



T. C. ANADOLU ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

# THE EFL STUDENTS' SELF-CORRECTION PERFORMANCE IN WRITING CLASSES

(YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ)

**H. Ferhan ODABAŞI**

ESKİŞEHİR, 1989

To my mother, Havva  
and to my daughter, Özüm,  
who both have taught me  
it is always worth trying.

✓

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u> .....	iii
<u>LIST OF TABLES</u> .....	iv
 <u>CHAPTER I</u>	
INTRODUCTION	
<u>1.1. Background to the Problem</u> .....	1
<u>1.1.1. An Overview of Error</u> .....	1
<u>1.1.2. Error Correction</u> .....	5
<u>1.1.3. The Aim and Scope of the Study</u> .....	6
<u>1.1.4. Limitations and Assumptions of</u> <u>the Study</u> .....	8
 <u>CHAPTER II</u>	
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
<u>2.1. Problems Related to Error Correction in the</u> <u>Teaching of English as a Foreign Language</u> ....	11
<u>2.1.1. Should Errors be Corrected?</u> .....	12
<u>2.1.2. When Should Errors be Corrected?</u> .....	14
<u>2.1.3. Which Errors Should be Corrected?:</u> <u>A Classification of Significance</u> .....	15

<u>2.1.4. How to Correct Learner Errors?.....</u>	19
<u>2.1.5. Who Should Correct Errors? Teacher-Centered Activity vs Student-Centered Activity.....</u>	21 <sup>x</sup>

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

<u>3.1. Research Design.....</u>	25
<u>3.2. Selection of Subjects.....</u>	27
<u>3.3. Data Collection Procedures.....</u>	28
<u>3.3.1. The Structural Level Test.....</u>	29
<u>3.3.2. The Composition Test.....</u>	29
<u>3.3.2.1. Composition Test: Group I; Regarding the Efficiency of Self-Correction without Teacher Assistance.....</u>	30
<u>3.3.2.2. Composition Test: Group II; Regarding the Efficiency of Self-Correction with Teacher Assistance.....</u>	30
<u>3.4. Data Analysis.....</u>	31
<u>3.5. The Related Hypotheses.....</u>	33

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

<u>4.1. Results of the Structural Level Test.....</u>	35
<u>4.2. Results of Analysis of Variance(F).....</u>	36
<u>4.3. Results of the t-tests.....</u>	41

<u>4.4. Classification of Errors.....</u>	43
<u>4.4.1. Persisting Errors in the Control Group</u>	46
<u>4.4.2. Persisting Errors in the Experimental</u> <u>Group.....</u>	48
<u>4.4.3. The Results of the Self-Correction</u> <u>Under Teacher Assistance; Conditions</u> <u>4 and 5 in the Experimental Group.....</u>	51
<u>4.4.3.1. Persisting Errors in</u> <u>Condition 5.....</u>	52
 <u>CHAPTER V</u>	
<u>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	
<u>5.1. Summary.....</u>	56
<u>5.2. Conclusions.....</u>	58
<u>5.3. Recommendations.....</u>	59
<u>5.4. Suggestions for Future Studies.....</u>	60
 <u>REFERENCES.....</u>	63
 <u>APPENDICES.....</u>	68

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Ahmet Konrot for his patient and intellectual guidance all through this study.

I will always remain indebted to Dr. Zülâl Balpınar for her support and help in making this all a reality.

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Gül Durmuşoğlu for her valuable friendship and for opening her own library to my use.

I am grateful to Dr. Jonathan de Berkeley-Wykes, without whose teaching this study would be impossible.

I would like to thank to Dr. Embiya Ağaoğlu for his never-ending support in donating me with the statistical information, and Dr. Yaşar Hoşcan for helping me in computer programs.

My thanks are due to Mrs. Christine Street of British Council, who shared her enthusiasm, time and knowledge with me.

I would like to thank to a colleague Sedat Serdar-oğlu who helped me with employing the tests.

The last but not the least, Yavuz and Özüm deserve special recognition for they were always there, full of love, for me.

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Before-after Design with Control Group.....	26
2 Self Correction Conditions in Foreign Language Performance.....	31
3 The Results of the F-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Group I.....	37
4 The Results of the F-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Group II.....	38
5 The Results of the F-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 in Group II.....	40
6 The Results of the t-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 3 and 4 in Group II.....	41
7 The Results of the t-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 4 and 5 in Group II.....	42

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1. Background to the Problem

##### 1.1.1. An Overview of Error

Since learning a foreign language is a very complex process, it is not surprising to find things going wrong now and then (Halliday et al. 1965: 225). Corder (1973: 256/7) in support of this, claims that making mistakes is not limited to language learners. Language learning, he says, like any other human learning is a process which involves making mistakes. As suggested by Abott (1981: 236), errors are inevitable however careful the initial teaching of an item is and however well the students perform in controlled practice sessions. When talking about error, of course, it is necessary



to make a distinction between errors and mistakes. Mistakes are performance errors that are either a random guess or slips of the tongue whereas, as Corder claims (in Richards, 1974: 24/5), errors are systematic deviances from the native model and are perfectly consistent with the learner's "true competence" at that point.

However, when literature is reviewed, it is seen that many instructors use the terms error and mistake interchangeably (Corder, 1973; Rivers, 1983; Chastain, 1980; Burt and Kiparşky, 1972; Krashen, 1985; Fromkin, 1980).

This may give a clue that there is a dilemma in choosing the term and defining the concept. It seems that there is no strict border between an error and a mistake both as terms and concepts. In the light of this situation, one should bear in mind that the terms error and mistake can be found interchangeably in any piece of work. On the other hand, as far as correction is concerned, errors are supposed not to be corrected since they are in the acquired system of the language, whereas mistakes may be corrected since they are related to learning. Thus the effect of correction of an error might be ephemeral, but the effect of correction of a mistake is permanent (Hubbard and Jones, 1986: 134; Lott, 1983: 257).

Gower and Walters (1983: 147), claim that the student can correct a mistake himself, either completely

unprompted or with the assistance of the teacher. However, they believe that an error is more ingrained. When an error is committed, the student might believe what he is saying is correct, might not know the correct form or might know the correct form but cannot get it right.

In general, since errors are regular and systematic deviances, the best way to decide whether the incorrect form is an error or a mistake, is to ask the student to try again. Hence, if a student can correct himself, it will indicate that he has a performance problem. If on the other hand, he can not correct himself with or without teacher assistance, one may conclude that the student faces a competence problem. This kind of a teaching strategy may help the teacher to differentiate errors from mistakes.

However, there are different reactions to the idea of error itself. Some instructors are completely against the concept of error, saying that all linguistic forms are finally arbitrary, thus no form is obligatory as long as the variant forms can be understood by the reader (Shaughnessy, 1977:9).

Still, errors made by language learners are of great interest to researchers in applied linguistics. Corder proposes that by studying a learner's errors, we get to the nature of his knowledge at a particular

point in his learning career. What is more, he suggests that by describing and classifying his errors in linguistic terms we may get an idea of the characteristics of the language which are causing him learning problems (1973: 256/7).

These suggestions indicate that errors provide feedback not only for the teacher but also for the learner himself:

When it is for the teacher, errors provide feedback as to what still needs to be taught and on how far the past teaching has resulted in learning. The teacher then may go for a new approach or different materials. When, on the other hand, it is the learner, errors provide feedback as to what stage he is at and what he still needs to know. One may consider learning a foreign language as formulating hypotheses about the target language and testing these hypotheses. Thus the learner finds out whether a hypothesis is confirmed or rejected-if it is rejected, then it must be put to further tests(Richards, 1974: 25).

The above lines may suggest that students have the capacity to learn from their own mistakes. Some people argue that the student does not learn from his own mistakes. If he did, the more mistakes he made, the more he would learn(Bright and Mc Gregor, 1970: 34).

Having said this, errors should be considered as a useful tool. It seems to be a fact that if errors are not considered important as feedback, they will be of no use in teaching and learning.

What Bright and Gregor seem to suggest is that students need assistance in testing their hypotheses about the rules of the target language. As a matter of fact, the teacher's inventiveness starts at the points after the errors have occurred. The teacher then may try different solutions to the errors. In fact, this will form the basis of the present study.

### 1.1.2. Error Correction

Correction is a kind of feedback to learners on their use of the language. By providing correction, the teacher tries to help the learner with his language at that time. Besides, learners are known to want correction and find it improving for their use of the language (Murphy, 1986: 146). It is known that when error correction is successful, it helps the learner to change his version of a conscious rule. However we must bear in mind that error correction is of no use for acquisition but only for learning as Krashen suggests:

"Error correction has little or no effect on subconscious acquisition but it is thought to be useful for conscious learning. Error correction supposedly helps the learner to induce or figure out the right form of a rule."(1982: 11)

Another idea put forward for error correction is by Vigil and Oller (in Chastain, 1980: 61). They claim that errors will fossilize and stay in a learner's linguistic system unless they are corrected. They further suggest the correction of errors in order to eliminate faulty constructions from the learner's competence. This view finds support in Daniels and Packard (1982: 88), who claim that a constant repetition of errors does nothing but ingrain them.

If the purpose of error correction is to improve learner competence and performance, then error correction should be highly valued in the developing of foreign language materials and curricula. Error correction can be placed within a remedial course in an ELT curriculum. The learner's attention can be focused on particular mistakes of the particular object of a lesson and thus a partial remedial effect is achieved. In fact a remedial session after the teaching of a new item may face the students with their own errors and enable them to recognize and cope with their own handicaps.

### 1.1.3. The Aim and Scope of the Study

Recent studies emphasize the importance of "Proofreading" and "Self-correction" techniques in the correction of written compositions. Both techniques have the advantage of being time and energy saving

and more learner-centered. They are alike fundamentally; both depend on the learner reading his work over and checking for his own mistakes. However, the teacher's role in a "Proofreading" session is a passive and a silent one whereas it is a more important and active one in a "Self-correction" session; the teacher assistance is stressed in "Self-correction" but absent in "Proofreading".

In fact, there are many correction techniques, each favouring a different attitude, yet no particular one has been shown superior to any other. Various techniques have been put forward but the last word on choosing a correction method for a class is always the teacher's (Burt and Kiparsky, 1972: 4/7; Broughton et al., 1980: 137/8; Abott et al., 1981: 219/21; Norrish, 1983: 100/3; Khalil, 1985: 335).

As it is upto the teacher to choose how to use any one of the techniques, he may want to emphasize certain grammar points in his lesson. So, he may wish the students to re-read their work concentrating on one specific language point at one time and on another point at another time.

Although the current views on language teaching support the idea that a student should be responsible for his work from the very beginning to the very end, thus minimizing the role of the teacher, the teacher as a consultant should do his best even within this limited role.

In the light of this information, the purpose of this study can be stated as to bring some insight to the problems involved in the issue of error correction in writing classes. For this purpose, two different correction techniques; "Proofreading; Self-correction without teacher assistance and "Teacher assisted Self-correction" are compared. The study, done within the scope of free-composition writing, tried to show the effect of teacher guidance in self-correction as applied to composition activities, by measuring the efficiency of self-correction at the end of a free-composition writing session. This study aims to answer the following question;

"Is it worth choosing any one technique of error correction over another?"

In order to examine this question, it is necessary to ask both of the following questions;

1. How efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a self-correction technique that requires no teacher assistance?
2. How efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a self-correction technique that requires teacher assistance?

#### 1.1.4. Limitations and Assumptions of the Study

This study was carried out at Anadolu University

Education Faculty. The second year students of the English Teacher Training Department were chosen as subjects. All subjects were speakers of English as a foreign language and native speakers of Turkish. It was assumed that the subjects have similar social backgrounds. They were supposed to have the same aim of becoming English teachers since, at the time of the research, they were being trained to be English teachers.

The number of subjects for each group is limited to 30, since this was the highest available number of students at the same level.

This study is limited to the comparison of two error correction techniques;

1. Self-correction under teacher assistance, and
2. Proofreading; self-correction without teacher assistance.

The study is focused on a writing activity as a testing base since a writing activity is more controllable than an oral activity in terms of error correction.

Another limitation of the study is that the correction sessions are not repeated. The two techniques are applied on the same day, each as one session. The students' efficiency of self-correction is measured according to the results of that one session.



As the study does not aim at error analysis, there is no classification made as to which errors to correct. Any structural deviances, such as incorrect or misused forms of article, agreement, tense etc. will be counted as an error. Incorrect lexical items on the other hand will not be taken into consideration. The study is limited to the classification of errors after the correction procedure takes place. Thus, an attempt will be made to define the uncertain distinction between error and mistake more closely.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### 2.1. Problems Related to Error Correction in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language

It is very important for the student to know whether what he has said or written is acceptable or not. Hendrickson (in Vandergrift, 1986: 660) claims that correction improves proficiency more than leaving errors uncorrected. By providing correction, the teacher tries to improve learning and what is more, many learners are reported to want correction and find it useful (Bailey and Celce-Murcia, 1979: 324). Considering this is the case, error correction, then, may reinforce a positive learning situation.

However there are several problems to be faced with in the issue of error correction. These problems can be summarized under the "five fundamental questions" of Hendrickson's (in Krashen, 1982: 116).

- "1. Should errors be corrected?
2. When should errors be corrected?
3. Which learner errors should be corrected?
4. How should learner errors be corrected?
5. Who should correct errors?"

Answering these questions in detail brings light to the problems related to error correction in the teaching of English as a foreign language.

#### 2.1.1. Should Errors be Corrected?

There are different answers to this question, depending on one's view of whether language is a linguistic system or a means of communication. Yet, another distinction is between accuracy and fluency. A lesson often falls into several distinct phases. If the teacher is focusing on accuracy exercises such as; teaching a new item and doing the drills, or exercising in the language laboratory, then he may point out a mistake. Because the class is very much under his control during these exercises, learners have less opportunity to be creative and therefore to make mistakes.

On the other hand when the focus is on fluency that is, when the students have started the communicative

practice, the teacher should not pounce on a mistake as it is produced and demand correction (Mc Keating in Abott et al., 1981; Brumfit, 1981).

When dealing with errors, the teacher should be very careful and sensitive towards the students as the affective factors play an important role in positive classroom motivation. If the teacher is successful in establishing a good affective atmosphere in his class, he may not have any problems on the cognitive side;

"As long as the affective messages conveyed to the students are predominantly positive, frequent instances of negative cognitive feedback are not likely to do any harm, and in fact are probably essential to a high level of attainment on the part of the learners in foreign language classrooms."

(Vigil and Oller, in Chastain 1980: 61)

Another concern for error correction is "fossilization". A large number of second language educators think that errors will fossilize and become ingrained in learner's linguistic competence. However, the opposite view claims that if the main concern is how much communication there is, then fossilized forms should be given credit as well (Ghadessy 1985: 262).

On the other hand, there is a distinction between language acquisition and language learning. Supported by Krashen, it follows that error correction encourages the student to avoid mistakes by avoiding difficult

structures and focusing less on meaning and more on form. Krashen further claims that the overuse of correction has negative effects for language acquisition and it would be a good idea to eliminate error correction in communicative type of activities (Krashen, 1982: 74/6). However, where "learning" is concerned error correction is still a valid process (Krashen, 1982: 117). Bailey and Celce-Murcia favour error correction believing that everything that is said in the classroom can be considered input, thus should be given maximum care (Bailey and Celce-Murcia, 1979: 325).

As a result, it seems important that error correction accomplish its purpose, that is, improve learner competence and performance. As long as this improvement is provided, each teacher may establish his own correction technique.

### 2.1.2. When Should Errors be Corrected?

There are different views as to when an error should be corrected. However, the common idea is against an immediate correction, considering its negative effect on students (Chastain, 1980: 64; McKeating 1981:238; Murphy, 1986: 146). Where the purpose is fluency, as it may be in oral work, correcting an accuracy mistake immediately may distract the learners from their aim namely, conveying an idea orally. Besides, a short pause may

give the learner the opportunity to correct himself or to find the correct usage.

As far as writing is concerned, however, a corrected draft should be given in the shortest time possible to reinforce positive accomplishment and to maintain the students' interest in their work(Walz, 1982: 127). Broughton et al(1978: 140) point out that immediate feedback is very important to a learner but, noting that it is usually difficult to provide corrections on the "spur of the moment" they recommend postponing some items to a later date.

### 2.1.3. Which Errors Should be Corrected?; A Classification of Significance

There have been various approaches as to which learner-errors to correct. Because it is both unwise and impractical to correct every mistake, teachers should be selective. It should be up to the teacher to decide what to correct and what to not between the limits of the subject he teacher(Bailey and Celce-Murcia, 1979: 324; Cardy, 1987: 294: 15). A grammar teacher may like to point out a particular grammar item he had taught recently whereas a reading instructor may wish to focus on the pronunciation of a particular sound. As quoted by Chastain(1980: 210),

"Depending upon the particular instructor's personal biases, some errors will be ignored, others will be tolerated, and others like crabgrass or dandelions in the lawn, will be the object of intense and repeated efforts directed toward complete and perpetual banishment from the student's linguistic repertoire."

Different ideas are put forward on the issue of which errors to correct, such as correcting "global" errors, errors that interfere with communication or impede the intelligibility of a message, suggested by Burt and Kiparsky(1972: 4/6).

Parallel to Burt and Kiparsky, Krashen(1982: 118) is also selective in his view of error correction. He claims that teachers should only correct the errors that show the rules which can be used as part of the conscious Monitor, namely the conscious grammar.

Norrish, on the other hand, proposes that a grammatical error is more serious than a lexical one but then leaves the distinction of error gravity to the teacher to make for the needs of his own class (Norrish, 1983: 100/3), since he believes that teachers are the ones to judge their classes on any issue. Another suggestion is, however that much importance should be given to the errors in the overall structure of sentences rather than the errors affecting the sentence partially(Broughton et al. 1980: 137/8). They propose the most important error types as; transformations,

tense, concord, case negation, article, order, lexical errors. An alternative way of deciding about the gravity of error, again suggested by Broughton et al., is looking at a mistake through the eyes of native speakers rather than on the basis of its linguistic appropriateness. It is claimed that native speakers tolerate lexical errors more than grammatical errors(1978: 137/8).

A study carried out in Morocco, in 1983 by Eirlys E. Davies, illustrates some contrasts between the non-native English teachers and native English teachers in their evaluation of learners' errors. The results show more evidence of the tendency of native speakers to be more lenient in their marking than non-native speakers. The author states that this might be due to native speakers' superior knowledge of wide-ranging norms in English.

In another study which tries to illustrate the communicative effect of a selected sample of errors in written English made by native Arab learners, Aziz Khalil(1985) has chosen 240 American undergraduates as judges considering that they were peers of Arab students who produced the deviant utterances. The result, however, doesn't give any important clues on error gravity. That is the American undergraduates do not think that one kind of error is more important than any other.



Walz(1982: 10/2) on the other hand proposes four criteria for deciding which errors to correct;

1. "Comprehensibility": Since the major aim of using a language is communicating ideas, teachers should correct errors that cause misunderstanding or lack of comprehension.

2. "Frequency": Errors that are made regularly by the whole class or by several students should be corrected.

3. "Pedagogical focus": Errors that are present in forms that students have recently learned in class should be corrected.

4. "Individual student concerns": Correction should be made according to the different characteristics of the learner, that is, whether he might profit from minor corrections or not, whether he might benefit from corrections of grammatical points or not.

Being selective while correcting errors, is useful except that it results in a fossilization of uncorrected forms and thus is not sufficient for developing the learner's linguistic competence(Vandergrift, 1986: 661). Again in Vandergrift, Rivers(1986: 665) suggests correcting all mistakes in a piece of written work. Such a correction might be time consuming but if done regularly on short writing assignments, the result will be worth it. However, as long as oral work is

considered, the emphasis is less on correction. Many instructors recommend keeping silent during an oral work since communication is a time for experimentation (Chastain, 1980; Rivers, 1978; Walz, 1982).

In a study carried out in 1984 by Roberta J. Vann, Daisy E. Meyer and Frederick O. Lorenz, different teacher approaches to learners' errors are very well shown. The study examined the faculty response to the written errors of students who are non-native speakers of English. The aim of the study was to determine which sentence-level errors are judged to be the most serious by an academic community. A survey was conducted to measure how a cross section of faculty at Iowa State University respond to certain common ELS writing errors. Results indicate that most respondents did not judge all errors as equally grievous.

To sum up, the general idea is that the last consideration about which errors to correct should be the teacher's. It is claimed that the decision is upto the teacher's consideration of error gravity (Abott et al., 1981: 219/21; Brown, 1980: 164/70).

#### 2.1.4. How to Correct Learner Errors?

There are various methods as to how to correct learner errors. However, whichever method is chosen, the aim should be minimizing the "red circle syndrome"

(Vandergrift, 1986: 663), namely, avoiding too many correction marks on a given work. For this purpose an error correction code can be developed to be written in the margin of a given written work for helping the student to identify his errors (Ellis, 1984; Hill and Dobbyn, 1981).

From the pedagogical aspect, however, this might not be sufficient for some individuals in the class. It may be necessary to give more information to one student than to another. For some students only underlining the errors would be enough whereas some others may wish to have the correct form provided. This might be balanced by organizing a class consisting of students with the same English levels. Still, the appropriate use of a correction code requires knowing the needs of each individual thus enabling the teacher to bring light into the subject.

However, the results of a research study carried by Harriet Semke in 1984 indicated that student progress is enhanced by writing practice alone. The study conducted for 10 weeks with 141 first-year German students at the University of Minnesota, compared the effects of four methods of teacher treatment of free-writing assignments:

- (1) Writing comments and questions rather than corrections;
- (2) marking all errors and supplying the correct forms;
- (3) combining positive comments and corrections; and

(4) indicating errors by means of a code and requiring students to find corrections and then rewrite the assignment. The result was that corrections did not increase writing accuracy, writing fluency or general language proficiency, furthermore the corrections had a negative effect on student attitudes, especially when students had to make corrections by themselves.

#### 2.1.5. Who Should Correct Errors? Teacher-Centered Activity vs Student-Centered Activity

A review of the literature suggests the order of persons who correct errors for the most productive language learning as; first, the student himself; second, other students in the class and last the teacher (Bright and McGregor, 1970; Vandergrift, 1986; Norrish, 1983; Rivers, 1978; Broughton et al., 1978; Walz, 1982; Freeman, 1986; Stevick, 1982).

Corder asserts that;

"Simple provision of the correct form may not always be the only or indeed the most effective form of correction since it bars the way to the learner testing alternative hypotheses. Making a learner try to discover the right form could often be more instructive to both learner and teacher."

(in Richards, 1974)

In support, Hendrickson suggests giving students the opportunity to find solutions to their written errors thus, allowing them to have more responsibility for their own writing (in Vandergrift, 1986). Also, Broughton et al (1978) claim that a proofreading of written work develops an awareness of one's own errors, and Bright and McGregor (1970) admit that the training of the proof reader is a "slow and painful" process but they note that it is worth while.

Suggested by Rivers is that students proofreading their own work may develop their interest in problem solving competition and thus improve their work. She believes that constant correction by the teacher is discouraging for the students (1983: 53).

However, the problem in self-correction or proofreading is, if a particular item is not present in one's linguistic competence, the individual is unable to correct his error with that particular item. The answer is probably to replace the error with another misused form of that particular item.

In support of this, several studies done on self-correction at the end agreed in their indication that self-correction was never perfect and never fulfilled its aim (Krashen and Pon, 1975; Schlue, 1977; White, 1977; Houck et al., 1978; Fathman, 1980 in Krashen, 1982; Sivell, 1980).

Another way to keep students active in the correction process is peer correction. Burt and Kiparsky(1972: 11) and Norrish(1983: 71) favour peer correction since it aids communication among the students and enables them to recognize eachother's "goof". McDonough on the other hand, deals with the subject rather tentatively. He claims that students are hardly willing to have their errors exposed to their friends due to "loss of face resulting from a punitive attitude to error." (McDonough, 1981: 84/5) but he goes on to point to the value of peer correction as long as a teacher has "fostered a non-hostile, trusting climate" in the classroom.

Teacher correction is needed during the early stages. It usually does not take much time for the students to become aware of the errors they have made and then they can correct themselves(Chastain, 1980: 63; Monreal, 1981: 42).

With regard to teacher correction, Bright and McGregor suggest that the teacher should pace very cautiously;

"The teacher who carefully crosses out or underlines every mistake in his pupil's book develops a keen eye for errors but his pupils do not;..."(1970: 154)

Then to eliminate such a situation, the teacher should provide the students with an "auto-corrective

capacity" by which the learners test their hypotheses of rule formation(Courchene in Walz, 1982: 17).

In the light of these prior studies, it can be seen that no matter who corrects, the concentration and the awareness should be on the student for his own sake. However the role of the teacher as a catalyst should never be underestimated in any kind of correction session.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Research Design

This research is designed as a before and after study. This design is one form of the classical control group design (Selltiz et al., 1976: 131). It uses two groups of subjects which have been purposively matched. Both groups are observed in relation to the dependent variable at the beginning ( $Y_1$ ) and at the end ( $Y_2$ ) of the experimental period. The experimental or independent variable ( $X$ ) is introduced in the experimental group only; it is not introduced in the control group.

The premeasures of the experimental group ( $Y_1$ ) and the control group ( $Y_1'$ ) are used to check the initial absence of difference between groups. After this is



assured, the final scores of the two groups ( $Y_2$  and  $Y_2'$ ) are compared to analyze the influence of the experimental variable ( $X$ ). Also change in scores can be calculated by using both the pre-measure scores and the post-measure scores of both groups. Then the change in the experimental group ( $d$ ) is compared with the change in the control group.

Table 1

## Before-after Design with Control Group

	"Before" measurement	Exposure to experimental variable	Exposure to uncontrolled events	"After" measurement	Analysis of data
Exp. Grp.	Yes( $Y_1$ )	Yes	Yes	Yes( $Y_2$ )	$d=Y_2-Y_1$
Cont. Grp.	Yes( $Y_1'$ )	No	Yes	Yes( $Y_2'$ )	$d=Y_2'-Y_1'$

From: Barnes, 1964, p.73.

This study can be explained in more detail as follows when before-after design is applied;

(dependent variable) = Students' performance in proof reading their own work without teacher assistance (Conditions 1 and 2 in both groups).

(X) = Teacher assistance (Conditions 4 and 5 in the experimental groups)

- $(Y_1)$  and  $(Y_2')$  =Groups' mean of errors in Condition 1
- $(Y_2')$  and  $(Y_2')$  =Groups' mean of errors in Condition 3 for the control group, and in Condition 5 for the experimental group.
- Control Group** =Group I; self-correction without teacher assistance.
- Experimental Group** =Group II; self-correction under teacher assistance, after Condition 3 where the independent variable(i.e., teacher guidance) is introduced.

### 3.2. Selection of Subjects

Every research establishes a set of cases or subjects for analysis. The way in which these set of cases or subjects is selected governs the generalizability of the conclusions one may draw from a study. In regard with this, selection of subjects involves a set of procedures that governs selecting a relatively small number of cases to represent a larger number of cases. Thus, generalizability of the results depends on how subjects are selected for a study.

The subjects chosen for this study are, thereby, picked by purposive sampling of one to one grouping. Sixty Turkish speaking students who are studying English,

as a foreign language, in the second-grade of English Teacher Training Department of Faculty of Education, Anadolu University, constituted the subjects.

The reason that the second year students, were chosen was because they had been taught by the same writing and grammar instructors since they started their education in the faculty. This is supposed to help the group to be more coherent.

After a multiple-choice pre-test was administered, two groups were formed by matching, according to the test results. That is, to be more accurate in sampling, the students with the same level of marks were distributed into each group by one to one. Thus a more fair equalization of the groups was provided (see Appendix B).

The subjects chosen in the school year of 1987-1988 were from the same age group ranging between 18-23. They were assumed to have similar educational and social backgrounds. The students were supposed to be a homogenous group in their career attitude as well, considering their aim to be English teachers in the future.

### 3.3. Data Collection Procedures

To obtain data regarding the students' self-correction efficiency with and without teacher assistance, a structural level test and a free composition writing were presented to the students.

### 3.3.1. The Structural Level Test

The structural level test, given in December 1987, consisted of ninety-five multiple choice questions, which mainly aimed to measure the structural knowledge of English. Duration was 75 minutes for the test. The test was taken from a book, Proficiency in English, which the students used as a supplementary book in the first and the second grades in grammar lessons.

The purpose of giving this test was to distribute the students into two groups with the "same" average language levels in English.

### 3.3.2. The Composition Test

In the composition test, the two groups were asked to write a composition about a holiday they had enjoyed most so far. This topic was chosen regarding that the Simple Past and the Past Perfect tenses were the last items the students reviewed in their grammar course, just before the composition test was given. Considering the time and the energy the students would use, the test was limited to 250 words, and the duration was 45 minutes. However, as different approaches were being measured in the two groups, the following steps were different. Thereby, the tests will be explained under two sub-tittles;

### 3.3.2.1. Composition Test: Group I; Regarding the Efficiency of Self-Correction without Teacher Assistance

After the students had completed the compositions (Condition 1), they were asked to proofread their work and rewrite the proofread version on a given second sheet of paper (Condition 2). When the students completed this task and handed in the rewritten compositions, the teacher gave a third sheet of paper, together with the second sheet of paper which they had rewritten their work. The instruction this time was that there were errors in their composition and the students were asked to correct their errors and write the corrected draft on the third sheet of paper (Condition 3).

The maximum duration for Condition 2 and Condition 3 was 30 minutes each.

### 3.3.2.2. Composition Test: Group II; Regarding the Efficiency of Self-Correction with Teacher Assistance

After the conditions applied to Group I (Conditions 1, 2 and 3), were assigned to students of this group, a fourth condition was used. In this condition (condition 4), the teacher underlined the errors on the third papers of the students and gave them back with a fourth sheet of paper. The last and the fifth condition consisted

of the teacher's underlining the errors and describing the broken rule on the fourth paper(Condition 5). In the last phase the students tried to correct their errors under the light of the information given by their instructor on a fifth sheet of paper.

The maximum duration for Condition 4 and 5 each, was 30 minutes.

Both tests, given to Group I and Group II were carried out on the same day, at the same hour in two different rooms.

The conditions applied in the two groups can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2

Self-correction conditions in foreign language performance(From: Krashen, 1982, p.107)

Condition	Instructions
I	None
II	Rewrite
III	Correct the error
IV	Correct this error
V	Correct this error, use this rule

### 3.4. Data Analysis

In order to form the data basis, the number of errors in each subject's paper was counted. This

error counting process was repeated for each step in Group I and Group II. Thus, three sets of error numbers was obtained for Group I and five sets of error numbers was obtained for Group II.

When errors were being counted, great attention was paid to that errors counted were only grammatical and structural ones and not any lexical ones.

The error counting process included merely a frequency count, that is, whatever there was accepted as an error within the limits of this study on the paper of a subject, was counted and the number was written down on his sheet of paper. As a result, raw error scores formed the data basis for statistical analysis.

Two statistical techniques were used to analyse the data in this study;

1. One factor analysis of variance
2. Paired-sample t-test

A "Statistical Program for the Social Sciences", (SPSS), was employed to generate the necessary statistics.

In the first phase, three groups of data were analysed by using one factor analysis of variance. The groups were formed as;

1 and 2; The data collected in Conditions 1, 2 and 3 of Group I and Group II.

3; The data collected in five Conditions of Group II.

In order to pin point at what condition a difference would occur, a paired-sample t-test was run where variance analysis showed a difference between all conditions under investigation.

Since the study is an exploratory one, .01 level of significance was considered sufficiently precise, thus this level was used in comparing the calculated results of the statistical tests with the table values.

### 3.5. The Related Hypotheses

As mentioned in Chapter I(cf. section 1.1.3), this study was initiated to answer the following questions;

1. How efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a "proof-reading"; self-correction technique that requires no teacher assistance?

2. How efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a "self-correction" technique that requires teacher assistance?

Under the guidance of these questions, the study tried to bring some insight to the issue of error correction in writing classes. When trying to do so, there were of course some hypotheses lying in the background of the study. These hypotheses, which are tested in



Chapter IV were stated as null hypotheses,  $H_0$  and alternate hypotheses,  $H_1$ .

The hypotheses tested in Chapter IV tried to state a common issue, that is the relationship between the number of errors and the treatment to the errors throughout the research.

The testing of the hypotheses will be handled in detail in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This chapter tries to present the analysis of results and thus to present the hypotheses and the way these hypotheses are analyzed.

#### 4.1. Results of the Structural Level Test

In order to assure that the subjects' English levels were almost the same, the control group and the experimental group were formed by using purposive matching(cf. section 3.2). As might be recalled, a structural level test was used in this process. The mean scores of Group I was 68.1 and the mean scores of Group II was 68.5.

Since the matching of the subjects was purposive and each group consisted students with the same average scores, no statistical tests were applied(See, appendix B).

#### 4.2. Results of Analysis of Variance (F)

It was mentioned in the Data Analysis that the difference between the experimental and control groups was determined by the F-test(cf. section 3.4). The results of the F-test are given with the related hypothesis in this section.

In order to answer the first sub-question of this study, (i.e., how efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a self-correction technique without teacher assistance), the following null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis were formulated and tested.

$H_0$ : There will be no significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 of Group I, where no teacher assistance is provided.

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 = \bar{X}_3$$

$H_1$ : There will be significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 of Group I, where no teacher assistance is provided.

$$H_1: \bar{X}_i \neq \bar{X}_j$$

Table 3

The Results of the F-test Showing the Difference  
Between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Group I  
(Self-correction without teacher assistance)

Level	Number of Subjects	Mean	Standard Deviation	Source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Means of Squares	F <sub>cal.</sub>	F <sub>tab.</sub>
Condition 1	30	5.367	3.023	Factor	2	14.16	7.08	0.85	4.98
Condition 2	30	4.600	2.908	Error	87	725.63	8.34		
Condition 3	30	4.467	2.726	Total	89	739.79			

$$\alpha = 0.01$$

With a significance level of .01, it is found that the table value for F with 2 and 87 degrees of freedom is 4.98. Since 0.85 is less than the table value, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the first three conditions of the writing task for Group I. In other words, students' performance in detecting and correcting their errors did not improve on the three occasions where they were asked to proof-read, detect and correct their errors without the assistance of a teacher.

Again, in order to answer the first sub-question of the study, but this time in Group II, the following null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis were formulated and tested.

$H_0$ : There will be no significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 of Group II, where no teacher assistance is provided.

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 = \bar{X}_3$$

$H_1$ : There will be significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 of Group II, where no teacher assistance is provided.

$$H_1: \bar{X}_i \neq \bar{X}_j$$

Table 4

The Results of the F-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 1, 2 and 3 in Group II (Self-correction under teacher assistance; before the experimental variable, teacher, is introduced)

Level	Number of Subjects	Mean	Standard Deviation	Source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Means of Squares	$F_{cal.}$	$F_{tab.}$
Condition 1	30	4.800	2.696	Factor	2	7.40	3.70	0.53	4.98
Condition 2	30	4.100	2.496	Error	87	613.00	7.05		
Condition 3	30	4.500	2.764	Total	89	620.40			

$$\alpha = 0.01$$

With a significance level of .01, it is found that the table value for F with 2 and 87 degrees of freedom is 4.98. Since 0.53 is less than the table

value, the null hypothesis of no differences between the groups could not be rejected. Thus the same result with the previous hypotheses was reached even though the groups were different. This might be a clue that the two groups operate on the same language level of English.

Supportedly, the results of the analysis of the two preceding hypotheses also find support in the review of literature in Krashen(1982) and Sivell(1980), who along with other instructors believed that self-correction never full-filled its aim(cf. section 2.1.5).

In order to answer the second sub-question of the study(i.e. how efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a self-correction technique that requires teacher guidance), the following null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis were formulated and tested.

$H_0$ : There will be no significant difference in the number of errors the subjects make between Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Group II.

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2 = \bar{X}_3 = \bar{X}_4 = \bar{X}_5$$

$H_1$ : There will be significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make between Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Group II in correcting errors.

$$H_1: \bar{X}_i \neq \bar{X}_j$$

Table 5

The Results of the F-test Showing the Difference Between the Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 in Group II (Self-correction under teacher assistance with the experimental variable, teacher)

Level	Number of Subjects	Mean	Standard Deviation	Source	Degree of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Means of Squares	F <sub>cal.</sub>	F <sub>tab.</sub>
Condition 1	30	4.8000	2.6961	Factor	4	525.11	131.28	28.94	3.32
Condition 2	30	4.1000	2.4962	Error	145	657.83	4.54		
Condition 3	30	4.5000	2.7637	Total	149	1182.94			
Condition 4	30	1.3333	1.1842						
Condition 5	30	0.1667							

$$\alpha = 0.01$$

With a significance level of .01, it is found that the table value for F with 4 and 145 degrees of freedom is 3.32. Since 28.94 is more than the table value, the null hypothesis of no differences between the groups can be rejected. Thus the introduction of Conditions 4 and 5, that is the teacher assistance seemed to cause a significant difference, in the students' performance of detecting and correcting their errors.

In regard to the review of literature, Chastain's (1980) and Monreal's (1981) claim, that once the teacher shows the way that students can correct themselves finds value within this hypotheses (cf. section 2.1.5).

### 4.3. Results of the t-tests

As a difference was observed between conditions after the experimental variable is introduced(cf. Table 5), the next task was to run a paired-sample t-test for the conditions that met the experimental variable, the teacher. Thus, t-test was employed to Conditions 3 and 4, and to Conditions 4 and 5 in Group II.

The results of the t-tests are given in Table 6 and Table 7.

$H_0$ : There will be no significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make when their errors are underlined(Conditions 3 and 4).

$$H_0 = \bar{D} = 0$$

$H_1$ : There will be significant difference in the number of the errors the students make when their errors are underlined(Conditions 3 and 4)

$$H_0 = \bar{D} \neq 0$$

Table 6

The Results of the t-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 3 and 4 in the Experimental Group(Group II)

Variable	Number of Subjects	Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	$t_{cal.}$	$t_{tab.}$
Condition 3	30	4.5000	2.764	29	7.78	2.756
Condition 4	30	1.3333	1.184	29		

$$\alpha = 0.01$$



With a significance level of .01, it is found that the table value for  $t$  with 29 degrees of freedom is 2.756. Since the calculated value, 7.78 is more than the table value, the null hypothesis that underlining the students' errors will not arise a significant difference, could be rejected. That is, a significant difference was observed in the number of the errors the students made when their errors were underlined. In other words, when students' errors were brought into focus by underlining them, students' performance in correcting their errors improved significantly.

$H_0$ : There will be no significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make when their errors are underlined and a correction code is provided(Conditions 4 and 5)

$$H_0: \bar{D} = 0$$

$H_1$ : There will be significant difference in the number of the errors the subjects make when their errors are underlined and a correction code is provided(Conditions 4 and 5)

$$H_1: \bar{D} \neq 0$$

Table 7

The Results of the t-test Showing the Difference Between Conditions 4 and 5 in the Experimental Group(Group II)

Variable	Number of Subjects	Mean Mean	Standard Deviation	Degree of Freedom	$t_{cal.}$	$t_{tab.}$
Condition 4	30	1.3333	1.184	29	6.07	2.756
Condition 5	30	0.1667	0.379	29		

$$\alpha = 0.01$$

With a significance level of .01, it is found that the table value for  $t$  with 29 degrees of freedom is 2.756. Since the calculated value 6.07 is more than the table value, the null hypothesis that underlining and providing a correction code for students' errors will not arise a significant difference could be rejected. That is, a significant difference in the students performance in correcting their errors was observed, when the errors were underlined and a correction code was provided.

#### 4.4. Classification of Errors

The structural errors committed by the subjects in the control group and the experimental group are classified according to their characteristics. The errors given below are taken from the students' first writing of the free composition for both groups. Namely the examples appear in the first condition of the composition test.

The purpose of this section was not to employ an error analysis on the papers of the students, thus the error types were given under very general titles. However, the aim in looking into the errors committed by the subjects, was to see whether what was accepted as a homogenous group originally showed a certain

consistency in their errors as well. Furthermore, examining the errors committed in the first step would help to make a distinction between errors and mistakes in the last phase of the study.

In answer to whether the subjects committed common errors or not, certain clues were found. For example, as far as "articles" were concerned, the subjects' errors were towards the misuse of the definite article, "the". On the other hand, misuse of agreement merely included misuse of verbs according to the countable or uncountable subject.

As a result, since the errors committed shared certain similar properties, it was possible to collect them under five types of titles. Below are the examples from the subjects' papers in Condition 1 for both groups.

### **Error Types**

#### **Type I: Misuse of articles and determiners**

After the Marmaris....

One of the our German friends.....

... but at the end of the our holiday...

We began to go to the everywhere...

I went to the Aydın...

#### **Type II: Misuse of agreement**

We was crowded...

Three of them was babies...

Everyone were there...

Each student have a holiday...

Some of them was Turkish people.

### Type III: Misuse of prepositions

#### Omissions

We were going the cinema...

We stayed İzmir three days...

We stayed a little hotel...

... and being together them...

... does not agree this idea.

#### Incorrect Use

At the 17<sup>th</sup> July...

They were interested of tourists.

We went to shopping.

I hate about women's fear...

I found a job by his help.

### Type IV: Improper use of word groups

You could feel the warm of the sun.

I realized the beautiness of the view.

The travel was so excited...

After the long discussing...

The picnic was very well.

### Type V: Misuse of the verbs.

#### Using one tense for another

I ve had the best holiday last year.

Two years ago, I've had my best holiday.

Five years ago, I had gone to Isparta.

I have a nice holiday about two years ago.

When I was ten years old. I've had my best holiday.

#### Misformation of the tense

... every moment we have spend there.

I been in Side with my family.

After that we seen a bird.

When we walk around, we met ...

#### The incorrect use of "to be" + Verb

We were sit down...

... that she was die ...

We were walked...

... we were return Günlüklü...

The beauty of the nature was affected me.

#### Misformation of modals

In holidays we could have go to the beach.

He would bought the tickets.

My family can stayed with us...

We had beter to go...

#### 4.4.1. Persisting Errors in the Control Group

When the students' compositions in Condition 3 are checked for the errors, it is seen that many errors found in Condition 1 persist.

Some examples can be given as follows;

- Misuse of articles and determiners

It was very luxury hotel.

Enjoyable a Holiday.

One of the our German friends.

- Misuse of agreement

British people is warm and tender.

Everything were ready.

In every places...

My parents does not like...

- Misuse of prepositions

I had to leave from them.

Although people want to go \_\_ a holiday, ...

... and they let to us ...

My father came to home.

- Improper use of word groups

It was very excited and enjoyable.

We were too exciting ...

I surprised to hear that ...

My holiday passed very good and cheerfull.

- Misuse of the verbs

She was die at that moment.

She was did ...

I am wanting to win since 1975.

Two years ago we've been to Edremit.

Any of the corrections done, did not include writing the correct form of the incorrect use but rather avoiding the incorrect form and paraphrasing the sentence.

**Condition 1:** ... I became more active and it toughed me something.

**Condition 3:** ... I became more active and it gave me some lesson about the things I could do.

**Condition 1:** We walked about around Antalya.

**Condition 3:** We went to the historical places of Antalya, such as ...

**Condition 1:** Then I found a job by his helping.

**Condition 3:** Then he helped me and I found a job.

In fact, the above situations find support in the literary review. Krashen(c.f. section 2.1.1.) claims that students avoid mistakes by avoiding difficult structures. What students did when they were forced to error correction was avoiding the structure they found wrong and difficult.

#### 4.4.2. Persisting Errors in the Experimental Group

The same errors that appeared in Condition 1 seem to stay all through Condition 3. It is only after the errors are underlined that the correct forms are supplied, namely in Conditions 4 and 5.

Some examples of the persisting errors in Condition 3 can be given as follows:

- Misuse of articles and determiners

I haven't been to the Marmaris before

It is \_\_\_ very nice island.

It was really \_\_\_ good place.

My father is \_\_\_ farmer.

- Misuse of agreement

I think the days in the third class was ...

The days was passing.

I were in Side with my family.

There were nobody there.

- Misuse of prepositions

We enjoyed very much from these games.

We stayed \_\_\_ a little hotel in Antalya.

My father does not garee \_\_\_ us.

I was attending in secondary school.

- Improper use of word groups

Everybody was amusing...

We could play free in the fields.

I realized the beautiness of the view.

You could feel warm of the sun ...

- Misuse of the verbs

Five years ago, I had gone to Isparta.

At that time the rain was begin.



The photos which I was taken ...

I have had it when I was seventeen years old.

When students tried to correct themselves between Condition 1 and Condition 3, they, like, what the students in the Control Group had done, preferred paraphrasing the sentence which they felt had included an incorrect item;

**Condition 1:** It was the first holiday which I passed without my family.

**Condition 3:** It was the first holiday that I was alone, I mean without my family.

**Condition 1:** If I had a chance like that, I would go there again.

**Condition 3:** If I have a chance like that again. I can go there once more.

**Condition 1:** Everything were very nice there.

**Condition 3:** I enjoyed everything there.

**Condition 1:** They sang the songs and danced.

**Condition 3:** They both sang and danced.

These examples might be a good clue to obtain some information about how students' defence mechanisms work when they are confronted with a barrier. The examples of the corrections the students had done without teacher assistance may reveal that they avoid difficult or

new structures and try to compensate them with what they already have in their competences.

#### 4.4.3. The Results of the Self-Correction Under Teacher Assistance; Conditions 4 and 5 in the Experimental Group

There has been a great increase in the number of the errors corrected in Condition 4, where the students' errors were underlined thus a focusing is provided. The students were able to correct a large percentage of their errors.

Some of the examples of the corrections done in Condition 4 are as follows;

Condition 3: We stayed a little hotel in Antalya.

Condition 4: We stayed at a little hotel in Antalya.

Condition 3: At that time the rain was begin.

Condition 4: At that time it began to rain.

Condition 3: At the time we leaved the camp, all of us had cried.

Condition 4: When we were leaving the camp, everybody was crying.

Condition 3: We went wherever we want.

Condition 4: We went wherever we wanted.

Condition 3: ... we went to town to make shopping.

Condition 4: ... we went to town to do shopping.

Condition 3: We enjoyed very much from these games.

Condition 4: We liked the games very much.

Condition 3: The photos which I was taken ...

Condition 4: The photos which I took ...

Although many of the corrections included writing the correct form of the underlined error, still paraphrasing was a valid process in self-correction, as can be seen in the above examples.

#### 4.4.3.1. Persisting Errors in Condition 5

When all the papers were checked for errors, it was observed that only five errors persisted until Condition 5 of the experimental group. The five errors were found on the papers of the five subjects, namely each had one persistent error. However the errors did not show a coherence. They were basically different types of errors: The following are the errors observed in Condition 5, that is after the students are given the rule they had broken with a correction code;

1. I think the days in the third class is the ...

(Misuse of agreement)

2. It was \_\_\_ very good place.

(Omission of an article)

3. They were interested at tourists.

(Misuse of preposition)

4. We decided to go \_\_\_ a holiday.

(Omission of preposition)

5. I have been still hearing to them.

(Misuse of preposition)

As can be seen from the examples it is not possible to draw a generalization for the occurrence of the errors. Students' individual competence and performance factors may play a role in the correction of errors, thus leaving to teacher to decide what to correct.

The results of the corrections, however may cast light on another question that whether what the subjects corrected were mistakes or errors. If we turn back to Chapter 1 where a distinction was tentatively made between an error and a mistake, we may get the idea that what the students corrected between Condition 1 and 2 may be mistakes since they did not need much effort to be corrected. However, what the students tried to correct from Condition 2 through Condition 5, seem to be errors since they needed much attention and persisted until they were brought into focus.

Of course, the correct forms of the errors cannot be expected to be permanent, as the correction of an error is ephemeral (Hubbard and Jones, 1986: 134). It is only after a systematic handling of the errors with

regular remedial teaching that we can expect success towards the correction of errors.

The results of the data analysis revealed that the students performed better under teacher assistance as far as error correction on written work was concerned. In other words, students' performance in detecting and correcting their errors on written work did not improve when they were merely asked to proof-read, detect and correct their errors without the assistance of a teacher. The students were not able to correct their errors by proofreading or even when they were told that they had committed errors and asked to correct them.

However, when the experimental variable, teacher assistance, was introduced there was a significant difference in the students' performance of self-correction. That is when the teacher underlined the errors, there was a significant difference in the number of the errors the students made. This might be due to the students' exposure to their own errors in a localized form, namely underlined forms.

One further step in teacher assistance, underlining the error and writing the broken rule in a correction code, resulted in a more significant difference. That is the students' performance in detecting and correcting their errors showed a significant difference when a correction code was provided.

Supported by Table 3 through Table 7, the above lines may indicate that the results of the study are inclined to show that proof-reading alone does not improve students' correcting their mistakes. On the other hand when teacher assistance is provided, the students are capable of correcting their errors almost totally.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter of the study consists of three separate sections. The first section provides a summary of the material contained in the first four chapters. In the second section, conclusions are based upon the findings of the study. Finally, in the last sections, recommendations are offered.

#### 5.1. Summary

In regard to use of error correction in writing classes, this study was initiated to answer the following question;

"Is it worth choosing any one correction technique over another?"

However, two other questions should be asked to examine the above question;

1. How efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a self-correction technique that requires no teacher assistance?

2. How efficient are the students in correcting their errors with a self-correction technique that requires teacher guidance?

When trying to answer the above questions, the purpose of the study was also determine the effect of teacher assistance in writing classes. That is, teacher's role as a guide and assistant towards the students was tried to be revealed. As supported in the review of literature, teachers were given the whole credit as to "how", "when" and "which" errors should be corrected(cf. Abott et al., 1981: 219/21; Brown, 1980: 164/70; Norrish, 1983: 100/3). However, the students were always wanted to have the prior responsibilities for their own works(cf. Bright and McGregor, 1970; Vandergrift, 1986; Rivers, 1978; Walz, 1982; Freeman, 1986; Stevick, 1982). Thus, this study tried to show how effective teacher assistance could be where students were still held responsible for their own works. It was hoped that the study would provide certain information to foreign language teachers by showing the value of teacher assistance in error correction.



The research was designed as a before-after study. The data were collected by means of a structural level test and then a free-composition writing test was given to a sample of sixty second-year students at the Anadolu University.

In order to obtain the statistical analyses of the data, one-factor analysis of variance and t-tests were used. The statistics were generated by an (SPSS) computer program.

## 5.2. Conclusions

The most significant findings of the study were as follows;

1. There was not a significant change in the number of errors when students were asked to correct their works without teacher assistance. In other words, the proofreading of their own work did not help the students to detect and correct their errors. Thus, students' performance in correcting their errors was not enhanced by proofreading only.

2. The assistance of the teacher, such as locating or explaining the errors, resulted in a significant change in students' performance in self-correction. That is students were able to detect and correct most of their mistakes when the teacher gave a "helping hand".

### 5.3. Recommendations

Under the light of the findings obtained by the data analysis, several recommendations can be put forward;

- Students' proofreading their own work as a correction technique should be applied only if the teacher is going to work on the proof-read version afterwards. Otherwise, the teacher will only help some errors fossilize in students competence. As can be seen in Chapter 4, sections; 4.3.1, 4.3.2, the same errors persist until they are localized or explained by the teacher. If there was not such an assistance, the existing errors might result in fossilization(cf. Vigil and Oller in Chastain, 1980; Daniels and Packard, 1982).
- On the other hand, if teacher's assistance is limited to underlining the errors only and not to control and let the students do their own corrections afterwards, the correction technique may not work sufficiently(cf. section 4.3.3). From the pedagogical aspect, individual concerns should be considered, since it may be necessary to give more information to one student than to another. Thus the teacher

• should follow the students' errors to the last step, up until he believes that the correct form does not exist in the students' competence.

- The teacher may like to prepare a remedial teaching session by making use of the students' errors committed on a given written work. This kind of a teaching is more time saving, since the correction is limited to certain hours. Furthermore, as will be discussed by the whole class, there will be more points of view as to why the errors occurred and as to how to correct them. Such an approach may work very well as far as affective factors are concerned, as well. Besides, teachers may get hints about how students' performance works when dealing with errors.

#### 5.4. Suggestions for Future Studies

The results of the study can be used to identify areas of needs for additional research. The scope of the study could be expanded in several directions. One direction would be to include the students' help, namely peer-correction. That would help the students to force their correction limits and guide the teacher about the correction abilities of his/her students.

A second direction of research could be into different classes such as Spoken or Translation classes. The same study can be applied to recorded oral work or can be worked out on a translation text. A string of dialogue with certain errors can be recorded and students can be asked to detect and correct the errors. On the other hand, students may be asked to detect errors on a translated draft of a given work. The teacher may like to emphasize the use of English tenses on one piece of translation and the use of prepositions on another so he may arrange his translated draft with certain errors in it. This might also be a good start to remedial teaching.

Another research possibility involves the assesment of the study on a long term schedule. The study can be carried out for a whole term for writing classes. A group of students may be asked to self-correct their work, which might be a home-work assignment or class-work, all through the term, while another group carry out the self-correction under teacher assistance. At the end of the term the two groups can be given a post-test to see if their performance levels vary from one another. Thus the effect of teacher assistance can be observed on a longitudinal study.

It is possible to list many more research projects on correction techniques, however whatever the project

may be, the focus should be on the student and on his benefits from a certain teaching point. Thus a foreign language teacher must be aware of donating his/her students with what he/she believes is the most useful to the students' language competence and performance.

### REFERENCES

- Barnes, F.D.(1964). Research for the Practitioner in Education. U.S.A.: National Education Association.
- Bright, J.A. and McGregor, G.P.(1970). Teaching English as a Second language. GB: Longman Group Ltd.
- Broughton, G. et al.(1980). Teaching English as a Foreign Language. London: Routledge Education Books.
- Brown, H.D.(1980). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. U.S.A.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Brumfit, C.(1981). "Accuracy and Fluency". Practical English Teacher. Vol: 1, No:3, 11.
- Burt, M.K. and Kiparsky, C.(1972). The Gooficon: A Repair Manual for English. U.S.A.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

- Cardy, M.(1987). "The Use of the Sottisier in Second Language Teaching". Canadian Modern Language Review. Vol: 43, No: 2, 293-301.
- Celce, M. and McIntosh, L.(1979)(ed.). Tesching English as a Second or Foreign Language. U.S.A.: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
- Chastain, K.(1980). Toward a Philosophy of Second-Language Learning and Teaching. U.S.A.: Heinle and Heinle Publishers, Inc.
- Corder, P.(1973). Introducing Applied Linguistics. New York: Penguin Book.
- Daniels, H. and Packard, D.(1982). "Learner-centered remedial work: a humanistic approach." In ELT documents. Humanistic approaches: an empirical view. G.B.: The British Council.
- Davies, E.E.(1983). "Error evaluation: the importance of viewpoint". ELT Journal. Vol: 37, No: 4, 304-311.
- Ellis, R. (1984). Classroom Second Language Development. G.B.: Pergamon Press.
- Freeman, D.(1986). Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. U.S.A.:OUP
- Fromkin, V.A.(1980)(ed.). Errors in Linguistic Performance: Slips of the Tongue, Ear, Pen, and Hand. London: Academic Press, Inc. Ltd.

- Ghadessy, M.(1985). "The role of developmental errors in assessing language competence". ELI Journal. Vol: 39, No: 4, 262-267.
- Gower, R. and Walters, S.(1983). Teaching Practice Handbook. A Reference Book for EFL Teachers in Training. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Halliday, M.A.K. et al.(1965). The Linguistic Science and Language Teaching. G.B.: William Clowes and Sons, Ltd.
- Hill, L.A. and Dobbyn, M.(1981). A Teacher Training Course for Teachers of EFL. G.B?: Richard Clay Ltd.
- Howard, A.P.R.(1985). A History of English Language Teaching Hong Kong: OUP.
- Hubbard, P. and Jones, H.(1986). A Training Course for TEFL. Oxford: OUP.
- Khalil, A.(1985). "Communicative Error Evaluation: Native Speakers' Evaluation and Interpretation of Written Errors of Arab EFL Learners". TESOL QUARTERLY. Vol: 19, No: 2, 335-351.
- Krashen, S.D.(1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S.D.(1985). Inquires and Insights. U.S.A.: Janus Book Publishers, Inc.



- Lott, D.(1983). "Analysing and counteracting interference errors". ELT Journal. Vol: 37, No:3, 256-261.
- McDonough, S.H.(1981). Psychology in Foreign Language Teaching. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Monreal, M.E.(1981). "Correcting Written Work". English Teaching Forum. Vol: 19, No: 3, 42.
- Murphy, D.F.(1986). "Communication and correction in the classroom". ELT Journal. Vol: 40, No: 2, 146-151.
- Norrish, J.(1983). Language Learners and their Errors. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Oller, J.W. and Richard, J.C.(1973)(eds.). Focus on the Learner: Pragmatic Perspectives for the Language Teacher. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Richards, J.C.(1974). Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Rivers, M.W.(1983). Communicating Naturally in a Second Language: Theory and Practice in Language Teaching. New York: CUP
- Rivers, W.M. and Temperley, M.S.(1978). A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language. New York: OUP

- Selltiz, C. et al.(1976). Research Methods in Social Relations. U.S.A.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Semke, H.D.(1984). "Effects of the red pen". In Foreign Language Annals. New York.
- Sezer, A. and et.al.(1983). Proficiency in English. Ankara: Tepe Yayınları.
- Shaughnessy, M.P.(1979). Errors and expectations: A Guide for the Teacher of Basic Writing. New York: OUP
- Sivell, J.(1980). "Self-correction of Compositions: The Three Pencil Method". English Teaching Forum. Vol: 18, No: 3, 42.
- Stevick, E.W.(1982). Teaching and Learning Languages. U.S.A.: CUP.
- Vandergrift, L.(1986). "Second Language Writing and Correction: Toward an Improved Model for Composition Correction". Canadian Modern Language Review. Vol: 42, No: 3, 658-667.
- Vann, R.J. et.al.(1984). "Error Gravity: A Study of Faculty Opinion of ESL Errors". TESOL QUARTERLY. Vol: 18, No: 3.
- Walz, J.C.(1982). Error Correction Techniques for the Foreign Language Classroom. U.S.A.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

## APPENDICES

Appendix A	Structural Level Test.....	69
Appendix B	Purposive Matching of the Subjects According to the Results of Structural Level Test.....	76
Appendix C	Free-composition Test in Group I (Under 3 Conditions).....	77
Appendix D	Free-composition Test in Group II (Under 5 Conditions).....	80



400

16. You ..... to stop talking to your friend; the teacher looks quite angry.  
 a) would c) should  
 b) have d) must
17. He is .... the most intelligent student in the class .... the most hard - working.  
 a) not only/but also c) not only/but  
 b) only/but also d) not/but also
18. .... he expressed his love for her, she refused to marry him.  
 a) Although c) In fact  
 b) Of course d) In spite of
19. He's seriously ill, ..... I hope he will recover soon.  
 a) because c) but  
 b) so d) so that
20. He got a poor grade .... he couldn't pass the university entrance examination.  
 a) but c) although  
 b) so d) in spite of
21. The guest you are waiting for will arrive .....  
 a) on tenth October c) October the ten  
 b) at the tenth of October d) on October the tenth
22. They clean windows. They are .....  
 a) window - cleaner c) clean - windowers  
 b) window - cleaners d) windows - cleaner
23. There was ... man under the tree. I thought .... man was sleeping.  
 a) a/the c) the/a  
 b) - / - d) a/-
24. .... is a good friend of .....  
 a) He's/hers c) He/hers  
 b) He/her d) She/her
25. Nobody helped ..... when he solved the problem. .... did it .....  
 a) him/him/him c) him/he/himself  
 b) he/him/himself d) himself/he/him
26. .... of the book .... interesting, you will enjoy reading it.  
 a) Some/are c) None/is  
 b) All/is d) Half/are
27. .... students were enthusiastic, so they .... gave a long explanation about their hometown.  
 a) Each/each c) Each of/both of  
 b) Both/each d) Both of/each of
28. It is ... expensive to go abroad, but a holiday in Turkey may be cheap .... for you.  
 a) very/too c) enough/very  
 b) too/enough d) enough/too
29. Do the French eat ..... bread?  
 Yes, they eat .... we do.  
 a) much/a lot c) much/more than  
 b) many/more than d) a lot of /more
30. I live .... 12 Bal Street, and Bill lives ... Gül Street.  
 a) in/to c) on/at  
 b) on/in d) at/on
31. Most of the students come to Beytepe ..... school buses, but some of them prefer to come ....  
 their own cars.  
 a) on/in c) at/on  
 b) in/by d) by/with
32. He hopes to arrive ..... Ankara ..... 7 p.m.  
 a) to/in c) at/on  
 b) in/at d) -/-

33. He wrote a book .... politics when he was .... abroad. 401  
 a) in/at c) at/on  
 b) in/- d) on/-
34. He's been attending this course .....  
 a) since two years c) for two years ago  
 b) since two years ago d) two years ago
35. Your car is good, but it is not as .... as mine. In fact, my car is much .... than yours.  
 a) good/well c) good/ more good  
 b) good/better d) well/good
36. My wife has three brothers, all are ... she is..... brother is a teacher.  
 a) older/Oldest c) more old/Most old  
 b) older than/The oldest d) older than/Oldest
37. A ..... runner runs ....., and a ..... runner runs .....  
 a) fast/fast ..... slow/slowly  
 b) fastly/fast .... slow/slow'  
 c) fast/fastly .... slow/slowly  
 d) fast/fast ..... slowly/slowly
38. Tom is .... careless that his father will never buy him ..... an expensive car.  
 a) so/so c) so/such  
 b) such/so d) such/such

PART II GRAMMAR Select the best choice.

39. Do people speak English all over the world?  
 a) Yes, people are English all over the world.  
 b) Yes, English is spoken all over the world.  
 c) Yes, all over the world is spoken English.  
 d) Yes, people are spoken all over the world by English.
40. "No one has ever beaten my brother at tennis" means .....  
 a) My brother hadn't ever been beaten at tennis.  
 b) My brother ever been beaten at tennis.  
 c) My brother has ever being beaten at tennis.  
 d) My brother hasn't ever been beaten at tennis.
41. "The maid used to wash the floor once a week" means .....  
 a) The floor was washing once a week.  
 b) The floor used to being washed once a week.  
 c) The floor used to be week.  
 d) The floor used to be washed once a week.
42. "Somebody must have taken it while I was out" means .....  
 a) It must been taken while I was out.  
 b) It must have taken somebody out.  
 c) I must have been taken out by it.  
 d) It must have been taken while I was out.
43. "Are you sure your information is accurate?" my sister asked him.  
 a) My sister asked him if he was sure his information was accurate.  
 b) My sister told him if he was sure his information was accurate.  
 c) My sister asked him about his information was accurate.  
 d) My sister asked to him he was sure his information was accurate.
44. Canan says, "I passed that course last semester."  
 a) Canan says I passed that course last semester.  
 b) Canan says she passed that course last semester.  
 c) Canan says she had passed that course a semester ago.  
 d) Canan says you had passed that course that semester.

402

45. a) Please send to me the pictures you have taken in Antalya.  
 b) Please send for me the pictures you have taken in Antalya.  
 c) Please send me the pictures you have taken in Antalya.  
 d) Please send at me the pictures you have taken in Antalya.
46. a) Having finish that paper in one day is very hard.  
 b) Finishing is very hard that paper in one day.  
 c) Having to finish that paper in one day is very hard.  
 d) The hard is having to finish that paper in one day.
47. a) Who is have an eraser that we can use?  
 b) Who have an eraser that we can use?  
 c) Who has an eraser that we can use?  
 d) Who does have an eraser that we can use?
48. a) Don't ask him if he knows me.  
 b) Don't ask him if he does know me.  
 c) Don't ask him if does he know me.  
 d) Don't ask him if he does knows me.
49. a) I don't know the man whom you ate.  
 b) I don't know the man with whom you ate.  
 c) I don't know the man you ate.  
 d) I don't know the man with you ate.
50. a) The lady who she was here yesterday has gone to London.  
 b) The lady who was here yesterday she has gone to London.  
 c) The lady who was here yesterday has gone to London.  
 d) The who was here yesterday lady has gone to London.

## PART III VOCABULARY Select the best choice.

51. Pop music ..... young people.  
 a) attend c) attaches  
 b) attracts d) attacks
52. I like apples as far as fruit is concerned, but when it comes to vegetables, I have no .....  
 a) reference c) prefer  
 b) reverence d) preference
53. James never tells lies. He is .....  
 a) famous c) dishonest  
 b) honest d) infamous
54. Naturally, I'm ..... that I didn't pass the examination but I'll try harder next time.  
 a) deceived c) refused  
 b) disappointed d) denied
55. The play was so .... that the audience went to sleep.  
 a) tired c) bored  
 b) tiring d) boring
56. Would you .... looking after the baby for me while I'm out?  
 a) admire c) mind  
 b) object d) care
57. I .... with his plan in general but objected to some details.  
 a) agreed c) approved  
 b) passed d) accepted
58. I .... the train so I had to wait for the next one.  
 a) missed c) caught  
 b) lost d) neglected

59. .... me to answer the letter. I might forget.  
 a) Recommend c) Regard  
 b) Remember d) Remind
60. The sun came out from behind the clouds and .... the weather got warmer.  
 a) However c) Subsequently  
 b) Meanwhile d) Before
61. Water is .... to all living things.  
 a) necessity c) harmful  
 b) essential d) effective
62. "He could hardly see the board" means .....
- a) he could see the board very well.  
 b) he couldn't see the board at all.  
 c) he could see the board was hard.  
 d) he couldn't see the board well.
63. "We miss you a lot" means .....
- a) We can see you all the time.  
 b) We wish you were here with us.  
 c) We can follow you very well.  
 d) We wish we could catch you.
64. "Those two boys get along very well" means .....
- a) They are going along happily.  
 b) They are very good friends.  
 c) They are earning lots of money.  
 d) They are carrying it easily.
65. "What she said was very funny, I couldn't help laughing" means .....
- a) What she said was very funny so I laughed.  
 b) What she said was very funny, but I couldn't laugh since I was in a helpless situation.  
 c) What she said was very funny, but I didn't feel like laughing.  
 d) What she said was very funny and I forced myself to laugh.

PART IV TRANSLATION Choose the best translation.

66. Although he is known as a succesful business man, I think he is really unhappy.  
 a) Başarılı bir iş adamı olduğu için, kanımca gerçekten mutsuz bir kişi.  
 b) Başarılı bir iş adamı olarak bilinmesine karşın kanımca gerçekten mutsuz bir kişi.  
 c) Gerçekten mutsuz olduğu için, iş adamı olarak başarılı olamadı.  
 d) Başarılı bir iş adamı olması onu gerçekten mutlu bir kişi olarak tanımama neden oldu.
67. We cannot deny the fact that the inventions and discoveries of the twentieth century have changed the structure of our society a great deal.  
 a) 20. yüzyıl buluş ve keşiflerinin toplumumuzun yapısını büyük ölçüde değiştirdiği gerçeğini inkâr edemeyiz.  
 b) 20. yüzyıl buluş ve keşiflerinin inkâr edilmesi toplumumuzun yapısını büyük ölçüde değiştirir.  
 c) 20. yüzyıl toplumunun, buluş ve keşiflerin yapısını değiştirdiği inkâr edilemez.  
 d) 20. yüzyıl buluş ve keşifleri toplumun yapısını hiçbir şekilde değiştirdiği gerçek değildir.
68. I'd rather get the job done today than leave it till tomorrow.  
 a) İşi yarın yaptırmak bugün yaptırmaktan daha iyidir.  
 b) İşi bugün bitirmek zorundayım, yarına erteleyemem.  
 c) İşi yarına bırakmadan bugün yaptırmak daha iyidir.  
 d) İşi yarına bırakmaktansa bugün yaptırmayı yeğlerim.
69. Üzür dileyeydi, bütün tartışma şimdiye kadar unutulmuş olurdu.  
 a) The argument would be forgotten completely by now if they apologized.  
 b) If he apologized, the whole argument would be forgotten now.  
 c) The whole argument would have been forgotten by now if he had apologized.  
 d) If he were sorry, the argument would be forgotten as a whole.



404

70. Gecen salıdan beri telefon bozuk.

- a) *The telephone has been out of order for last Tuesday.*
- b) *The telephone has been out of order since last Tuesday.*
- c) *The telephone would be out of order since last Tuesday.*
- d) *The telephone was out of order last Tuesday.*

## PART V : READING COMPREHENSION

Read the passage carefully and choose the correct answer.

## MAKING A FILM

Making a film takes a long time and is very hard work. Writing the story for the film may take many weeks. Filming the story being acted -or shooting the film as it is called- often takes at least six months. Actors and camera-men work from very early in the morning until late at night. Each scene has to be acted and re-acted, filmed and re-filmed, until it is just right. Sometimes the same scene may have to be acted twenty or thirty times.

The film studio is like a huge factory, and the indoor stages are very big indeed. Scenery of all kinds is made in the studio: churches, houses, castles and forests are all built of wood and cardboard. Several hundred people work together to make one film. Some of these people are the actors and the actresses. The director of the film, however, is the most important person in a film studio. He decides how the scenes should be filmed and how the actors should act.

Most people go to see a film because they know the film star in it. Sometimes the film may be very poor. It is best to choose a film made by a good director. Some famous film directors make their films very real. People feel that they themselves are among the people in the film.

71. The actors are told how to act by

- a) *the film stars.*
- b) *the camera-men.*
- c) *the director.*
- d) *the story writer.*

72. The scenery in the film studio is made from

- a) *in the studio.*
- b) *wood and cardboard.*
- c) *indoor stages.*
- d) *churches, houses, castles etc.*

73. A director is very important because

- a) *he is sometimes very famous.*
- b) *he makes films very real.*
- c) *he is in charge of making the film.*
- d) *he talks to the actors.*

74. We should choose a film which

- a) *is made by a good director.*
- b) *has the actors we know.*
- c) *takes a long time to make.*
- d) *seems very real.*

75. The scenes have to be filmed many times because.

- a) *writing the story for the film takes weeks.*
- b) *it takes a long time to make a film.*
- c) *many people work together.*
- d) *it is often difficult to make them just right.*

PART VI CLOZE TEST Read the whole passage, then choose the best word for each space from the words below.

Dawn was breaking as the first .....(1) of the disaster reached London. It .....(2) the tenth of February and the .....(3) of milk bottles was the only .....(4) in the black, icy streets. In .....(5) Street a Reuters operator was handed .....(6) news flash and his fingers ran .....(7) over the keys of his machine .....(8) he transmitted the message to subscribers.....(9) blocks away, in the office of .....(10) big London newspaper, a sleepy sub-editor .....(11) the noise of the message as ..... (12) came through on the teleprinter. He .....(13) it as the carriage of the .....(14) jumped back and forth. Then the .....(15) sheet of paper was pushed through .....(16) opening in the glass top. He.....(17) it off and stood there reading .....(18):

CAPETOWN FEBRUARY 10 REUTER : SOS RECEIVED ..... (19) THE FACTORY SHIP,  
SOUTHERN CROSS. THE .....(20) IS CAUGHT IN ICE IN WEDDEL SEA.

Choose the best word:

- |                  |            |                  |               |
|------------------|------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1- a. light      | b. lightly | c. new           | d. news       |
| 2- a. was        | b. is      | c. came          | d. or         |
| 3- a. rattle     | b. both    | c. two           | d. cry        |
| 4- a. noisy      | b. sound   | c. very          | d. color      |
| 5- a. the        | b. several | c. ....          | d. Fleet      |
| 6- a. a          | b. only    | c. carefully     | d. the        |
| 7- a. nervous    | b. under   | c. automatically | d. toward     |
| 8- a. that       | b. as      | c. who           | d. what       |
| 9- a. Buch       | b. When    | c. Two           | d. It         |
| 10- a. ....      | b. your    | c. whose         | d. a          |
| 11- a. saw       | b. heard   | c. which         | d. although   |
| 12- a. it        | b. they    | c. he            | d.            |
| 13- a. and       | b. watched | c. nor           | d. looked     |
| 14- a. newspaper | b. quickly | c. as            | d. machine    |
| 15- a. yellow    | b. there   | c. empty         | d. slowly     |
| 16- a. narrow    | b. it      | c. their         | d. the        |
| 17- a. watched   | b. made    | c. tore          | d. put        |
| 18- a. them      | b. message | c. it            | d. subscriber |
| 19- a. before    | b. from    | c. well          | d. until      |
| 20- a. both      | b. message | c. subeditor     | d. ship       |

## Appendix B

<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>
87	88
84	87
52	52
62	61
68	68
80	80
63	63
65	64
55	55
59	59
79	77
76	76
74	72
70	72
60	60
63	63
67	68
77	77
67	66
82	89
69	67
71	74
60	64
69	66
79	75
54	56
66	68
50	56
69	68
<u>66</u>	<u>64</u>

$$\bar{X}_1 = 68.1$$

$$\bar{X}_2 = 68.5$$

THE BEST HOLIDAY I'VE HAD SO FAR

7

I would like to mention about my holiday I had two  
 and ago. One day my uncle's daughter Çülliştan, her children,  
 İnter & Levent and her friend, Fidan came to Mersin from  
 Ankara for nine days. After they had a rest we went  
 to Çirine play in Mersin. We had a nice day at the  
 beach and in the sea. All we were tired when the  
 weather got dark then we came back to Mersin. After one  
 day they wanted to see somewhere to be seen in  
 Mersin. We went and they liked everything firstly Mersin's  
 coastline they wanted to go to beach again. This time  
 they, my family and I went to the beach and we  
 rented two rooms there for 3 days. We stayed there 3 days.  
 Then I said I'd rather to go some interesting place than  
 to go to beach. They accept my idea and we went  
 to go to "Clorus - Borç" they liked that so much.  
 At the sixth day we decided to go to  
 "Cennet & Cehennem" and "Şifke Kaleri" in Şifke,  
 and we went. Cennet was very nice place. All  
 trees were green and birds were singing while the sun  
 was shining. The weather and water were very cold in  
 the cave. Then we went around Şifke Kaleri.

No. of errors; 7

## Step-2

AMEL (78) ARICAN  
566 - 23.

I would like to mention about my best holiday I had two years ago. One day my uncle's daughter, Coşkun, her children and her friend, Fidan came to Merin from Ankara for nine days. After they had a rest we went to Ginece together. We had a nice day at the beach and in the evening. Fidan was a sweet girl. We have never seen each other before but we liked each other in a short time. All were tired when the weather got dark. Then we came back to Merin. After one day they wanted to do something and somewhere famous and interesting. We went somewhere such as Atolink Park, Lüleburgaz etc. They enjoyed so much. They liked Merin especially the sun and the weather which was not cold. The next day they wanted to go to the beach again. This time my family came with us. We rented two rooms there for three days. And we stay there. Then I said going to "Cennet & Cehennem" was better than to stay here. They accept my idea and but firstly we went to "Tarsus Barajı" they liked there so much.

At the ninth day we decided to go to Cennet Cehennem and "Ky Kaleri" in Silifke and we went. Cennet was very nice place. All there were grown and birds were singing while the sun was shining. The weather and water were very cold in the case.

Then we went to Silifke Kaleri

8

No. of errors; 8

THE BEST HOLIDAY I'VE HAD SO FAR <sup>Step 3 -</sup> EMEL<sup>79</sup> ARICAN

I would like to mention about my best holiday I had 566-28  
a years ago. One day my uncle's daughter, Gulistan, her children  
and her friend Fidan came to Mersin from Ankara for nine  
days. After they had a rest we went to a beach called "Güneş  
Plajı" altogether. We had a nice day at the beach. Fidan  
is a sweet girl. We have never seen each other before  
but we liked each other in a short time. All of us were  
tired at the end of the first day. When the weather got  
dark we came back to Mersin. After a day they wanted  
to go to somewhere ~~was~~ interesting. We went to Atatürk  
Parkı, Yunuspaşa etc. They enjoyed everything so much. They  
liked Mersin especially, the sun and the weather which was not  
old. The next day they wanted to go to the beach again. This  
time my family came with us. We rented two rooms there for  
days and we stay there. Then I said going to "Cennet  
Cahennem" was better than staying here. They accepted my idea,  
but firstly we went to "Tarsus Barajı", they liked there  
so much.

At the sixth day we decided to go to Cennet Cahennem  
and "Diyadin" in Silifke and we went. Cennet was very  
nice place. All the trees were green and the birds were singing  
while the sun was shining. The weather and water were  
very cold in the cave. Then we went to "Diyadin".

No. of errors; 4

4

of errors: 9

Appendix D

Last year we decided to go to Side for our summer holiday. I was going to go there for first time. We got up early that morning and got on the car. We had prepared our luggage before. The way was very long so sometimes we had to stop. At 5 o'clock we arrived at Side and tried to find our hotel. At the end we found it. It was very nice, comfortable and it has a wonderful view. Firstly I went to bed to relax for an hour. Because the trip made me very tired. Then I put my luggage to the wardrobe. I wanted to go beach and I wanted to swim. I had seen the sea view and it was so wonderful that I couldn't land anymore. I wear my sea dress and run to the sea. At night we went to a restaurant which has very delicious meals. In Side I introduced some tourists and talked to them. Till the end of my holiday, I swam, read book, discussed some daily events with my father, dealt with my sisters and little brother. We also went some historical places like Aspendos. Briefly I can say that my last summer holiday was very nice. I could completely relax and I enjoyed it very much.

## Step (2)

of errors: 7

Last year we decided to go to Side for our summer holiday. I was going to go there for first time. We got up early that morning and got on the car. We had already prepared our luggage before. The way was very long so sometimes we had to stop. At 5 o'clock, we arrived at Side and we tried to find our hotel. At the end we could find it. It was very nice, comfortable, clean and also it had a wonderful view. Firstly, I went to bed to relax for an hour. Because the trip made me very tired. Then I put my luggage to the wardrobe. I had seen the sea view and it was so wonderful that I couldn't sleep anymore. I wore my sea dress at once and ran to the sea. At night we went to a restaurant which had very delicious meals. In Side I introduced some tourists and talked with them. Till the end of my holiday, I swam, read books, discussed some daily events with my father, dealt with my sister and little brother. We also went to some historical places like Aspendos. Briefly I can say that my last summer holiday was very nice. I could completely relax and I enjoyed it very much.



No. of errors: 6

Last year we decided to go to Side for our summer holiday. I was going to go there for first time. We got up early that morning and got on the car. We had already prepared our luggage before. The way was very long so sometimes we had to stop. At 5 o'clock we arrived Side and we tried to find our hotel. At the end we could find it. It was very nice, comfortable, clean and also it had a wonderful scene. Firstly, I went to bed to relax for an hour. Because the trip made me very tired. Then I put my luggage to the garage. I had seen the sea scene and it was so wonderful that I couldn't lead anymore. I wore my sea dress at once and ran to the sea. At night we went to a restaurant which had very delicious meals. In Side I introduced some tourists and talked them. Till the end of my holiday, I swam, read books, discussed some daily events with my father, dealt with my sisters and little brother. We also went some historical places like Aspendos. Briefly, I can say that my last summer holiday was very nice. I could completely relax and I enjoyed very much.

## STEP ④

of errors: 3

Last year we decided to go to Side for our summer holiday. I was going to go there for the first time. We got up early that morning and got on the car. We had already prepared our luggage before. The way was very long so sometimes we had to stop. At 5 o'clock we arrived <sup>prep.</sup> to Side and we tried to find our hotel. At the end we could find it. It was very nice, comfortable, clean and also it had a wonderful scene. At first I went to bed to relax for an hour. Because the trip made me very tired. Then I put my luggage to the wardrobe. I had seen the sea scene and it was so wonderful that I couldn't <sup>v1</sup> lead anymore. I wore my sea dress at once and ran to the sea. At night we went to a restaurant which had very delicious meals. In Side I <sup>wrong verb</sup> introduced some tourists and talked with them. Till the end of my holiday, I swam, read books, discussed some daily events with my father, dealt with my sisters and little brother. We also went to some historical places like Aspendos. Briefly I can say that my last summer holiday was very nice. I could completely relax and I enjoyed it very much.

: of errors : 2

step ⑤

Last year we decided to go to Side for our summer holiday. I was going to go there for the first time. We got up early that morning and got on the car. We had already prepared our luggage before. The way was very long so sometimes we had to stop. At 5 o'clock we arrived in Side and we tried to find our hotel. At the end we could find it. It was very nice, comfortable, clean and also it had a wonderful scene. At first I went to bed to relax for an hour. Because the trip made me very tired. Then I put my luggage to the garage. I had seen the sea scene and it was so wonderful that I couldn't lead anymore. I wore my seadress at once and ran to the sea. At night we went to a restaurant which had very delicious meals. In Side I introduced some tourists and talked with them. Till the end of my holiday, I swam, read books, discussed some daily events with my father, dealt with my sisters and little brother. We also went to some historical places like Aspendos. Briefly I can say that my last summer holiday was very nice. I could completely relax and I enjoyed it very much.