THE ROLE OF THE ERROR CORRECTION JOURNAL ON THE WRITTEN PERFORMANCE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDENTS

USKOKOVIC, BUDIMKA
DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

Mrs. Budimka Uskokovic
Department of Germanic Languages
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

The Role of the Error Correction Journal on the Written Performance of Foreign Language Students

Synopsis:

This paper will provide more insight into error correction and an effective feedback. Participants will be able to learn more about Error Correction Journal, and how students can improve their writing, which is not only an important academic skill that can be applied to other areas outside of foreign language learning, but it is also a necessary life skill that students can employ beyond the classroom.

The Role of the Error Correction Journal on the Written Performance of Foreign Language Students

Abstract

This study focuses on the effects of error recording and analysis in the form of an Error Correction Journal (ECJ) on the linguistic accuracy of students of German and on their motivation to learn the language. It focuses on three groups of students, one that completed the ECJ, one that received coded feedback, and one that was given direct correction. The goal of the study was to check for improved accuracy and increased motivation based on the use of a journal to analyze and to raise awareness about errors. Through the use of the ECJ, students became more aware of their language learning and were better able to recognize and avoid errors. They also became more aware of the types of errors they made and felt more motivated and empowered in their learning based on the use of ECJ.

Purpose and Background

Research in second language acquisition (SLA) has shown that writing is one of the most important skills for foreign language learners because it reinforces the acquisition of grammar, "a notion that was typically underscored in traditional research studies examining the acquisition of grammatical rules and the development of accuracy" (Homstad & Thorson, 1994, p.6). Greenia (1992) claimed that this argument was wrong, claiming that "writing in the foreign language in itself has not proved an effective vehicle for learning grammar" (p. 33). There are, however, many varying arguments suggesting how best to go about the teaching of FL writing effectively (Ellis et al., 2006). Ellis (2009) suggests several guidelines that incorporate corrective feedback, such as ascertaining students' attitudes toward corrective feedback (CF), not being afraid to correct students' mistakes because CF really works, using focused CF, ensuring that learners know they are being corrected, and implementing a variety of CF strategies. Ellis also stresses the importance of adapting strategies to the learners being corrected. The instructor should

experiment with the timing of CF, attend to the correction and revision of writing, pay attention to the cognitive and affective needs of the individual learner, correct a specific error several times, and monitor the extent to which CF causes anxiety in learners (Ellis, 2009, p. 14).

One theory suggests that CF from the instructor or another expert interlocutor is most effective in teaching FL writing (Ferris, 2006). Ferris attributes this to the fact that teachers know how to scaffold learning and how to correct students' mistakes without making students anxious. Ferris (2001) argues that more research must be done on the use of CF until feedback is conclusively proved ineffective or detrimental to the learner's learning process.

Perhaps, the question of whether or not error correction is an effective method of teaching FL writing leads back to students' reaction to having their errors corrected. It is not clear if all students react positively to teacher suggestions and if motivation is positively affected by direct alterations of their work. Many experimental studies on written CF carried out over the last ten years suggest that written corrective feedback can be helpful to students, but studies remain inconclusive as to which type of error correction is most effective and whether all students benefit in the same way from a particular correction method.

In response to the gaps in research on error correction in L2 learning, this study focuses on contextual and learner differences and whether there is a significant difference in the effect of direct versus indirect written corrective feedback on the short-term acquisition of targeted errors, long-term accuracy in writing, and learner motivation. Questions concerning the approach to error correction in FL writing and its link to student performance and motivation are particularly important for intermediate language students, whose writing has moved beyond the expression of basic vocabulary and learned phrases and is beginning to take on markers of more complex sentence structure, the expression of more complicated ideas, and the markers of

different aspects and time frames. These issues became particularly apparent to me in the study

of third-semester German students at one large University, who wrote multiple essays in order to

improve their presentational writing skills, based on which they were evaluated.

Present Study

My main objectives in this study were to: 1) identify the most

frequent errors; 2) devise a method by which to help students recognize those errors themselves;

and 3) propose ways in which students can be motivated to correct their errors based on a higher

awareness of the types of mistakes they make. Among the most common errors were lexical,

grammatical, syntactic and semantic inaccuracies, each with a different origin and reason

according to the individual learner. Based on the results of this study, I hoped to develop

research-based directives for helping students to understand the origin of their errors and the

errors that they most frequently make so that they may avoid them in the future. Therefore, I

tried to answer the following questions:

1. Can an ECJ improve the ability of students to avoid common errors in written

communication?

2. Do students perceive an improvement when they use an ECJ as a learning tool?

3. Do students perceive improved motivation toward writing?

<div align="center">

Method

</div>

Participants

There were 36 undergraduate students (11 women and 25 men) with different majors

(only 2 were German majors) taking the course for 17 weeks. All of them were U.S.-Americans

with English as their first language who had some previous knowledge in German based on their

previous education at the high-school and/or college level. The participants were randomly divided in two control groups, and one experimental group.

Procedure

There were three groups in this study: an experimental and two control groups. At the beginning, students in the experimental group completed a survey (Appendix A) in which they rated the areas in which they make the most errors. All groups also wrote an initial essay to see what types of errors they usually make; for this essay they received a grade, which was later compared with other writing samples. They were asked to write three essays during the course of the semester (two drafts of each) for which they utilized error correction procedures. After submitting and receiving the first draft, which was corrected with a correction key (Appendix C), students in experimental group analyzed the nature and frequency of their errors in the ECJ by filling out a chart provided by the instructor (Appendix C). The instructor compiled the data from the error correction chart to draw conclusions about the types of errors students make. A final essay was assigned at the end of the semester to gage overall improvement. The control groups responded to error correction feedback without keeping a journal. Control group I received direct feedback, and control group II received the same coded feedback as experimental group, but they did not keep a journal about their errors.

The essays were collected, and the errors were analyzed and compared in order to see if students made the same mistakes after they received their first essay with suggested correction, or if there was a significant difference in improvement between experimental group, control group II, and control group I. The data were analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, and the instructor checked for overall improvement during the course of semester. At the end of the semester, all students completed the survey again and reevaluated their areas of weakness

(Appendix D). Students in the experimental group also rated the degree to which the ECJ helped them to identify and avoid errors on subsequent assignments.

In order to collect information about individual learners' reaction to error correction, students were asked to write a series of three essays, with two drafts each, about which they received feedback. Essays were a part of the syllabus for the courses in which the study was conducted. They were a part of a three-pronged assessment model called Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs), a testing form promoted by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. The participants received a prompt for each essay (travel plans, a fairy tale, future plans).

Students complete the first draft of their essay in class and can use a (3"x5") note card with vocabulary and other learning tips but without English translations, conjugation tables (e.g. adjective endings), conjugated verbs (e.g. simple past forms), full sentences and sentence fragments, or tiny handwriting/printouts. For this study, some students received feedback on their essays in the form of direct correction of mistakes without additional feedback (control group I), while the other students were asked to participate in a reflective process of error correction, which involved the active identification of writing challenges through journaling and surveys (experimental group).

The Error Correction Journal (ECJ), through which the above reflective activities took place, was designed as a tool to provide students with a deeper insight into their errors through the completion of charts and written reflection on their errors. Students were asked to identify common errors, reflect on what helped them improve their writing, and to discuss their attitudes toward errors and the way they were corrected.

Results

Students' Attitudes toward Errors and Error Correction

As stated above, the researcher asked students in the experimental group to fill out an

initial survey (Appendix A) about errors and error correction in order to gain deeper insight into

their attitudes toward writing, their areas of difficulty, and their awareness of these areas.

According to the first question on the initial survey (How often do you still make errors in

German compositions?), students perceived the frequency of their errors as quite high. On the

Likert scale (0-5), 45.45% of the students said they make errors frequently, and 45.45% noted

that they make errors occasionally. Students also described the rate of feedback as high, with

63.6% noting that they received frequent comments and corrections on their work. The survey

also shows students' overall satisfaction with the type of feedback they received, with 54.5%

giving that category the highest rating. In response to Question 4, (What do you think is the

greatest grammar area you make the most errors?), students listed articles (54.5%) and

prepositions (27.3%) as the areas of greatest error-making.

Based on the categories in the survey, students provided the following assessment of their

rate of errors: verb errors (occasionally - 45.4%), noun and article errors (occasionally - 45.4%),

pronoun errors (occasionally - 54.5%), adjective ending errors (occasionally - 45.4%),

preposition errors (occasionally - 36.4%) and (frequently- 36.4%), and negation errors

(frequently 54.5%). Students also identified areas in which they made relatively few errors. For

example, 63.6% said they understood the difference between the forms of negation in German:

kein and nicht.

The survey results also provide good insights into students' reception of and response to

error correction. Most of the students reported a preference for direct feedback (72.7%) over

indirect feedback (27.3%). All students agreed that an instructor can help students to identify the

errors they make in written communication (100%) and that the Error Correction Journal can improve the ability of students to recognize and avoid common errors in written communication (100%).

Advantages of the ECJ in Written Communication

As part of the draft-writing process, students in the Experimental Group were asked to answer questions about the nature of the errors they made on the first draft prior to writing the second draft and on the second draft prior to writing a subsequent essay. Students were then asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the ECJ by answering free-response questions about the manner in which the errors were corrected and how those corrections could help them in their future writing. These evaluations of the ECJ were compared with comments about the ECJ and collected after subsequent essays and their drafts had been written. The answers to the questions about how the ECJ had helped students were compared for similarities and differences.

Responses to the first question show that the students were satisfied with the feedback that they received from the teacher. Moreover, 100% of the students stated that they believe they can benefit from writing a second draft because repetition is crucial for practice and improvement. In addition to favorably evaluating the draft-writing process, students also reflected positively on the process of filling out the error correction chart. The chart in the ECJ helps students recognize their errors because there is a clear overview of grammatical categories. Students can refer to the chart to identify their previous mistakes and thus avoid them in the future. The ECJ helps students keep track of the mistakes and identify multiple errors because they must physically enter the number of mistakes. By maintaining a running tally of errors, the students were more aware of the number and frequency of errors and were therefore empowered

to do better on a second draft if they referred to the list of mistakes and avoided them on the second draft. Students also noted that the ECJ helped students learn by its virtue as a visual aid. The completion of the chart in the ECJ did not appear to be equally effective for all students in the experimental group. Many students at the 203 level do not understand the grammatical categories into which their errors fall and are not able to identify those grammatical points as areas of difficulty. According to the comments, students benefited most from logging their errors in a chart only if the information in the chart could be corroborated and explained by the teacher's corrections. They needed teacher feedback to understand exactly what their errors were, which category they fell under, and how they could be improved.

Students' Perception of Their Own Improvement

An important aspect of the chart in the ECJ is, however, not simply that students count their mistakes, but that they also understand the nature and origin of the errors they make and that they see progress from one draft to the next. students described their errors as: "simple", "foolish", "moderate", "careless", "correctible with more practice", "spread out over various grammar areas." The fact that students reflect on their errors and consider their origin through the ECJ suggests that the process of recording those errors can help them understand the nature of their mistakes.

Through the process of self-reflection on errors, students are taking proactive steps toward readying themselves to learn new forms. In addition, the feedback that they receive from the teacher is slightly above the level at which they made the error, and, therefore, based on the notion of comprehensible input and i+1 (Krashen, 1984), the error correction process is an instrumental form of scaffolding that bolsters self-directed learning on the part of the individual.

Ultimately the ECJ is a form of structured input (VanPatten, 1996) based on the manner in which it fosters awareness and facilitates noticing.

Students showed a very positive attitude toward the ECJ because, as they say, it helped them to self-correct errors based on the clearly structured and precise components of the ECJ. Due to insufficient linguistic knowledge, however, some students did have issues correcting their mistakes, and neither the second draft nor the ECJ could help them. Ultimately, it is clear that the knowledge of linguistic structures is the first factor that can help students improve their writing; the second draft and the ECJ just facilitate the process of improvement.

Students' motivation toward writing

The responses indicate that there are different reasons why students were interested in improving their writing, but in general, their motivation can be divided into two categories: extrinsic and intrinsic. Students' answers referring to extrinsic motivation included the desire for good grades. Students are very interested in improving their grades because they are aware of the impact they may have on their future life and job search. The extrinsic motivation of good grades was also intertwined with the intrinsic motivation to move to Germany for work and to live in Germany. Another intrinsic motivation was the desire to improve language skills, such as different grammar structures because students were interested in language itself and the differences and similarities between their L1 and L2. Again, this motivation was intermingled with the intrinsic motivation to better understand and communicate with Germans. Ultimately, regardless of their intrinsic or extrinsic source of their motivation, many students wanted to continue learning and working on writing out of a desire to improve their linguistic proficiency.

Evaluation of Student Performance Based on the ECJ

All three groups started with almost the same average score; the experimental Group did, however, begin with a slightly better average score. This higher score can attest to the fact that those students who chose to participate in the Experimental Group were more highly motivated or engaged in their own learning, which might also suggest that they were more successful in their language courses in general. On the second essay, the average score of the experimental group rose from 19.41667 to 20.08333. The average score of control group II rose from 18.83333 to 19.75. In summary, the experimental group improved by 0.67, and the control group II improved by 0.91. Although the end score of control group II is lower by 0.3 than that of the experimental group, the improvement of the experimental group was 0.25 less than the improvement of control group II between the two essays, which suggests that the improvement in the experimental group was not significant compared to control group II. This implies that the use of the ECJ did not help students in the experimental group to improve their scores in a way that was significantly better than the strategies used by Control Group II. The average score of participants in Control Group I dropped from 18.83333 to 18.58333. This could, in part, be attributable to the fact that students in this group received only direct feedback, although other factors may have also come into play, such as simply copying the form provided to them without learning how to improve performance (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Ferris, 2006; Lalande, 1982). Another factor refers to motivation, which as Guénette (2007) argues, can improve if students are provided with appropriate feedback given at the right time and at the right context. The direct feedback given to control group I may not have supported students' motivation enough to lead to improvement. Ultimately, it is clear that students show much more improvement if they receive coded rather than direct feedback because

they have to correct their mistakes by themselves. Self-correction played a key factor in students' improvement from one draft to the next.

The combination of coded feedback and the ECJ, however, seems to have a better long-term effect. The participants in the experimental group had the same average score after the second and third essay (20.083333), whereas the average score of the participants in control group II dropped from 19.75 to 18.8333 from the second to the third. The participants in control group I also showed a slightly decreased average score (from 18.58333 to 18.3333). We can conclude that in the first three essays the experimental group showed an increase in performance, but control group II and control group I showed oscillations in their performance. The results of the average score on the essay of the final exam show an unexpected decline in the experimental group.

At the end of the study, the participants in the experimental group had a better average final course grade than the participants in any other group. The experimental group went from the average score of 20.083333 on the third essay to 19.16667 on the final essay. The participants in both control groups scored much higher on the final essay than on the third essay. The participants in control group II experienced a score increase, from 18.8333 to 19.66667, and the scores of control group I went up from 18.3333 to 18.75. It seems that both control groups were motivated by a better final grade than the experimental group because they knew that the grade on the final exam could slightly affect their final grade since their grades on the IPA were lower and the participants in the experimental group already knew what grade to expect.

Conclusion

In response to the first question about the improvement of students using the ECJ, the data have suggested a variety of answers. For some students it was very helpful to rely on the logging of errors and journaling about them because it enabled them to approach their weaknesses in a new and systematic way. The ECJ helped them to go about the drafting process in a more productive manner by identifying and tracking their errors and avoiding those errors on subsequent drafts. By using the ECJ, students also improved significantly in their writing overall and in particular especially in certain individual categories, such as verb tense, gender, and case.

While many students appreciated the Error Correction Journal and the greater insight into their learning that it brought to them, some of the students did not see the positive side of the chart because, while they counted errors, they did not reflect on them. As Krashen (1982) argues in his Order Hypothesis, it is clear that recording errors is not enough to bring about significant improvement in writing. Students also have to consider the source of the errors, why they made them, and how to avoid making them in the future. In short, the ECJ helps develop a more sophisticated monitoring apparatus, which Krashen argues, is necessary for developing linguistic competence and for making comprehensible naturally acquired speech. The ECJ enables learners to focus on correctness, to think about the form on the second draft, to look at different grammatical categories, and to check the number of mistakes in a certain category has decreased over time. An important aspect of this reflective process is that students examine and understand the rules governing the linguistic structures they used so that they can employ the correct forms in the future; coded feedback is not as effective in helping students avoid errors because it only draws their attention to an error in grammatical category, but not to a rule.

Regarding the second question about students' perception of improvement while using the ECJ, the survey results suggest that students are more aware of the reasons why they make mistakes based on their use of the ECJ. They attribute these mistakes to issues such as an insufficient understanding or practice of new structures, the inability to memorize new structures, and an insufficient familiarity with new structures. This observation is logical, given that the participants had learned some of the structures only a short time prior to having to use them. One must also take into consideration the fact that students had German class only three times a week, each class lasting only 50 minutes, and that many students were not exposed to the German language outside of the classroom. Although students did not have enough time to correct their errors in the class, they were given enough time to correct the first draft at home. However, their background knowledge was still evolving as they began applying new structures. Students also stated that the ECJ provided them with more confidence because it showed them their weakest areas through the practice and repetition of structures. As Sheen (2007) has shown, meta-linguistic comments are very important for improvement. The chart that students were asked to fill out after each draft helped them improve their writing because they engaged in this metalinguistic process and identified the mistakes they made. By doing so they were able to recognize their strong and weak points in writing. It also allowed them to focus on their weakest areas.

In response to the third question about students' motivation toward writing, the participants showed both extrinsic and intrinsic motivations for writing, as was expected. Students were motivated to practice more, to improve their mistakes, to write fluently, to expand their vocabulary, and to get a better grade on the future assignments based on the ECJ because it made them feel empowered. The ECJ helped students to identify the categories in which they

still needed to improve (sentence structure, word order, adjective endings), and it helped them to avoid making the same mistakes on subsequent assignments. It also showed them an important strategy, self-correction and reflection, that will help them improve their future writing in both their native and foreign languages. The positive ramifications of reflection and motivation are indeed the most important findings of this study. While the difference in scores on accuracy was not always significant, students in the Experimental Group revealed in both quantitative and qualitative measures that they perceived a greater understanding of their learning and thus were more motivated to engage in the learning process.

Despite all of the insights that this study provided into the nature of error correction among foreign language students, it still had some shortcomings. While the analysis clearly showed many interesting aspects regarding the influence of the ECJ on the student perception of their errors, following 14 different categories of errors was too extensive. For future studies, it would be more constructive to focus on one or two grammatical areas as Bitchener and Knoch (2009) did because, as they stated, a 'single corrective feedback' is more effective in helping learner improve by narrowing their focus and ensuring that significant has occurred prior to moving to the next category. Another limitation of the study was the timeframe, in particular with regard to the first research question. The study lasted four months but would have produced more statistically results if it had been longer, e.g., throughout two semesters. In a future iteration of the study, it would be imperative to conduct the writing of three essays over a longer period of time and to replace the final essay with another essay not contained on the final exam. This assignment would serve as a true post-test to help show whether the ECJ can help students improve over more extensive period of time. The timeframe between essays should be longer in order to determine whether an ECJ has a long-term impact on writing performance and whether

students can really benefit from using this learning tool.

References

Bitchener,S., & Knoch,U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: A ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 193-214.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *28*, 339-368.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, *63*, 97-107.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*, 161-184.

Ferris, D. R. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (pp. 81-104). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Greenia, G. (1992). Computers and teaching composition in a foreign language. *Foreign Language Annals*, *25*, 33-46.

Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *16*, 40-53.

Homstad, T., & Thorson, H. (1996). Writing theory and practice in the SL classroom: A selected annotated bibliography. *Technical Report Series*, *8*, 1-42.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practices in SL acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory, and applications*. New York: Pergamon Institute.

Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *The Modern Language Journal*, *66*(2), 140-149.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*, 255-283.

VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction: Theory and research*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

A Survey of Errors in German Compositions

The following survey should provide an insight into your errors in German compositions, especially into the greatest areas of weakness in which you make the most errors. Please recall those areas answering the following questions and rating them on the scale from 0 to 5 (0-never, 1-very rarely, 2-rarely, 3-occasionally, 4-frequently, 5-very frequently).   Please circle the number you think the best describes your errors, and answer all of the questions to the best of your ability.

1. How often do you make errors in German compositions?

0   1   2   3   4   5

2. How often do you get a feedback?

0   1   2   3   4   5

3. How often are you satisfied with that feedback?

0   1   2   3   4   5

4. What do you think is the greatest grammar area you make the most errors? Circle just one area.

o Verbs o Nouns o Articles o Pronouns o Adjectives o Prepositions

5. How often do you make verb errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

6. How often do you make noun and article errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

7. How often do you make pronoun errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

8. How often do you make adjective ending errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

9. How often do you make preposition errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

10. How often do you make negation errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

11. Do you know the main difference between kein and nicht?

o Yes o No

12. How often do you make word order errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

13. a. Is the word order in a simple declarative sentence more difficult for you than the word order in the question sentence?

o Yes o No

   13. b. Why do you think so?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

14. How often do you make coordinating conjunction errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

15. How often do you make subordinating conjunction errors?

0   1   2   3   4   5

16. What do you think is the best way to provide a feedback?

o Direct (errors are corrected) o Indirect (errors are identified, but not corrected)

17. Do you think that an instructor can help students to identify the errors they make in written communication?

o Yes o No

18. Do you think that an Error Correction Journal can improve the ability of students to recognize and avoid common errors in written communication?

o Yes o No

Appendix B
Correction Key
Korrekturschlüssel

Zeichen	Bedeutung	Übersetzung	Beispiele
AE	Adjektiv-Endung	Incorrect adjective ending	ein gut<u>er</u> Buch: ein gut*es* Buch
Dpl	Pluralform im Dativ	"n" is missing from a dative plural noun	den Kinder: den Kinder<u>n</u>
G	Genus	Incorrect gender	d<u>ie</u> Bild: *das* Bild
HV	Hilfsverb	Wrong auxiliary/helping verb	sie <u>hat</u> gereist: sie *ist* gereist
I	Idiom	idiomatic expression	<u>ich bin</u> heiss: *mir ist* heiss
K	Kasus	Incorrect grammatical case	er sieht <u>der</u> Mann: er sieht *den* Mann
G-K-S	Groß- oder Kleinschreibung	Improper capitalization/failure to capitalize where needed	das <u>h</u>aus : das *H*aus Wenn <u>I</u>ch: Wenn *i*ch
Konj	Konjunktion	Wrong conjunction	<u>Wenn</u> ich ein Kind war *Als* ich ein Kind war
L	Logik	Improper logic; sentence does not make sense	Das Wetter <u>spricht.</u>

P	Präposition	Incorrect preposition or case following preposition	Ich denke <u>um </u>dich. Ich denke *an* dich. Ich denke an <u>dir.</u> Ich denke an *dich.*
PL	Plural	Incorrect plural form	die Bruder: die Brüder
PR	Pronomen	Incorrect pronoun	(der Tisch) <u>Es</u> ist da. *Er* ist da.
R	Rechtschreibung	Spelling error/typo	D<u>ue</u>tsch: D*eu*tsch
S	Steigerung (Komparativ Superlativ)	Incorrect comparative or superlative form	Es ist viel <u>groß.</u> Es ist viel *größer* Das <u>am beste </u>Auto Das *beste* Auto
SD	schwache Deklination	weak declination ("Masculine N-Nouns") require "n" or "en" ending in acc. dat. and genitive cases	den Student, dem Student: den Student**en,** dem Student**en**
SK	Satzkonstruktion	Faulty or awkward sentence construction	... damit, wenn es regnet, ich nicht draussen stehe. *damit ich nicht draussen stehe, wenn es regnet*.
ST	Stil	Inappropriate choice of expression in view of context	Königin Elisabeth findet es echt geil, dass ...

			Königin Elisabeth ist hoch erfreut darüber, dass ...
VF	Verbform	Verb form error	ich spiel<u>e</u> gestern ich spiel*te* gestern Ich bin <u>gehen</u> Ich bin *gegangen* du musst <u>sprichst</u> du musst *sprechen*
VSÜ	Verb-Subjekt- Übereinstimmung	verb-subject agreement error	du komm<u>en</u> du komm*st*
WF	ein Wort oder mehrere Wörter fehlen	one or more words missing	ich erinnere____ ich erinnere *mich*
WW	Wortwahl	incorrect word choice	mit dem Auto <u>gehen</u> mit dem Auto *fahren*
WS	Wortstellung	incorrect word order	Sie kauft <u>ein</u> jetzt. Sie kauft *jetzt ein.*
X	X-Beliebiges	miscellaneous: Errors not classified elsewhere; special notes will be given in the margins	Wir suchen <u>spielen.</u> Wir suchen *Spiele.*
Z	Zeichensetzung	incorrect or missing punctuation	Gut__ich gehe<u>?</u> Gut, ich gehe.
?	total unverständlich	nonsensical	er aus nicht

Appendix C

A Chart of Errors in German Compositions

The following chart should provide significant evidence about your areas of weakness in which you made the most errors on the first draft of your composition in German and analyze the nature of your errors. You will rate your grammar ability to use the certain forms in several grammar parts: verbs, nouns and articles, pronouns, adjectives, prepositions, negation, word order, conjunctions. Please look at your errors you made on the first draft and write how frequently your errors occurred on the first draft of your composition. It means that you should write the right number of your errors made in that grammar part. In each column you can find a number that is related to the whole amount of errors you made in your composition, and it helps you to categorize the frequency of your errors. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability. The last column is related to the errors on the second draft so write just the number of your errors in the certain category.

	0	1	2	3	4	5	more	II draft
verb form								
verb tense								
subject-verb agreement								
gender								
article								
case								
plural								
adjective ending								
pronoun								
negation								
preposition								
word order								
wrong word								
conjunctions								
sentence structure								

Appendix D

A Survey of Errors in German Compositions

You have participated in the research study about error correction feedback throughout the semester. You have answered the questions about the first and the second draft of each essay. It is time now to summarize your writing skills and to how much you think you have developed them. The following survey should provide an insight into your errors in German compositions, especially into the greatest areas of weakness in which you still make the most errors. Please recall those areas answering the following questions and rating them on the scale from 0 to 5 (0never, 1-very rarely, 2-rarely, 3-occasionally, 4-frequently, 5-very frequently).   Please circle the number you think the best describes your errors, and answer all of the questions to the best of your ability.

1. How often do you still make errors in German compositions?

0   1   2   3   4   5
2. What do you think is the greatest grammar area you still make the most errors? Circle just one area.

o Verbs o Nouns o Articles o Pronouns o Adjectives o Prepositions
 3. How often do you still make that type of error?

0   1   2   3   4   5
4. Have you been satisfied with the feedback throughout the semester?

0   1   2   3   4   5
5. What do you think is the best way to provide a feedback?

o Direct (errors are corrected) o Indirect (errors are identified, but not corrected)
6. Has the instructor helped you to identify the errors you make in your written communication?

Yes   No
7. Has the Error Correction Journal helped you improve the ability to recognize and avoid common errors in written communication?

o Yes o No If yes, how? What part?
_____
_____
_____
8. Has the Error Correction Journal increased your motivation to write in German in the future? o Yes o No If yes, how? What part?
_____

_____
_____

9. Have you improved from feedback in 203 in general? o Yes o No

Comments:

_____
_____
_____

10. In order to improve the Error Correction Journal, I would be thankful for any additional comments and suggestion:

_____
_____
_____
_____

Thank you for your participation in the research study.