2	12	144	0.238	2	17	95	0.365
3	34	148	0.586	3	19	123	0.377	3	9	66	0.193
4	38	176	0.655	4	24	103	0.477	4	30	139	0.644
5	31	115	0.535	5	24	73	0.477	5	16	57	0.344
6	52	130	0.897	6	32	116	0.635	6	34	90	0.730
7	19	128	0.328	7	14	131	0.278	7	14	120	0.301
8	25	117	0.431	8	35	119	0.695	8	27	99	0.560
9	32	114	0.552	9	--	--	--	9	16	72	0.344
10	38	169	0.655	10	25	132	0.496	10	15	100	0.322
11	32	76	0.552	11	11	113	0.218	11	22	78	0.473
12	21	117	0.362	12	23	92	0.457	12	29	104	0.623
13	32	100	0.552	13	16	48	0.318	13	17	62	0.365
14	32	113	0.552	14	--	--	--	14	--	--	--
15	34	105	0.586	15	23	76	0.457	15	5	72	0.107
16	35	102	0.604	16	40	81	0.794	16	33	91	0.709
17	20	99	0.345	17	21	110	0.417	17	16	86	0.344
18	17	92	0.293	18	14	88	0.278	18	8	104	0.172
19	49	151	0.845	19	39	139	0.774	19	17	87	0.365
20	27	115	0.466	20	25	100	0.496	20	20	80	0.430
21	25	117	0.431	21	21	77	0.417	21	19	65	0.408
22	13	99	0.224	22	30	107	0.596	22	5	64	0.107
23	13	104	0.224	23	23	103	0.457	23	18	122	0.387
24	40	137	0.690	24	32	144	0.635	24	--	--	--
25	16	105	0.276	25	11	82	0.218	25	14	79	0.301
26	46	156	0.793	26	30	140	0.596	26	34	127	0.730
27	11	61	0.190	27	16	103	0.318	27	15	96	0.322
28	10	118	0.172	28	16	104	0.318	28	13	82	0.279
29	18	99	0.310	29	34	113	0.675	29	17	118	0.365
30	18	85	0.310	30	24	105	0.477	30	22	93	0.473
31	37	109	0.638	31	14	98	0.278	31	16	118	0.344
32	17	77	0.293	32	16	82	0.318	32	22	89	0.473
33	30	138	0.517	33	15	99	0.298	33	12	90	0.258
34	35	169	0.604	34	29	121	0.576	34	22	84	0.473
35	20	94	0.345	35	22	93	0.437	35	13	60	0.279
36	18	91	0.310	36	38	124	0.754	36	31	81	0.666
37	16	79	0.276	37	12	72	0.238	37	12	92	0.258
38	43	120	0.741	38	20	81	0.397	38	25	83	0.537
39	15	104	0.259	39	23	106	0.457	39	21	173	0.451
40	18	89	0.310	40	31	129	0.616	40	17	68	0.365
41	19	103	0.328	41	15	94	0.298	41	9	96	0.193
42	22	71	0.379	42	15	54	0.298	42	29	87	0.623
43	27	119	0.466	43	21	121	0.417	43	13	102	0.279
44	13	112	0.224	44	--	--	--	44	17	135	0.365
45	29	75	0.500	45	19	57	0.377	45	23	70	0.494
46	15	98	0.259	46	18	127	0.357	46	15	117	0.322
47	38	137	0.655	47	20	144	0.397	47	12	101	0.258
48	29	94	0.500	48	29	103	0.576	48	38	98	0.816
49	20	82	0.345	49	20	93	0.397	49	19	101	0.408
50	50	150	0.862	50	27	100	0.536	50	25	103	0.537
51	14	92	0.241	51	23	125	0.457	51	17	67	0.365
52	25	89	0.431	52	17	77	0.338	52	21	101	0.451
	1,376	5,800	23.727		1,093	5,037	21.704		951	4,656	20.408

grammatical errors committed by each student

- WD= Number of words written by each student
- Prop= Proportion of No. of gram. Errors by each student to Tot. No. of words written by all the Sts X 100

• E
R
=n
u
m
b
e
r
o
f

APPENDIX IX

No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp.1 (main)

	WC	FR	PR	PU	SP	AR	CN	QU	PS	UN	O M	VF	WF	Pm	W O	AW	Prl	
1	2	4	6					1		1	1	5	7					27
2	2	1	2	2			1			1		6	6					21
3	3	4		8	3		4			3		6	3					34
4	4	2	2	6		1			3	4		6	7	1	1	1		38
5		4	3	1	1	2					2	8	7	1	1	1		31
6	2	5	3	10	3	2	1		1	1	1	11	9	2	1			52
7		1	1	2		2	2		1			4	6					19
8		2	3	1		1		1		3		5	7		1		1	25
9	3	2	2	9	1		3				2	6	2			2		32
10	2	3	3	5		1			1	4		12	5	1	1			38
11	1	3	5		3	1	1			4	1	4	7		1	1		32
12	2	2	3	2			1			1	1		9					21
13			3	4	2	3	2	1		2		7	3	3	1	1		32
14		2	2	9	1	1	1	1		4	1	6	1	1	1	1		32
15	2	3	3	4		4				1	3	7	5	1	1			34
16	1	2	2	1	2	2	1			4	4	4	9	1		2		35
17		1	3	3		1				2	1	3	5	1				20
18	4	5	1	1							1		4				1	17
19	1	2	9	5		3	1			3	8	5	6	3	2		1	49
20		1	4	5							1	4	10	1	1			27
21	2	3	1	6		1	1			2		3	3		1	1	1	25
22	3	1	3	3								2	1					13
23		2		1		1					1	3	3	1	1			13
24	4	1	6	7					4	2	2	7	4	1	1		1	40
25	2			4	1	1	1					3	3	1				16
26	3	1	3	8	2	2	1			5	3	6	11	1				46
27				2								4	5					11
28		1		3	1							2	1	2				10
29	2		1	3	1	1		1	1	1	1	3	2		1			18
30	2	3	3	1		1				1	3	2	2					18
31	1	3	3			1	2		1	1	2	4	14	1	4			37
32		3	1	5			1			1	1	4		1				17
33	1			5		3		1		2	1	8	7	2				30
34	2	1	3	7		2	2	2	1	1		7	4	1		2		35
35	2			3	1						3	6	4	1				20
36	3	1	5	1		1						4	3					18
37	1	1				1	1				1	3	6			1	1	16
38		1	5	5		3	1	1		1	4	12	7	2	1			43
39		2		1		2						4	6					15
40	1		1	1	2			2	3	1		1	6					18
41	1	1	3	4	1		1			1		4		2	1			19
42		2	1	5		2	3			2	2	3	1	1				22
43		1	2	7		6		1			1	4	5					27
44	1	1	1	3		1			1	1	1	3						13
45	1			10	5	3						4	6					29
46	2		1	6								3	3					15
47	2	3	6	8			1			1		4	7	5	1			38
48	1	3	4	4		4	1					4	2		4	2		29
49		3	3	3			1			1		2	4			2	1	20
50	3	2	4	14		3	1			4	3	5	9	2				50
51	1			6				1		2		2	2					14
52		1	2	11	4		1			2		1	1	2				25
	70	90	122	225	34	62	38	13	17	70	56	236	250	42	27	17	7	1,376

APPENDIX X

No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp. 2 (main)

	WC	FR	PR	PU	SP	AR	CN	QU	PS	UN	O M	VF	WF	Prn	W O	AW	Prl	
1	1	1	1	2		1						4	4		1			15
2	1		1	1		1				1		2	3	1	1			12
3		1		1						1		8	7	1				19
4	2	1		1		2	1		4	4		4	4		1			24
5	1	3	1	1	1	1			1			8	6	1				24
6		3	4	3	2	2	3		3			5	4		1	2		32
7	1		2	2	1				1	1	1	2	1	1	1			14
8	1	2		6	1	1	2				1	12	3	5		1		35
9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10		1	2	4			1		5	2		5	2	1	1	1		25
11			1	7								2	1					11
12	3	1	2	5		1				1		2	7	1				23
13	2	3		2						1	1	2	3	2				16
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15		7		1		2				2		4	4	1	1		1	23
16		3	7	1	7		2		3	4		6	4	2	1			40
17				2	1	4	1		1	1		9	1	1				21
18	6			1	1							4	1	1				14
19	2	2	9	4			1			2	1	7	9	2				39
20		2	4	5		4				1	1	2	3	2	1			25
21	1	2	1	4								2	8	2		1		21
22	2	2	6	5		2	1		1	1	1	7	1	1				30
23	3	5	1	2		1				1		2	7			1		23
24	1	3	3	3		1			1	4	2	6	6	1	1			32
25				1	1					1		6	2					11
26	1	2	1	3		4	3			1		9	2		2	2		30
27	1		1	3		1				1		4	3	2				16
28	1		1	3		2			1	1		1	3	2	1			16
29			3	4	1	3	2			1		3	16	1				34
30	3		1	1		2	1			1	1	8	1	4	1			24
31		1	1	2		1	1					3	3	2				14
32	1	1							2			3	4	3	2			16
33	2	1	1	3						1		3	3	1				15
34	2	1		4		2		1		2	2	8	7					29
35	1		2	1							1	8	9					22
36	1	3	6	3	1	1	1					8	2	4	6	2		38
37		2		2		1		1				3	3					12
38	3	1	2	4							1	4	4	1				20
39	3		1	2		2						7	8					23
40	2	1	2	4	2	2	2		2	2	1	6	3	1	1			31
41	1			1		1			2		1	3	2	4				15
42	3	2	1	4	2	1	1									1		15
43	1		5	1		1	1					6	6					21
44	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
45	1			3	2		1				1	4	5	2				19
46	1		3	3	1	1				1		4	2	1			1	18
47	1	2		7			1			1		2	2	4				20
48	2	1	1	3	1		1			2	1	5	8	3			1	29
49			1	3	1		1				1	7	3	2		1		20
50		1	1	2	1	4				1		5	10	2				27
51				8		1			1			7	3	3				23
52	3	1	1	4		2						1	5					17
	61	62	80	142	27	55	28	2	28	43	18	233	208	68	23	12	3	1093

APPENDIX: XI

No. of errors of each grammatical category by each student in Comp. 3 (main)

St	WC	FR	PR	PU	SP	AR	CN	QU	PS	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	W O	AW	Prl	
1			1	2		1	1		1	1		8	1	2	2			20
2	2	1	3		1	1						2	6		1			17
3	1	2	1				1				2	2						9
4	3	1	3	5		3	2			1		6	3	1		2		30
5	1	2	1	1		1	2				1	4	2		1			16
6	1	3	2	7			4	1		1	2	8	3	1		1		34
7	1			8		1	1			1		1	1					14
8	2		1	3		4	1			2	1	5	7				1	27
9		3	3	4			2					3	1					16
10		1		2		3	1		1	1		3	1	1	1			15
11		2	2	4		3	3			2		3	3					22
12			2	6		1	2			1	3	5	6	3				29
13	1	2	1	2			2					2	4	1	2			17
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
15	1											1	1	1	1			5
16	2	2	3	2		4	3			1	1	4	3	1	3	4		33
17	2	1	1	1		1					1	5	2	1			1	16
18				4							1	2	1					8
19		1	1	2			1	1		1	2	5	2	1				17
20		3	2	3			2			2	1	2	2		1	2		20
21		2		2	1		1				1	5	3	3			1	19
22			1									1	1	2				5
23	1	3	3	2		1	1				1	4	1	1				18
24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
25			2	2					1			2	6	1				14
26		3	2	1			5			8	3	3	5	1	2	1		34
27		1		2	2							6	3	1			0	15
28	1	1		3			4					3	1					13
29				3		2	1			3		6	1				1	17
30		1	1	10			1	2		1		2	3			1		22
31		2	1			1	3	1				7	1					16
32		2	1	7		1				2		7			2			22
33	2			4						1		3	1	1				12
34	1	2		6						2	1	4	5	1				22
35			1	3		2	1					2	4					13
36		6	1	3		3	5			2		6	3		1	1		31
37						2	1			2		5	2					12
38	2		2	7	1	2	2	1		1	1	2	3	1				25
39		1		6		2						7	4	1				21
40	1	1		2		2	1			1		4	5					17
41		1			1							7						9
42	4	4	1	2	3	2	3		1		5	2	2					29
43				1		4						7	1					13
44		3	1	2	1	1					1	2	5		1			17
45		3	1	4	4					2	1	2	5	1				23
46	1		3			1			2			4	4					15
47		2	1	2							2	1	3	1				12
48		2	4	6	1	2	3		1	3	2	9	1		2	2		38
49			5	2	2		1	1		1	1	3	2	1				19
50	1	2		4		1	1			1	2	4	5	2	1	1		25
51			1	4			1			2		3	4	1			1	17
52		3	3	2			2					7	4					21
	31	69	62	148	17	52	65	7	6	47	36	201	137	32	21	15	5	951

APPENDIX: XII

Number and proportion of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in the 3 Compositions (Main)

No.	Composition 1		Composition 2		Composition3	
	No. of errors	Prop. of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in Comp. 1 to total No. of words by the group in Comp.1 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in Comp. 2 to total No. of words by the group in Comp.2 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. of grammar errors by each student in the FCFG in Comp. 3 to total No. of words by the group in Comp.3 X 100
1	27	0.970	15	0.609	20	0.854
3	34	1.221	19	0.771	9	0.384
5	31	1.114	24	0.974	16	0.683
7	19	0.683	14	0.568	14	0.598
9	32	1.149	--	--	16	0.683
11	32	1.149	11	0.446	22	0.939
13	32	1.149	16	0.649	17	0.726
15	34	1.221	23	0.933	5	0.214
17	20	0.718	21	0.852	16	0.683
19	49	1.760	39	1.582	17	0.726
21	25	0.898	21	0.852	19	0.811
23	13	0.467	23	0.933	18	0.769
25	16	0.575	11	0.446	14	0.598
27	11	0.395	16	0.649	15	0.641
29	18	0.647	34	1.380	17	0.726
31	37	1.329	14	0.568	16	0.683
33	30	1.078	15	0.609	12	0.512
35	20	0.718	22	0.893	13	0.555
37	16	0.575	12	0.487	12	0.512
39	15	0.539	23	0.933	21	0.897
41	19	0.683	15	0.609	9	0.384
43	27	0.970	21	0.852	13	0.555
45	29	1.042	19	0.771	23	0.982
47	38	1.365	20	0.812	12	0.512
49	20	0.718	20	0.812	19	0.811
51	14	0.503	23	0.933	17	0.726
	658	23.636	491	19.923	402	17.164

APPENDIX XIII

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp.1, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
1	2	4	6					1		1	1	5	7					27
3	3	4		8	3		4			3		6	3					34
5		4	3	1	1	2				2		8	7	1	1	1		31
7		1	1	2		2	2		1			4	6					19
9	3	2	2	9	1		3				2	6	2			2		32
11	1	3	5		3	1	1			4	1	4	7		1	1		32
13			3	4	2	3	2	1		2		7	3	3	1	1		32
15	2	3	3	4		4				1	3	7	5	1	1			34
17		1	3	3		1				2	1	3	5	1				20
19	1	2	9	5		3	1			3	8	5	6	3	2		1	49
21	2	3	1	6		1	1			2		3	3		1	1	1	25
23		2		1		1					1	3	3	1	1			13
25	2			4	1	1	1					3	3	1				16
27				2								4	5					11
29	2		1	3	1	1		1	1	1	1	3	2		1			18
31	1	3	3			1	2		1	1	2	4	14	1	4			37
33	1			5		3		1		2	1	8	7	2				30
35	2			3	1						3	6	4	1				20
37	1	1				1	1				1	3	6			1	1	16
39		2		1		2						4	6					15
41	1	1	3	4	1		1			1		4		2	1			19
43		1	2	7		6		1			1	4	5					27
45	1			10	5	3						4	6					29
47	2	3	6	8			1			1		4	7	5	1			38
49		3	3	3			1			1		2	4			2	1	20
51	1			6				1		2		2	2					14
	28	43	54	99	19	36	21	6	3	27	28	116	128	22	15	9	4	658
%	1.00	1.54	1.94	3.55	.	1.29	.754	.	.108	.970	1.00	4.16	4.59	.790	.539	.323	.	23.635
	6	5	0	7	682	3		216			6	7	8				144	

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 1=2,784
- Number of errors by the FCFG students in composition 1=658
- Proportion of total number of errors by the FCFG students to total number of words by the FCFG=23.635

APPENDIX XIV

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp.2, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
1	1	1	1	2		1						4	4		1			15
3		1		1						1		8	7	1				19
5	1	3	1	1	1	1			1			8	6	1				24
7	1		2	2	1				1	1	1	2	1	1	1			14
9	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
11			1	7								2	1					11
13	2	3		2						1	1	2	3	2				16
15		7		1		2				2		4	4	1	1		1	23
17				2	1	4	1		1	1		9	1	1				21
19	2	2	9	4			1			2	1	7	9	2				39
21	1	2	1	4								2	8	2		1		21
23	3	5	1	2		1				1		2	7			1		23
25				1	1					1		6	2					11
27	1		1	3		1				1		4	3	2				16
29			3	4	1	3	2			1		3	16	1				34
31		1	1	2		1	1					3	3	2				14
33	2	1	1	3						1		3	3	1				15
35	1		2	1							1	8	9					22
37		2		2		1		1				3	3					12
39	3		1	2		2						7	8					23
41	1			1		1			2		1	3	2	4				15
43	1		5	1		1	1					6	6					21
45	1			3	2		1				1	4	5	2				19
47	1	2		7			1			1		2	2	4				20
49			1	3	1		1				1	7	3	2		1		20
51				8		1			1			7	3	3				23
%	22	30	31	69	8	20	9	1	6	14	7	116	119	32	3	3	1	491

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 2=2, 464
- Number of errors by the FCFG students in composition 2=491
- Proportion of total number of errors by the FCFG students to total number of words by the FCFG=19.927

APPENDIX XV

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the FCFG (Comp. 3, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
1			1	2		1	1		1	1		8	1	2	2			20
3	1	2	1				1				2	2						9
5	1	2	1	1		1	2				1	4	2		1			16
7	1			8		1	1			1		1	1					14
9		3	3	4			2					3	1					16
11		2	2	4		3	3			2		3	3					22
13	1	2	1	2			2					2	4	1	2			17
15	1											1	1	1	1			5
17	2	1	1	1		1					1	5	2	1			1	16
19		1	1	2			1	1		1	2	5	2	1				17
21		2		2	1		1				1	5	3	3			1	19
23	1	3	3	2		1	1				1	4	1	1				18
25			2	2						1		2	6	1				14
27		1		2	2							6	3	1			0	15
29				3		2	1			3		6	1				1	17
31		2	1			1	3	1				7	1					16
33	2			4						1		3	1	1				12
35			1	3		2	1					2	4					13
37						2	1			2		5	2					12
39		1		6		2						7	4	1				21
41		1			1							7						9
43				1		4						7	1					13
45		3	1	4	4					2	1	2	5	1				23
47		2	1	2							2	1	3	1				12
49			5	2	2		1	1		1	1	3	2	1				19
51			1	4			1			2		3	4	1			1	17
	10	28	26	61	10	21	23	3	1	17	12	104	58	18	6	0	4	402
%	0.42	1.19	1.110	2.60	.	.897	.982	.128	.043	.726	.512	4.44	2.47	.769	.256	0	.	17.16
	7	6		5	427							1	7				159	

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 3=2, 342
- Number of errors by the FCFG students in composition 3=402
- Proportion of total number of errors by the FCFG students to total number of words by the FCFG=17.164

Appendix XVI

Number and proportion of grammar errors and words by the students in the UFCFG in the 3 Compositions (Main)

No.	Composition 1		Composition 2		Composition 3	
	No. of errors	Prop. Of no. of grammar errors by each student in the UFCFG in Comp. 1 to the total no. of words by this group in Comp.2 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. Of no. of grammar errors by each student in the UFCFG in Comp. 2 to the total no. of words by this group in Comp.2 X 100	No. of errors	Prop. Of no. of grammar errors by each student in the UFCFG in Comp. 3 to the total no. of words by this group in Comp.3 X 100
2	21	0.696	12	0.466	17	0.735
4	38	1.260	24	0.933	30	1.297
6	52	1.724	32	1.244	34	1.470
8	25	0.829	35	1.361	27	1.167
10	38	1.260	25	0.972	15	0.648
12	21	0.696	23	0.894	29	1.253
14	32	1.061	--	--	--	--
16	35	1.161	40	1.555	33	1.426
18	17	0.564	14	0.544	8	0.346
20	27	0.895	25	0.972	20	0.864
22	13	0.431	30	1.166	5	0.216
24	40	1.326	32	1.244	--	--
26	46	1.525	30	1.166	34	1.470
28	10	0.332	16	0.622	13	0.562
30	18	0.597	24	0.933	22	0.951
32	17	0.564	16	0.622	22	0.951
34	35	1.161	29	1.127	22	0.951
36	18	0.597	38	1.477	31	1.340
38	43	1.426	20	0.777	25	1.080
40	18	0.597	31	1.205	17	0.735
42	22	0.729	15	0.583	29	1.253
44	13	0.431	--	--	17	0.735
46	15	0.497	18	0.700	15	0.648
48	29	0.962	29	1.127	38	1.642
50	50	1.658	27	1.049	25	1.080
52	25	0.829	17	0.661	21	0.906
	718	23.808	602	23.400	549	23.726

APPENDIX XVII

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.1, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
2	2	1	2	2			1			1		6	6					21
4	4	2	2	6		1			3	4		6	7	1	1	1		38
6	2	5	3	10	3	2	1		1	1	1	11	9	2	1			52
8		2	3	1		1		1		3		5	7		1		1	25
10	2	3	3	5			1		1	4		12	5	1	1			38
12	2	2	3	2			1			1	1		9					21
14		2	2	9	1	1	1	1		4	1	6	1	1	1	1		32
16	1	2	2	1	2	2	1			4	4	4	9	1		2		35
18	4	5	1	1							1		4				1	17
20		1	4	5							1	4	10	1	1			27
22	3	1	3	3								2	1					13
24	4	1	6	7					4	2	2	7	4	1	1		1	40
26	3	1	3	8	2	2	1			5	3	6	11	1				46
28		1		3	1							2	1	2				10
30	2	3	3	1		1				1	3	2	2					18
32		3	1	5			1			1	1	4		1				17
34	2	1	3	7		2	2	2	1	1		7	4	1		2		35
36	3	1	5	1		1						4	3					18
38		1	5	5		3	1	1		1	4	12	7	2	1			43
40	1		1	1	2			2	3	1		1	6					18
42		2	1	5		2	3			2	2	3	1	1				22
44	1	1	1	3		1			1	1	1	3						13
46	2		1	6								3	3					15
48	1	3	4	4		4	1					4	2		4	2		29
50	3	2	4	14		3	1			4	3	5	9	2				50
52		1	2	11	4		1			2		1	1	2				25
	42	47	68	126	15	26	17	7	14	43	28	120	122	20	12	8	3	718
%	1.39	1.55	2.25	4.17	.	.862	.564	.232	.464	1.42	.928	3.97	4.04	.663	.398	.265	.	0.100
	3	8	5	8	497					6		9	5					

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 1=3,016
- Number of errors by the UFCG students in composition 1=718
- Proportion of total number of errors by the students in the UFCFG to the total number of words produced by the students in this group=.23.806

APPENDIX XVIII

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.2, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
2	1		1	1		1				1		2	3	1	1			12
4	2	1		1		2	1		4	4		4	4		1			24
6		3	4	3	2	2	3		3			5	4		1	2		32
8	1	2		6	1	1	2				1	12	3	5		1		35
10		1	2	4			1		5	2		5	2	1	1	1		25
12	3	1	2	5		1				1		2	7	1				23
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16		3	7	1	7		2		3	4		6	4	2	1			40
18	6			1	1							4	1	1				14
20		2	4	5		4				1	1	2	3	2	1			25
22	2	2	6	5		2	1		1	1	1	7	1	1				30
24	1	3	3	3		1			1	4	2	6	6	1	1			32
26	1	2	1	3		4	3			1		9	2		2	2		30
28	1		1	3		2			1	1		1	3	2	1			16
30	3		1	1		2	1			1	1	8	1	4	1			24
32	1	1							2			3	4	3	2			16
34	2	1		4		2		1		2	2	8	7					29
36	1	3	6	3	1	1	1					8	2	4	6	2		38
38	3	1	2	4							1	4	4	1				20
40	2	1	2	4	2	2	2		2	2	1	6	3	1	1			31
42	3	2	1	4	2	1	1									1		15
44	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
46	1		3	3	1	1				1		4	2	1			1	18
48	2	1	1	3	1		1			2	1	5	8	3			1	29
50		1	1	2	1	4				1		5	10	2				27
52	3	1	1	4		2						1	5					17
39	32	49	73	19	35	19	1	22	29	11	117	89	36	20	9	2		602
%	1.51	1.24	1.90	2.83	.	1.36	.738	.039	.855	1.12	.428	4.54	3.45	1.39	.777	.350	.	
	6	4	4	8	738	0				7		7	9	9			078	

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 2=2,573
- Number of errors by the UFCG students in composition 2=602
- Proportion of total number of errors by the students in the UFCFG to the total number of words produced by the students in this group=23.400

APPENDIX: XIX

Number of errors in each grammatical category by each student in the UFCFG (Comp.3, main)

	WC	Frg	Prp	PU	SP	Art	Con	Qu	Pos	UN	OM	VF	WF	Prn	WO	Awk	Prl	
2	2	1	3		1	1						2	6		1			17
4	3	1	3	5		3	2			1		6	3	1		2		30
6	1	3	2	7			4	1		1	2	8	3	1		1		34
8	2		1	3		4	1			2	1	5	7				1	27
10		1		2		3	1		1	1		3	1	1	1			15
12			2	6		1	2			1	3	5	6	3				29
14	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
16	2	2	3	2		4	3			1	1	4	3	1	3	4		33
18				4							1	2	1					8
20		3	2	3			2			2	1	2	2		1	2		20
22			1									1	1	2				5
24	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
26		3	2	1			5			8	3	3	5	1	2	1		34
28	1	1		3			4					3	1					13
30		1	1	10			1	2		1		2	3			1		22
32		2	1	7		1				2		7			2			22
34	1	2		6						2	1	4	5	1				22
36		6	1	3		3	5			2		6	3		1	1		31
38	2		2	7	1	2	2	1		1	1	2	3	1				25
40	1	1		2		2	1			1		4	5					17
42	4	4	1	2	3	2	3		1		5	2	2					29
44		3	1	2	1	1					1	2	5		1			17
46	1		3			1			2			4	4					15
48		2	4	6	1	2	3		1	3	2	9	1		2	2		38
50	1	2		4		1	1			1	2	4	5	2	1	1		25
52		3	3	2			2					7	4					21
	21	41	36	87	7	31	42	4	5	30	24	97	79	14	15	15	1	549
%	.908	1.77	1.55	3.76	.	1.34	1.815	.173	.216	1.29	1.037	4.19	3.41	.605	.648	.648	.	23.725
		2	6	0	303	0				7		2	4				043	

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 3=2,314
- Number of errors by the UFCG students in composition 3=549
- Proportion of total number of errors by the students in the UFCFG to the total number of words produced by the students in this group=23.725

APPENDIX XX

Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the 3 compositions (All, Main)

No.	Comp.1		Comp.2		Comp.3	
	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion
1	22	0.379	12	0.238	12	0.258
2	17	0.293	7	0.139	12	0.258
3	21	0.362	17	0.338	5	0.107
4	23	0.396	10	0.199	18	0.387
5	23	0.396	19	0.377	10	0.215
6	38	0.655	19	0.377	23	0.494
7	14	0.241	7	0.139	10	0.215
8	18	0.310	23	0.457	16	0.344
9	21	0.362	--	--	14	0.301
10	28	0.483	14	0.278	7	0.150
11	19	0.328	11	0.218	14	0.301
12	16	0.276	17	0.338	19	0.408
13	17	0.293	10	0.199	11	0.236
14	20	0.345	--	--	--	--
15	22	0.379	16	0.318	2	0.043
16	18	0.310	21	0.417	14	0.301
17	15	0.259	12	0.238	10	0.215
18	11	0.290	6	0.119	7	0.150
19	27	0.466	31	0.616	11	0.236
20	24	0.414	16	0.318	12	0.258
21	16	0.276	17	0.338	12	0.258
22	10	0.172	21	0.417	3	0.064
23	9	0.155	17	0.338	13	0.279
24	25	0.431	21	0.417	--	--
25	10	0.172	9	0.179	12	0.258
26	29	0.500	17	0.338	14	0.301
27	11	0.290	11	0.218	12	0.258
28	7	0.121	8	0.159	8	0.172
29	9	0.155	26	0.516	10	0.215
30	11	0.290	11	0.218	17	0.365
31	24	0.414	10	0.199	11	0.236
32	13	0.224	8	0.159	17	0.365
33	20	0.345	11	0.218	8	0.172
34	22	0.379	20	0.397	17	0.365
35	13	0.224	13	0.258	10	0.215
36	14	0.241	22	0.437	19	0.408
37	10	0.172	10	0.199	7	0.150
38	30	0.517	15	0.298	14	0.301
39	13	0.224	18	0.357	18	0.387
40	9	0.155	16	0.318	12	0.258
41	12	0.207	6	0.119	8	0.172
42	12	0.207	7	0.139	11	0.236
43	19	0.328	18	0.357	9	0.193
44	8	0.138	--	--	13	0.279
45	20	0.345	12	0.238	15	0.322
46	13	0.224	12	0.238	11	0.236
47	28	0.483	13	0.258	9	0.193
48	17	0.293	18	0.357	22	0.473
49	15	0.259	14	0.278	10	0.215
50	34	0.586	19	0.377	15	0.322
51	10	0.172	18	0.357	12	0.258
52	16	0.276	12	0.238	19	0.408
	923	16.212	737	13.343	617	13.211

- Number of words by all the students in composition 1=5,800
- Number of words by all the students in composition 2=5,037
- Number of words by all the students in composition 3=4,656

APPENDIX: XXI

Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the FCFG in the 3 compositions (Main)

No	Comp.1		Comp.2		Comp.3	
	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion
1	22	0.790	12	0.487	12	0.512
3	21	0.754	17	0.690	5	0.214
5	23	0.826	19	0.771	10	0.427
7	14	0.503	19	0.771	10	0.427
9	21	0.754	--	--	14	0.598
11	19	0.683	11	0.446	14	0.598
13	17	0.611	10	0.406	11	0.470
15	22	0.790	16	0.649	2	0.085
17	15	0.539	12	0.487	10	0.427
19	27	0.970	31	1.258	11	0.470
21	16	0.575	17	0.690	12	0.512
23	9	0.323	17	0.690	13	0.555
25	10	0.359	9	0.365	12	0.512
27	11	0.395	11	0.446	12	0.512
29	9	0.323	26	1.055	10	0.427
31	24	0.862	10	0.406	11	0.470
33	20	0.718	11	0.446	8	0.342
35	13	0.467	20	0.812	10	0.427
37	10	0.359	10	0.406	7	0.299
39	13	0.467	18	0.731	18	0.769
41	12	0.431	6	0.244	8	0.342
43	19	0.683	18	0.731	9	0.384
45	20	0.718	12	0.487	15	0.640
47	28	1.006	13	0.528	9	0.384
49	15	0.539	14	0.690	12	0.512
51	10	0.359	18	0.731	12	0.512
	440	15.804	377	15.423	277	11.827

- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 1=2,784
- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 2=2, 464
- Number of words by the FCFG students in composition 3=2, 342

APPENDIX XXII

Number and proportion of TGE's by each student in the UFCFG in the 3 compositions (Main)

No	Comp.1		Comp.2		Comp.3	
	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion	No. of TGE's	Proportion
2	17	0.564	7	0.272	12	0.519
4	23	0.763	10	0.389	18	0.778
6	38	1.260	19	0.738	23	0.994
8	18	0.597	23	0.933	16	0.691
10	28	0.928	14	0.544	7	0.303
12	16	0.531	17	0.661	19	0.821
14	20	0.663	--	--	--	--
16	18	0.597	21	0.816	14	0.605
18	11	0.365	6	0.233	7	0.303
20	24	0.796	16	0.622	12	0.519
22	10	0.332	21	0.816	3	0.130
24	25	0.829	21	0.816	--	--
26	29	0.962	17	0.661	14	0.605
28	7	0.232	8	0.311	8	0.346
30	11	0.365	11	0.428	17	0.735
32	13	0.431	8	0.311	17	0.735
34	22	0.729	20	0.777	17	0.735
36	14	0.464	22	0.855	19	0.821
38	30	0.995	15	0.583	14	0.605
40	9	0.298	16	0.622	12	0.519
42	12	0.398	7	0.272	11	0.475
44	8	0.265	--	--	13	0.562
46	13	0.431	12	0.466	11	0.519
48	17	0.564	18	0.700	22	0.951
50	34	1.127	19	0.738	15	0.648
52	16	0.531	12	0.466	19	0.821
	483	16.017	361	14.030	340	14.740

- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 1=3,016
- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 2=2,573
- Number of words by the UFCFG students in Composition 3=2,314

Appendix XXIII

Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample students (Composition 1, Main)

The researcher's identification of errors

	St6	St11	St 13	St14	St26	St38	St42	St49	Tot
WC	2	2	2			1	1		8
FR	5	3	2		2		1	1	14
PRE	3	3	3	3				2	14
PUN	10	5	2	4	1	5		7	34
SP	3			2					5
ART	2			3	1	3	1	6	16
CON	1	1	1	2			1		6
QUN				1		1		1	3
POS	1	1							2
UN	1	4	1	2		2			10
OM	1		1		1	1	1	1	6
WF	7	5	9	3	3	7	6	5	45
VF	11	12		7	3	8	3	4	48
PRN	2	1		3	1	2			9
WO	1	1		1	1				4
AWK				1			1		2
PARA							1		1
Tot	50	38	21	32	13	30	16	27	

Rater 1's identification of errors

	St6	St11	St 13	St14	St26	St38	St42	49	Tot
WC								1	1
FR				1					1
PRE	1			2			1	2	6
PUN			2		1	1	1	9	14
SP	1			1			1		3
ART				1				5	6
CON									0
QUN						1		1	2
POS									0
UN						1			1
OM									0
WF	1		4			3		4	12

VF						3	2	3	8
PRN	1		3					2	6
WO	1		1						2
AWK	5	1	3	1		4		2	16
PARA	1						1		2
Tot	11	1	13	6	1	13	6	29	

Rater 2's identification of errors

	St6	St11	St 13	St14	St26	St38	St42	49	Tot
WC	9	1	6	4	1	3	3	3	30
FR									0
PRE			2	2			1		5
PUN	8	2	3	1	4	5		6	29
SP		4	2	7		2	4	4	23
ART	1			1				2	4
CON									0
QUN									0
POS		2							2
UN		6	3						9
OM	4	2	1	2	1	4		4	18
WF	5		11			6			22
VF	1	8	1	2	1		4	3	20
PRN	3						2		5
WO	2	2		2		3			9
AWK				3		3			6
PARA					2		3		5
Tot	33	27	29	24	9	26	17	22	

Appendix XXIV:

Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from 8 sample students (Composition 2, Main)

The researcher's identification of errors

	St2	St7	St 18	St23	St32	St33	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1	1	6	3	1	2	1	1	16
FR				5	1	1			7
PRE	1	2		1		1		3	8
PUN	1	2	1	2		3	1	3	13
SP		1	1					1	3
ART	1			1	1		1	1	5
CON									0
QUN									0
POS		1			2		2		5
UN	1	1		1		1		1	5
OM		1					1		2
WF	3	1	1	7	4	3	2	2	23
VF	2	2	4	2	3	3	3	4	23
PRN	1	1	1		3	1	4	1	12
WO	1	1			2				4
AWK				1					1
PARA								1	1
Tot	12	14	14	23	17	15	15	18	

Rater 1's identification of errors

	St2	St7	St 18	St23	St32	St33	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1		3	1	1	3	1		10
FR	1			5					6
PRE	2		1			1			4
PUN		5	1	5	2	1	1	2	17
SP			2		2			1	5
ART				1	2				3
CON		1							1
QUN									0
POS				1	2	2			5
UN		1		2		2		2	7

OM		3		1					4
WF	4	2	2	4	1		1	3	17
VF	2	3	4	2	5	1	5	3	25
PRN	2	1	1	1	2	1	4	2	14
WO	1								1
AWK		4	4	1					9
PARA					1	1			2
Tot	13	20	18	24	18	12	12	13	

Rater 2's identification of errors

	St2	St7	St 18	St23	St32	St33	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1	3	4	2	3	2	1		16
FR									0
PRE	1	1							2
PUN	1	5	2	9	7	5		3	32
SP		1	1	3	2		1		8
ART			1	1	1				3
CON									0
QUN									0
POS				1					1
UN	6	2	2	1					11
OM	1	2	1	6	1				11
WF	1		4	2	2	4		2	15
VF	3	1	1	2	3	3	4	2	19
PRN			1		1	1		1	4
WO									0
AWK									0
PARA									0
Tot	14	15	17	27	20	15	6	8	

Appendix XXV

Summary of errors identified by the researcher and the two raters from the 8 sample students (Composition 3, Main)

The researcher's identification of errors

	St5	St10	St 17	St25	St28	St35	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1		2		1			1	5
FR	2	1	1		1		1		6
PRE	1		1	2		1		3	8
PUN	1	2	1	2	3	3			12
SP							1		1
ART	1	3	1			2		1	8
CON	2	1			4	1			8
QUN									0
POS		1						2	3
UN		1		1					2
OM	1		1						2
WF	2	1	2	6	1	4		4	20
VF	4	3	4	2	3	2	7	4	29
PRN		1	1	1					3
WO	1	1							2
AWK									0
PARA			1						1
Tot	16	15	15	14	13	13	9	15	

Rater 1's identification of errors

	St5	St10	St 17	St25	St28	St35	St41	St46	Tot
WC	3	4	2		1		1		11
FR	1		1		1		2		5
PRE			2		2	2	1	1	8
PUN	1	1	1	2	4	1			10
SP							1		1
ART			2				1		3
CON					2	1			3
QUN									0

POS								2	2
UN		2				1			3
OM									0
WF	3		3	3		3			12
VF	4	2	3	1	3	1	6	7	27
PRN	1	1		1				1	4
WO		1							1
AWK			2	1		1			4
PARA		1	2						3
Tot	13	13	18	8	13	10	12	11	

Rater 2's identification of errors

	St5	St10	St 17	St25	St28	St35	St41	St46	Tot
WC	1				1		1		3
FR	1				1				2
PRE			2					1	3
PUN	2	5	4	3	5	5			24
SP	2	1			1	1	3	1	9
ART		2	4	1		1			8
CON									0
QUN									0
POS								1	1
UN		5	3	2	1		1	1	13
OM	1		1	1	1	2	1		7
WF	2	1	1	2	2	2		2	12
VF	2	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	18
PRN									0
WO									0
AWK									0
PARA									0
Tot	11	16	18	10	15	12	9	9	

Appendix XXVI

Sample Students' Paragraphs (Composition 1, Main)

Student 2

ADVANTAGES OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY

There are a lot of technologies that are produced at current time. For instance, mobile technology is one of the important and advantageous company. From these advantages, some of the following are listed below.

It is used to transfer ideas through telephoning. As a result, every society all over the world can receive currently information that conduct or happen in the world. The other point is also uses as a means of books or reference. This means by downloading the mobile that have an internet services can help us to solve questions and give precisely note. On the other hand, it can also important to send text messages in a short period of time. These are some of the advantages of mobile that can use as a profit for us.

Student 7 (Comp.1)

ADVANTAGES OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY

Technology is used for country growing. as Ethiopia is a developing country, she needs educated person and the educated person must be creative to be hard worker. Computer is one of the instrument from new technologies. it uses for many purposes. among these uses increase of teaching learning process, to communicate with peoples or exchange of information and to store data or to putting data that gathered from different sources. So peoples use such kind of works

they will get pure knowledge and they will be creative person. Then they avoid their poverty and their countries poverty.

Industry is the another types of new technologies. In industry any tools are produced by educated peoples. So people gets tools they will be hard worker and will be rich.

Sample Students' Paragraphs (Composition 2, Main)

Library Service at Wollo University (Student 2)

Library service at Wollo university in Dessie campus. There are three libraries at Dessie campus. These are social library, natural library, and the new and the largest library named as Meles library, but these libraries do no give the same service to the users. Especially, the librarian present Meles library are all fresh and they couldn't know the title of the books. As a result, so many students are made disagreement and enter to conflict with them. Except one or two librarian most of the librarian is they couldn't know the rules and regulations of the library. During the studying program, they are speaking loudly when they get one student in unnecessary activities. This disturbs the students and shouted all students. Additionally, there is alack of chairs, tables, and necessary text books and reference books in the library. This is the weakness of the academic management of Wollo University.

Library service at Wollo University (Student 7)

In Wollo university there are three known libraries. I saw the one library which is called Meles library. When I entered for the first time, I was falling in bad feeling because the library was not as I thought before; there were no books that I want to use. When I entered for the second time I was happy because I used that I want to read. the library in this cumpas is sp much good. there were enough books but the books present in the library are kind, there are no different boos , that are out of our text book. In the library there is no suitable desk for reading as I compared fro other universities library. The workers in the library are so good but they are not properly working people.

Library Service at Wollo University (Student 18)

When I saw the library service of Wollo university, It worked 6 days in te weak. In the library there is many different problems. The one that is the employer service. The employer service is the major problem to treat the students unwisly. The user fought with the employer and the students are cruwded. The book present in the library is limited by the shortage of economy . The user used time unwisly by the case of un punctual employer. Finally the service of Wollo university library is un favorable.

Library Service at Wollo university (Student 23)

Library service at Wollo university has so, many problem. Some of the limitation lack of book service, chair, and lack of servant. The servants characterestics very difficult, they are noise, for employers, and have no Enough Experieance. at Wollo university library service weakness is Greater than strength. One day I asked a servant. please give me organic text book. but she say that “there is no organic chemistry here” but organic chemistry present in library. this show that she has no any experieance about library uses. but it has it’s own strength for enstance works 24 hours and nearest students block and bed room.

Library Service in Wollo University (Student 32)

Library service in Wollo university are good in most criterias. For example, chare, tables, light, books and air condition, but it’s workers are not working properly. and students are not silent, it’s mobile are not silent their students are showtly talking, it is not many books in any subject its present maximum one or two books in one subject . but many students are reading in library. In this condition (case) Wollo university Library service are it is not available for students reading.

Library Service at Wollo university Student 33)

Libray service at Wollo univeristy is very comfortable, But there is lack of so many materials w/h is useful for student’s. for example, there is lack of Rference Book, chair and others. When we enter at 1:30 o’clock, we can not get achair and other materials. the servant who works at W.U. library does not agood behaviour, when we enter and find achair they say’s when you haven’t achair please, go out unless and otherwise give me you ID No they says. like this Behaviour is not good contacting with student.

Sample Students' Paragraphs (Composition 3, Main)

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 5)

high population have d/t disadvantage in one country. In one country can not appropriate the width of area and population come a lot of problem. That problems are deforestation, erosion, shortage of food.... In case of deforestation people attacked by disease. Because cannot get pure air. By this reason, that country can not developed and dependent.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 10)

When by the presence of high population in one country, there are so many Disadvantages are occurred in that country. Some of them are, the pollution of air, the shortage of farm land, shortage of cultivated land, deforestation and shortage of rain...etc are occurred in the country. Due to this above case population's in the country are not get good health care, enough food, and all the necessary basic needs are not fulfilled. especially developing countries are affected by this matter like Ethiopia and other higher population countries. So to decrease this matter especially developing countries to be controlled our population.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 17)

High population have many disadvantages, especially in developing countries. Example, Ethiopia is one of the poorest countries in Africa and also for world. The population are increasing by double rate at this time. this increasing population have negative effect on the school, hospital and on work place and also on food is the most problem of Ethiopian population.

To solve this problem decreasing the birth rate literate unilliterate people or children, increasing building of hospital to decrease death rate and prepare the work place workless.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 18)

High population is disadvantage in one country. The civil service of the country is not fairly distributed. Because the population is high, the civil service present in the country is not balanced with the population. The air condition of the country is disturbed by different ways. First, for living place deforestation is takes place, due to this reason the temprature of the country increases by increasing the amount of carbondioxide. So, desretification is sread out in the country and soil erosion is favored. Due to this all reason the production of one country is affected. Generally high population degrade the development of one country.

Disadvantages of High Population (Student 28)

High population growth have many disadvantages for the growth of one country. Population increases the farming area also increases. So the farming area increases as the same time it became deforestation. deforestation causes air pollution. But when the air polluted it causes illness for population. The other is when the population increases the number of industries also increases. This also one of the cause of air polllution. In general the result of high population is death or poorness for human being.

Student 25

Disadvantages of High Population

Obviously it is true that high population in one country or in the world have disadvantage directly or indirectly. When we see specially the high population of undeveloped country which

like with in agriculture, there is deforestation and un wisly use of land. Consquently; these follows polluted of water condition, drought and famine across the country. due to these reasons there will be hostile or conflict through the country and finally the life of human being will pass away.

Appendix XXVII:

Categorization of linguistic errors identified from students' pre-test compositions during the pilot study

No.	Error type /category	Number of errors	% of errors to total No. of words (2,512)
1	Word choice errors	46	1.831
2	Spelling errors	18	0.717
3	Sentence fragment	37	1.473
4	Errors in Preposition use	39	1.553
5	Errors in Punctuation use	40	1.592
6	Tense use errors	11	0.438
7	Unnecessary	26	1.035
8	Pronoun use errors	12	0.478
9	Word formation errors	52	2.070
10	Possessive 's	7	0.279
11	Errors in article use	21	0.836
12	Word order errors	14	0.557
13	Verb formation	57	2.269
14	Active/ passive errors	15	0.597
15	Omission errors	16	0.637
16	Errors in connector use	10	0.398
17	Faulty parallelism	7	0.279
18	Comparative formation	1	0.040
19	Unclear/awkward	8	0.319
20	Errors in quantifier use	3	0.119
	Total	440	17.517

