

The Effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback on The Writing Performance of Senior High School Students in Ansano Memorial National High School

Sittie Jannah A. Macaurog

College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mindanao State University Marawi City. Email: macaurog.sa15@s.msmain.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

This study, entitled The Effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback on the Writing Performance of Senior High School Students in Ansano Memorial National High School, aimed to determine the effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) on the writing performance of senior high school students. Specifically, it sought to answer the following research questions: (1) What were the pre-test mean scores of the participants in the control and experimental groups? (2) What were the post-test mean scores of the participants in the control and experimental groups? (3) What were the mean gain scores of the participants in the control and experimental groups following the intervention? (4) Was there a significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups prior to the intervention? (5) Was there a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups? (6) Was there a significant difference between the mean gain scores of the control and experimental groups following the intervention? (7) What was the writing performance of the participants, as assessed using the ESL Composition Rubric, following the intervention? and (8) What were the participants' feedback and preferences regarding the use of Indirect Corrective Feedback?

The study employed a quasi-experimental research design to determine the differences in the writing performance of the control and experimental groups. A total of 40 students participated in the study and were divided into two homogeneous groups based on their first-quarter grades in the subject Reading and Writing. Prior to the intervention, the two groups obtained different pre-test mean scores, with the control group attaining a mean score of 53.10 and the experimental group obtaining a mean score of 57.80. Despite this difference, the results of Levene's test indicated that the two groups were comparable, as the observed difference of 4.70 points between their mean scores was not statistically significant. The findings further revealed that, prior to the intervention, the writing performance of both the control and experimental groups was qualitatively described as ranging from fair to poor. Following the intervention, the control group continued to demonstrate a fair-to-poor level of writing performance, whereas the experimental group demonstrated an improvement, attaining a good-to-average level of performance. These findings indicate a positive effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback on the writing performance of the participants.

Furthermore, a significant difference was observed between the mean gain scores of the control and experimental groups following the intervention. The experimental group demonstrated greater improvement in the writing components assessed through the pre-test and post-test, namely content, organization, language use, mechanics, and vocabulary. The experimental group obtained higher scores across all of these components, indicating measurable improvement in their overall writing performance following the implementation of Indirect Corrective Feedback. Based on these findings, the study concluded that there was a significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups following the intervention. The results suggest that the use of Indirect Corrective Feedback contributed to the improvement of the participants' writing performance, particularly across the assessed components of writing.

INTRODUCTION

Any form of feedback in writing whether revising, editing or proofreading is not just an icing on the cake but it is an essential part in writing. Error correction or feedback whether positive or negative promotes interaction. One of the shared issues in teaching English around the world is the role of corrective feedback in a learner's uptake also known as learner's reaction to the teacher's feedback.

In the researcher's research locale, in Ansano Memorial National High School, where there are only four English teachers in Grades 7-12 classes, they find it hard and difficult to correct their students' compositions. They are yet on the stage of looking for the best or the most effective way to correct their students' essays in order to develop or enhance their students' writing performance. Other schools in the researcher's locale also have similar problems. Moreover, some schools in other countries which applied corrective feedbacks vary in terms of their findings as to what corrective feedback is deemed most effective especially to the non-native speakers of English. Some say it develops the writing skills; others find it to have harmful effects among the students.

This motivated the researcher in exploring on the perfect ingredient to enhance the writing performance of their students.

Writing greatly pushes second language learners to process the target language with much mental effort than in listening and reading. How English language teachers correct their students' written outputs still remains a question that needs to be addressed to. Moreover, there are various debates whether correcting and giving feedback to the students' compositions could improve their writing skills (Bitchener J., Young S., Cameron D., 2005). There are quite some studies that examined the relative effectiveness of varying feedback types, with the dichotomy between Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback receiving the lion's share of researchers' attention (Beuningen et.al., 2003). As cited by Beuningen et.al. (2003), a longitudinal study of Lalande (1982) showed that students who received Indirect Corrective Feedback outperformed students in other type of feedback. Frantzen and Rob et.al. (1986) on the other hand found that direct way of giving corrections and Indirect Corrective Feedback were equally effective. Also, Ferris et.al (2000) revealed yet another pattern that Indirect Corrective Feedback proved to be most effective in improving students' accuracy in a subsequent writing. As opposed to Lalande and Ferris et. al (2000), Chandler (2003) found that providing the corrections directly after students committed them resulted in the largest accuracy of gains not only in revisions but also in subsequent writing.

With this regard, it must be considered that writers are not created being impeccable at first, and it is indeed absurd to expect students to produce and submit comprehensive and polished compositions without first going through stages of drafting and receiving feedbacks on their drafts. As what Bitchener J., Young S., Cameron D. (2005) stressed, "feedbacks which is considered to be a vital part in writing cannot be abolished." In fact, English Language Teaching (ELT) must not be done in a way that the teacher will submerge the students with memorization of grammar rules and paradigms. Because if that is the case, then teachers are not doing their duties if learners will know only the rules but unable to apply them (Celce-Murcia, 2006). Rather, the goal of language teachers must be a facilitator where guiding the students in applying the rules of grammar structure in an accurate, meaningful and appropriate way through writing. Only when students have given freedom to discover learning, do they can achieve a meaningful and a lifelong learning. In many cases, providing the correct answers directly when students commit mistakes could not be the best way to make the students learn or not providing feedback at all may lose the role of the teacher being a facilitator in a classroom setting. Hence, providing the answers in a straightforward way could lead to spoon feeding which is highly discouraged in the K-12 curriculum.

With this, the very reason why this study on the effect of Indirect Corrective Feedback on the writing performance of senior high school students was undertaken in order to prove or disprove whether indirect way of giving feedback through codes such as symbols and abbreviations are really an effective tool in improving students' writing performance specifically to the researcher's research locale.

Through conducting a quasi-experimental research design, this helped to substantiate the effectiveness of Indirect Corrective Feedback as an intervention to the researcher's subject participants.

Theoretical Framework

This study was banking on the following theories: Noticing Hypothesis of Richard Schmidt, Comprehensible Output Hypothesis of Merrill Swain and Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis by Robert Lado.

The first theoretical argument supporting written corrective feedback (WCF) is the Noticing Hypothesis. Schmidt (2001) stated that it is only through conscious attention that input can be converted into learners' intake and he further concluded that noticing is a prerequisite for language learning.

Gass and Varonis (1994) as cited by Wang and Jiang (2014) likewise related the importance of noticing to the process of Second Language Acquisition by emphasizing that when learners are aware of the gap between what they can produce and what they need to produce, as well as between what they produce and what target language speakers produce, such an awareness would trigger a modification of their current interlanguage knowledge.

The Noticing Hypothesis would be important to this study to check whether the subject participants are aware as to what they are composing or developing into a composition. Their outputs could show whether they are conscious on developing the topic given to them.

The second theoretical stance favorable to WCF is the Output Hypothesis. Swain (2005) acknowledged that learners' output enjoys great significance in the process of language acquisition in that output pushes learners to process language more deeply and with more mental effort than is necessary during listening and reading. With respect to the specific roles played by output, Swain reasonably identified three functions. The first one is the noticing function since output arouses learners to notice the gaps in their interlanguage system. Besides, it also has the function of hypothesis-testing by enabling learners to test hypotheses about linguistic correctness. Furthermore, output triggers learners' metalinguistic reflection which is conducive to their metalinguistic knowledge development on how second language works (Cited by Wang and Jiang, 2014).

Output Hypothesis would show the writing level performance of the participants. That is, if their compositions have numerous errors then it shows that their writing level performance is still low.

Finally, the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis which was deeply rooted in behaviorism and structuralism, claimed that the principal barrier to second language acquisition is the interference of the first language with the second language system. A scientific structural analysis of the two languages in question would yield a taxonomy of linguistic contrasts between them and would, in turn, enable the linguist to predict the difficulties a learner would encounter (Brown, 1987).

It is possible to identify the areas of difficulty in a particular foreign language for native speakers of another language by systematically comparing the two languages and cultures. Where the two languages and cultures are similar, learning difficulties will not be expected; where they are different, then learning difficulties are to be expected, and the greater the difference, the greater the degree of expected difficulty. Where no interference could be predicted, no difficulty would be experienced since one could transfer positively all other items in a language (Lado, 1957). The logical conclusion from these various psychological and linguistic assumptions was that second language learning basically involved the overcoming of the differences between the two linguistic items—the native and the target languages (Brown, 1987).

On the basis of such analysis, it was believed that teaching materials could be tailored to the needs of learners of a specific first language. Lado (1957) was too aware of the importance of cultural difference in mastering a foreign language. However, his appeal to compare cultures was not taken up, and in practice contrastive analysis focused on a surface comparison of languages, starting with the sounds, then the grammar and finally - and only selectively - the vocabulary (goo.gl/rkLBXY).

Finally, Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis would also show whether the first language of the participants interfere when they construct sentences and in their entire compositions as a whole.

Conceptual Framework

This study aimed to identify the effects of Indirect Corrective Feedback on the compositions of the Grade 11 students of Ansano Memorial National High School. The study used a quasi-experiment type of research where two groups were considered (control and experimental group). The subject participants in the control group have no corrective feedback at all in their compositions; and the other one which was the experimental group was the group who had received the Indirect Corrective Feedback intervention.

Both groups were given the same pre-test and post-test. The pre-test showed the current level in writing of the respondents; while the post-test showed the improvement of the writing performance especially in the experimental group. This study also presented the significant difference between the two groups' mean gain scores. This then revealed that there were positive effects of Indirect Corrective Feedback on the subject participants' writing performance.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted at Ansano Memorial National High School in Taraka, Lanao del Sur. The subject participants of this study were only the Grade 11 students of senior high school.

A corrective feedback was introduced to the subject participants in the experimental group namely, Indirect Corrective Feedback. This type of feedback were given by the teacher-researcher in a form of codes like abbreviations and symbols. This served as the intervention in the experimental group. The intervention was

done for over a month where the participants were given 10 topics to develop into a composition. The topics were: "Alone in a Dessert Island", "An Invention that Transformed the World", "What I Regret Most", "My Belief in Myself", "If I Could Never Die then...", "The Ill Effects of War", "How Do I See the Future", "A Reaction Paper on the JS Promenade", "A Change that could Improve School Life", "A Personal Habit I'd like to Change" -all these topics were given to them by the teacher-researcher that were adopted from the list of suggested topics for compositions for senior high school students. The participants' compositions were submitted to the teacher-researcher for corrections and these were returned to them for them to know their errors. Afterwards, the participants rewrote and revised their compositions.

One of the limitations of the study was that the rating of the subject participants' outputs. These were rated by the teacher-researcher herself using a standardized rubric. Another limitation was the topics given to the subject participants to be developed into a composition were chosen for them by the teacher-researcher. Still another limitation could be the review on grammar, the lecture on the process of writing, and the input on Indirect Corrective Feedback was given to the subject participants altogether. The two groups were only given 1 topic to develop as their pre-test and the same topic in the posttest. The subject participants' compositions then were rated by the teacher-researcher in the areas of content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics using Jacobs' et.al ESL Composition Profile which is a standardized rubric for rating a writing performance. The primary data of the study was solely the results of the pre-test and post-test scores.

RELATED LITERATURE

Corrective Feedback

Feedback has particular characteristics which makes it worthy of application. As Ryan (1997) believes, feedback provided is effective and can alert students about their current writing skills and how the feedback can further develop their writing. Also, self confidence in writing and motivation is an important feature of feedback in the concept of active learning (Butler, 1988). The constructive feedback also causes students to better revise drafts which consequently increases their self-confidence in their writing (Goldstein, 2004). It also increases self-regulated learning (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006) which occurs when students receive feedback on a draft from the lecturer and are required to revise and make the relevant repairments based on the written feedback provided. The written feedback gives them new ideas and makes them understand what the lecturer wants. Above all, feedback offers a sense of direction to the writer (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). When students receive directed feedback, they are able to comprehend the feedback and obtain their writing goal which is to make an improved version of their essays. It can be concluded that written feedback provided has a great effect on the students' writings and also on their attitude towards writing (Leki, 1990) as cited by Azizi et.al.(2014).

The role, importance, and effect of feedback in English as second or foreign language have been key issues in several studies in the teaching of writing (Paltridge, 2004; Reichelt, 1999). The large number of research studies focusing on different types of feedback and its impact on student writing is evidence that many scholars and researchers believe that feedback plays influential role in the writing process. Feedback on student writing can make learning more effective. As stated by Cardelle and Corno (1981), the more feedback students receive of their performance, the better they understand what they need to do to correct their mistakes. The understanding of why they made mistakes and how to correct such mistakes helps students correct their mistakes and increase their achievements (Kulhavy, 1977). Feedback according to Carless (2006) can also modify students' thinking or behavior toward their work and focus their attention on the purpose of writing (Cited by Marmar, 2015).

Research on corrective feedback has gained prominence in the domain of second language acquisition because it plays a crucial role in developing the second language acquisition theories as well as in teaching second languages. Second language acquisition researchers have contended that the role of corrective feedback in second language acquisition will determine the relative importance of positive input or negative input in second language acquisition, which in turn, will provide a framework for choosing teaching methods and

materials, and the role of teachers and students in providing the types of appropriate input in class (Krashen, 1981).

The proliferation of written corrective feedback research is driven its significant theoretical and pedagogical implications for Second Language Acquisition research and instruction. Cognitive interactionist theories such as interaction hypothesis, noticing hypothesis propose that error correction assists language acquisition by helping learners establish form-meaning mappings (Bitchener and Cameron 2005). Error correction plays a central role in classroom discourse; its amount and form are closely related to the efficiency of second language instructions. This is particularly true for Written Corrective Feedback since many second language researchers are concerned with whether Written Corrective Feedback is able to assist second language student to improve the overall effectiveness of their writing (Ellis, 1994).

Providing effective written feedback is one of the most important tasks for English writing teachers (Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Hyland, 2001). According to Keh (1990) and Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996), while providing written feedback to students, a teacher can take four roles. First, teacher as a reader or as a respondent who responds to the content and may show agreement about an idea or content of the text. Second, as a writing teacher or as a guide that show concern about certain points or confusing or illogical ideas in students' text. Third, as a grammarian who writes comments or corrective feedback with reference to grammatical mistakes and relevant grammatical rules. Fourth, as an evaluator or judge whose main role is to evaluate the quality of students' writing as an end product of a writing process and grade students' writing based on their evaluation (cited by Azizi et.al., 2014).

According to Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1996) and Lockhardt and Ng (1995), among the different kinds of feedback, students prefer teacher written responses because they contain a great value in improving their writing proficiency. Generally, there are two types of teacher response, written feedback and oral feedback. Both give writers opportunities to develop the quality of future drafts. Also, the type of teacher feedback will influence their student approaches to writing process (cited by Azizi et.al., 2014).

Hence, Ferris (2006), Goldstein & Conrad (1990) as well as Hyland (1998) as cited by Azizi et.al (2014) claimed that in order to give effective written feedback, teachers should take into account the needs and desires of their students when considering whether and how to give written corrective feedback. Teachers can also encourage learners to discuss, analyze, and evaluate feedback, discuss why it is given, and how it is aimed to influence their writing. Another strategy to increase the effectiveness of feedback is to use tools such as revision and editing checklists to help students develop self correction and self-revision strategies (Ashwell, 2000; Hyland, 1998; Hyland & Hyland, 2001) as cited by Azizi (2014).

Types of Corrective Feedback

Lyster and Ranta (1997) distinguished six types of feedback, namely: explicit correction, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. Explicit correction clearly indicates that students' sentence is wrong and the teacher provides the correct form. Recast is a kind of corrective feedback in which teachers not directly showing that the students' essays are incorrect. Clarification on the other hand is that the teacher uses phrases such as "excuse me" or "I don't understand" that show that the message has not been understood or that the students' utterance includes some kind of error. Metalinguistic clues is a kind of feedback where teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the learners' utterance. While repetition let the teacher to repeat students' errors adjust intonation to draw students' attention.

In everyday classrooms, teachers and their students must interact with each other on many levels. High communication abilities are required in order to teach and motivate these students effectively. Therefore feedback is an important part of teaching and learning (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Rod Ellis (2009) provided some strategies in corrective feedback namely: direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, focused versus unfocused corrective feedback, electronic feedback and reformulation.

Direct corrective feedback provides the student with the correct form. This can take a number of different forms—crossing out an unnecessary word, phrase, or morpheme, inserting a missing word or morpheme, and writing the correct form above or near to the erroneous form. Direct corrective feedback has the advantage that it provides learners with explicit guidance about how to correct their errors. This is clearly desirable if

learners do not know what the correct form is (i.e. are not capable of self-correcting the error). Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggest direct CF is probably better than indirect CF with student writers of low levels of proficiency. However, the disadvantage is that it requires minimal processing on the part of the learner and thus, although it might help them to produce the correct form when they revise their writing, it may not contribute to long-term learning. However, a recent study by Sheen (2007) suggests that direct corrective feedback can be effective in promoting acquisition of specific grammatical features.

Indirect corrective feedback involves indicating that the student has made an error without actually correcting it. This can be done by underlining the errors or using cursors to show omissions in the student's text or by placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing the error. In effect, this involves deciding whether or not to show the precise location of the error. Indirect feedback is often preferred to direct feedback on the grounds that it caters to 'guided learning and problem solving and encourages students to reflect about linguistic forms. For these reasons, it is considered more likely to lead to long-term learning (Lalande, 1982) cited by Ellis (2009).

In focused versus unfocused corrective feedback on the other hand, teachers can select to correct all of the students' errors, in which case the CF is unfocused. Alternatively they can select specific error types for correction. Processing corrections is likely to be more difficult in unfocused CF as the learner is required to attend to a variety of errors and thus is unlikely to be able to reflect much on each error. In this respect, focused CF may prove more effective as the learner is able to examine multiple corrections of a single error and thus obtain the rich evidence they need to both understand why what they wrote was erroneous and to acquire the correct form. If learning is dependent on attention to form, then it is reasonable to assume that the more intensive the attention, the more likely the correction is to lead to learning. Focused metalinguistic CF may be especially helpful in this respect as it promotes not just attention but also understanding of the nature of the error. However, unfocused CF has the advantage of addressing a range of errors, so while it might not be as effective in assisting learners to acquire specific features as focused CF in the short term, it may prove superior in the long run (Ellis, 2009).

Since technology is commonly used nowadays, Ellis (2009) also added Electronic feedback as an instrument in providing corrections and it has an extensive corpora of written English (either carefully constructed or simply available via search engines such as Google) it can be exploited to provide students with assistance in their writing. This assistance can be accessed by means of software programs while students write or it can be utilized as a form of feedback.

Reformulation is similar to the use of concordances in that it aims to provide learners with a resource that they can use to correct their errors but places the responsibility for the final decision about whether and how to correct on the students themselves. A standard procedure in error analysis is reconstruction. That is, in order to identify an error, the analyst (and the teacher) needs to construct a native- speaker version of that part of the text containing an error. The idea for reformulation as a technique for providing feedback to learners grew out of this procedure. It involves a native-speaker rewriting the student's text in such a way as 'to preserve as many of the writer's ideas as possible, while expressing them in his/her own words so as to make the piece sound native- like. The writer then revises by deciding which of the nativespeaker's reconstructions to accept. In essence, then, reformulation involves two options 'direct correction' + 'revision' but it differs from how these options are typically executed in that the whole of the student's text is reformulated thus laying the burden on the learner to identify the specific changes that have been made (Cohen 1989) cited by Ellis (2009).

Bitchener (2008) reported that students who received direct corrective feedback with written and oral metalinguistic feedback, along with the group that received direct corrective feedback with no metalinguistic feedback outperformed the group who did not receive a feedback. There are also considerable discrepancies among the Written Corrective Feedback studies. Some studies reported a major effect of indirect Written Corrective Feedback studies that only identifies grammatical errors. Others have reported similar or more positive effects offer by direct Written Corrective Feedback in error identification and correction. Studies of Ellis et.al.(2008), Sheen (2007), Young and Lyster 2010) have found that Written Corrective Feedback focused on a single linguistic feature is most effective. Other studies have advocated the use of Written Corrective Feedback on variety of lingusitic challenge (cited by Baleghizadeh and Dadashi, 2010). Hyland (1998) points that error correction codes allow language teachers to provide implicit feedback and reduce negative

and disheartening effects of indicating writing errors without reducing the effects of error correction (cited by Azizi et.al., 2014).

Peer Feedback

Edge (1989) cited by Lee (1997) in Mistakes and Corrections gave importance to peer feedback in fact he named some advantages accruing peer corrections. There are four (4) advantages of peer correction. First when a learner commits an error and the other learner corrects it, both the learner become involved in listening and thinking about the language. This is quite related to what the famous theory in language teaching which is the monitor hypothesis. Wherein if you become aware of your mistakes, you can monitor your errors before your utterance. Second, when a teacher encourages learners to correct each others' errors, the teacher gets a lot of important information about the students' ability. Third, the students become used to the idea that they can learn from each other. With this, peer correction helps make them less dependent on teachers. Lastly, if students get used to the idea of peer correction without hurting each others' feelings, they will be able to help each other learn when they work in pair and groups, when the teacher cannot hear what is said.

Human beings perceive the world through their senses. Since perception is a seamless and permanent component of all actions. Different scholars arrived at several definitions of perceptions. Perception, as defined by Irvin Rock in his book, "An Introduction to Perception, is a unique field of inquiry with a purpose of explaining objective facts and events. Objective in a way that the events which are wished to be explained are independent of the observer and are observable to all and not mere illusions. Perception is an essential way of having the knowledge to be learned (Miller and Lair, 1991).

Previous research into students' beliefs toward language learning and error correction suggests that students may have widely differing perception from teachers regarding how error should be corrected in the classroom (Schulz, 2001). It is widely recognized that a difference in belief can lead to student frustration and demotivation. It would be worthwhile to further investigate student attitude towards different kinds of feedback in order to gain a deeper insight into the preferences for specific feedback types (Kalaja and Barcelos, 2003)

Motivational factor is also a major contributor in learning the second language. In fact, both integratively and instrumentally motivated students spent more time thinking about the correct answer than those not so motivated, suggesting that both elements have an energizing effect (Brown, 1995). However Hendrickson (1980) added that one cannot eventually be a good writer just by knowing the grammar and just by being motivated alone. One has to undergo a so called trial and error. In other words, it is through practice that one makes perfect. And normally in practicing writing, there are always be errors along the way that must be corrected in order to make it comprehensible and polished enough (cited by Brown (2000).

Written Corrective Feedback as an Interactive Input

The role of corrective feedback identified by the Interaction Hypothesis has been more frequently discussed in oral contexts than in written contexts. This does not mean however that proposals arising from this context are irrelevant to the written context and the role of Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition. Ways in which theoretical constructs might also be extrapolated to the written context have been noted in several respects. First, learners can receive input from what they read as positive evidence and from teachers' Written Corrective Feedback as negative evidence on their written output. The requirement of text revisions or new text writings offers learners the same chance to produce modified written output as in the case of oral interaction. Besides, conscious attention, similar to the oral context, is also indispensable in the written context if learners are to internalize the feedback. An advantage of Written Corrective Feedback is that learners are provided with enough time to notice the feedback, which might not be the case in the oral context given the time constraints during on-line interactions. Furthermore, as it is proposed in oral interaction that individual factors may exert mediating effects on the uptake of feedback, individual differences would also have facilitative or inhibitive effects on learners' noticing and performance in the writing process. Taken together, conditions for language learning that can result from Written Corrective Feedback seem to be similar to those arising from oral interaction, hence the interactive input role of Written Corrective Feedback (Bitchener and Cameron, 2005).

Theoretical Objections against WCF

Wang and Jiang (2014) cited three theoretical objections in WCF namely: problem of pseudolearning, problem of learnability, and problem of potentially harmful side effects. The first position against the practice of written corrective feedback (WCF) which is the problem of pseudolearning is that a simple information transfer like WCF could only lead to explicit knowledge, not to the implicit knowledge that is required for language acquisition (Truscott, 1996). Within the field of SLA, whereas implicit knowledge refers to the unconscious knowledge of a language that is non-verbalized, readily accessible during online language use, explicit knowledge refers to the conscious linguistic knowledge of grammatical rules and the appropriate meta-language for verbalizing this knowledge (Ellis, 2004). Currently, the assumption that implicit knowledge enables learners to communicate fluently has gained wide acceptance, while the value of explicit knowledge resulting from grammar instruction has been a controversial topic. Although some scholars (e.g., Ellis, 2005) maintain that explicit knowledge can be used in formulating utterances and monitoring language use, others presume its value to be very limited as it can only be used in monitoring when there is a focus on form.

Aside from the debate on the usefulness of explicit knowledge, views on the relationship between implicit and explicit knowledge have also been divergent. Some propose that the gap between the two types of knowledge can be gradually bridged by practice. Other linguists (e.g., Krashen, 1985) contend that the two systems can never interact through an interface. Based on the non-interface viewpoint, explicit knowledge resulted from the practice of WCF can never become the implicit knowledge that drives the actual language use, or, in Truscott's (1996) words, WCF will only lead to "pseudolearning"—described as "a superficial and possibly transient form of knowledge" thus negating the role of WCF in second language instruction.

The second theoretical objection advanced by Truscott (1996) against WCF relates to Pienemann's (1989) Learnability Hypothesis, which claimed that different grammatical features were acquired in a relatively strict order, and that learners can only acquire features for which they show developmental readiness. Linguistic structures that are beyond learners' stage of development will be unteachable since their internal learning mechanism cannot be steered to the instructional requirements. Following this logic, Truscott deduced that if WCF provides learners with grammatical structures that they are not yet ready to acquire, no intake will occur at all. In order to produce any potentially positive effects, WCF should be provided in tune with a learner's current level of second language development. Given the paucity of research findings on language developmental sequences thus far, developing a sequenced WCF methodology in practice might be impossible. Therefore, Truscott argued that WCF cannot be assumed to produce beneficial effects on second language learning. (Cited by Wang and Jiang, 2014)

Apart from claiming the ineffective role of WCF, Truscott (1996) further suggested that it could even be detrimental for the learning process. An inherent problem of WCF lies in triggering a high affective filter in learners, including increased anxiety and low self-esteem, which may discourage them from experimenting with the language and writing more in new tasks. Besides, WCF may further provoke learners' avoidance of using the structure that they have used awkwardly, resulting in their simplified writings that are lexically and structurally less complex. Moreover, the great amount of time spent on providing feedback diverts the attention of both the teacher and the students from other important activities, such as additional writing practice, which might be more likely to contribute to acquisition. Last but not least, doubt has also been cast onto second language teachers' capacity in providing adequate and consistent WCF. Since most second language teachers in EFL background are non-native speakers, if inappropriate judgment is made on learners' writing accuracy, harmful effects will naturally take place. (Cited by Wang and Jiang 2014).

Type of Errors

Errors may be viewed as either global or local (Burt and Kiparsky, 1972 cited by Brown, 2000). Brown (2000) points-out that global errors hinder communication; they prevent the hearer from comprehending some aspect of the message. Local errors do not prevent the message from being heard, usually because there is only a minor violation of one segment of a sentence allowing the hearer/reader to make an accurate guess about the intended meaning.

In a very practical article on error treatment, Hendrickson (1980) advised teachers to try to discern the difference between global and local errors. Hendrickson recommended that local errors usually need not be corrected since the message is clear and correction might interrupt a learner in the flow of productive

communication. Global errors need to be treated in some way since the message may otherwise remain garbled (cited by Brown, 1987)

Lennon (1991) as cited by Brown (2000) suggests that two related dimensions of error, domain and extent should be considered in any error analysis. Domain is the rank of linguistic unit (from phoneme to discourse) that must be taken as context in order for the error to become apparent, and extent is the rank of linguistic unit that would have to be deleted, replaced, supplied, or reordered in order to repair the sentence.

In order to analyse learner language in an appropriate perspective, it is crucial to make a distinction between mistakes and errors, technically two very different phenomena. A mistake refers to a performance errors that is either a random guess or "slip," in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. Lapses or mistakes are not a result of deficiency in competence but a result of some temporary breakdown or imperfection in producing speech. On the other hand, an error is a noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, it reflects the competence of the learner.(Brown, 2000).

However, utterances are not clearly global or local, extent or domain nor mistake or error. And it is difficult to discern the necessity for corrective feedback. The bottom line is that teachers simply must not stifle their students' attempts at production by smothering them with corrective feedback (Brown, 2000). With this, the matter of how to correct errors is exceedingly complex. There is no specific best technique in correcting errors. In "natural" untutored environment, non-native speakers are usually corrected by native speakers on only a small percentage of errors that they make (Chun et.al, 1982) cited by Brown (2000); native speakers will attend basically on global errors and usually not in a form of interruptions but at transition points of conversations (Brown, 2000).

Stages of Learner's Errors

According to Corder (1973) as cited by Brown (2000), he found four (4) stages of what the learner does in terms of error alone namely: random errors (first stage), emergent (second stage), systematic (third stage), and stabilization (fourth stage).

Random errors (first stage) also known as "presystematic," in which the learner is only vaguely aware that there is some systematic order to a particular class of items. Inconsistencies like "John cans sing," "John can to sing," and "John can singing," all said by the same learner within a short period of time, might indicate a stage of experimentation and inaccurate guessing.

The secondstage emergent is a stagewhere a learner have agrowing consistency in linguistic production. The learner had begun to discern a system and to internalize certain rules. This stage is characterized by "backsliding", in which the learners seems to have grasped a rule or principle and then regresses to some previous stage.

The third stage which is systematic is the stage where the learner is now able to manifest more consistency in producing the second language. Although the rules that they learned are not yet well-formed, they more closely approximate the target language system. The most salient difference between the second and third stage is the ability of the leaner (in the third stage) to correct their errors when they are pointed out.

Another one is the fourth stage called stabilization also known as the "postsystematic" stage. It is a stage where the learner as relatively few errors and has mastered the system to the point that fluency and intended meaning are not problematic.

Bailey (1985) cited by Brown (2000) gave a taxonomy on how to deal with errors these are called seven "basic options" complemented by eight "possible features" within each options. The basic options are: to treat or to ignore, to treat immediately or to delay, to transfer treatment, to transfer to another individual, a group, or the whole class, to return, or not to original error after treatment, to permit other learners to initiate treatment, and to test for the efficacy of other treatment. While the possible features are: fact of error indicated, location indicated, opportunity for new attempt given, model provided, error type indicated, remedy indicated, improvement indicated, praise

Indicated

Error Analysis (EA)

Error Analysis is a type of linguistic study that focuses on the errors learners make. It consists of a comparison between the errors made in target language and within that target language itself (Darus, 2009). There has been a change from looking at the product (error) to the process (why students make errors). Although still in the infant stages, this cognitive approach sees errors as a clue to what is happening in the mind (Corder, 1967) in fact he added that systematically analyzing errors made by language learners makes it possible to determine areas that need reinforcement in teaching (cited by Darus, 2009) .

Corder (1967) also stressed that errors are visible proof that learning is taking place. He has emphasized that errors, if studied systematically, can provide significant insights into how a language is actually learned by a foreigner. He also agrees that studying students' errors of usage has immediate practical application for language teachers. In his view, errors provide feedback; they tell the teachers something about the effectiveness of his teaching (cited by Darus, 2009). According to Ancker (2000) as cited by Schachter (1974), making mistakes or errors is a natural process of learning and must be considered as part of cognition. Making errors is one of the most unavoidable things in the world. In language acquisition, learning, and teaching, error has been referred to and has been defined in many ways. There are reviewed terms and definitions of error in Error Studies and consolidated these definitions using the communicative event framework (addresser; addressee; code, norm, and message; and setting). From the perspective of norm or well-formedness of a sentence, error is regarded as "an infringement or deviation of the code of the formal system of communication through which the message is conveyed". Some researchers corroborates this definition by saying that error is the "flawed side of learner speech or writing that deviates from selected norm of mature language performance". Errors are alterations of the rules of the accepted norm and are termed as surface errors which may be further classified as omission errors, addition errors, misformation errors, wrong order, spelling error, systems error, and the like. Also the terms overt and covert errors (Corder, 1973, Faerch, 1984, & Medges, 1989) may be added in the list. The former refers to errors that are not observable within the surface but implied in the message, and the latter refers to those that are clearly identifiable in the surface (cited by Gustilo and Magno, 2012)

One general conclusion can be drawn from the study of errors in the linguistic systems of learners is that learners are indeed creatively operating in the second language—constructing either consciously or subconsciously, a system for understanding and producing utterances in the language. The teacher's task is to value learners, prize their attempts to communicate, and provide optimal feedback for the system to evolve in successive stages until learners are communicating meaningfully and unambiguously in the second language (Brown, 2000).

Schachter (1974) as cited by Khansir (2013) stressed that error analysis will reveal to the investigator just what difficulties the learners have in fact: the difficulties in the target language will show up as errors in production or the frequency of occurrence of specific errors will give evidence of their relative difficulty.

Error Analysis (EA) is concerned with the analyses of the errors made by second language learners by comparing the learners' acquired norms with the target language norms and explaining the identified errors (James, 1998). Stephen Pit Corder's (1967) seminal work "The Significance of Learner's Errors" has given EA a significant turn in that it views errors as valuable information for three beneficiaries: for teachers, it clues them on the progress of the students; for researchers, it provides evidence as to how language is acquired or learned; for learners themselves, it gives them resources in order to learn (Corder, 1967 as cited in Maicusi, Maicusi, & Lopez, 2000). With this approach errors are regarded as resources for learning and teaching rather than as "flaws" which connote failure in the acquisition process and, therefore, needs to be eradicated. Despite the criticisms against EA such as complete reliance on errors per se and not seeing the whole picture of the learners' linguistic behaviour by looking also at the non-errors (Gass & Selinker, 1994; Maicusi, Maicusi, & Lopez, 2000). EA has contributed comprehensively to Second Language Acquisition Theory and second language writing instruction (cited by Gustilo and Magno, 2012).

Sources of Error in Second Language Writing

Myles (2002) cited social and cognitive as one of the major contributing factors that cause error in second language. Both social and cognitive factors affect language learning. Exploration of social factors gives us some idea of why learners differ in rate of second language learning, in proficiency type (for instance, conversational

ability versus writing ability), and in ultimate proficiency (Ellis, 1994). Research based on direct (self-report questionnaires) and indirect measures generally shows that learners with positive attitudes, motivation, and concrete goals will have these attitudes reinforced if they experience success. Likewise, learners' negative attitudes may be strengthened by lack of success or by failure (McGroarty, 1996). Needless to say, although ESL learners may have negative attitudes toward writing for academic purposes, many of them are financially and professionally committed to graduating from English-speaking universities, and as a result, have strong reasons for learning and improving their skills.

There is a direct relationship between learner attitudes and learner motivation. Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model is designed to account for the role of social factors in language acquisition. It interrelates four aspects of second language learning: the social and cultural milieu (which determines beliefs about language and culture), individual learner differences (related to motivation and language aptitude), the setting (formal and/or informal learning contexts), and learning outcomes. Integrative motivation involves a desire to learn a second language because individuals need to learn the target language to integrate into the community. In addition to this interest, the people or the culture represented by the other language group may also inspire them. On the other hand, instrumental motivation acknowledges the role that external influences and incentives play in strengthening the learners' desire to achieve. Learners who are instrumentally motivated are interested in learning the language for a particular purpose, such as writing a dissertation or getting a job. According to the theory, if second language learning takes place in isolation from a community of target language speakers, then it benefits more from integrative motivation, whereas if it takes place among a community of speakers, then instrumental orientation becomes the more effective motivational factor. Despite problems in Gardner's research design, it can be concluded that motivational factors "probably do not make much difference on their own, but they can create a more positive context in which language learning is likely to flourish" (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994) as cited by Myles (2002).

Myles (2002) stated that, learners may continue to exhibit errors in their writing for the following social reasons: negative attitudes toward the target language, continued lack of progress in the second language, a wide social and psychological distance between them and the target culture, and, a lack of integrative and instrumental motivation for learning. On the other hand, academic writing is believed to be cognitively complex. Acquisition of academic vocabulary and discourse style is particularly difficult. According to cognitive theory, communicating orally or in writing is an active process of skill development and gradual elimination of errors as the learner internalizes the language. Indeed, acquisition is a product of the complex interaction of the linguistic environment and the learner's internal mechanisms. With practice, there is continual restructuring as learners shift these internal representations in order to achieve increasing degrees of mastery in second language (McLaughlin, 1988).

One model that applies to both speaking and writing in a second language is Anderson's (1985) model of language production, which can be divided into three stages: construction, in which the writer plans what he/she is going to write by brainstorming, using a mind-map or outline; transformation, in which language rules are applied to transform intended meanings into the form of the message when the writer is composing or revising; and execution, which corresponds to the physical process of producing the text. The first two stages have been described as "setting goals and searching memory for information, then using production systems to generate language in phrases or constituents" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p. 42). Writers vacillate between these processes as they actively develop the meaning they wish to express in writing. Anderson's learning theory supports teaching approaches that combine the development of language and content knowledge, practice in using this knowledge, and strategy training to encourage independent learning (Snow, 2001).

Universal Grammar

Noam Chomsky is probably the best known and the most influential linguist of the second half of the Twentieth Century. He has made a number of strong claims about language: in particular, he suggests that language is an innate faculty - that is to say that humans are born with a set of rules about language in our minds, which he refers to as the 'Universal Grammar'.

The universal grammar is the basis upon which all human languages build. If a Martian linguist were to visit Earth, he would deduce that there was only one language, with a number of local variants. He would be able to study the language and determine the rules based on the patterns he hears and the patterns of other

languages. Children do not simply copy the language that they hear around them. They deduce rules from it, which they can then use to produce sentences that they have never heard before. They do not learn a repertoire of phrases and sayings, as the behaviorists believe, but a grammar that generates an infinite number of new sentences. A toddler acquiring new language suddenly change from "I play." to "I'm playing." without any formal instruction. Children are born, then, with the Universal Grammar wired into their brains. This grammar offers a certain limited number of possibilities - for example, the word order of a typical sentence. Some languages have a basic Subject Verb Object (or SVO) structure -- "The teacher gave a lecture." 75% of the world's languages such as English, French, and Vietnamese use either this structure or Subject Object Verb (SOV) including Japanese, Tibetan, and Korean; while others prefer Verb subject object (VSO) such as Welsh or Verb Object Subject (VOS) such as Malagasy. Some languages, such as Latin, appear to have free word order, but even here, SOV is very common. (Brown, 2000)

Markedness Hypothesis

Fred Eckman (1977, 1981) as cited by Brown (2000) proposed a useful method for determining directionality of difficulty. His Markedness Differential Hypothesis (otherwise known as markedness theory) accounted for relative degrees of difficulty by means of principles of universal grammar. Celce- Murcia and Hawkins (1985) cited by Brown (2000) sum up markedness theory: It distinguishes members of a pair of related forms of structures by assuming that the marked member of a pair contains at least one more feature than the unmarked one. In addition the unmarked (or neutral) member of the pair is the one with a wider range of distribution than the marked one. For example in the case of the English indefinite articles (a, an), an is the complex or marked form (it has an additional sound) and a is the unmarked form with the wider distribution. Eckman (1981) showed that marked items in a language will be more difficult to acquire than unmarked, and that degrees of markedness will correspond to degrees of difficulty. Rutherford (1982) used markedness theory to explain why there seems to be certain order of acquisition of morphemes in English; marked structures are acquired later than unmarked structures cited by (Brown, 2000).

Acculturation Model

Schumann's theory is that the greater the social distance between two cultures, the greater the difficulty the learner will have in learning the second language and conversely, the smaller the social distance (the greater the social solidarity between the two cultures), the better will be the language learning situation. Schumann's (1996) research on social distance was also extended to the concept of pidginization. A pidgin is a simplified and reduced form of language used for communication between people with different languages, and is characterized by lack of inflectional morphology and a tendency to eliminate grammatical transformations. Schumann and others hypothesized that pidginization is, in the past, a result of social distance (Cited by Brown et.al., 1995).

Central Processes Underlying Language Learning

Selinker (1972) identified five central processes underlying language learner which distinguish it from the way in which first language acquisition proceeds this are: language transfer, transfer of training, strategies of second language learning, strategies of second language communication, and over-generalization of second language rules. Selinker (1972) used the term "language transfer" rather than "interference" to stress the active role of the learner, an emphasis also implicit in Weinreich's term "interlingual identifications." This language transfer is also known as Interlingual transfer. In the book of Penny Ur (2012), it is stated that second language learners are already fluent in one language. So unless they are already aware of the differences, they may sometimes unconsciously apply a usage which is not appropriate for the second language also known as interference. In "transfer of training", it means the effects of bad teaching. For example, in a German classes at school it rarely used informal second person plural verb forms (the ihr form) although they had plenty of practice with the other forms, including the singular informal form (du). The result was that when it came to Germany they generally made the correct choice in the singular between formal and informal forms but tended to use the formal Sie form inappropriately for the ihr form in the plural. This was not because of interference from first language English, where choice in the singular would also have been equally affected, since English does not possess the informal/formal distinction at all, but because of transfer of training (goo.gl/rkLBXY).

On one hand, “Strategies of second language learning” include various attempts to simplify the system which the learner is struggling to master. To avoid cognitive overload learners seem to shut out some distinctions available to them in input and use what they perceive as the most fundamental elements. Examples are learners who use simple present tense for narration in the past, who never use progressive verb forms, who use a base form of the verb without inflectional endings, or who make nearly all nouns, say, masculine in languages which have grammatical gender. Selinker admitted that it is difficult to distinguish “strategies of second language learning” from “strategies of second language communication” on the basis of production data alone. The distinction is a psycholinguistic one (goo.gl/rkLBXY).

In communication strategies, however, the speaker focuses on getting his meaning across and allows inaccuracies (production strategies) in form to be produced to achieve this end however, these may be a source of error. Communication strategies have proved a most fertile field of research. Selinker’s original idea seemed to be merely that the learner may trade off formal accuracy against fluent delivery so as not to lose speaker attention. Research has since revealed the wide range of strategies to which learners may resort when faced with a communication impasse, either based on first language or second language or both. These include word coinage, code switching, paraphrase, avoidance, appeals to the interlocutor, and many more. They may or may not result in error (goo.gl/rkLBXY).

On the other hand in “overgeneralisation of second language rules”, Selinker was referring to processes such as extending the “-ed” morpheme for forming past tenses to verbs to which it does not apply (e.g. choosed) or extending the “s” morpheme for forming noun plurals to nouns where it does not apply (e.g. sheeps) (goo.gl/rkLBXY). Overgeneralization is also known as negative intralingual transfer and it has already been illustrated in such utterances as “Does John can sing?” Other examples abound— utterances like “He goed,” “I don’t know what time is it,” and “Il a tombe.” The teacher or researcher cannot always be certain of the source of an apparent intralingual error, but repeated systematic observation of learners speech data will often remove the ambiguity of a single observation of an error (Ur, 2012).

However, there has been criticism of this category, and it has been argued that it is really a form of simplification and should more properly be included under strategies of learning. Selinker was aware that although interlanguage is systematic, it is also variable, as his remarks concerning communication strategies show. At any one time, the interlanguage may show forms from an earlier stage of the interlanguage which have not disappeared completely, as well as emergent forms, which are just starting to appear, often alongside the forms they are to replace and which the learner is on the threshold of acquiring. Furthermore, learners may under particular circumstances (stress, anxiety, fatigue, fear, but also when very relaxed, when their guard is down, as it were) “backslide” into earlier stages of their interlanguage. Finally, Selinker stated that for most learners the interlanguage will stop short of the attainment of native speaker norms and will eventually reach a state where it cannot develop any more despite added instruction or input. He called this putative state “fossilization” (goo.gl/rkLBXY).

Contrastive Rhetoric

Contrastive rhetoric is an area of research in second language acquisition that identifies problems in composition encountered by second language writers and, by referring to the rhetorical strategies of the first language, attempts to explain them. Initiated almost thirty years ago by the American applied linguist Robert Kaplan, contrastive rhetoric maintains that language and writing are cultural phenomena. As a direct consequence, each language has rhetorical conventions unique to it.

Furthermore, Kaplan asserted, the linguistic and rhetorical conventions of the first language interfere with writing in the second language. Contrastive rhetoric is the study of the ways in which the rhetorical structures of a person’s native language may interfere with efforts to write in a second language. Also known as intercultural rhetoric. “Broadly considered,” says Ulla Connor, “contrastive rhetoric examines differences similarities in writing across cultures” (goo.gl/H5aLqg).

Contrastive Analysis (CA)

According to Corder (1967), there has been shift in the approach to analyzing errors. In Contrastive Analysis, the theoretical base which is behaviorism, errors were seen as “bad habits” that had been formed. The response was based on the stimulus. It was assumed that interference of the mother tongue (first language)

was responsible for the errors made during the transitional period of learning the target language. Contrastive Analysis viewed that the most effective materials for teaching second language are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language (NL hereinafter) of the learner. The best way to achieve this was to undertake a comparative analysis of first language and second language. Given this, Contrastive Analysis assumes that those elements that are similar to the native language will be simpler to the learner, and those that are different will be difficult. Therefore, it is recommended that pedagogical materials be designed which would address the target language (Target Language hereinafter) in a systematic fashion based on the predicted difficulty of structures as derived from Contratsive Analysis. It is believed that, carrying out 'CA' as well as planning the writing course outline and instruction materials is as a result of the effort put in by Lane as cited by (Ammar and Nina, 2006). Such analyses were envisioned to be carried out in terms of forms, meaning and distributions of linguistic and cultural units in both first language and second language. Three major sources contributed to a general rationale for conducting CA studies: First, the observation by students of language contact of the phenomenon of interference. Such a phenomenon was defined by Weinrich as "those instances of deviation from norms of either language which occur in the speech of the bilinguals as the result of their familiarity with more than one language"(cited in Bowers, 2002, 186).

The practical experience of teachers of foreign language and their identification of deviations attributed to the learner's mother tongue (MT hereinafter) provide the second source, while the learning theory of interference within first language based on findings in psychology constitutes the third dimension. Given the above rationale, CA can be viewed in terms of three separate approaches: First, the purely linguistic approach, which maintains that CA is nothing more than contrasting for the sake of contrasting and the new knowledge it might provide. The second approach, on the other hand, maintains that CA is capable of encompassing all the errors which occur in SLA. Finally, there is a third position somewhere between these two points of view that contends that CA has been relegated much too high a position in language learning in the past, and further, on its own merits. CA does not hold a legitimate position in the general scheme of language teaching (cited by Al-khresheh, 2016).

It was considered theoretically possible to predict what errors would be made by making a careful detailed comparison of a learner's first language and second language. Differences would constitute potential sources of errors. The weak version is a model with an explanatory power as opposed to a predictive power: That is, it is claimed that researchers can look at errors once they have been combined and offer an explanation based on a CA of that area of grammar as to why those errors occurred (Mair, 2005). Furthermore, the strong version of CA refers to areas of complexity in the TL, which are expected by comparing first language and second language. The areas of contrast will then form the basis for teaching materials. In contrast, the weak version of CA attempts to account for observed errors by starting with classroom data and using the differences between the two linguistic systems to clarify the errors. According to Bell (1981), the strong version of this approach is not only a resource of exploring errors but also a method for expecting them. The weak version presumes that equipped with a CA of the language concerned, the teacher will have a comprehensible depiction of the trouble area even before the learner has started to learn it (Al-khresheh, 2013) as cited by Alkhresheh (2016).

The basic premise of CA hypothesis is that language learning can be more successful when the two languages – the native and the foreign – are similar. Alkhresheh (2013) points out that there are four types of divergences that are caused by differences between native language and target language. They can be summarized as follows: 1. Overproduction: learners produce a given second language structure with much greater occurrence than natives of second language do. They can often be as a result of underproduction. Instead, learners make extreme use of what they suppose to be correct and acceptable; consequently, resulting in overuse of certain words or structures. 2. Underproduction (or avoidance): learners produce hardly any or no examples of second language structure. They can often be caused by conscious avoidance of complex second language structures. 3. Misinterpretation: This type of errors occurs when first language structures influence the interpretation of second language messages. 4.

Production: This type of errors can be classified into six categories: substitutions
(i.e. think is pronounced as /ink/ in Poland and /sink/ in Egypt, people as /beoble/ in

Arabic, love as /laugh/ in Saudi Arabia, fish as /fis/ in Malaysia, and thirty as /dirty/ in India), calques, under-differentiation, over-differentiation, hypercorrection and alterations of structures. According to Odlin (2003, 37), calques, substitutions and alterations of structures compose most forms of production errors (cited by Al-khresheh, 2016).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study was a quasi-experiment type of research also known as a classic experimental design. In this design, two groups were specified, the experimental group and the control group. In this study, the control group was given the traditional method of feedback while the experimental group was given Indirect Corrective Feedback as the intervention. The primary data of the study was solely the subject participants' pre-test and post-test results.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted in Ansano Memorial National High School located in the Municipality of Taraka, province of Lanao del Sur. It was founded by Aleem Dr.Majid Ansano, a former professor in the King Faisal Center for Islamic and Asian Studies (KFCIAS), Mindanao State University and a former secretary of Department of Education, Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao. It is a public high school under the Department of Education, Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao. The school was established on September 17, 2004 with only five (5) teachers. Furthermore, it was established in order to cater to the free educational needs of the youth in the Municipality of Taraka whose major means of family income are farming and fishing. Its mission is to provide quality education among the students as well as to promote excellence not only in western education but in Islamic values as well. Currently, Ansano Memorial

National High School has 18 teachers and just recently, they are now offering Senior High School under the K to 12 curriculum.

Subject Participants of the Study

The subject participants of this study were the Grade 11 students of Ansano Memorial National High School. A total of 40 students were the researcher's subject participants of which 27 were females while 13 were males, ages 16-18 years old. 20 subject participants comprised each group (the control group and the experimental group).

Below was the picture of the subject participants in the experimental group who were taking their pre-test.

Data Gathering Procedure

Pre-stage

In gathering the data, the following procedure were made. First was that, subject participants were grouped homogeneously based on their first grading grades in their reading and writing subject. Based on their grades, they were equally distributed to each group. After subject participants were equally grouped homogeneously, a pre-test which was a writing activity entitled, "A Day I will Always Remember" was given. The latter was rated by the researcher using Jacobs' et.al ESL Composition Profile, a standardized rubric used in identifying the level of writing skills of the subject participants. This rubric had five features such as content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics. These features were the basis for rating the students' compositions before and after the intervention. However, before the intervention of written corrective feedback, participants were given a lecture on how their compositions would be rated using the rubric. This was done so that they could have an idea of what they need to pay attention to when writing. The next one was that only the experimental group was given a discussion on some important points to consider in Indirect Corrective Feedback.

Intervention Stage

After some preparations were done, the teacher-researcher assigned the subject participants in writing different compositions such as "Alone in a Desert Island", "An Invention that Transformed the World, Your Identity", "The Gift of Kindness", "What I Regret Most, What is your Belief in Yourself", "If I knew that I Could Never Die", "How Do I See the Future", "My Reaction in the Junior-Senior High School Promenade", "A Change that Would Improve School Life". These topics that were developed into compositions by the experimental group received indirect corrective feedback from the teacher-researcher while those in the control group received traditional method of corrective feedback.

Post-stage

After one month of writing and administering intervention, the subject participants were given the same topic for their post-test entitled "A Day I will Always Remember". Their post-test compositions then were rated again by the teacher-researcher. The results in their pre-test and post-test writing activities were tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted. Finally, findings generalizations were drawn.

Research Instruments

There were only two instruments used in gathering the data for this study. These were students' compositions, and Jacob's ESL Composition Profile.

Subject Participants' Compositions. In this study, the subject participants were tasked to write various compositions all throughout the duration of the intervention. This also included their pre-test and post-test compositions.

Jacob's ESL Composition Profile. In an effort to estimate the reliability of the measures investigated in this study, subject participants' pre-test and post-test were evaluated by the researcher/teacher. They were rated using the Jacobs et.al. ESL Composition Profile.

Proofreading Symbols and Abbreviations. This composed of symbols and abbreviations that were used as a way of giving Indirect Corrective Feedback to the experimental group.

Statistical Tools

This study used the following as statistical tools:

1. Mean was used to determine the scores of the respondents in their pre-test and post-test

The Mean

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where,

$\sum$ represents the summation

X represents scores

N represents number of scores.

2. t-test was used to determine the significant difference between the mean scores and mean gain scores of the respondents' pre-test and post-test.

$$t = \frac{(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2) - (\mu_1 - \mu_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

Where, m and s are the mean and the standard deviation of the difference (d) n is the size of d.

3. Standard Deviation was also used to measure the writing performance of the respondents before and after the intervention.

$$\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x - \mu)^2}{N}}$$

Where, x represents each value in the population m
 $\bar{x}$ is the mean value of the population
 Σ is the summation (or total)

N is the number of values in the population

4. Levene's test was also used. It is an inferential statistic used to assess the equality of variances for a variable calculated for two or more groups.

Formula Calculating W value

$$W = \frac{(N-k) \sum_{i=1}^k N_i (\bar{Z}_{i.} - \bar{Z}_{..})^2}{(k-1) \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^{N_i} (Z_{ij} - \bar{Z}_{i.})^2}$$

With the W value and the degrees of freedom it could calculate the p value.

where:

$\bar{Z}_{ij}$ = Mean of all i data

$\bar{Z}_{i.}$ = Mean group N = total number of

samples N_i = number of samples in group

k = number of groups

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Effects of ICF on the writing performance of the subject participants

To fully determine and measure the extent of improvement on the writing performance of the subject participants after the intervention, their pre-test and post-test scores were compared.

The table below shows the pre-test and post-test scores of the subject participants. From their scores, the effects of Indirect Corrective Feedback could be determined. Their scores then encapsulate their overall writing performance.

Writing performance of the subject participants as shown in the ESL Composition Rubric

ESL Composition Profile	Group	Mean (N=20)		SD		Qualitative Description		Writing Competence
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	
Content	CG	12.85	12.80	3.81	2.89	Fair to Poor	Fair to Poor	Less Competent
	ExpG	14.60	17.30	3.57	3.08	Fair to Poor	Good to Average	Competent
Organization	CG	13.55	13.30	4.20	2.79	Fair to Poor	Fair to Poor	Less Competent
	ExpG	15.40	18.35	3.19	2.52	Fair to Poor	Good to Average	Competent
Language Usage	CG	12.00	13.40	3.12	2.89	Fair to Poor	Fair to Poor	Less Competent
	ExpG	13.40	17.90	2.62	2.12	Fair to Poor	Good to Average	Competent
Vocabulary	CG	8.15	7.85	2.15	1.92	Fair to Poor	Fair to Poor	Less Competent
	ExpG	7.950	10.45	2.41	1.43	Fair to Poor	Good to Average	Competent
Mechanics	CG	6.55	6.90	1.39	1.16	Fair to Poor	Fair to Poor	Less Competent

	ExpG	7.50	8.50	1.19	0.76	Good to Average	Good to Average	Competent
--	------	------	------	------	------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------

Legend:

CG- Control Group

ExpG- Experimental Group

Pre- Pre-test

Post- Post-test

Excellent-Very Good- More Competent

Good to Average - Competent

Fair to Poor - Less Competent

Very Poor- Not Competent

After the intervention of Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) the writing performance of the two groups was described qualitatively. As shown in Table 7, the control group had a fair to poor performance in writing even after the intervention. That is, they had inadequate development of the topic. Their ideas were confusing or disconnected. They had major problems in simple to complex constructions, limited vocabulary and frequent errors in spelling, punctuation and capitalization. In short they were less competent in writing.

On the other hand, except in mechanics, the experimental group had a fair to poor performance before the intervention. But after the intervention, they became competent in writing. In other words, their ideas were already relevant to the topic. The main idea of their compositions were sometimes disorganized but stood out. Their sentence constructions were simple yet effective. Although they had occasional errors on spelling, punctuation, and capitalization, they had enough vocabulary and their ideas were not obscured.

This finding shows that the ICF intervention is effective in improving the writing performance of the subject participants in the experimental group than those in the control group. In particular, the experimental group was now competent in the areas of content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics. While the control group remained to be less competent after the post-test.

Cardelle and Corno (1981) as cited by Marmar (2015), said that providing the learners a chance to understand why they commit mistakes and how to correct their mistakes can increase their achievements. Feedback according to Carless (2006) as cited by Marmar (2015)

This finding also proves what Krashen (1981) stressed that through giving feedback teachers will know the areas of difficulty that learners are facing. This will then lead to providing framework for choosing teaching methods and materials, and the role of the teachers and students in providing the appropriate input in class. Giving written corrective feedback is like analyzing the error of the learners. Schachter (1974) stressed that error analysis will reveal to the investigator just what difficulties the learners have in fact: the difficulties in the target language will show up as errors in production or the frequency of occurrence of specific errors will give evidence of their relative difficulty. It views errors as valuable information for three beneficiaries: for teachers, it clues them on the progress of the students; for researchers, it provides evidence as to how language is acquired or learned; for learners themselves, it gives them resources in order to learn (Corder, 1967 as cited in Maicusi, Maicusi, & Lopez, 2000).

The success of the Indirect Corrective (ICF) according to Lalande (1982) as cited by Ellis (2009) was due to the fact that it caters guided learning and problem solving and encourages students to reflect about linguistic forms. For these reasons, it is considered more likely to lead to long-term learning. Feedback also causes students to better revise drafts which consequently increases their self-confidence in their writing (Goldstein, 2004). It also increases self-regulated learning (Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, 2006) which occurs when students receive feedback on a draft from the lecturer and are required to revise and make relevant repairments based on the written feedback provided. The written feedback gives them new ideas and makes them understand what the lecturer wants. Above all, feedback offers a sense of direction to the writer (Hyland and Hyland, 2006). When students receive feedback, they are able to comprehend the feedback and obtain their writing goal which is to make an improved version of their essays. Written feedback provided has a great effect on the students' writings and also on their attitudes towards writing (Leki, 1990).

It implies that ICF is a must to be done by every writing teacher. The use of codes such as symbols and abbreviations in giving corrections is effective in Grade 11 subject participants--a higher grade level. It implies then that ICF can be used among senior high schools and college students. Poor background in grammar and more so in writing such as vocabulary, mechanics, language use, organization and content are a major causative factors why the subject participants could not produce better written outputs. The teachers then should give

pre-writing activities to her students and from there, she would be able to know their English language inadequacy. After knowing their inadequacy she could give a brief review to address it.

Feedbacks and Preferences of Subject Participants on Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF)

To prove whether the ICF intervention was successful and effective, the experimental group participants were asked about their feedbacks and preferences on ICF. The following were the preferences of the subject participants:

Use of codes, symbols and abbreviations (Indirect Corrective Feedback)

For Nafida and Abdul Wahid, ICF had made them independent learner; for Jamila, ICF had enhanced her knowledge in writing, respectively.

“I like coded corrections because I learned many things from it. Just like the way to be an independent learner. Because I can know my mistakes by myself.” - Nafida

I like coded type of giving corrections because I learned many things from it like on how to be an independent learner. Because of it, I can discover my mistakes.

“Because of it (ICF) I become independent to be able to correct my mistakes and correct myself in those mistakes”. -Abdul Wahid

Because of Indirect Corrective Feedback, I became more independent in discovering my mistakes and correct those mistakes.

Moreover Jamila said:

I really appreciate the comments and corrections about my compositions. Furthermore my knowledge was enhance in writing a composition and now I know that it's quite difficult to make an accurate composition. I'm glad that I gain this learnings because when I'm going to apply a job and make a letter, it's not difficult for me to compose a letter. -Jamila

I really appreciate the comments and corrections about my compositions. Furthermore, my knowledge was enhanced in writing a composition and now I know that it's quite difficult to make an accurate composition. I am glad that I gain this learning because when I am going to apply for a job and make a letter, it's not difficult for me to compose a letter.

Focus Corrective Feedback on grammar

Moreover, the subject participants also expressed their preferences on how their teacher would give feedbacks in their compositions. They preferred to receive corrective feedbacks on grammar and that their teacher must provide explanations on these as can be seen from their comments.

For Hijara, grammar is the area where she finds it difficult when writing;

Sobaira just simply wants to focus and be corrected on grammar. Moreover, Farhanah, Jassar, Hissan, Sittie Aina and Ibn find grammar as the most difficult and confusing.

Farhana, Jassar, Hissan, Sittie Aina and Ibn have almost similar preference and feedback. They said:

“We want to be corrected only in grammar kasi dun kami madalas malito at nahihirapan. Pero maganda naman ang Indirect kasi nahahanapan namin ng paraan paano matuklasam ang aming pagkakamali”

We want to be corrected only in grammar because it is where we had a lot of difficulty and confusion. But Indirect Corrective Feedback is good because we discover and learn from our mistakes.

I want to be given corrections in grammar because I always have hard difficulty in grammar. I appreciate our teacher for providing me with symbols and

codes because that way, we are becoming more independent and prevent committing mistakes again". -Hijara

I want to be corrected on grammar because I always have difficulty with grammar. I appreciate my teacher for providing me with symbols and abbreviations because through this, I became more independent and would avoid committing the same mistakes again.

"I prefer to be corrected on grammar."-Sobaira I prefer to be corrected on grammar usage.

Preference on providing explanations in every error

Furthermore, some participants preferred to find explanation in every error they committed. For Yasser, he wanted to know the nature of his errors; for Sobaira, she wanted to be provided with explanations in every error.

"I want to be provided with explanations to our errors that we commit. And dapat lahat ng errors namin my explanations kung bakit kami nagkamali"., - Yasser

I want to be provided with explanations to my errors that I commit. And it must be that those explanations would emphasize the nature of my error

I wanted that wherever I commit errors I want to get an explanations on why I commit those errors". -Sobaira

I want that whenever I commit errors, my teacher would provide explanations on why I commit those errors.

Direct Corrective Feedback

Two participants, Almera and Norhana, preferred to receive direct corrective feedback from their teacher.

"I want to be given the correct answer right away because indirect is so hard and time consuming" -Almera

I prefer direct way of giving corrections because I have difficulty in the coded type of feedback since it is time consuming to know my errors.

"The technique was good. It will be easy for those people who are very good in memorization, but it will take time for a person like me to familiarize and to memorize all of it. So I'd rather stick to the providing the correct answer to your error right after you commit it -Norhana

Indirect Corrective Feedback was good. It will be easy for those people who are already familiar with the codes used. It will take time for me to familiarize and memorize all the codes. So I'd rather want to receive corrections directly.

Oral Corrective Feedback

Finally, one participant wanted that she be corrected personally by the teacher. She wanted to listen from her teacher the errors she had and how these be corrected.

"For me this technique seems to be a lot more complex than the traditional one because this technique requires memorization and familiarization which makes it complicated for me to understand as a student with difficulties in memorization. I'd rather consult with my teacher about my mistakes personally and verbally. In that way, I can even have a much clearer insights about my mistakes."-Sittie Jenan

For me Indirect Corrective Feedback seems to be a lot more complex than the traditional one because this technique requires memorization and familiarization which make it complicated for me to understand as a student with difficulties in memorization. I'd rather consult my teacher about my mistakes personally and verbally. In that way, I can even have a much clearer insights about my mistakes.

Generalization formulated from the findings and feedbacks

Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) such as using codes, symbols and abbreviations in correcting the errors committed by students has a great positive impact in error-reduction of their compositions. With the coded errors they found in their papers, they are now motivated to write trying not to commit the same mistakes again. The participants admitted that the most difficult part in writing is grammar, and this is where they wanted to be corrected most by their teacher. This fact challenges them more to be cautious with grammar. Hence, before any writing activity to start, teachers should equip their students with grammar skills.

Students should, first of all, be motivated to write intrinsically or extrinsically. For intrinsic motivation, this is not a problem because this is innate in the students. They love or are motivated to write because they found writing to be personally gratifying. For extrinsic motivation, this is what a writing teacher should look into. Students write expecting for some external rewards like a better mark or the indirect corrections made by the teacher in their compositions would inspire them to improve it, or if not, to write better next time. Now that they are motivated to write, they would pay attention to the corrections of the teacher and are happy to see their teacher's feedbacks on writing.

Indirect corrective feedbacks from the teacher drive the students to rewrite and improve their compositions, which in turn, build some self-confidence in writing for those who do not have it yet, and increase those that have it already. ICF is effective when it is done over a long period of time, say a semester in college or throughout the year in high school. By this, students could devote much time to actual writing, and with the facilitation of the teacher giving ICF on their write-ups, they would be encouraged to write better compositions regularly, this time committing only minimal errors along the way.

CONCLUSIONS

The pre-test mean scores of the subject participants were 53.10 in the control group while 57.80 in the experimental group, this scores were proven by the Levene test that the two groups were comparable. This concludes that the homogenous groupings made by the teacher-researcher before the intervention were done properly and that the two groups (control and experimental) were of equal level in writing performance before the intervention of Indirect Corrective Feedback. Therefore, the H_0 : There is no significant difference between the pre-test mean scores of the subject participants in the control and experimental group is accepted.

However, during the post-test, the mean scores of subject participants in the control and experimental groups after the intervention were no longer the same, for the control group had a post-test mean score of 54.70 while the experimental group had a post-test mean score of 72.50 respectively which is far greater than that of the control group. Therefore the H_0 : There is no significant difference between the post-test mean scores of the control and experimental groups after intervention is rejected. Consequently, the researcher also concludes that with the intervention of Indirect Corrective Feedback, it is indeed effective and can be one of the strategy to be implemented in the researcher's research locale and the researcher's subject participants in particular.

Furthermore, after the intervention the control group had a mean gain score of 1.60 while the experimental group had 14.70 as their mean gain score. The difference of mean gain scores of the two groups was obviously apparent. Thus, this leads the researcher to conclude that Indirect Corrective Feedback is effective and successfully administered to the subject participants of the experimental group. Therefore, Indirect Corrective Feedback is effective to the Grade 11 Senior High School Students - a higher level.

Moreover, the writing performance of the subject participants after intervention that was shown in the ESL Composition Profile was that from fair to poor, the experimental group had turned to good to average in their writing performance. Moreover, this concludes that Indirect Corrective Feedback is effective in improving the writing skills of the subject participants especially in the areas of content, organization, language use, vocabulary and mechanics.

Majority of the feedbacks on preferences given by the subject participants of the experimental group was that they like how they were given codes and abbreviations as a way of correcting their mistakes while some preferred other kinds of corrective feedback such as a corrective feedback that is more focused and directly giving them the correct usage and provide explanations in every errors they had committed. Nevertheless, since majority of the subject participants in the experimental group had a positive feedback on Indirect

Corrective Feedback, this only concludes that the way such feedback intervenes on the experimental group's compositions was effective enough and successful. This is due to the fact that indirect way of giving corrections lead the students to better understand the process of revision and the purpose of their writing compared to those students who did not received feedback at all.

Finally, Indirect Corrective Feedback (ICF) such as using codes, symbols and abbreviations in correcting the errors committed by students has a great positive impact in error-reduction of their compositions. The participants admitted that the most difficult part in writing is grammar, and this is were they wanted to be corrected most by their teacher. This fact challenges them more to be cautious with grammar.

Students should, first of all, be motivated to write intrinsically or extrinsically. For intrinsic motivation, this is not a problem because this is innate in the students. They love or are motivated to write because they found writing to be personally gratifying. Students write expecting for some external rewards like a better mark or the indirect corrections made by the teacher in their compositions would inspire them to improve it, or if not, to write better next time.

Indirect corrective feedbacks from the teacher drive students to rewrite and improve their compositions, which in turn, build some self-confidence in writing. ICF is effective when it is done over a long period of time, say a semester in college or throughout the year in high school. By this, students could devote much time to actual writing, and with the facilitation of the teacher giving ICF on their write-ups, they will be encouraged to write better compositions regularly.

REFERENCES

Books

1. Brown, D. (2000). Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York, USA: Pearson ESL.
2. Brown, D. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New York, USA: Pearson ESL.
3. Brown, D. (1987). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. San Francisco University: Prentice Hall Inc.
4. Ellis, R. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Kalaja, P., & Barcelos, A.M. (2003). Beliefs about SLA: New Research Approaches: London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
6. Krashen, S. (1981). Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning. UK: Pergamon.
7. Merriam-Webster, (2018), Merriam-Webster Dictionary. USA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
8. Miller, W.R. and Rollnick, S. (1981). Motivational Interviewing : Preparing People to Change Addictive Behavior. New York: Guilford Press.
9. Murcia, M., & Olshtain, E. (2000). Discourse and Context in Language Teaching "A Guide for Language Teachers". Cambridge, USA: Cambridge University Press.
10. Murcia, M. (2001). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Boston, Massachusetts, USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
11. Murcia, M. (2006). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. USA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
12. Tiongson, M., Therese A., & Rodriguez, M. R. (2016). Reading and Writing Skills. Rex Bookstore: Manila, Philippines.
13. Skills. Rex Bookstore: Manila, Philippines.

Unpublished Theses/Materials

1. Alamis, Ma. Melvyn P. Evaluating Students 'Reactions and Responses to Teachers' Written Feedbacks. Published Graduate Thesis. University of Santo Tomas: Manila, 2010
2. Araneta, Margarita Regina D., The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Revision of Compositions of First Year College Students of MSU-IIT, First Semester, S.Y. 2009-2010. Mindanao State University- Iligan Institute of Technology: Iligan City, 2010
3. Eubanas, Rizza C. A Case Study of the Strategies in Term Paper Writing of Ten English II Students of the Mindanao State University - Iligan Institute of Technology. Unpublished Graduate Thesis. Mindanao State University- Iligan Institute of Technology: Iligan City, Philippines, 2008.
4. Gabinete, Karen L. The Contrastive Study Between Written Feedback Given by Language and Non-Language Teachers on Essay of Students in the Higher Education. Published Graduate Thesis. San Beda College: Manila, 2012

5. Marmar, Norhaimah B. The Effects of Rod Ellis' New Pedagogical and Theoretical Perspective on Students' Autobiographical Essays. Unpublished Graduate Thesis. Mindanao State University, 2015
6. Rangiris, Jehaylin G. Perceptions of Secondary English Teachers in Masiu, Lanao del Sur on Feedback System. Unpublished Graduate Thesis. Mindanao State University, 2013

Journals

1. Baleghizadeh S., Dadashi M. (2010) The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Students' Spelling Errors. *Bogota Columbia Journal*. 13(1), 129-137
2. Bitchener J., Young S., Cameron D. (2005) The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 1(14), 191-205
3. Brown H.D., Scott M.L., Brown C. (1995). Resources in Teacher Language Education. *TESOL Quarterly*. 29(2), 389-393
4. Dekeyser, C. (1993). The Effects of Error Correction on L2 Grammar Knowledge and Oral Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(4). 00.1111/j.15404781.1993.tb019999.x
5. Ellis R. (2009). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*. 63(22), 97-107
6. Erel, O. and Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: a comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 1, pp.397-415. Retrieved from www.researchgate.net.
7. Park, Gipyoo (2010). Preference of Corrective Feedback Approaches Perceived by Native English Teachers and Students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*. 7(4), 29-52
8. Horbacauskienė and Kasperaviciene. (2015). Learners' Preferences Towards Corrective Feedback in Writing Assignments in Tertiary Education. *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics*. 1(1), 70-83
9. Lee, I. ESL Learners' Performance in Error Correction in Writing: Some Implications for Teaching, System, 1997: 25(4), 465-477.
10. Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of form in Communicative Classroom: Studies in L2 Acquisition, 19, 37-66. 1997
11. Magno C., Amarales A. M., (2011). Teachers' Feedback Practices in Second Language Academic Writing Classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment* 6(2), 21-29.
12. Marzano, J. and Arthur S. (1977). Teacher Comments on Student Essays: It doesn't Matter What to Say. *Eric*. 1(12). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED147864>.
13. McMartin-Miller, C. (2013). How much feedback is enough. *Assessing Writing*, 19(1). 10.1016/j.asw.2013.11.003
14. Rassaei E., Moinzadeh A. (2010). Investigating the Effects of Three Types of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of English Wh-question Forms by Iranian EFL Learners. *Canadian Center of Science and Education* 4(1), 97-101
15. Rassaei E., Moinzadeh, A., Youhanee M. (2012). The Effect of Corrective Feedback on the Acquisition of Implicit and Explicit L2 Knowledge. *The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning*. 2(1), 59-75
16. Wang, Bing., Yu, Yuanfang (2009) A Study of Language Learning Strategy Use in The Context of EFL Curriculum and Pedagogy Reform in China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 29(4), 457-468

On-line Sources goo.gl/rkLBXY [June 20, 2018]

goo.gl/H5aLqg [June 20, 2018]

<https://www.google.com.ph> [February 9, 2018]

<http://www.google.com.ph> [February 8, 2018]

www.googlemap.com [December 10, 2017]

<http://www.cc.comment.edu/writing/symbols.htm> [December 10, 2017]

<http://darkwing.uoregon.edu/~guion/444notes/corder.html> [February 15, 2017]