

ESP WRITING CORRECTION: WHEN RATER MATTERS

Ali Asghar Ghasemi, Mehdi Moharami

Faculty of Foreign Languages, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Iran
E-Mail: ghasemi.aliasghar@gmail.com

Abstract. *For nearly four decades, EFL and ESL scholars have been trying to find which type of feedback - direct vs. indirect, explicit vs. implicit, peer vs. teacher, etc. leads to improving accuracy and retention. Also, focus on the type and nature of writing tasks of university and ESP learners has increased as if many surveys have been conducted to figure out the factors affecting the performances of ESP writers. In an attempt to shed a new light on issues about English language teachers, this study tried to examine possible differences between language teachers graduated from English language major [henceforth EFL teachers] and those graduated from fields other than language major [henceforth Content teachers] regarding their main concerns while rating writing tasks of ESP learners. To fulfill these aims, five English learners, having the same level of language proficiency, and ten teachers, five in each population, were selected. The teachers rated the tasks written by the learners on the topic given to them. The findings, analyzed using chi-square test, revealed that the rating of teachers from different educational backgrounds differed.*

Key words: *Feedback, EFL, Content, language proficiency.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Feedback plays a pivotal role in increasing students' motivation and their potential for learning. In classes with focus on the enhancement of writing accuracy and linguistic knowledge, feedback gives rise to a more effective outcome. Since its introduction, feedback has been categorized into different types such as teacher direct and indirect feedback, peer feedback and technological feedback like computer delivered type (Bitchener & Knotch, 2010).

From the very beginning, these unanswered questions about the extent to which written corrective feedback (CF) on linguistic errors improves the accuracy of writing over time and whether students benefit from it, continue to be an issue of interest to researchers and teachers (Bitchener & Knotch, 2010). Having published a significant piece of research on the theme of feedback consequences, Truscott (1996) cast doubt on the improvement of accuracy and believed that accuracy even in the case of improvement would be at the cost of fluency. Despite the glaring discrepancies among the results of different research on the effectiveness of feedback, it has been admitted that some areas and domains of language are more treatable than others.

New terms named treatable and untreatable errors introduced by (Fazio, 2001; Lalande, 1982; Sheppard, 1992, Truscott, 1996) point to the fact that different linguistic categories should not be treated as if they are equivalent in that they represent separate domains of knowledge that are acquired through different stages and processes. Nearly all of the above-mentioned studies targeting specific error categories found that there were significantly different rates of student achievement and progress across error types.

Various scholars scrutinized the efficacy of different sorts of written corrective feedback or their combinations but not all agree on the effectiveness of one over the other. Indirect corrective feedback seeks a way to indicate the errors without any explicit attention in order to give the students the opportunity to find and solve the mistakes by themselves (Ferris, 2003). Students would be exposed to this through: underscoring or circling the error; use of margin for recording the errors in the sentence or line; or using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type of error it is (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). For example, the advocates of indirect feedback believe that this type owing to its merits such as necessary reflection, noticing, and attention contributes to long-term retention (Ferris & Robert, 2001). On the other hand; the supporters of direct feedback have no faith in this type and count its shortcomings. They maintain that not only is it of no help to the learners, but that it also brings about confusion when decoding teachers' cryptic notes. In addition, direct feedback can provide more information, and finally immediate feedback paves the way for better learning (Chandler, 2003).

In direct corrective feedback, as the term shows, teachers provide students with the correct linguistic form or structure that are above the linguistic error (Ferris, 2003). Students may be exposed to this strategy by the addition of a missing word/phrase/morpheme; removal of the unnecessary word/phrase/morpheme; or provision of the correct form or structure. Furthermore, it can be introduced and provided through two channels: 1) written meta-linguistic explanation in which the rater writes the related and necessary grammatical rules at the end of the paper, and by a code determines the relationship to the mistakes and 2) spoken meta-linguistic explanation in which the teacher orally gives pieces of information to one group or the whole class in order to obliterate the defects (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009).

Investigations on feedback are not just confined to the usefulness and efficiency of direct and indirect feedback or priority of one over the counterpart. Studies done in this area can be dedicated to the merits of the direct or indirect feedback subgroups and the ultimate result of each. The following studies reported on the probable precedence of direct/indirect or their subgroups: (1) Lalande (1982) has stated an advantage for indirect feedback, (2) Semke (1984) has mentioned no difference between these two, and (3) Chandler (2003) has announced positive findings for both direct and indirect feedback. All these above-mentioned research findings indicate that it is difficult to claim that direct feedback is better than its indirect counterpart or vice-versa. This controversy exists not only for written but also for oral feedback as researchers have claimed contrasting viewpoints. Havranek and Cesnik (2003), Lyster (2004), Muranoi (2000), Nagata (1993), Rosa and Leow (2004) pointed out the value of direct over indirect and others such as DeKeyser (1993) emphasized the advantage of oral indirect feedback.

Having made a distinction between "treatable" and "untreatable" errors, Ferris (1999) suggested that some cases (verb tense and form, participant-verb agreement, article usage, plural and possessive noun endings, and sentence fragments) occur in a rule-governed way; hence, learners can be referred to a grammar book or a set of rules to resolve the errors. On the other hand, he added that word choice errors, with the possible exception of the use of some pronouns and prepositions and unidiomatic sentence structures, resulting from problems to do with word order and missing or unnecessary words are idiosyncratic that require learners to utilize their acquired knowledge of language to correct the error. In other words, during a term, learners make substantial progress over reducing errors in verb tense and form ("treatable"), noun ending errors ("treatable"), article error categories ("treatable");

however, they make slight progress in reducing lexical and sentence structure (“untreatable”) (Ferris and Roberts, 2001). Moreover, they asserted that it gets worse if the structure, for instance definite and indefinite articles consists of complex rules with various forms in different situation (Ferris & Roberts, 2001).

Apart from the conflicting views of researchers, the students’ view on teacher feedback is of high interest. The results from different studies indicate that students are more inclined to get feedback from their teachers rather than from their peers. In addition, students are more willing in receiving indirect written corrective feedback because it makes them more active and engaged in the process of learning (Enginarlar, 1993; Leki 1991). Leki (1991) maintained that most students find feedback very useful. But, some researchers believed that learners would like even feedbacks on how native speakers express the same ideas regarding both content and form.

2. ESP WRITING

Over the last 20 years, the focus on the type and the nature of writing tasks of university and ESP learners has increased. This trend can be examined at two levels: pedagogical and theoretical (Zhu, 2004). At the pedagogical level, writing researchers and teachers take advantage of task analysis as a means of identification of learners’ needs in order to make the learners ready for academic writing tasks. At the theoretical level, writing researchers hope to better understand the nature of communicative conventions in different discourse communities as well as students’ acquisition of those conventions (Zhu, 2004).

Research on writing in academic contexts can also be examined from the perspectives of the functions; the context and the role in helping students learn the discourse practices of a community (Prior, 1998). Prior in 1998 investigated the nature of writing tasks in two chemical engineering classes, which she called Lab and Design. By resorting to the methods such as including open-ended and discourse-based interviews, class observations, student and faculty surveys, and analysis of student written products, Herrington (1985) figured out that the two classes functioned as two discourse communities, with the Lab as a “school forum” and Design as a “professional forum”. The results of her studies revealed that writers write for different purposes, to different addressees, and by assuming different roles. The most popular academic writing tasks are in science, engineering and business fields. Research in Business communication and its related areas are so important that journals such as Business Communication Quarterly and The Journal of Business Communication highlighted the main areas as follows (Prior, 1998):

- (1) What is expected from them in a real situation, students' needs, the faculty perspectives and the students' strength and weakness in writing?
- (2) Standards and training in MBA and undergraduate business programs.
- (3) Various facets of students' writing from the specialists' viewpoints.
- (4) The efficacy of certain kinds of instruction on the writing performance of learners.

In spite of much research done in Business and ESP courses for determining the real needs of learners, and its effects on the final performance of learners, a few studies, if any, investigated teachers' attitudes toward writing assessment and the differences emerging from their diverse academic backgrounds.

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants

3.1.1. Learners

This study was conducted in a private English Language Institute in Tehran. Five out of 10 qualified learners (Intermediate level) volunteered to participate in this research. All learners, three males and two females, aged from 25-30. All the participants were graduates of various field of study (Mechanics, Chemistry, Industrial Engineering and Music). In order to meet the needs pertinent to their jobs, all the learners attended this ESP course of “Business Corresponding”.

3.1.2. Teachers

The teachers who were asked to participate in this survey were categorized into two groups and five in each group: EFL and Content teachers. On one side, those who majored in English and were teaching this language were regarded EFL teachers. On the other side, the number of Content teachers, those who majored in fields other than English but were teaching this language, was five too. This group was selected from graduates of Engineering, Medicine, Management and Accounting. To ensure the expertise and homogeneity, the teachers were expected to have these qualifications: (a) To be currently teaching or have taught at or near the grade level being assessed; (b) To be familiar with student writing at the level being assessed; (c) To have basic knowledge of writing assessment model; and to have achieved a score higher than 7.5 in IELTS or the equivalent proficiency in TOEFL.

3.2. Materials and instruments no ‘empty’ titles, please

3.2.1. Course-book

The course, Business Corresponding, a participant-specific one aims to help them with their job writing. The course is based on principles of process writing which is suitable for people who want to be able to build good relationships with international clients and colleagues. Situations offered in this course-book were designed to make learners’ writing more appropriate and help them make more confident ways in order to establish and maintain successful business relationships.

3.2.2. Composition

The topic selected for this research consisted of four parts, which presented the participants’ appropriate behaviors and cross-cultural conversations. This topic required the learners to write about the formalities, expectations and their own opinions and self-experiences in business meetings. The topic was equally represented within those five students. While scoring the compositions, the raters were also asked to identify the feature they label the best and worst of each work. The learners were allowed to write for 30 minutes. Since the participants were of intermediate proficiency and had had a similar topic in their courses in advance, no help _semantically, syntactically and linguistically_ were given to them. The topic for this study was based upon three criteria:

1. It was considered appropriate because it is a real life task that they would encounter in different settings.
2. The second reason was that it made them contemplate on condition they need to regard before any formal meetings.
3. And finally, the topic was similar to what they had and have during learning which automatically brings them the content for writing.

3.2.3. Error Categories

Error categories used in this study were based on the finding of Bardovi-Harlig and Bofman (1989) (See Appendix A). The categories included errors in syntax (e.g. errors in word order, missing elements), morphology (e.g. verb tense, participant-verb agreement), grammar (e.g. use of articles, prepositions), and in lexis (word choice). In addition to analyzing the scripts by using a range of linguistic measures, the researcher analyzed the participants' writing from the aspect of text structure, rhetorical quality, coherence and cohesion, and content. Given the brevity of the writing and varied topics, the criteria for evaluating these aspects of writing had to be simple and flexible enough to enable us to trace changes. Therefore, the guide to the analysis of text structure and rhetorical quality provided in Storch & Tapper (2009) was used (See Appendix B).

4. RESULTS

This study was conducted in three individually scheduled data collection procedures. In the first stage, five out of ten intermediate learners volunteered to participate in the survey. In the second stage, shortly after the first one, the participants were asked to write on the given topic for 30 minutes. For two reasons, one for the equivalent level of the participants and the topic and the other one for showing their real writing performance, they were not allowed to use any reference book, dictionary or consultation. To restrict the effects of any factor, the names and any biodata of the participants were recorded separately. Having copied the papers according to the number of the raters, the researcher submitted ten papers to each rater. In the last phase, ten teachers _five in each group_ were requested to evaluate and assess the compositions. Also they were asked to take down the features they noticed most in writing correction. Not to invalidate the results, the raters were informed that they deal with a study; but, the specific purpose and details of the research were submitted to them after its completion. In order to answer the research questions on the differences between the EFL and Content teachers, chi-square test was used.

Table 1 Results of error category frequencies

Error category	Teacher			
		Observed N	Expected N	Residual
word order	content	13	13.5	-.5
	EFL	14	13.5	.5
	Total	27		
major constituent	content	10	10.5	-.5
	EFL	11	10.5	.5
	Total	21		
minor constituent	content	6	6.5	-.5
	EFL	7	6.5	.5
	Total	13		
linking ideas	content	20	13.0	7.0
	EFL	6	13.0	-7.0
	Total	26		
plural	content	27	28.5	-1.5
	EFL	30	28.5	1.5
	Total	57		
agreement 1	content	2	6.0	-4.0
	EFL	10	6.0	4.0
	Total	12		
possesive	content	8	8.5	-.5
	EFL	9	8.5	.5
	Total	17		
tense	content	10	11.0	-1.0
	EFL	12	11.0	1.0
	Total	22		
agreement 2	content	5	5.5	-.5
	EFL	6	5.5	.5
	Total	11		
passive	content	1	1.5	-.5
	EFL	2	1.5	.5
	Total	3		
derivational	content	9	5.5	3.5
	EFL	2	5.5	-3.5
	Total	11		
determiner	content	8	16.5	-8.5
	EFL	25	16.5	8.5
	Total	33		
article	content	22	28.5	-6.5
	EFL	35	28.5	6.5
	Total	57		
preposition	content	10	9.0	1.0
	EFL	8	9.0	-1.0
	Total	18		
word choice	content	50	37.0	13.0
	EFL	24	37.0	-13.0
	Total	74		
collocation	content	2	25.0	.0
	EFL	9	25.0	.0
	Total	11		
capitalization	content	10	17.5	-7.5
	EFL	25	17.5	7.5
	Total	35		
punctuation	content	20	40.0	-20.0
	EFL	60	40.0	20.0
	Total	80		

Table 2 Test statistics and statistical significance

Test Statistics		teacher
Error category		
word order	Chi-Square	.037a
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.847
major constituent	Chi-Square	.048b
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.827
minor constituent	Chi-Square	.077c
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.782
linking ideas	Chi-Square	7.538d
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.006
plural	Chi-Square	.158e
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.691
agreement 1	Chi-Square	5.333f
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.021
possesive	Chi-Square	.059g
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.808
tense	Chi-Square	.182h
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.670
agreement 2	Chi-Square	.091i
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.763
passive	Chi-Square	.333j
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.564
derivational	Chi-Square	4.455i
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.035
determiner	Chi-Square	8.758k
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.003
article	Chi-Square	2.965e
	df	-1
	Asymp. Sig.	.085
preposition	Chi-Square	.222l
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.637
word choice	Chi-Square	9.135m
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.003
collocation	Chi-Square	4.465n
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	0.34
capitalization	Chi-Square	6.429p
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.011
punctuation	Chi-Square	20.000q
	df	1
	Asymp. Sig.	.000

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Content teachers

The main thrust of this project was to determine whether the two populations of teachers, EFL and Content, differ in what they focus on while evaluating a writing/essay. The results would seem to indicate that the observed differences in the overall performances of these two groups of teachers can be attributed to their perceived constructs.

According to the study, the most striking result to emerge from the data is that Content teachers pay more care and attention to linking ideas, derivation, and word choice. This would be traced to their concern with comprehensibility and meaning of the phrases and sentences. In contrast to the study conducted by Brown (1991) who made a claim that there is no difference between ENGLISH and ESL raters, this research found dissimilarities between the populations of EFL and Content teachers. To them, the features which would affect the whole content and meaning of the sentences, and impede comprehensibility (Krashen, 1982), are the key factors for an appropriate essay.

A wrong addition of suffixes for the formation of new words (derivation) and misuse or absence of adverbs or unit for introducing and connecting clauses (linking ideas) could result in changes in the part of speech which eventually bring out a new lexical category. Finally, misuse of words instead of the alternatives can completely change the meaning and convey something else. Content teachers due to the above-mentioned justifications give credit to linking ideas, derivations, and word choice as the crucial features in writing assessment.

5.2. EFL teachers

Brown (1991) argued that, on average, raters score somehow similarly the students regardless of the faculty in which they are teaching. This study, however, clarified that teachers who teach in English and ESL faculty appear to evaluate their learners' compositions differently. What the research unearthed was that the EFL teachers are more concerned with linguistic errors/mistakes originating from well-formedness of sentences. They tend to care more about the linguistic accuracy and well-developedness of units, phrases and clauses. That might result from their interest in encouraging students for more efforts and care on form rather than content.

The results suggest that the primary focus of this group of teachers is on agreement of nouns and pronouns, determiners, articles, collocation, capitalization and punctuation. These teachers would believe that learning and avoiding these mostly frequent errors greatly improve the writing. They are firmly of this opinion that no matter how original an idea writers come up with, the inability to express ideas accurately through the written word will hinder the success of their essay. The rules of mechanics are complex; in fact, they sometimes confuse even professional writers.

Thus, the findings provide some evidence that these teachers strictly cling to being a strict grammarian in order to write well. It was found that the raters are likely concerned with agreement in person, number and specific reference to nouns. Also, the use of commas, semicolons, dashes and etc. (proper punctuation) makes writing more polished and technically correct, and will convey the voice more directly. Their justification for capitalization, necessary both for specific words and to start a new sentence and quotes, is possibly owing to this fact that the overuse or misuse may make the writing appear casual or sloppy.

Regarding the use of articles, they believe that overuse or misuse of this class of grammar might induce definiteness or indefiniteness to nouns. Also, EFL teachers added that peculiarity or generality to the noun could change the meaning, too. Despite the wrong use of a preposition or a required noun after a verb leading to an appropriate collocation seems a meaning-matter, EFL teachers excelled their counterparts in the modification of this type of error. Addition of “ing” or a wrong preposition sounds a grammatical commitment to them. What they want is avoiding ambiguous language, using correct modifiers, eliminating unnecessary phrases, sentences and preposition, correct spelling and capitalization.

5.3. Commonalities

The findings revealed that despite the variety of mismatches, the population of teachers bears some similarities in their assessment. Research evidence indicated that on basic writing features, they perform relatively equally. Word order, Major/Minor constituent, Plural, Tense, Agreement (noun/verb), Possessive, Passive and Preposition were the syntactical features that they somehow equally took into account to avoid. The other significant evidence derived from the results is that EFL and Content teachers on the very basic grammatical features act in the same way. The primary focus of teachers, as it was revealed, was on the consistency of verb tenses, active voice instead of passive one. Incomplete sentences semantically or syntactically are the common errors that the teachers try to avoid at all cost.

5.4. Text structure and rhetorical quality

Due to the fact that the compositions gathered from the learners were relatively structured, not many teachers found significant defects and mistakes in their essays. However, it was found that Content teachers are more inclined to pay heed to content quality, coherence and introduction. Regarding content quality, they seek more for relevance and well-developedness of sentences. The ability for writing fluently, expressing ideas, having a good outline, having different ways for expressing their ideas, and writing coherently are the main concerns of this population. In addition, the results highlighted that adherence to the main topic and clarity in paragraphs are what content teachers focus on. Writers are supposed to follow seamlessly from points to the next, avoid irrelevances and use details and examples for reinforcement. Besides, to them, a good essay is the one with appropriate links between and within paragraphs. Presence of register and background information plays a crucial role in writing introduction. Furthermore, they appear to believe that an essay introduction, serving to attract the readers' interests, must contain an attention-getter, some background information and central idea chronologically.

On the other hand, EFL teachers seem more concerned with the varied sentence structures. The more various structures are used, the better the essays are. Use of different tenses, complex structures and variety of relative clauses are the most fundamental features they want from an appropriate composition. The second apparent factor which rose out of their interests, regarding the appearance of essays, was spacing. Distance between lines and legibility of sentences is what these teachers want. A good essay, to them, has separate and well-structured paragraphs for each part, including introduction, body and conclusion. Cohesion is also the other remarkable feature that this group of teachers takes into account. The surface structure feature of a text which links different parts and the lexical and grammatical relationship between different elements of sentences sound of highly more

importance to them. Finally from their point of view, it might be claimed that a good writing is the one with a good grasp of rules of writing.

5.5. Most/least important features

The fact that differences existed in the views of the raters from two populations with regard to both the most and least important concerns, led to the analyses of this study. The attributes identified as the most concern by Content teachers was word choice while verb/subject agreement was for EFL teacher.

Use of vocabulary (word choice), in terms of both range and appropriacy, is considered an important aspect of academic writing. However, the analysis and use of vocabulary in writing of ESP learners is a challenge to Content teachers. Academic words are assumed to pose a challenge to non-native English speaking students because of their lack of salience and low frequency. They also play a central role in construing the meaning of a text.

The data continued to report that agreement between subjects and verbs, in person and number, was the main concern of EFL teachers. Since subject and verb are the most notable elements of sentences, improving their relation, clarifying the subject and making the verbs more vigorous will improve sentences. The study revealed that this group of teachers is most attentive to this aspect of English grammar.

With respect to the least important feature, EFL and Content teacher appeared to agree that they are concerned least with possessive. Use of " 's ", for talking about possessions, relationships and physical characteristics, was identified as the least important linguistic feature by both groups equally. This issue was recognized as the least crucial one possibly due to the minimum change it can have on meaning and the least damage it might have on structure.

6. CONCLUSION

The obtained results from the study revealed that the ratings of teachers from diverse educational backgrounds differ, and it can be attributed to their perceived constructs. Content teachers pay more attention to linking ideas, derivation, and word choice. In other words, it can be mentioned that comprehensibility and meaning of words and sentences play important roles to them. They believe that what impedes comprehension must be modified or removed from the text. On the other hand, EFL teachers seem more attentive to well-formedness, well-developedness, and linguistic accuracy of units, phrases, and clauses. As it was revealed, the primary focus of this group was on agreement of nouns and pronouns, determiners, articles, collocations, capitalization, and punctuations.

REFERENCES

- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Bofman, T. (1989). Attainment of syntactic and morphological accuracy by advanced language learners. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 17–34.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193–214.

- Brown, J. D. (1991). Do English and ESL faculties rate writing samples differently? *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(4), 587–603.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error correction for improvement of the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 12.3, 267–296.
- DeKeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 501–514.
- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System* 21.2, 193–204.
- Fazio, L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority- and majority language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 10.4, 235–249.
- Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to student writing*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1–10.
- Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161–184.
- Havranek, G., & Cesnik, H. (2001). Factors affecting the success of corrective feedback. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, 1, 99–122.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal* 66.2, 140–149.
- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals* 24.3, 203–218.
- Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399–432.
- Nagata, N. (1993). Intelligent computer feedback for second language instruction. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 330–339.
- Prior, P. (1998). *Writing/disciplinarity: A sociohistoric account of literate activity in the academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rosa, E. M., & Leow, R. P. (2004). Awareness, different learning conditions, and second language development. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25, 269–292.
- Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195–202.
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23, 103–110.
- Truscott, J. (1996). 'The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327–369.
- Zhu, W. (2004). Faculty views on the importance of writing, the nature of academic writing, and the teaching and responding to writing in the disciplines. *Journal of second language writing* 13.1, 29–48.

APPENDIX A

The 18 error categories

(Developed from Bardovi-Harlig & Bofman, 1989)

Syntactical

1. Word order
2. Absence of major constituent, such as participant, verb, object
3. Absence of minor constituent (e.g. 'Enterprises may not be professional [enough] to master the coordination of ...')
4. Errors in linking ideas (missing, redundant, or incorrect)

Morphological: nominal

5. Plural
6. Agreement (noun or pronoun with verb)
7. Possessive

Morphological: verbal

8. Tense and verb form. Errors of tense, aspect, mood and form for the same verb were counted as one error.
e.g. 'Then we cannot argue that this project manager is fail [has failed]'.
But: 'It is sometimes necessary cross [to cross] geographical differences' was coded as 2 errors of verb form and word choice (possible meanings were 'to overcome' or 'to deal with').
9. Agreement of verb with participant. Agreement errors involving both participant and verb in the same phrase were counted as one error.
e.g. 'Every details [detail] need [needs] to be considered'.
10. Passive form (missing or incorrect)
11. Derivational (word form)
e.g. 'very technologic [technological] parameters'

Grammatical

12. Determiners (e.g. this, that, it, those). Missing, redundant or incorrect. e.g. 'when building cantilever bridges. Those [These] bridges.'
e.g. 'Looking at its [this] background and current situation, '
13. Articles. Errors of article and noun plurals were counted as one error.
e.g. When the context shows that 'the problem' should be 'problems', one error was counted.
14. Prepositions (missing or redundant)

Lexical

15. Word choice. (Register errors such as 'lots of' were not included).
e.g. 'Many countries still out of [lack] responsibility'.
e.g. 'especially in developing countries, such as my hometown [home] d China'.
Prepositions were coded as word choice if the choice was incorrect.
e.g. 'The glaciers in [at] the two poles of the earth'.
16. Collocation. Erroneous expressions and phrasal verbs were counted as one error.
e.g. the key of the [to] success
e.g. I am interested to conduct [in conducting].
If meaning was so obscure that reformulation was impossible, a phrase or clause was counted as one collocation error.
e.g. 'The definition should "with which" or "follow with" conclude the rights, the duties.' was one error.

Mechanics**(Spelling omitted)**

17. Capitalisation

18. Punctuation (if meaning was affected)

A repeated error was counted each time it occurred. Errors were counted according to the minimal number of corrections required to make a phrase or clause error-free, while maintaining the apparent meaning indicated by the context. For example, when taking context into account, a minimum reformulation of the following sentence yields 5 errors.

Original text: Communication is a critical field for a successful project manager, how need to communicate his customers.

Minimal reformulation: Communication is a critical field for a successful project manager, who (1) needs (2) to know (3) how (4) to communicate with (5) his customers.

(The phrase was not reformulated as “who needs to communicate with his customers”, because from the context it was clear that the student wanted to convey the importance of a project manager knowing how to communicate.)

APPENDIX B

Guide to analysis of text structure and rhetorical quality

(Developed by Storch, N. & Tapper, J. 2009)

Structure**Introduction**

_ is present and well developed (contains background information and an advanced organiser)

_ is present but development is limited

_ is absent

Body paragraphs:

_ separate and well structured

_ no separate paragraphs

Conclusion:

_ present as a separate paragraph and appropriate

_ combined with body

_ absent

Cohesion and coherence

_ main point/topic is clear in each paragraph and clear and appropriate links are present between and within paragraphs.

_ some paragraphs lack clear cohesion/coherence.

_ entire text difficult to follow

Content quality

_ relevant and well supported

_ main points not well developed/repetition

_ irrelevant and/or not well developed