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Advice based on research about error correction on written compositions varies. One perspective is that all errors should be corrected. Another is that errors, as part of the natural process of learning, should not be corrected. Research on appropriate error correction techniques is not clear as to whether teachers use error correction techniques that students would like to have. The major purpose of this research study was to investigate freshman students’ preferences for error correction techniques. This research study also aimed at investigating types of error correction used, the reactions of freshman students towards teacher error correction, and students’ response to error correction they receive.

The subjects of this study were seventy-seven freshman students from eighteen different departments at Middle East Technical University. Sixty-two students completed questionnaires, and interviews were held with additional fifteen students that were not given questionnaires. Frequencies and percentages, means and standard deviations were calculated.

The results indicate that the majority of the students prefer teachers to correct all of their errors by supplying the correct forms or indicating the location of the
errors. The students also give more importance to grammatical error correction than other types of error corrections. On the other hand, the results indicate that teachers generally correct student errors by giving clues about how to correct their errors so the students can correct them. The findings also showed that half of the students have problems in understanding teachers’ comments. The students could not understand some words, symbols or the teachers’ handwriting. However, the findings indicated that many of the students respond to corrected composition papers by reading through the paper carefully and asking the teacher for help.

Although much of the research on writing indicates that using clues help students because it encourages them to correct errors themselves, teachers might consider taking the preferences of students into consideration while they are correcting student errors on composition papers.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Many English writing teachers believe that error correction is one of the most important functions of a writing teacher and, as a result they may spend many hours correcting errors on student papers. Obviously, these teachers assume that their error correction method will have a positive effect on student writing. What they fail to consider is how the role of student preferences affects the student’s response to such teacher feedback.

The term “error correction” in this study refers to teacher feedback on surface-level errors. I am not including style or organization as a part of error correction, but only errors in syntax or orthography, such as tense, plurality, and copula.

From one perspective, error correction is accepted as a crucial part of teaching writing. Zamel (1985, p.84), for instance, claims that “teachers are still by and large concerned with the accuracy and correctness of surface-level features of writing and calling attention to error is still the most widely employed procedure for responding to ESL writing.” Bates, Lane and Lange (1993, p.15) point to error correction as “being an essential part of the learner’s language acquisition process, feedback on sentence error is also important for ESL students because writers of formal written English are held to high standards in both academic and professional worlds.”

On the other hand, there are studies that lead one to question the value of error correction. Hendrickson (1978) states that marking and writing the correct
forms of errors on students' composition papers has no statistically significant effect on students' writing proficiency (cited in Fathman and Whalley, 1990). According to Semke (1984) "corrections do not increase writing accuracy, writing fluency, or general language proficiency, and they may have a negative effect on student attitudes, especially when students must make corrections by themselves" (cited in Mings, 1993, p.173).

There have been studies on the importance of students' preferences for error correction. The study of Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) claims that students prefer their teachers to use correction symbols on their composition papers and not to use a red pen while correcting errors. Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990, p.176) point out that "clear teacher-student agreement on feedback procedures for handling feedback could lead to more productive and enjoyable composition writing in the classroom."

Some scholars studied the importance of showing the strengths of students by giving positive comments in error correction procedure. For instance, Ferris (1995) studied 155 students with the results showing that the students thought their writing improved when they got positive comments. On the other hand, the students noted that their motivation and self-esteem is decreased when they receive only negative comments from their teacher. Beavens (1977), Cardella and Corno (1981) and Krashen (1982) claim that "this positive 'affective' feedback can be very important because, as research shows, within this positive affective climate, the student can more easily receive negative messages" (cited in Bates, Lane and Lange, 1993, p.6).

The impetus for this study originated in the interest that I experienced while teaching English Composition Writing at Mehmet Emin Resulzade Anatolian High School in Ankara. This school, as in all other Anatolian High Schools of that time,
conducted most classes in English, including two hours of English Composition lessons each week. In the composition class I would introduce a topic by using some interesting pictures from the textbooks and then ask the students to write about the topic. Then I collected the composition papers, corrected and returned them.

When I gave their papers back after correcting errors I noticed that students put their composition papers away after only glancing at the corrections and comments I had spent hours making. For this school students were not required to revise and return their composition papers after their teacher corrected their errors. Also, there were no guidelines in the program indicating which technique teachers should use when correcting student composition errors, so I was free to use whatever type of error correction method that I preferred. I corrected student papers by crossing out errors and writing the corrections above them.

While working as an English instructor at Mustafa Kemal University I read articles and books about English composition teaching. After reading the literature on student error correction preferences however, I discovered that my preferred technique is not a technique that scholars advise. I became more interested in this subject because I wanted to find out the best method to use with my own students.

Data collection procedure of this study was conducted at Middle East Technical University, Department of Modern Languages. At this department students learn to write compositions first by learning to write an introduction, second they learn to write the body, and third they learn how to write conclusions. Finally, they learn to write a composition as a whole. Students’ errors were corrected by using different kinds of error correction techniques.
Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study is to investigate which error correction techniques freshman students prefer their teachers to use. Another focus is to determine whether students are satisfied with teachers’ error correction types, extents and styles. The other aim of this study is to find out students’ responses to error correction when they receive their composition papers.

Significance of the Study

Since this research study will indicate students’ preferences for error correction, teachers gain important information and perhaps adjust their own error correction techniques. This would increase interest in their composition papers when they receive them from their teacher.

Moreover, teachers will be made aware of students’ attitudes towards different types of error corrections on composition papers. For instance, teachers will be aware of whether students would like to have their grammatical errors corrected or their punctuation errors corrected. Furthermore, if students would like to have some types of errors corrected, teachers will know how much they want. This would help teachers arrange the quantity of different types of error corrections according to students’ preference.

In addition, since this study will investigate students’ preference for the use of coloured ink, teachers may adjust their error correction procedures and the ink colour that they use according to students’ preferences.

This study will also give information to university and high school English teachers about whether students understand their comments on the composition
papers and, if not, the reasons for not understanding them. This would give teachers a chance to be aware of whether they are commenting on papers in a way that students can understand. If not then teachers might make some changes in their error correction procedure.

As a result of this study, teachers might adapt both their error correction techniques and error correction extent to address students’ preferences in order to be more useful.

Research Questions

This research study will address the following research questions:

What are the preferences of freshman students at METU regarding error correction techniques on their composition papers?

The sub-questions are:

a. What types of error corrections are used?

b. What are the reactions of freshman students towards teacher error correction?

c. How do students respond to the error corrections they receive?
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

"Errors have played an important role in the study of language acquisition in general and in examining second and foreign language acquisition in particular" (Lengo 1995, p.20). The inevitability of errors has led to a number of studies attempting to determine whether errors are bad or good. In this chapter, first I will discuss contradictory ideas about error correction. Next, I will discuss underlying theoretical approaches. Following this, I will discuss error correction techniques, and finally, students’ preferences for error correction techniques and feedback.

Contradictory Ideas about Error Correction

English language instructors often correct all students’ errors without consciously considering whether the number of corrections they use will be the most helpful to their students. Bolitho (1995) in a discussion of student perceptions of a teacher’s role, creates an interesting equation: corrections indicate how responsible a teacher is, therefore the fewer corrections a teacher makes, the more likely students are to think the teacher are not working hard enough for them. Because teachers are aware, at least to some extent, of this student expectation, they may be motivated to make even more corrections in order to be perceived as responsible by their students. Connors and Lunsford (1993) also claim that “most teachers, if our sample is representative, continue to feel that a major task is to ‘correct’ and edit papers, primarily for formal errors but also for deviation from algorithmic and often rigid ‘rhetorical’ rules as well” (cited in Reid, 1994, p.280).
There is no consensus of opinion among scholars that error correction improves student writing ability. Some writers argue that error correction helps students improve writing ability, so teachers should correct all students' errors on their composition papers. For instance Leki (1991, p.203) conducted a study with 100 ESL students in freshman composition classes and found that “these students equate good writing in English with error-free writing and, therefore, that they want and expect their composition teachers to correct all errors in their written work.” Cathcart and Olsen (1976 cited in Hahn, 1987, p.8) also made a study where results indicated that students want their errors corrected on their composition papers “even more than teachers feel they should be.” Moreover, other writers who support the same view (Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1990; Fathman and Whalley, 1990) claim that the numbers of errors that ESL students make are decreased after error correction. (cited in Leki 1992). In addition, Leki 1991 and Radecki and Swales 1988 also claimed that advanced ESL writers also believe that their writing ability will improve when their errors are indicated, so they want their teacher to correct all their composition errors (cited in Leki, 1992, p.107).

On the other hand, other scholars claim that correction of all errors does not help students, so they believe that teachers should not correct all of the student errors and advise teachers to be selective while correcting students’ errors. For instance, Edge (1989) claims that “it is very depressing for a student to get back any piece of written work with many errors corrected on it.” (p.50). Moreover, Semke (1984) who also shares the same view stated that over-correcting composition papers had negative effects both on students’ attitudes towards composition writing and the improvement of composition writing process (cited in Robb, Ross and Shortreed,
Walkner (1973 cited in Walz, 1982, p.27) points out that “his survey found university students to be discouraged by excessive correcting.”

Writers who support the view that correction of all errors is not useful for students claim that teachers should correct only some of the errors. For instance, Hendrickson (1978) pointed out that “when teachers tolerate some errors, students often feel more confident writing in the target language than if all errors corrected” (cited in Chapin and Terdal, 1990, p.5). In addition, Edge (1989, p.64) who does not favour teachers correcting all student errors, claimed that language teaching would be very easy if students remembered everything they saw corrected on composition papers and she also added that correcting all students’ errors means “comparing the student’s English to an outside finished product, instead of seeing correction as matter of helping people develop their own accuracy.”

Underlying Theoretical Approaches

The disagreement about whether error correction is useful, as well as teachers’ attitudes towards error correction in general, can be tied to a change in theoretical approaches. For instance, according to Hahn (1987) it is the shift from a behaviouristic approach to a cognitive approach in second language acquisition that caused a change in how student errors are viewed. Though scholars agree that studying student errors is important, they have different ideas about what student errors really mean.

From a behaviouristic perspective, student errors are thought to be the result of habit formation, in other words, behaviourists believe that uncorrected errors result in a student “leaving” his/her mistakes rather than correcting them. Obviously,
advocates of this approach have negative attitudes towards errors, and as a result see
error as “negative aids” in second language learning. “Negative aids” are entities that
complicate rather than facilitate second language acquisition.

Leki (1992), in her analysis of the behaviouristic approach, points out that
“teachers, including ESL teachers influenced by behaviourist ideas, considered
language learning simply a matter of developing habits” (p.105). Skinner (1968 cited
in Brown, 1994, p.22) states that “when consequences are rewarded, behaviour is
maintained and is increased in strength and perhaps in frequency. When
consequences are punished, or when there is lack of reinforcement entirely, the
behaviour is weakened and eventually extinguished.” Instructors who support this
view believe that when they correct student errors, it helps students avoid the same
kind of errors in the future.

At the opposite end of the scale is the cognitive approach. According to
Anderson and Ausebel (1965 cited in Brown, 1994) the cognitive approach in second
language acquisition focuses on the student’s ability to convey “meaning.” From this
perspective surface errors are of minor importance. Writers who embrace the
cognitive approach view errors as positive aids, entities that facilitate second
language acquisition, though they entertain a number of different ideas about them.
For instance, Bates, Lane and Lange (1993) support a cognitive approach and claim
that the errors made by second language students are positive and the real signals that
indicate the student is developing his/her own idiosyncratic linguistic system.
Moreover, Lengo (1995) states that errors are the signals of learning stages in the
target language development and the learners’ level of mastery of the language
system can be determined from the errors that they make.
Other writers who support the cognitive approach view errors as a necessary and natural part of second language learning. For instance, according to Leki (1992, p.105) “ESL teachers are not particularly focused on errors, which are no longer regarded as evidence of students’ failure to learn. Rather, errors are thought of as a natural part of the second language learning process.” Furthermore, Corder (1974) says that the world that we live in is not perfect, so errors will always happen in spite of our every effort. In addition, Broughton, Brumfit, Flavel, Hill and Pincas (1980) claim that errors are a necessary and unavoidable part of learning process, adding that errors are not bad things but signals of learning activity.

Error Correction Techniques

As discussed above, some scholars claim that students’ errors must be corrected. If teachers follow this approach; they then need to consider who should correct, what should be corrected, when should it be corrected, and how? For instance, language teachers need to be aware of who should correct a student’s paper. This is an important decision for language teachers because teachers are not the only ones who can correct students’ errors; the student has other sources such as friends and sometimes parents. Another issue is that language teachers may be unsure about what to correct. There are many error correction techniques that teachers may use so they might like to have some knowledge about these techniques. The other issue is when to correct. The last issue is how to correct. All these are important decisions for language teachers. The next four sections discuss these four important issues.

Who Should Correct

Walz (1982) claims that students prefer and expect teachers to correct their
errors. On the other hand, Broughton et al (1980, p.141) states that it is by no means necessary or advisable that all the correction should come from the teacher.” Cohen (1975 cited in Leki 1991 p.205) points out that “while teacher error correction may not produce a long-lasting improvement in student writing, self-correction and peer correction do focus students’ attention on errors and result in greater control of the written language.” Furthermore, Broughton et al (1980) inform us that the better students might correct errors of weaker ones doing pair work. Raimes (1983), for instance encourages teachers to assign students to read each other’s composition papers and she also advises teachers to prepare some checklists that indicate what to do while reading the other students’ paper. Mahili (1994) claims that a workshop study that includes groups with three or four students can be very helpful and this kind of study gives a chance to students to have comments by both friends in the groups and their teacher.

**How to Correct**

The question of how to correct is also not clear for teachers. In part, this may stem from the fact that there are many different techniques of error correction. For instance, Wingfield (1975, cited in Walz, 1982, p.26) mentions five techniques: (a) providing clues for self-correction; (b) correcting the text; (c) making marginal notes; (d) explaining errors orally to students; (e) using errors as an illustration for class discussion. Walz (1982, p.33) states that “research has not proven the superiority of any one error correction over another.”

Many scholars advise teachers to allow students to find their errors themselves by giving some clues to students. They claim that this is more helpful for students. For instance, Chapin and Terdal (1990) state that pointing out errors is very
helpful to students since it causes students to use other sources. A grammar book or a dictionary can serve as these sources, as suggested by Mahili (1994). In addition, Makino (1993) points out that “self correction gives students an opportunity to consider and activate their linguistic competence.” Furthermore, Reid (1994) claims that “researchers recommended that a teacher must somehow make it possible for students to take control of their writing.”

When to Correct

When to correct is also the subject of debate. Krashen (1984) prefers “delaying feedback on errors until the final stage of editing” (cited in Robb, Ross and Shortreed, 1986, p.83). On the other hand, Ferris (1995, p.48) in a study of 155 students found that “teacher feedback on preliminary drafts of student work may be more effective than responses to final stages.” Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990) state that writing teachers tend to give feedback to students during the process of writing; on the other hand, students favour teachers who respond to final drafts (cited in Bates et al. 1993). Bates et al. (1993, p.27) claim that “many experienced writing instructors, however, find that their students greatly appreciate feedback on drafts as well as final papers.” Ferris (1995, p.33), drawing on Freedman (1987) and Krashen (1984) states that “research in L1 and L2 student writing has suggested that teacher response to student compositions is most effective when it is given on preliminary rather than final drafts of student essays.” Broughton et al. (1980) point out that teachers can give immediate response to student written work during in class writing.

What to Correct

The issue of what to correct is another important subject for teachers. As
shown above many researchers claim that teachers should not correct all of the errors. Therefore, teachers must make decisions, either guided by their departments’ directives, or on their own, about what types of errors to correct. Robinett (1972 cited in Walz, 1982, p.27) advocates “correcting paragraphs for specific errors such as spelling, punctuation, or articles. Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) claim that “many foreign language students expect to make the greatest improvement in writing quality and to ‘learn the most’ when their teachers highlight grammatical and mechanical mistakes.” Moreover, Bates et al. (1993) advise teachers to be selective in correcting the errors and they propose the following criteria for deciding which errors to correct: “(a) give top priority to the most serious errors, those that affect comprehensibility of the text; (b) give high priority to errors that occur most frequently; (c) consider the individual student’s level of proficiency, attitude, and goals; (d) consider marking errors recently covered in class” (p.33-34).

Students’ Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

There are many techniques that teachers may use while correcting students’ composition papers but students do not prefer these techniques equally. Teachers can benefit by knowing the techniques that students prefer. Some scholars who have investigated students’ preferences for error correction techniques claim that students prefer to be corrected by being given some clues. Scholars have also found that some students like to have positive feedback from their teacher and they think that this increases their motivation in composition writing.

Leki (1991) studied 100 ESL students asking the following questions: (a) How important was it to students for their teacher correct grammatical errors? (b) To
what extent did students like their teachers to correct when they had many errors? (c) How did students prefer their teachers to correct errors in their written work? (d) What colour ink did students want their teacher to use to correct their errors? (e) What were the strategies of students when looking at the error corrections of teachers? (f) Whom did students ask for help if they could not understand teacher’s error correction on their composition paper?

The results of her questionnaires indicated that the majority (78%) of the students believes that corrections of grammatical forms of errors are important for them. Moreover, the results also indicated that the majority (70%) of the students wanted their teachers to correct all of their major and minor errors when they had many errors on their composition papers. In addition, the results showed that 67% of the students preferred the error correction technique in which their teacher shows the place of error and gives a clue about how to correct it. On the other hand, 25% of the students indicated they preferred the technique in which the teacher supplies the correct answer. No student wanted the teacher to say that they have errors but leave the correction up to the student.

Furthermore, the results showed that 60% of the students did not give importance to the colour of ink that the teacher uses while correcting errors on students’ composition papers. The results also indicated that a large number (45%) of the students examined the errors on their composition papers by rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong. In addition, the results of her questionnaire showed that majority (58%) of the students reported that they asked to their teachers when they could not understand the teacher’s corrections.

Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994, p.154) studied 137 FL and 110 ESL
students. Their study indicated that “both groups expressed a moderate preference for the use of correction symbols on the part of their teachers, although teachers’ use of a red pen again appeared to be consistently disfavoured.”

Students’ Comments on Feedback in General

Although the topic of error correction, most other types of feedback, is the focus of this study, studies on feedback in general gives important insights into the issues raised in this study. Brandl (1995) claims that there is little information about students’ preferences for different kinds of feedback. The findings of some scholars indicated students consider teacher feedback important and they want to have feedback from teachers. For instance, Ferris (1995, p.46) studied 155 university students taking ESL classes and asked students whether they felt that their teachers’ feedback is helpful. The results of her questionnaire indicated that “145 (93,5%) students felt that their teacher’s feedback had indeed helped them improve as writers because it helped them know what to improve or avoid in the future, find their mistakes, and clarify their ideas.” Furthermore, the research of Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990); Hedgcock and Leftkowitz, (1994) and McCurdey (1992) found that “students expect and value their teachers’ feedback on their writing” (cited in Ferris, 1995, p.34).

Some studies indicate students’ preference for the type of feedback. For instance, studies by Cohen (1987), Leki (1991) and Radecki and Swales, (1988) indicated that “students preferred to receive feedback on grammar, rather than content” (cited in Ferris, 1995, p.40). Furthermore, according to Hedgcock and
Leftkowitz (1996) students explained that their writing improves when they have feedback on their grammatical and mechanical mistakes.

Some scholars also claim that students want to have positive response from their teachers because this would motivate students write better compositions. For instance, Ferris (1995) asked 155 students whether or not they receive positive response from their teacher and how they feel about it. The results of her study showed that five students received only positive response from their teacher and they think that this improves their composition writing. A few students noted that their teacher rarely or never gives positive response and several students said that they receive only negative response from their teacher and that this fact decreased their self-esteem and motivation and made them unhappy. Moreover according to Diederich (1974) “noticing and praising whatever a student does well improves writing more than any kind or amount of correction of what he does badly” (cited in Raimes, 1983, p. 88)

As English language teachers we give response to composition papers of students and hope that all of the students read our comments carefully and understand all of the words and markings that we use while giving response to our students. This issue of student response toward teacher feedback has been studied. Cohen (1987) found that most of the students reported that they reread their composition papers; however, 20% did not reread their compositions. “Most students claimed that they only made a mental note” (cited in Ferris 1995, p.36).

In another study, Cohen (1990, p.170) reports on a study of 217 American university students. The findings of his study showed that students did not understand comments that are formed from single words or short phrases like “confusing.” Ferris
(1995) studied 155 students asked them what they do in response to teacher feedback and whether or not they have difficulties in understanding their teacher's feedback. The results of her study indicated that nearly 50% of the students noted that they never had any difficulties in understanding teacher's comments and 11% reported they sometimes had difficulties. Furthermore, 13 students (9%) said that they could not read their teacher's handwriting.

Difficulties in Understanding Teacher Comments

The subject of what students' attitudes are when they do not understand teacher's comments was also investigated by scholars. Again the study by Ferris (1995, p.36) revealed that more than 50% of the students have difficulties in understanding teachers' feedback. They then tried many ways to understand teacher feedback like "asking the teacher for help, looking up corrections in a grammar book." On the other hand, in the study of Cohen (1990, p.172) students pointed out that "if they did not understand a comment they indicated that they would be more likely to ask the teacher than to consult a grammar book, a dictionary, a peer, or a previous composition."

These reviews indicate that there are limited studies about students' preferences for specific error correction techniques and their attitudes towards error correction. This study attempts to add to the research by investigating students' preferences for error correction techniques. These results may lead to a harmony between student's preferences and teacher's use for error correction techniques.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The major focus of this study was to find out the students' preferences for error correction techniques at METU. This study also aims at finding out the types of error corrections that are used, the reactions of freshman students towards teacher error correction, and freshman students' response to error corrections they receive. This chapter discusses subjects, materials, procedures, and data analysis in detail.

Subjects

The subjects of this study were seventy-seven freshman students at METU who enrolled in English 102, Development of Reading and Writing Skills, at the Department of Modern Languages. They were from eighteen departments of METU. Seventy-two students were distributed questionnaires, but sixty-two students completed questionnaires. For this reason, these ten who did not complete questionnaires were not taken into consideration. In addition, another fifteen freshman students from eleven departments were interviewed. The subjects had graduated from various high schools or colleges so their levels of English proficiency were varied.

Materials

In this study, data were collected through questionnaire and interviews. Questionnaires (See appendix A) were distributed to sixty-two students and
interviews were conducted with fifteen students who enrolled in English 102 at the Department of Modern Languages at METU. The questionnaire used in this study was adapted from Leki (1992) and Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994).

Questionnaire

Before giving the questionnaire (See Appendix A) to the students I asked the headmaster of department of Modern Languages and instructor of the class for permission, which was granted. First, I piloted questionnaires with five students. Then, I distributed questionnaires to seventy-two students. Sixty-two of the students completed all the answers of the questionnaire.

The student questionnaire was prepared in English and included only closed-ended questions. If students had any problems while answering the questions, I explained the questions to them in English.

The questionnaire included three sets of questions that aimed to get information about freshman students' preferences for error correction techniques on their composition papers at METU. The questions in the first part of the questionnaire were about the background of the students. These were general questions that were about gender, age, and high school of the students. The aim of asking these questions was not only to get information but also to ease students into the questionnaire.

The questions in the second part of the questionnaire were about the preferences of students for error correction techniques. The questions in the third part of the questionnaire were asked to investigate whether students think that their teacher's response to their composition papers is helpful to them or not. Students
were asked whether or not they could understand their teacher’s comments on their first draft of the composition papers. Then, students were asked what they do if they could not understand teacher feedback.

**Interviews**

The interview questions (See Appendix B1 and B2) were open-ended. At first the interview questions were prepared in English. Later, in order to get more information about the preferences of freshman students on their composition papers at METU, questions were translated into Turkish (See Appendix B2). After that a pilot study in Turkish was conducted with two freshman students at METU and a few changes were made in questions according to the pilot study. All interviews were conducted in Turkish. I interviewed 15 students, each for about fifty minutes. I tape recorded and took notes while conducting the interviews.

The interviews began with some questions like their birthplace and the high school they graduated from in order to get a general idea about students’ background. They proceeded with questions about students’ attitudes towards error correction procedure and their preferences for error correction techniques. Moreover, the students were asked about their revising procedures for corrected composition papers and whether or not they have difficulties in understanding teachers’ feedback. In addition, students were asked some other questions such as what they do when they could not understand teacher feedback and whether or not they believe that they benefit from teacher feedback. The interviews were made to get more information about students’ preferences for error correction techniques.
Procedures

Questionnaire questions (See appendix A) were prepared in English and they were revised before they were given to freshman students at Department of Modern Languages at METU. Questionnaires were given to seventy-two students who enrolled ENG 102 Composition Writing classes. Before the students were given questionnaires they were informed that their names would not be revealed and their instructor would not know their answers for the questionnaire. The students were given the questionnaire in English and they received an explanation in English when they had any problems responding to the questions. It took the students about twenty minutes to respond to the questionnaire; the complete response rate for the questions was about 86%.

The interviews for the data collection were conducted with fifteen students at the Department of Modern Languages who were interviewed individually during their lunch breaks. Furthermore, the interviews were tape-recorded and notes were taken during the interviews. Then, they were transcribed. The interview was made in Turkish to get more detailed answers from the interview questions.

Data Analysis

Questionnaires and interviews were analysed using descriptive data analysis; that is by using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. These findings were shown in some tables to reflect them more clearly to readers. In addition, some bar graphs were drawn to indicate preferences of students for error correction techniques. The discussions highlight the major findings according to the percentages of both questionnaire and interview results.
CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Introduction

The major purpose of this study was to determine freshman students’ preferences for error correction techniques. This study also investigated the types of corrections that were used, freshman students’ reactions towards teacher error correction, and students’ responses to error corrections they receive. METU freshman students from 18 departments participated in this study. Data were collected by means of questionnaires and interviews with students from METU. In this chapter, I discuss the data analysis procedure and the results of the analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

Student Questionnaire

Data were collected by means of student questionnaires and student interviews administered between the dates of 20 March 1998 and 13 April 1998. Seventy-two questionnaires were distributed to the students and all of which were returned.

The student questionnaire (see Appendix A) consisted of four sections. In the first section, there were two subsections. The first subsection contained questions about students’ background: their gender, age, birthplace, the high schools they graduated from, their department at METU, the place and age they began to learn English, and the length of time they have been studying English at METU. The second subsection contained questions dealing with whether or not students attended the Department of Basic English at METU and what students’ attitudes towards error correction were.
The second section of the questionnaire also had two subsections. The first subsection contained some questions dealing with students’ preferences for error correction priorities, students’ attitude towards having symbols on their composition paper, and taking feedback for their composition papers. A 5-point Likert scale of agreement was used to learn students’ preferences in this part. In the second subsection, there was only one question about instructors’ style of giving feedback to their students on the preliminary draft of composition papers.

The third section of the questionnaire posed questions about students’ preferences for error correction techniques. These questions were asked using a 5-point Likert scale.

In the last section of the questionnaire there were two subsections. The first subsection consisted of questions about teachers’ error correction style and students’ preferences for evaluations of composition papers, while the second subsection included questions about understanding teacher’s comments.

Interviews

Fifteen freshman students selected from the departments of History, Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, Industrial Engineering, City and Regional Planning, Computer Engineering, Chemistry, Political Science and Public Administration, Civil Engineering, Industrial Engineering, Economics, and Industrial Engineering were interviewed.

The interview questions (see Appendix B1 and B2) consisted of open-ended questions in two sections. The first section covered questions about students’
birthplace and their educational background. The second section of the questionnaire included some general questions on students' preferences for error correction techniques and correction of error types.

The interviews were transcribed from taped recordings. Then the notes and transcription were analysed and compared with the results of questionnaires. These data were used to substantiate the questionnaire results.

Results of the Study

In this section of the chapter the findings of the questionnaires are given in tables. The results of questionnaires and interviews are discussed along with the questionnaire data.

Description of respondents

The number of subjects who responded to questionnaires was sixty-two. Of the total, only 10 (16.1%) were female. This gender breakdown is not surprising since METU is a technical university and there are more male than female students enrolled.

The ages of the students that were given in questionnaires are shown in Table 1.
Table 1

Subjects' age distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(38.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(25.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(24.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. f=frequency; (%)=percentage

The subjects come from 18 departments as shown in Table 2.
### Table 2

**Subjects’ departments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City and Regional Planning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Engineering</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science and Public Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metallurgical and Materials Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum and Natural Gas Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. f=frequency; (%)=percentage

Students in the City and Regional Planning constituted a high percentage (21%) of the respondents because I was able to administer my questionnaires to an entire class. As for the other departments, students were given questionnaires in
random locations, sometimes in the halls, sometimes in the library, and sometimes in the campus cafeterias.

The subjects of this study were also asked at what age they started to learn English. The results of the questionnaires indicated that 21% of the students started to learn English when eleven years old or younger, while 79% of the respondents responded that they started to learn English when twelve years old or older.

Many (69.4)% of the subjects of this study attended the Department of Basic English at METU.

**Students' General Attitudes**

When the students were asked whether or not they liked composition writing as class assignments, many (62.9%) of the students indicated that they did not like composition writing as a class assignment.

The students were also asked whether or not they felt it was important for them to have as few errors in English as possible in their written work. The results of the question showed that majority (83.9%) of the students considered it important for them to have as few errors as possible. It is interesting to note that though many students (62.9%) do not like composition, majority (83.9) of the students still feel that it is important to have ‘error-free’ writing.

**Nature of errors corrected**

Students were asked about the nature of errors corrected by the teachers at METU. Table 3 presents frequencies and percentages about the nature of errors that teachers corrected.
Table 3

**Extent of correction**

(Question 16)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-All errors teacher thinks major</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(38.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-All major and minor errors</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(37.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-A few of the major errors</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-Errors interfering communication</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-All repeated errors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-No correction but comment on ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. f=frequency; (%)=percentage*

Table 3 shows that teachers generally correct all major and minor errors and the errors that they think important.

**Teachers' error correction techniques**

Table 4 presents information about error correction techniques that teachers use according to student questionnaire responses.

Table 4

**Teacher's error correction technique**

(Question 14)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-Gives a clue how to correct</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(41.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-Corrects</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(38.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Show where the error is</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(16.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-Ignores errors and pays attention to ideas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. f=frequency; (%)=percentage*
It is clear that the many (41.9) of the students say that teachers correct student’ errors using clues about how to correct. The same question was asked in interviews where the results indicated that 47% of teachers correct by giving a clue about how to correct errors, 40% correct by writing the appropriate form and 13% use only underlining. Since the responses of both questionnaires and interviews were similar, we can infer that it is common for freshman English teachers at METU use one or a combination of these techniques.

To get more information about teachers’ feedback styles, the subjects of the study were also asked whether or not their teacher gives feedback outlining strengths and weaknesses of their preliminary drafts. The frequencies and percentages were calculated for the results of the question and are indicated in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' Feedback Style</th>
<th>(Question 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of feedback</strong></td>
<td><code>(n=62)</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Strengths</td>
<td>1 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Weaknesses</td>
<td>13 (21.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Weaknesses and strengths</td>
<td>48 (77.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Neither</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* f=frequency; (%)=percentage

The results of the table show that all teachers give some kind of feedback. The data indicate that the majority (77.4%) of the freshman English teachers at METU highlight both weaknesses and strengths when giving feedback to their students on the preliminary draft of the composition papers. When the same question
was asked in the interviews, the results were similar. The majority of students (80%) claim that their teachers give both positive and negative comments on their composition papers and these (80%) students claim that positive feedback increases their motivation. The remaining 20% stated that because their teacher comments only on the weaknesses of their composition papers, they are discouraged about composition writing. These (20%) students said that they want to see positive words like “very good” on their composition papers in addition to negative feedback.

**Error correction and feedback**

Students were asked about their preferences for correction of errors and feedback comments. Their answers are shown in Table 6.
Table 6

Students' preference for error correction and feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of correction</th>
<th>1 (%)</th>
<th>2 (%)</th>
<th>3 (%)</th>
<th>4 (%)</th>
<th>5 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrects grammatical errors</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrects vocabulary use</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrects punctuation, captilization and spelling</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments on ideas</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses a set of symbols</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluates the organization of ideas</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=uncertain, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree; (%)=percentage

It is clear from the results that students give most importance to the correction of grammatical and vocabulary errors (M=1.31 for the former and M=2.40 for the latter). These means are in Appendix D. The same question was asked in interviews, and the students likewise reported that they first prefer teachers to correct grammatical errors, second their vocabulary use, and third correct their punctuation, spelling and capitalization errors. This is interesting since in my literature review (see Chapter Two) I noted that the current trend toward emphasising meaning and organization rather than surface level correction leads to less teacher correction of
grammatical errors. If teachers follow this trend, it could lead to a conflict between student preferences and teacher behaviour.

**Extent of error correction**

Table 7 below indicates students’ preference about how many errors they would like to be corrected.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Preference about Extent of Error Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Question15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of error correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-All major and minor errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-All errors that teachers think major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Errors interfere communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-All repeated errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-A few of the major errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-No correction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. f=frequency; %=percentage

It can be seen from Table 7 that the students want to have all major and minor errors corrected on their papers. During interviews the same question was asked and the answer was similar: 67% of students said that they want to see all of their errors corrected.

**Use of coloured pens**

The frequencies and percentages of the results were calculated and are shown in Table 8.
Table 8

Coloured Ink

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-A red pen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(40.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-I don’t care</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(38.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-A pen that has less noticeable colour</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(21.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. f=frequency; %=percentage

As shown in Table 8, a large number (40.3%) of students indicated that they would rather see red ink than another less noticeable colours, while 38.7% of the students responded that they didn’t care. It is not certain from this answer whether these students would chose the alternative ‘I don’t care’ when their papers have many corrections. The interviews, however, shed some additional light on this question, showing that 33% of the students do not like the use of red ink. Another 20% of the students did not mind if red ink used unless teacher corrected many errors.

Error Correction Techniques

The students were asked to circle their preferences for different types of error correction techniques. See questionnaire example. (Appendix A). The preferences of students were determined using a 5-point Likert scale. The responses of the students for each item were analysed separately and percentages were calculated. The results are given in Table 9. The bar graphs for each technique are also drawn. (See Appendix C).
### Table 9

**Preference for error correction techniques**

(Question 13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error correction techniques</th>
<th>(n=62)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher:

- gives advice: 21.0 (very helpful), 17.7 (helpful), 24.2 (somewhat helpful), 19.4 (little helpful), 17.7 (not helpful)
- suggests a meeting: 22.6 (very helpful), 21.0 (helpful), 11.3 (somewhat helpful), 11.3 (little helpful), 33.9 (not helpful)
- indicates place of error: 30.6 (very helpful), 35.5 (helpful), 25.8 (somewhat helpful), 8.1 (little helpful)
- corrects errors: 38.7 (very helpful), 27.4 (helpful), 27.4 (somewhat helpful), 6.5 (little helpful)
- gives a clue: 17.7 (very helpful), 29.0 (helpful), 24.2 (somewhat helpful), 11.3 (little helpful), 17.7 (not helpful)
- underlines error: 11.3 (very helpful), 6.5 (helpful), 27.4 (somewhat helpful), 22.6 (little helpful), 32.3 (not helpful)
- does not correct: 3.2 (very helpful), 1.6 (helpful), 3.2 (somewhat helpful), 9.7 (little helpful), 82.3 (not helpful)

**Note.** Freshman students—1=very helpful, 2=helpful, 3=somewhat helpful, 4=little helpful 5=not helpful; (%)=percentage.

If we combine both “very helpful” and “helpful,” it is clear from the results that the top preferences of freshman students at METU are for the teacher either to correct errors or to indicate the place of the error, and then the students prefer the teacher to give a clue about how to correct their errors. In comparing “correcting” with “not correcting” we see a clear difference: M= 2.02 for the former and M=4.66 for the latter (see Appendix D).

To get more information, also I asked students about their error correction preferences in the interviews. Almost half (47%) of the students reported that they prefer teachers to correct errors by both underlining and writing the correct form over the errors. They said that as freshman students they have many difficult lessons that
they have to study. For this reason, they would prefer teachers to correct their errors by supplying the correct forms. They believed that this would give them at least a chance to see their errors and learn the correct forms. They also stated that sometimes teachers use very thick pens and draw lines on their errors, so they can not see errors again. For this reason they reported that they would appreciate it if teachers did not use such pens.

A second group of students (33%) said that they would prefer to have the teacher give clues about how to correct errors. These students said that they like to find the errors themselves with teacher's clues. They also stated that when they found errors themselves they did not repeat the same errors again.

A third group of interview students (20%) reported that they would prefer to have the teacher underline errors. They reported that this technique forces them to find correct forms. They said that while trying to find correct forms they improve their knowledge about that topic. In addition, they stated that this technique gives them chance to ask the correct form to teachers if they can not find it themselves.

**Students' difficulties in understanding teacher's comments**

In question 17 in the questionnaire students were asked whether or not they had difficulties in understanding teacher's comments (See appendix A). The percentages and frequencies are presented in Table 10.
Table 10

**Difficulties in understanding teacher’s comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-Sometimes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(41.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>(54.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. f=frequency; %=percentage

More than half of the students (55%) do not have difficulties understanding teacher comments. On the other hand, near half of the students answered that they sometimes had difficulties in understanding teacher comments. In the interviews the students were also asked whether or not they had difficulties in understanding their teacher’s comments, and again the answers were almost the same. About half (53%) of them reported that they understood all of teacher’s comments and 46.7% said that they sometimes had difficulties in understanding teachers’ comments. Stating that teachers sometimes use words, signs and abbreviations that the students don’t know. The students also reported that sometimes they could not understand teacher’s handwriting.

**Students’ preference to get help when they had difficulty**

Table 11 indicates what students do when they have difficulty in understanding the teacher’s comments.
Table 11

Students’ preference to get help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference to get help</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-No difficulty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(53.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-Ask teacher for help</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(35.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Ask friends for help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-nothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. f=frequency; %=percentage

The questionnaire indicates that students like asking their teachers for help when they have difficulty. The students at interviews also reported that 71.4% of them asked their teachers to explain when they could not understand the teacher’s comments. These students stated that they believe that teachers are the most reliable sources, so they prefer to ask teachers. On the other hand, 27% of the students asked their friends when they could not understand teacher’s comments. Explaining that they were embarrassed to asking questions of their teachers and felt hesitant about whether or not their teachers would be angry with them when they asked for clarification.

Students’ response to corrected papers

Students were asked to indicate on the questionnaire whether or not they have difficulties in understanding the teacher’s comments (See appendix A). The percentages and frequencies are presented in table 12.
Table 12

Response action

(Question 20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a-Read through the paper carefully</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(22.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-Rewrite the whole paper</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c-Rewrite the the sentence include error</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-Not do anything</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-Rewrite wrong part near the error</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-Read the corrections to understand them</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>(50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  f=frequency;  %=percentage

It can be seen from the results that half (50.0%) of the student read the corrections to understand them. The same question was asked in the interviews, the results were similar. Most students (60%) read the corrections to understand them, while 33% of the students read through the paper carefully.

In conclusion, this study indicates that even though majority of students contacted (62.9%) do not like composition writing as a class assignment, they do give importance to error correction. In fact, 83.9% believe that having few errors is important. Furthermore, the majority (87.1%) of the students wants teachers to correct their grammatical errors. In addition, many (67%) of the students want teachers to correct all of the errors on the composition papers. More than half (53%) of the students reported that they do not like teachers to use a red pen while correcting a lot of errors.

In sum, the top preferences of the freshman students for error
correction for the teacher to correct errors are either by supplying the correct form or indicating the place of error. Then, the students prefer for the teacher to give a clue about how to correct errors.

The other findings of this study are that near half of the students (45%) could not understand teacher comments and the majority (71.4%) of these students prefer to ask their teacher when they can not understand the comments. Of those that can read their teachers’ responses, more than half (60%) indicate that they can take action by reading through their papers and focusing on the errors.

As a result the findings show that even though the students stated that they did not like composition writing as a class assignment, they do give importance to error correction.
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Summary of the Study

The main focus of this study is to find out the preferences of freshman students at METU for error correction techniques. For this reason, it investigated the types of error corrections that are used at METU, the reactions of freshman students towards teacher error correction, and (c) students’ response to error corrections they receive.

This study was carried out at METU department of Modern Languages. The questionnaires were piloted with five freshman students from different departments. Then, freshman students from eighteen different departments were distributed seventy-two questionnaires; 62 were completed. In addition, fifteen freshman students from eleven departments were interviewed. The interviews were recorded, notes were taken and transcribed.

The findings of both questionnaires and interviews were analyzed using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations. Furthermore, these findings were displayed in tables. Some bar graphs were drawn to show the preferences of freshman students for error correction techniques. The findings of both questionnaires and interviews were discussed in Chapter 4.

Discussions of Findings

This section of the chapter compares the findings of the study to the findings of scholars that were mentioned in Chapter 2. In addition, this section discusses the conclusions of the study: students’ preferences for error correction techniques, the
types of error corrections that are used at METU, the reactions of freshman students towards teacher error correction, and students’ response to error corrections they receive. Table 13 presents not only the results of what students say teachers do but also what techniques students like.

Table 13

Types of error correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(n=62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give clue (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What students say</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Table 4, p.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What techniques</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Table 9, p.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. responses 1 and 2 are combined; %=percentage

Students’ preferences for error correction techniques

Students’ preferences for error correction techniques were investigated in questionnaires. The results of the questionnaires (see p.35) indicate that top preferences of the students both (66.1%) are either teacher to correct by supplying the correct form or indicate the place of error. When “very helpful” and “helpful” are added, the results indicate that (46.7%) of the students prefer teacher give a clue to correct their errors.

It was interesting for me to find the type of error correction I did while I was teaching at Mehmet Emin Resulzade Anatolian high school is one of the top
preferences of the students. Even though, the literature that I read while working at Mustafa Kemal University said that as English teachers we should correct students’ errors by giving some clues about how to correct students themselves.

In addition, my literature review (See Chapter 2) explains that many scholars advise that teachers should correct errors of students by giving some clues that students can find the correct forms using these clues. For instance, Hedgcock and Leftkowitz (1994) studied 137 FL and ESL students found that both groups prefer teachers to correct their errors using some symbols. Leki (1991) studied 100 ESL students claimed that the majority of the students wanted to be corrected by showing the place of error and giving clues about how to correct their errors.

In sum, contrary to the suggestions of the scholars, correcting students’ errors using some clues about how to correct their errors, this study shows that majority of the students want to be corrected either by being supplied the correct forms or indicating the place of error.

The types of error corrections that are used at METU

Regarding what types of error corrections are used at METU, the results (see p.29) show that nearly half (41.9%) of the students say that teachers correct errors by giving a clue as to how to correct error and some (38.7%) of the teachers correct errors by supplying the correct forms. In addition, a minority (3.2%) of the teachers ignores errors and pays attention to only ideas.

It is clear that nearly half of teachers correct errors of students in the way that what scholars’ advise teachers to correct errors; i.e. by giving a clue. Furthermore, more than half of teachers (54.8%) correct errors of students by using one of the top two preferences of students.
The reactions of freshman students towards teacher error correction

Table 14 presents not only how much students say teachers correct but also how much correction students like.

Table 14

Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All major and minor (%)</th>
<th>All (%)</th>
<th>A few (%)</th>
<th>Those that interfere (%)</th>
<th>Repeated (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much students say</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Table 3, p.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much correction</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Table 7, p.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. %=percentage

With regard to extent of error correction students favor, the majority (67%) of the student reported that they want all of their errors are corrected. On the other hand the minority (4.8%) of the students wants not to be corrected.

These findings conflict with the findings of Edge (1989), Walkner (1973), and Hendrickson (1978), all of whom brought out students' negative responses toward error corrections. Other scholars who conflict with students' stated desires state that surface errors are not very important. For instance, Leki (1992) claims that
errors are natural part of language learning and they are not evidence of students’ failure to learn. Corder (1974) also states that we live in a world that is not perfect so errors will always happen in spite of every effort.

Although many of the scholars believe that students do not like a number of error corrections and surface errors are not very important, the results of findings show that students want a number of error corrections.

Students were asked in questionnaires what types of error corrections they prefer to have corrected. The results of the questionnaires (p.32) show that half (50%) of the students want their grammatical errors corrected. Furthermore nearly half (41.9%) of the students like their vocabulary use corrected. In addition 27.4% of the students want their punctuation, capitalization and spelling errors are corrected. It is clear that correction of grammatical errors is very important for the students.

This is similar to the findings of scholars. For instance, Cohen (1987), Leki (1991), and Radecki and Swales, (1988) stated that students want grammar corrections instead of feedback on content.

**Students’ response to the error correction they receive**

Table 15 presents not only what students say but also what researchers say.
Table 15

Responses to error correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difficult to understand com.</th>
<th>Ask for teachers help</th>
<th>Read to understand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n=62)</td>
<td>(Table 10)</td>
<td>(Table 11)</td>
<td>(Table 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What students say

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>What researchers say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>(Ferris 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>(Leki 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>most</td>
<td>(Cohen 1987)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.com=comments; %=percentage

Regarding whether the students have difficulties in understanding teacher comments, the questionnaire results showed that nearly half (46.8%) of the students reported that they had difficulties at least sometimes in understanding teacher’s comments. Of those, 75.8% of the students preferred to ask teachers for help. The interviews yielded similar results (46.7%). The reasons of difficulties were reported as some unknown words or signs used by teachers and teachers’ handwriting.

The findings of writers are similar to my findings. For instance, Ferris (1995) also stated that 50% of the students had difficulties in understanding teachers’ comments and she claimed that 9% of the students reported that they could not read their teachers’ handwriting. In addition, Cohen (1990) stated that students could not understand words that are formed from single words.
Students were also asked what they did when they could not understand their teachers' comments. The results of interviews showed that 71.4% of the students asked their teachers when they could not understand teachers' comments. Leki's (1991) study also pointed out that more than half (58%) of the students asked their teachers when they could not understand teachers' comments.

With regard to students' response action when they take their composition papers corrected, the results indicated that half (50.0%) of the students read the corrections to understand them. Furthermore, 22.6% of the students read through the paper carefully. This shows that students would like to respond to teachers' corrected papers by reading and trying to understand in their minds. Cohen (1987) also claimed that most of the students responded to their teachers' corrected composition papers by making only a mental note.

Pedagogical or Institutional Implications

The results of this study show that the majority (67%) of the students want teachers correct all of their errors. However, scholars who support the cognitive approach advise teachers not to correct every surface error because they believe that these kinds of errors are not very important. Since the majority of the students expect us correct all of their errors, there is a conflict that has no clear resolution.

As English teachers we sometimes become too involved in the teaching theory. Because the scholars advocating the cognitive approach advise against it, we try not to correct student errors. However, the results of this study show that there would be a gap between our students’ expectations of us, and what we do in our classrooms.
In order to bridge that gap, teachers may wish to distribute questionnaires to students at the beginning of the semester to determine their error correction preferences. This way, teachers can more easily understand the students’ expectations and address those expectations as they mark student papers.

Another point of interest to teachers is that though the theoretical literature advises correcting student compositions by giving “clues” about how to correct errors, the findings of this study indicate that majority of students prefer the teacher to correct errors by supplying the correct forms or indicating the location of error. Again, taking the time to determine student preferences may have more positive impact on their compositions.

Finally the results of the study show that 46.7 of the students had problems understanding teachers’ comments. Those problems were linked to difficulties deciphering the teachers’ handwriting, and also understanding words or signs, which were either unknown to students or unexplained.

All of these findings are helpful to teachers not just at METU, but in other institutions, by reminding them of the differences between what students expect and teacher provide.

Limitations

The major limitation of this study was time. Because of time limitations and economic constraints this study could not include all of the freshman students in Ankara. This might be done by data collection from different universities in Ankara. For this reason, this study will reveal only the preferences of freshman students at METU.
The other limitation of the study again related to time was that only sixty-two freshman students were given questionnaires and fifteen students interviewed.

**Further Research**

Further research might be conducted with subjects from different universities of the students in Ankara. This would provide a general idea about all freshman students in Ankara. If there were enough time, this type of study might be done for all Turkish universities.

Another research study could be conducted on the relationship between student grades and their responses to corrected errors on their composition papers, while the other research study could focus on whether students’ errors decrease when teachers use error correction techniques that majority of the students prefer in a classroom.

All of these suggestions would add further to the issue of error correction on written compositions.
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Appendix A

ERROR CORRECTION PREFERENCES QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

Dear Students,

I am an MA TEFL graduate student at Bilkent University. I am doing a research project on students' preferences for error correction techniques in the Department of Modern Languages at Middle East Technical University. Your responses will help me a great deal with my research. Your responses will be kept confidential. You do not have to give your name and no one will know your specific answers to these questions. I will be very grateful if you would take a few moments to complete the questions below.

Thank you, for participating and answering questions thoughtfully.

Filiz Muluk

Section I

Part A.

Directions: Read each question below carefully. Then answer the questions by writing that applies to you.

1. Are you female or male?___________
2. What is your age?_______________
3. Where were you born?________________
4. Which high school did you graduate from?__________________
5. What is your department at METU?__________________
6. Where did you begin to learn English? ____________________ In what age? __________
7. How long have you been studying English at METU?__________________

Part B.

Directions: Read each question below carefully. Then answer the questions by circling the answer that applies to you.

7. Did you attend the Department of Basic English at METU?
   a. Yes   b. No
8. Do you enjoy writing compositions as a class assignment?
   a. Yes   b. No
9. Is it important for you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?
   a. Yes   b. No
Section II.

Part A.

Directions: Please refer to the following scale and circle the comment that most closely corresponds to your opinion about the statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree = 1</th>
<th>Agree = 2</th>
<th>Uncertain = 3</th>
<th>Disagree = 4</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. On a preliminary draft, I like it when my instructor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. corrects grammatical errors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. corrects my vocabulary use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. corrects punctuation, capitalization, spelling etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. uses a set of symbols (eg., T = tense, sp = spelling etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. comments on my ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. evaluates the way I have organized my ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part B.

Directions: Please circle the letter that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

11. Does your teacher give feedback about your strengths and weaknesses in your preliminary draft?

a. only my strengths
b. only my weaknesses
c. both my weaknesses and strengths
d. neither my weaknesses nor strengths.
Section III
Part A.
Directions:

The following sentences have grammar errors and each sentence is corrected by using different kind of error correction method. Look over different kinds of error correction methods and rate each method. If you think the method is a very helpful way to correct errors, circle = 1. If you think the method is not a helpful way to correct error, circle = 5. If you think the method is somewhere between helpful and not helpful, circle the number 2, 3 or 4 that best represents your behaviour.

Description of error techniques shown below.

a. Instructor gives advice  e. Instructor gives a clue about how to correct error.
b. Instructor suggests a meeting. f. Instructor underlines error.
c. Instructor indicates the place of error  g. No correction
d. Instructor corrects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Sentence</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ever since he left his family, he is very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Ever since he left his family, he is very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Since he left his family, he has been ever very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ever since he left his family, he is very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ever since he left his family, he is very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Ever since he left his family, he is very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Ever since he left his family, he is very upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IV

Directions:

Part A

Read following questions below. Then a put a tick ✔ on the one answer that most closely corresponds to your opinion.

13. What type of error correction method does your instructor usually use?
   1. ________ shows where the error is.
   2. ________ crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct word or structure.
   3. ________ ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the ideas expressed.
   4. ________ shows where the error is and gives a clue about how to correct it.

14. What do you prefer your instructor to do if there are many errors on your composition paper?
   1. ________ correct only a few of the major errors
   2. ________ correct only errors that interferes with your communication.
   3. ________ correct all major and minor errors
   4. ________ correct all repeated errors
   5. ________ correct no errors and comment only your ideas
   6. ________ correct all errors that instructor thinks major.

15. What do you prefer your instructor to use in correcting your composition paper?
   1. ________ a red pen
   2. ________ a pen that has less noticeable colour of ink
   3. ________ I don't care

16. How does your English instructor usually correct your errors now?
   1. ________ corrects only a few of the major errors
   2. ________ corrects only errors that interferes with your communication.
   3. ________ corrects all major and minor errors
   4. ________ corrects all repeated errors
   5. ________ corrects no errors and comments only your ideas
   7. ________ corrects all errors that instructor thinks major.
Part B.

Directions:

For the following questions please circle the option that is suitable to you or write your answer.

17. Do you have difficulties in understanding your teacher’s comments on your first composition draft?
   a. Yes         b. Sometimes         c. No

18. If your answer is yes or sometimes what do you prefer to do?
   a. ask my instructor for help
   b. ask my friends for help
   c. check grammar books
   d. ask other teachers
   e. nothing
   f. other __________________________ (If your answer is other, please write what do you do.)

If you circled more than one of the options above which is the most helpful?

____________________________________________________________________________________

19. What do you do to help you learn from the errors corrected on your paper and not repeat that error again.
   a. I only read through the paper carefully without rewriting anything.
   b. I rewrite the whole paper
   c. I rewrite on another paper just the sentence in which an error appeared.
   d. I do not do anything because I know I’ll probably just forget and make the same errors again whatever I do.
   e. I rewrite only the part of the sentence that was wrong near the error.
   f. I read the corrections to understand them.
   g. other __________________________ (if your answer is other, please write what do you do)

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION
Appendix B1

Interview Sheet

STUDENT INTERVIEW SHEET

INTERVIEWER: Filiz Muluk
INTERVIEWEE: ________________
DATE : ________________
TIME : Start: ______ Stop: ______

The questions on this paper are only guiding questions for interviewer. The interviewer will ask follow up questions during the interviews. The questions are open-ended in this interview.

The purpose of this interview to get information to improve teaching writing classes. It is a part of research project being carried on as a partial fulfillment of the MA TEFL Program at Bilkent University. The aim is not evaluate the teachers or students. All the responses will be kept confidential. Please stop me and ask questions about anything that you do not understand that I say.

Thank you for taking the time to answer the questions thoughtfully.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Where were you born?

2. Which high school did you graduate from?

3. What is your department at METU?

4. Did you attend the Preparation School at METU?

□ Yes □ No

If your answer answer is yes when did you attend?

5. How long have you been studying English at METU?
II. General Questions

This part of the interview will be about your preferences for feedback for your composition writing?

6. Do you believe that your errors should be corrected on your composition papers? If your answer is yes, who do you prefer to correct your composition papers? (teacher, classmate, friend, mother)

7. What kind of error correction(s) do you think the least helpful when your composition errors are corrected on your composition papers?

8. What kind of error correction(s) do you think most helpful when your errors are corrected on your composition papers?

III. Specific questions about your teacher's error correction.

9. How does your English instructor usually correct your errors on your composition papers?

10. Do you mind if your instructor use red pen or coloured pen while correcting your composition errors on your composition papers? If your answer is yes, what colour don’t you like and what colour do you prefer?

11. Do you prefer your English instructor to correct all your composition errors on your composition papers or just some of your errors?

12. What kind(s) of errors do you prefer to be corrected by your instructor on your composition papers? (e.g spelling, tense etc.)
13. Does your teacher give you both positive and negative feedback for your composition papers?

IV. Interviewee’s response to teacher’s feedback

Do you examine your composition errors when your instructor gives your composition paper after correcting your errors? If you examine your composition paper how do you examine it?

14. Do you have difficulty in understanding your instructor’s correcting your errors on your composition papers? If you have any difficulty what do you do?

15. Do you benefit from your teacher’s error correction process? If your answer is yes how do you understand that you benefit from your teacher’s feedback?

Is there any other thing(s) you would like to add?

Thank you very much for spending your time to participate in this interview.
RÖPORTAJ SAYFASI

RÖPORTAJI YAPAN: Filiz Muluk
RÖPORTAJ YAPILAN: ____________________
TARIH : ____________________
ZAMAN : Başlama: _________ Bitiş: _________


Soruları cevaplamak için bana zaman ayırınız, bu ince davranışınızdan dolayı size teşekkür ederim.

I. ÖZGEÇMİŞ BİLGİSİ

1. Nerede doğdunuz ?
   ____________________

2. Hagi liseden mezun oldunuz ?
   ____________________

3. ODTÜ’ de bölümünüz nedir ?
   ____________________

4. ODTÜ’ de İngilizce Hazırlık Bölümünde öğrenci oldunuzmu ?
   □ Evet □ Hayır
   Eğer cevabınız evetse ne zaman öğrenci oldunuz ?
   ____________________

5. ODTÜ’ de ne kadar süreden bu yana İngilizce öğreniyorsunuz?
II. Genel Sorular
Röportajın bu bölümü sizin kompozisyon yazmadaki tercihleriniz hakkında olacaktır


7. İngilizce kompozisyon kağıdınızda hatalarınız düzeltildiken en az tercih ettiğiniz hata düzeltme türlerini belirtiniz.

8. İngilizce kompozisyon kağıdınızda hatalarınız düzeltildiken en çok tercih ettiğiniz hata düzeltme türlerini belirtiniz.

III. İngilizce öğretmeninizin hata düzeltme yöntemi ile ilgili sorular

9. Öğretmeniniz İngilizce kompozisyon kağıdınızda hatalarınızı düzeltken genellikle hangi yöntemi kullanır?

10. Öğretmeniniz hatalarınızı düzeltken kırmızı kalem ya da renkli kalem kullanıyor mu? Eğer renk sizin için önemli ise, ne renk kullanılmasından hoşlanırsınız ve hangi rengin kullanılmasından hoşlanmazsınız.

11. Öğretmeninizin, kompozisyonunuzda ki bütün hataları mı ya da sadece bir kısmını mı düzeltmesini tercih edersiniz?

12. Ne tür hataları kompozisyon kağıdınızda düzeltmesini tercih edersiniz? (e.g. gramer, noktalama, yazım vs.)
13. Öğretmeniniz İngilizce kompozisyon kağıtlarımızdaki hatalarınızı ve eksiklerinizi gösterirken kompozisyon kağıdınızdaki hem olumlu hem de olumsuz yanlarınızı gösteriyornu? 

IV. Röportaj yapılanın öğretmenin verdiği hata düzeltme ve yorumlama sistemi hakkında düşüncesi

14. Öğretmeniniz kompozisyon kağıtlarımızdaki hatalarınızı düzeltip tekrar size verdiğinde hataları inceliyormusunuz? Eğer inceliyorsanız nasıl inceliyorsunuz?

15. Öğretmeninizin kompozisyon kağıdınızda kullandığı bütün işaretleri anlıyormusunuz? Eğer anlayamazsanız, ne yap OnCollision?

16. Sizce öğretmeninizin, sizin hatalarınızı düzeltmesi size faydalı oluyormu? Eğer cevabınız evetise faydalı olduğunu nasıl anlıyorsunuz?

Eklemek istedğiniz herhangi bir şey var mı?

Bu röportaja katılmak için zaman ayırdığınız için çok teşekkür ederim.
APPENDIX C

Students’ Preferences for Error Correction Techniques

Figure 1. Students’ preference for teacher’s giving advice.

Figure 2. Students’ preference for teacher’s suggesting a meeting.
Note. VH - Very helpful, H - Helpful, SH - Somewhat helpful, LH - Little helpful, NH - Not helpful.

Figure 3. Students’ preference for teacher’s indicating the place of error.

Note. VH - Very helpful, H - Helpful, SH - Somewhat helpful, LH - Little helpful, NH - Not helpful.

Figure 4. Students’ preference for teacher’s correcting errors.
Figure 5. Students’ preference for teacher’s giving a clue about how to correct errors.

Figure 6. Student’s preference for teacher’s underlining errors.
Note. VH- Very helpful, H- Helpful, SH- Somewhat helpful, LH- Little helpful, NH- Not helpful.

Figure 7. Students’ preference for teacher’s not correcting
### Appendix D

**Table**

*All means and standard deviations of variables in the study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(n=62)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.71</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance to Department of Basic English</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoying composition writing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of having few errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting grammatical errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting vocabulary use</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting punct., cap., and spelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a set of symbols</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenting on ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s feedback style</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s giving advice</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s suggesting a meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s indicating the place of error</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s correcting</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s giving a clue</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s underlining errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s not correcting</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s error correction techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ preference about extent of error correction</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ preference for teacher’s pen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of errors corrected</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in understanding teacher com.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ preference to get help</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ response to corrected papers</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. punc.=punctuation; cap.=capitalization; er.=error; cor.=correction*