Constructive Feedback: An Effective Constituent for Eradicating Impediments in Writing Skills

Malik Ajmal Gulzar[1], Sartaj Fakhar Jilani[2] & Choudhary Zahid Javid[3]

[1] English Language Center, Taif University, Taif, KSA

[2] Government Degree College (W), Rahwali Cantt, Gujranwala, Pakistan

[3] Foreign Language Dept., Taif University, Taif, KSA

Correspondence: Malik Ajmal Gulzar, Supervisor of Curriculum Development and Research Unit, English Language Center, Taif University, Taif, KSA. Tel: 966-582-927-088. E-mail: agmsfa@gmail.com

Abstract

It is inevitable that learners make mistakes in the process of learning a foreign language. Despite this fact, what is questioned by language teachers is why students go on making the same mistakes even when such mistakes have been repeatedly pointed out to them. Yet, not all mistakes are the same and sometimes they seem deeply ingrained, but at other time students correct themselves with ease. Thus, researchers and teachers of foreign language delineate the fact that students' errors, while being in the process of constructing a new system of language, should be carefully understood in the process of second language acquisition. This study intends to identify whether any significant differences exist between traditional method of feedback and constructive feedback process to endorse this critical process of rectification as a part of the teachers' job. The researchers highlight this phenomenon at a juncture of time when there is a growing concern about the deplorable conditions of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Pakistan. Regardless of the fact that EFL teachers in Pakistan have an extensive experience of teaching English, the high failure percentage along with the sub-standard feedback processes are annoying everyone concerned. In this study, causes of poor writing are explored while targeting upon the constructive feedback (hereinafter CFB) through the error analysis system (EAS). For this specified purpose, the researchers used experimental research design to find out the reasons of poor writing of participants at Secondary School Level. This article determined the significance of CFB through EAS and proved that writing errors of the students could be minimized by the proper employment of CFB. Henceforth, in the light of the research findings, emphasis is given on recommendations for all the stakeholders.

Keywords: constructive feedback, error analysis system, traditional methods of rectification, writing skills, second/foreign language learning

1. Introduction to the Study

The earth we are living on is a global village now. Due to the quick expansion in the media, the latest innovations in all fields of life and invasion of knowledge compels people to adopt a 'lingua-Franca'. The English language most probably becomes the one which could easily satiate the emerging needs of the world in trade, diplomacy and scientific research. And, Pakistan has no option to stand aloof in this regard. Pakistan being a part of the developing world owns two systems of schools: English medium schools and Urdu medium schools at secondary level in Pakistan. However, students learn English as a compulsory subject in all schools. The teaching and learning situation in English medium schools is comparatively better, but in Urdu medium schools it presents entirely an unhappy state (Gulzar, 2010). A single prescribed textbook is taught for a whole year with Urdu language as the medium of instruction. Though reading of textbook is the starting point, and the focus at once shifts to improve writing skills to such an extent that students could pass the examination. Gulzar. (2009, p. 122) defines this situation and claims that "theoretically students learn the grammar-translation rules and they know only about reading and writing. The syllabus followed in these institutions puts an extra-emphasis on acquiring the knowledge of grammar." Thus, learning of English here means subsequent mastery of grammar. And, later on students' performance is assessed upon rote learning and their abilities of memorization. Furthermore, the classes remain overcrowded which consist of mixed ability students that formulate another challenge for the teachers to teach English. Consequently, English language learning and particularly writing

skills having no particular specifications does not serve the underlying purpose of teaching and learning writing skills. However, when students enter an English medium institutions for higher education, they have to encounter a lot of problems with their varying degrees of English abilities in written and spoken English. In government schools, due to the non-existence and non-availability of nominal criterion of CFB, students remain hesitant to use English even for functional purposes in and outside schools. On the contrary in private English medium schools, students can produce quality written texts with higher intelligible excellence, and CFB system is also properly designed and implemented.

1.1 Aims of the Study

The aims of the study are to:

- To highlight the benefits of CFB through EAS at Secondary School Level.

- To investigate traditional methods of feedback which serve as barriers in students' written work.

- To enhance the understanding of English language teachers to better cope with errors and mistakes in the students' writing texts.

1.2 Hypothesis of the Study

Effective implementation of CFB through EAS can enhance the ratio of productivity in students' written work.

1.3 Significance/Scope of the Study

Findings from the present research may bring useful changes in various ways:

- The study may guide teachers in general and particularly English language teachers in gaining acquaintance and familiarity with the CFB through EAS, and how they should deal with students' errors and mistakes in the domain of writing skills.

- The students can recognize and eradicate errors by being familiar with the significance of CFB.

- The study can open new avenues for the course designers by highlighting through the aspects which they assess and measure in their target audience.

1.4 Methodological Parameters

The researchers used experimental research design to present statistical and analytical view of the study. The researchers used an experimental design to help investigate the possible cause-and-effect relationship by manipulating an independent variable (teaching) to influence the dependent variable (learning) in both control and experimental groups. This experimental study was delimited to secondary level (9th class) in one of the Government schools in Pakistan. The population of the study was stratified through random sampling which comprised of 40 students. As Gay (1996:112) defines that "the population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which he would like the results of the study to be generalizable." The participants were between 14-16 years old. As Bell (1999:126) opines: "A random sample will give each of the individuals concerned an equal chance of being selected." The researchers determined the actual sample size of the population using the means of Proportional Allocation Method.

Proportional Allocation (ni) = n * Ni / N

$$= 30 * 20 / 40$$

$$= 15$$

Where n = randomly selected sample size

Ni = randomly selected population of a stratum

N = Total Population

Afterwards, final two groups were randomly selected, having sample size of 15 by means of Proportional Allocation Method as mentioned earlier. Gay (1996, pp 2002) defines that "experimental design studies with light experimental controls, however, may be valid with as few as 15 subjects per group. Also, the researchers gave the name codes to the participants (both experimental & control groups) who were the part of the present research.

1.5 Codified Names of the Participants

Codified names of participants for experimental group:

B-901   B-902   B-903

B-904	B-905	B-906
B-907	B-908	B-909
B-910	B-911	B-912
B-913	B-914	B-915

Codified names of participants for control group:

C-901	C-902	C-903
C-904	C-905	C-906
C-907	C-908	C-909
C-910	C-911	C-912
C-913	C-914	C-915

2. Literature Review

2.1 Some Operational Definitions

Crystal (1987, p. 112) defines that "error analysis is a technique for recognizing, identifying, classifying and interpreting methodically the deviant forms produced by a foreign language learner by means of any of the principles and procedures as presented in linguistics." This definition clarifies that error analysis is an activity to identify, classify, and interpret or describe the errors made by someone in speaking or in writing. Brown (1980, p. 166) while highlighting the concept of error analysis regards it as "a process of observing, examining, explaining and classifying the deviating rules of second language and by giving exposition to the systems mechanized by the learner." Candling (2001, p. 69) defines that "the monitoring and understanding of the learner's language through error analysis holds a vital importance for the understanding of the processes of Second Language Acquisition." However, the Crystal's definition is used to analyze the data collected to serve the purpose of the present study.

2.2 Significance of Writing

Writing is an important marker of any language. It is not an optional rather it is the only mean of assessment from primary to higher level in Pakistan. Thus, its importance as a conduit cannot be negated both inside and outside the classroom. Despite the significance of writing skills in multidimensional aspects of life, teachers teach this skill in the most disappointing manner and in this way fundamental of writing skills does not serve the purpose in the language classroom. The role of teachers while teaching writing skills   is to properly diagnose the errors and mistakes of the students. But unfortunately in the context under study, neither students follow the goals of writing skills, nor do teachers let them know about the tangible basis of their errors and mistakes (Gulzar, Al Asmari & Saeed, 2011). Moreover, students are not given individual attention and particular feedback for the sake of improvement and up-gradation in this skill-oriented task. In the light of this consideration, observation of O'Brien (1989:22) about writing in EFL/ESL classrooms justifies that "writing is often "writing to learn" the language rather than "learning to write" i.e. writing as a channel, rather than a goal." Pakistani students hardly develop familiarity with the nature of writing process as they do not know the channels of writing. As expertise in writing is a key to success in the manifold aspects of life, so teaching writing, as Harmer (1998) puts it, is probably writing as a skill, just as important as listening, speaking and reading. According to Harmer (1998) students need to know how to work with paragraph construction, coherence, cohesion, punctuation, and so on. Hammer (1998) further mentions other reasons which are briefly summarized below to signify the writing skills:

• **Reinforcement:** It is when students write sentences with the language they have already learned to benefit from it. It helps some students to keep the language in their memories and also understand how it fits together.

• **Language development:** It is when students learn by writing down pieces of information. They develop the mental activity which is part of the writing process and also of learning a language.

• **Learning style:** It is an aid to students who have to work at their own pace to learn a language, which means they can take longer to produce it.

Hence, to understand channel of writing skills, students must learn how to use and manipulate the words, along with encoding of meaning both structurally and functionally as defined by Hammer in the above lines. Hence, language learning is a complex phenomenon having multidimensional aspects, as a learner of a second or third language keeps on changing his language performance to bring into line with that of the standard dialect. And,

this fluctuating position in the process of writing skills is obligatory in this process (Ellis, 1997). The whole process of human learning proceeds by making errors and mistakes, as the occurrence of errors and mistakes is a natural and basic ingredient of learning. Richard (1974, p. 100) explains that "it is a matter of common observation that even the most intelligent, motivated learners do make errors when learning under the best possible conditions." Basically, a learner acquires the bulk of knowledge through hit and trial method. Researchers of second language have also realized that learners' errors and mistakes should be analysed through careful analysis because they serve as an effective methodological tool for diagnosis and also provide a key to understand the process of second language acquisition/learning in a strategic way (Gulzar, 2010). Teachers instead of developing a minute insight into learners' errors and mistakes, they show a harsh and derogatory attitude towards their errors. But now the techniques and strategies to tackle the rectification process have changed due to the latest approaches and methodologies (Allwright & Bailey, 1991). The underlying aim of this CFB is to know something about students' knowledge of language, what they think and feel and how they use their potential to manipulate language and adjust the ideas, thoughts and expectations (Gass & Selinker, 1994). This would enable both teachers and learners to contribute effectively in the joint venture of teaching and learning writing skills.

2.3 Significance of Errors and Mistakes in Writing

In this age of communication, when the world has become a global village, written communication owes its great significance in multifarious facets of life. Effectiveness of writing skills in educational, professional and private institutions serves as a backbone of communication. Until now, the skill-oriented approach towards writing has not been properly used in the context under study due to many reasons as one of them is described by Gulzar (1992, p. 19) in these words: " Teachers do not bother to make students understand the channels of the writing process. Consequently, they start committing errors and mistakes in writing." Teachers' job assignment about CFB follow a three-step process. Firstly, they must find the cause of a mistake or an error. Secondly, they must devise techniques by which they can effectively interact with the student in correcting their errors. Thirdly, they must also evolve strategies to ensure that their students do not repeat these errors (Edge 1995). Conversely, in the context of the present study, students' errors and mistakes become a hallmark of students' writing only due to teachers' stiff and crude ways of correction. For this reason, students become ill-confident and really feel afraid of taking initiatives in expository, narrative, free sort of writing skills. So helping students to communicate in a foreign language is part of the teachers' role. And teachers' proper focus facilitates students getting ideas and composing well written paragraphs and the other part is giving CFB on the student's written work.

2.4 What Is Error Analysis and Why the Error Analysis?

Corder (1967, p. 187) gave a new outlook to error analysis as he writes that "Error Analysis is a part of investigation of language learning. In this respect, it resembles methodologically with the study of acquisition of mother tongue. It provides us with a picture of the linguistic development of a learner and gives us an indication of the learning process." Likewise, Richards et al. (1985) focus on the functional basis of error analysis. According to them, error analysis is the study of errors committed by the second and foreign language learners. It aims at finding out the progressive modes and awareness of language learners about the process of language learning. Also, error analysis helps in sorting out different routes adopted by the learner as how he learns the language. It also provides information about the problem areas in which learners face problems in language learning, and this process also helps to devise teaching-learning methodologies in the long run. This is how the study of errors is particularly relevant to the methodologies of teaching. Weireesh (1991) also considers that error analysis is a valuable aid for learners and it witnesses and stands for a consistently useful feedback to design a remedial teaching method. However, errors whether systematic or unsystematic are sources of information and are significant in three ways: Errors are important for teachers because they show how far the learner has made progress. It also provides a framework for teachers to focus on the shortcomings which demand further attention. Moreover, they highlight the degree of effectiveness and productivity of teaching materials and teaching methodologies. Secondly, errors provide information to the researchers in the light of proofs of how a learner has learnt or acquired the language. Also, they define the procedural development and strategic ways employed by the learner in the journey of learning a new language. Thirdly, errors are a source of guideline for the learner himself, as he learns from his errors which are inevitable in his learning process (Corder 1981). Vahdatinejad (2008) further points out that error analysis can determine how much information learner still requires, as it provides information about the shortcomings in learners' competence. Thus, on the basis of a variety of critical views, it is explicit that error analysis provides information related to the psycholinguistic process of language learning and it can also help in drawing conclusions about the strategies adopted by the learners in the process of learning.

3. Data Collection and Data Analysis

The researchers used pre and post-tests of both control and experimental groups to investigate the phenomenon under study. A pre-test for both groups (control and experimental) was taken to check the basic understanding of some delimited errors, such as errors of prepositions, the present form of the verb, punctuation, sentence structure and of articles.

At pre- test, students of both groups were given five questions, based on fill in the blanks about delimited errors, and each question comprised of five parts. After that, the researchers identified and corrected the errors of experimental group with the latest approach, while keeping in view the parameters of CFB. However, they identified the errors of the control group according to the traditional techniques of error-correction. After the treatment given to both groups, the post-test of both groups was taken by the teachers. One teacher taught all the classes in a control group with traditional feedback process and another teacher taught all the classes of experimental group using CFB process. The teaching continued for four weeks and the teachers took one class of forty minutes daily in both groups. Finally, the performance of students of both groups was compared and findings were drawn by the researchers using different statistical procedures.

➤ **Discussions on Pre-test and Post-test of Control Group**

During the analysis of the data of Table 1, it was found in the pre-test of the control group that the problem areas of the students were in sentence structure, punctuation, preposition, articles and correct form of verbs. It is worth mentioning here that the participants belong to remote ruler areas and the results cannot be generalized as they are only specified for remote areas. The results show that a great number of participants were below the line of general standard. Comparatively, a very few students were fairly better in capitalization. Furthermore, a large number of the participants were weak at the base of different grammatical items and they were not familiar with the practical usage of grammatical items.

➤ **Results of Pre- test and Post- test of Control Group**

Table 1. Pre-test of Control Group

	No. of Errors/ Mistakes Committed						
Name Codes of Students	PUN. (OUT OF 10)	ART. (OUT OF 10)	V (OUT OF 10)	PREP (OUT OF 10)	SS (OUT OF 10)	Grand Total (OUT OF 50)	Percentage (%) of Grand Total of Errors committed
C-901	10	6	9	7	10	42	84%
C-902	10	5	7	8	10	40	80%
C-903	10	7	8	7	10	42	84%
C-904	10	7	9	7	10	43	86%
C-905	9	10	10	8	10	47	94%
C-906	9	10	9	9	10	47	94%
C-907	10	10	9	8	10	47	94%
C-908	10	8	8	7	10	43	86%
C-909	10	8	7	7	10	42	84%
C-910	10	9	7	7	10	43	86%
C-911	10	7	8	7	10	42	84%
C-912	8	8	7	6	10	39	78%
C-913	9	8	8	6	10	41	82%
C-914	6	6	6	5	10	33	66%
C-915	9	7	7	7	10	40	80%

It is clear from the Table 2 presented below that almost all the specified areas are difficult for the participants. After examining the post-test (see Table 2) of the students which the teachers took almost after a month of remedial teaching it was found that no drastic change occurred in the writing standards of the participants even after a month. Their performance level was almost at the same point with minor improvement in some of the participants. For instance, the participants with code Nos C-906, C-907, and C-908 showed improvement in their learning despite the traditional process of feedback and error analysis. Thus this old-fashioned method cannot be totally negated as the results show that this method provided remedies for a few of the mistakes as participants were unable to get rid of all the delimited errors at the highest level. But this very limited utility of the method cannot sort out the multifaceted issues related to CFB method.

Table 2. Post- test of Control Group

	No. of Errors/ Mistakes Committed						
Name Codes of Students	PUN. (OUT OF 10)	ART. (OUT OF 10)	V (OUT OF 10)	PREP (OUT OF 10)	SS (OUT OF 10)	Grand Total (OUT OF 50)	Percentage (%) of Grand Total of Errors committed
C-901	09	07	10	06	09	41	82%
C-902	10	06	09	07	08	40	80%
C-903	10	07	09	06	08	40	80%
C-904	09	08	09	08	08	42	84%
C-905	09	08	10	09	08	44	88%
C-906	08	09	10	06	10	43	86%
C-907	09	07	10	05	10	41	82%
C-908	10	07	08	06	10	41	82%
C-909	10	08	06	08	09	41	82%
C-910	08	09	08	09	09	43	86%
C-911	09	07	07	09	10	42	84%
C-912	08	06	09	08	08	49	78%
C-913	07	07	08	07	10	41	82%
C-914	07	06	05	05	10	33	66%
C-915	08	07	08	07	10	40	80%

➢ **Discussion on Differences in Pre-test and Post-test of Control Group**

It was found while calculating the differences of Pre and Post-tests of control group as reflected in Table 3, it was found that the improvement in the writing errors of the participant was quite minor as it was no more than 8% for one participant and 6% also for one participant. And only two participants showed 4% and two more showed only 2% improvement, and this level of improvement is not satisfactory at all because a great majority of participants did not show even 1% improvement. Therefore, the results of the study show that the complete adoption of traditional method for feedback proved futile. In this way, the percentage of progress on participants' writing falls even below average. The result of the study authenticates the idea of Mitchell and Myles (2004) that error analysis is a forceful and dynamic way of reshaping and resetting language parameters. In the control group, teachers could not provide constructive feedback and, consequently, participants could not get rid of their errors due to this outmoded method of rectification.

Table 3. Difference of Pre- test and Post-test of Control Group

Name Codes of Students	GRAND TOTAL (PRE-TEST)	GRAND TOTAL (POST-TEST)	DIFFERENCE/ DECREASE IN ERRORS	DIFFERENCE/ DECREASE IN ERRORS (%)
C-901	42	41	01	02%
C-902	40	40	0	0%
C-903	42	40	02	04%
C-904	43	42	01	02%
C-905	47	44	03	06%
C-906	47	43	04	08%
C-907	47	41	03	06%
C-908	43	41	02	04%
C-909	42	41	01	02%
C-910	43	43	0	0%
C-911	42	42	0	0%
C-912	39	39	0	0%
C-913	41	41	0	0%
C-914	33	33	0	0%
C-915	40	40	0	0%

➤ **Discussions on Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Group**

It was found during analysis of Table 4 that participants in the Pre- test of experimental group faced difficulties in the areas of sentence structure, punctuation, verb and preposition. Problem areas and obstacles were almost the same as they were found in the Pre-test of a control group. As the participants were from the same sample and due to this reason data reflected similarity in the results. Some participants were better as compared to the rest of the participants. Overall, they are also weak in theoretical and practical knowledge of grammar. After a remedial teaching by English language teachers, who had good knowledge of CFB method, participants showed a great improvement and got rid of their errors and mistakes at maximum level. There were some shortcomings at certain places among the participants which were also due to their sheer carelessness and shortage of time on the part of the participants (both teachers and students). The results of Post-test reflected that participants got rid of errors due to proper CFB strategies and proper implementation of EAS. A very few problems in the use of articles, and prepositions remained there due to interference of mother tongue and over generalization of rules. These errors were not fully rectified but the improvement was still there compared to control group. On the basis of the results, the researchers can claim that CFB through EAS proved more useful in helping participants in writing skills.

➤ **Results of Pre- test and Post- test of Experimental Group**

Table 4. Pre- test of Experimental Group

No. of Errors/ Mistakes Committed						
Name Codes of Students	PUN. (OUT OF 10)	ART. (OUT OF 10)	V (OUT OF 10)	CAP (OUT OF 10)	SS (OUT OF 10)	Grand Total (OUT OF 50)	Percentage(%) of Grand Total Of Errors committed
B-901	09	07	07	08	10	39	78%
B-902	10	06	07	07	10	40	80%
B-903	08	10	07	07	10	42	84%
B-904	10	09	08	08	10	45	90%
B-905	10	09	10	09	10	48	96%
B-906	10	06	08	07	10	41	82%
B-907	10	07	09	08	10	44	88%
B-908	08	10	09	10	10	47	94%
B-909	08	08	08	08	10	42	84%
B-910	10	06	07	07	10	40	80%
B-911	07	06	08	06	10	37	74%
B-912	09	06	08	07	10	40	80%
B-913	10	06	08	07	10	41	82%
B-914	07	07	07	06	10	37	74%
B-915	08	06	08	08	10	40	80%

Table 5. Post – test of Experimental Group

No. of Errors/ Mistakes Committed						
Name Codes of Students	PUN. (OUT OF 10)	ART. (OUT OF 10)	V (OUT OF 10)	CAP (OUT OF 10)	SS (OUT OF 10)	Grand Total (OUT OF 50)	Percentage(%) of Grand Total of Errors committed
B-901	02	02	02	02	03	11	22%
B-902	04	01	01	02	03	11	22%
B-903	03	03	03	01	04	14	28%
B-904	04	02	02	02	0	10	20%
B-905	03	04	03	02	03	15	30%
B-906	02	0	01	01	0	04	08%
B-907	01	01	01	04	03	10	20%
B-908	02	02	03	04	04	15	30%
B-909	03	02	02	05	04	16	32%

B-910	02	01	01	03	03	10	20%
B-911	02	02	0	0	03	07	14%
B-912	03	0	02	01	0	06	12%
B-913	04	01	0	02	01	08	16%
B-914	01	03	02	0	0	06	12%
B-915	02	04	0	01	0	07	14%

➢ **Discussion on Differences in Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Group**

The results in Table 6 of pre-test of experimental group reflect that more problems for the participants were in the use of preposition, article and sentence structure. It was also astonishing that some of the participants were exceptional and some were very weak in the writing skills. The results of the post-test showed that participants got rid most of their errors of punctuation, preposition, articles and sentence structure after the remedial teaching. In the results of post-test, it was found that many of the participants could not get rid of those errors which were due to the interference of mother tongue. Inter and intra-lingual types of errors were not fully understood by the participants, but improvement of the experimental group was better compared to the control group. So, it was clear after analysing the results that the implementation of CFB through EAS was useful for the participants of the study. In order to get rid of errors and mistakes altogether, more practice and understanding of the nature of the errors is essential for both teachers and students. The grand total of pre-test and post-test of experimental group clearly shows the effectiveness of CFB process. The results show that implementation of the latest approach to correct errors/ mistakes of participants made a huge difference in the percentage of improvement. After a month of remedial teaching, the highest improvement in percentage was 78% and the lowest percentage was 52%. The results of the present study substantiate Corder's views: Errors are a source of positive feedback as they tell the teachers about the usefulness and effectiveness of their teaching (Corder, 1967). The results of the study approved that participants showed a great improvement due to the effective implementation of constructive feedback through the error analysis system.

Table 6. Difference of Pre- test and Post- test of Experimental Group

Name Codes of Students	GRAND TOTAL (PRE-TEST)	GRAND TOTAL (POST-TEST)	DIFFERENCE/ DECREASE IN ERRORS	DIFFERENCE/ DECREASE IN ERRORS (%)
B-901	39	11	28	56%
B-902	40	11	29	58%
B-903	42	14	28	56%
B-904	45	10	35	70%
B-905	48	15	33	66%
B-906	41	04	37	74%
B-907	44	10	34	68%
B-908	47	15	32	64%
B-909	42	16	26	52%
B-910	40	10	30	60%
B-911	37	07	30	60%
B-912	40	06	34	78%
B-913	41	08	33	66%
B-914	37	06	31	62%
B-915	40	07	33	76%

It was found that the teacher in the control group used traditional method to treat the mistakes and errors made by the participants and only supplied corrections for some of the mistakes and errors. This method is no more practical and useful as participants were not informed about their mistakes/errors, and teachers did not discuss the causes of their mistakes. Consequently, these mistakes and errors become a permanent feature of their writing styles. But in the experimental group, a teacher used an innovative method such as group method for the purpose of rectification that ensures a thorough diagnosis of mistakes and errors. It facilitates the teacher's work

in giving necessary help and it also supports students to correct their own mistakes and errors as well as of their classmates. In these groups, students from one group may help in correcting the mistakes and errors of another group.

4. Conclusion

The implementation of CFB through EAS proved an effective strategic tool to eradicate errors and mistakes in the students' written work. For the effective correction of written work, it is compulsory that the teacher should rectify students' mistakes and errors using symbols [e.g., for spelling mistake 'SP'] indicating that there is something wrong with that sentence, word or punctuation. This is how students can be able to correct themselves by getting the clue of their mistakes. Results of Pre and Post-tests of control and experimental groups show that the teacher in the control group was completely unaware of the modern techniques and strategies of rectification unlike experimental group. Moreover, feedback techniques were obsolete which resulted in the poor performance of the students.

Thus, the results of the study show that the criterion of proper analysis of errors is far below the general standard of assessment/evaluation in most of the government sector institutions of Pakistan. Also, it can rightly be claimed that language learning is not like a parrot learning that depends simply on imitation. The present study confirms that a variety of writing materials and an effective implementation of CFB are valuable for developing writing skills as a skill-oriented approach. It is important to signify that when teachers provided opportunity for students to correct their own mistakes and by employing certain useful strategies of CFB process, they showed great interest and willingness to contribute in writing activities. The results of the present study reveal that the area of CFB was totally overlooked and abandoned by a great number of teachers, and CFB process was not implemented at Secondary School Level. Also, students were not motivated and stimulated, so they avoided group checking and pair checking for the correction of written work. Moreover, students had a lackadaisical attitude in the correction work because they felt humiliated and embarrassed while going through this process and the reason for this reaction was traditional and nonconstructive attitude of the teachers. Moreover, teachers were not familiar with the most up-to-date theories of corrections of errors; and those who were familiar they didn't like to execute them as they were the product of the same system. In a limited class time, it was altogether difficult to check the work of all students and due to this unfeasible situation majority of government school teachers could not do justice to the correction work.

5. Recommendations

The following recommendations are put forward in the light of the conclusions derived from the study:

(i) CFB strategies should be part of the syllabus. As it is not mentioned at the end of the chapter or unit how teachers should rectify errors/mistakes for this particular chapter or unit. Due to this insufficiency, each teacher adopts self-developed rectification method and this discretionary power damage underlying motive of CFB process.

(ii) Teachers must offer students different writing tasks according to their level e.g., controlled writing tasks for very poor students guided writing tasks for moderate students and free writing tasks for relatively good students. By applying this method, the teacher can enhance their standard of written English at quite good level while rectifying their errors and giving them positive feedback about their errors and mistakes.

(iii) It is a common observation that teachers always use native language and use GTM (Grammar Translation Method) in the classroom in which they give the translation task to students from Urdu to English and English to Urdu. Due to this method, many errors, e.g., inter-lingual errors occur due to the students' comparison of the two languages. Teachers should try to employ the Direct Method and the Communicative method to avoid inter and intra-lingual errors in the language classroom. It should be a policy that teachers should always use a target language while teaching the target language in EFL/ESL classrooms.

(iv) Teachers should assign writing tasks to the students at least twice a week, and they should check, and these errors must be analysed and rectified through CFB process.

(v) Teacher should instruct students to work in pairs and to correct each others' composition before submitting them. This procedure allows students to work in a non-threatening educational setting that helps build their self-confidence and enhances learning by discovering and sharing.

(vi) Teacher should discuss different kinds of errors which students produce most often in their compositions. After that, teachers can distribute sentences or short paragraphs containing those common errors/mistakes, and then he can ask students to locate and correct them. Also, students can do this exercise as a homework assignment and teachers should discuss this assigned task in the next class meeting with the process of CFB.

(vii) Before planning systematic error correction practices for classrooms, the teacher should consider the indigenous context of students in which they use language and commit errors, and this type of feedback can help elicit student errors and especially inter and intra-lingual errors.

(viii) Teachers can benefit by taking time to find out how they can address students' errors. Focusing on this point, they should ask a colleague or classroom adviser to observe their classes to note down the plus and minus points of their CFB techniques and/or should audio record a number of lessons to reflect on the same.

(ix) Good teachers understand that one size does not fit all. Moreover, for this purpose, the teacher should spend at least 10 to 15 minutes with the students in the analysis of the mistakes and errors, especially when the exam papers/written assignments are returned to the students, so that they could recognize their mistakes and errors.

References

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, J. (1999). *Doing Your Research Project* (3rd ed.). A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science. Open University Press, Philadelphia. Printed by St. Edmundsbury Press Ltd, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk in Great Britain.

Brown, H. D. (1980). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J. Prentice Hall.

Burt, M., Dulay, H., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Byrne, D. (1979). *Teaching writing skills.* Harlow, Longman.

Byrne, D. (1980). *English Teaching Perspectives.* Longman.

Candling, R. B. (2001). *Vocabulary and language teaching.* New York: Longman.

Chater, P. (1984). *Marking and Grading in English.*

Chomsky, N. (1966). In J. P. Allen, & P. Van Buren (Eds.), *Chomsky: Selected Readings* (pp. 152-9). London. Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. In J. C. Richards (Ed.) (1972), *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition.* London, Longman.

Corder, S. P. (1974). Error analysis. In Allen, J. L. P., & Corder, S. P. (Eds.), *Techniques in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 125-127). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage.* Oxford. Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction.* London: Longman.

Edge, J. (1995). *Mistakes and correction.* Longman.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1994). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course.* Mahwah, NJ: LEA.

Gay, R. L. (1996). *Educational Research.* Published by Prentice Hall, Inc., A Simon and Schuster Company Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. Printed in the United States of America.

Gulzar, M. A. (2009). Error analysis system in the writings of students at Intermediate level: A Pakistani context. *Pakistan Journal of Education, 26*(2), 54-72.

Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Analysis of rectification process in Pakistani context: A case study. *Journal of Social Sciences, 4*(1), 101-116.

Gulzar, M. A. (2010). Linguistic Controversy: Promotion of English as an Elite Language. *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities, XVII*(1), 1-13. Allama Iqbal Open University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Gulzar, M. A., & Waseem, R. (2009). *Research methodology: An Anthology (560)* (1st ed.). Islamabad: Allama Iqbal Open University.

Gulzar, M. A., Abdulrahman A. A., & Saeed, F. (2011). Developing a Module for Rectification Taxonomy pro ELT Teachers. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research, 13*(1). Muzaffarabad: University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan

Gulzar, M. A. (2009). Shift in the Language Teaching Methods: Implications of the Methodologies in Pakistani

EFL Classrooms. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research, 11*(1), 121-130. University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir, Muzaffarabad Pakistan.

Halliday, J. (1998). Technicism, reflective practice, and authenticity in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(6), 597-605. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(98)00010-9

Harmer, J. (1983). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Longman.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Essex: Longman.

Harmer, J. (1998). How to teach writing. *How to teach English* (Cap. 8, pp. 79-86). Harlow: Longman.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). The Treatment of Error in Written work. *Modern Language Journal.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1980.tb05188.x

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error Correction in foreign language teaching: Race theory and Research and Practice. *Modern Language Journal.*

Johnson, K. (1988). Mistake Correction. *ELT Journal, 42*(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/42.2.89

Keshavars, M. H. (1997). *Contrastive analysis and error analysis*. Tehran: Rahmana Pub.

Klassen, Johanna. (1991). Using student errors for Teaching. *English Teaching Forum*.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers Ann arbor*. Michigan: University of Michigan.

Lier, L. V. (1989). Analyzing Interaction in Second Language Classrooms. *English Language Teaching Journals.* Oxford University Press.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback Learner Uptake: Negotiation of forma in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition.*

McLaughlin, B. (1990). Restructuring. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 113-128. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.113

McNeil, J. D. (2003). *Curriculum the teachers' initiative.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.

Miller, G. A. (1966). Language and psychology. *New Directions in the Study of Language*. Editor EH Lenneberg. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, M. (2004). *Second language learning theories*. New York: Hodder Arnold.

Nobuyoshi, J., & Ellis, R. (1993). Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal, 47,* 203-210.

Norrish, J. (1983). *Language Learners and their Errors.* London. Macmillan.

O, Brien, T. (1989). *Teaching writing skills in a second language* (MD 345), Units 1-5. University of Manchester.

Pica, T., Halliday, L., Lewis, N., & Morgenthaler, L. (1989). Comprehensible output as an outcome of linguistic demands on the learner. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 63-90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S027226310000783X

Raimes, Ann. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press, New York.

Richards, J. (Ed.) (1974). *Error Analysis* (p. 100). London. Longman.

Richards, J. C. (1971). A Non-contrastive Approach to Error Analysis. In Richards, J. C. (Ed.), *Error Analysis.* London: Longman.

Richards, J. C. (1986). *The Language Teaching Mtarix*. CUP.

Singhal, P. R. et al. (1995). Towards Quality Secondary Education. Council of Boards of School Education in India (COBSE) in Association with VIKAS Publishing House PVT Ltd. 576, Masjid, Jangpura, New Delhi – 110014. Printed at Ramprintograph Delhi – 51, India.

Strevens, P. (1980). *Teaching English as an International Language* (Chapter No. 2, pp. 18-28). Causes of Failure and Conditions for Success in the Leaning and Teaching of Foreign Languages. Pergamon Press Ltd. Printed by A. Wheaton & Co. Ltd., Exeter in Great Britain.

Taylor, G. (1986). Errors and explanations. *Applied Linguistics.* http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/7.2.144

Vahdatinejad, S. (2008). Students' error analysis and attitude towards teacher feedback using a selected software:

a case study. Unpublished Masters thesis. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.

Weireesh, S. (1991). How to analyze Interlanguage. *Journal of Psychology & Education,* 113-22.

Widdowson, H. G. (1985). *An Approach to Teaching of Scientific English Discourse in Explorations in Applied linguistics.* Oxford, U.K: Oxford University Press.