

CO150 grammar intervention: Using and evaluating Ferris

Devon Jancin

Colorado State University

Abstract

Though there are many well-known studies about numerous topics on written grammatical error correction (Bitchener & Knock, 2008; Ferris, 2006; Sheen, 2007) most of these studies only focus on its effectiveness in Academic English Programs. This is a classroom-based research study in the context of an undergraduate-required English composition course (CO150) which does not have extra time for additional grammar instruction. The four participants, all native Chinese speakers, were making severe grammatical errors, which were affecting the meaning of their papers. This study focuses on individualized grammar help given to high-proficiency ELL students in CO150. To do this, the study investigates the effects of Ferris' (2002) error correction model on students' short term accuracy and attitude. Data was collected using self-assessment surveys, writing samples, direct written error correction forms, and standardized open-ended interviews. Quantitative and qualitative data analysis showed that students' accuracy and motivation increased. These findings call for further research with a larger participant pool to add supplementary insight to the results' generalizability.

Keywords: written corrective feedback, error correction, classroom-based research, composition

CO150 grammar intervention: Using and evaluating Ferris

Colorado State University requires all undergraduates to take CO150, a standard English composition and rhetoric class. The curriculum is fast-paced, requiring five major essay assignments in different genres in one semester. According to CO150 teachers, the average grade for native speakers of English in CO150 is a C (J. Levin, personal communication, September 25, 2013). Because of the difficult content, CSU has created five sections of CO150 International, for English Language Learners (ELLs). CO150 international classes have the same amount and type of assignments, but take more time to scaffold the material for students. Consequently, CO150I is a rigorous class, both academically and linguistically for international students, most of whom are still in the process of learning academic spoken and written English.

In addition to having to learn Academic English writing conventions, English grammar usage also presents a problem for many ELL students at the college level. The role of written error correction in the writing process at universities has been often researched, but most of these studies have taken place in Intensive English Programs (IEP) (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2006; Sheen, 2007), whose students are writing at a level far below standard university-level writing. After graduating from the IEP, all ELL students at Colorado State University must then take CO150. The students learn new genres of writing, conduct research for the first time, and put in to practice higher-level thinking rhetorical concepts. Though CO150 teachers follow the hierarchy of rhetorical concerns, which states that grammar should be the last priority when revising a paper, often ELL's grammatical errors affect the meaning of their paper, causing good ideas to be presented indecipherably. Though there is a great need for grammar instruction in CO150, the curriculum is not designed for it, and allows

no extra time in-class that could be devoted to serious grammatical problems. When students' poor knowledge of grammar is negatively affecting how they express their ideas, the teacher must discover an appropriate way to help their students.

The problem this classroom-based case study intends to address is that CO150 teachers need to find a suitable way to give students written grammatical corrective feedback (CF) on their work without taking up class time. This study sought to discover information for teachers on how they might address this problem, as well as help address students' personal concerns about their own grammar improvement.

Literature Review

The best way to provide written corrective feedback (CF), and even whether it is effective at all, is a topic which is often debated. At the heart of the debate are Truscott's (1996) argument against the effectiveness of written CF, and Ferris' (1999) rebuttal in support of it. Truscott's paper, though 17 years old, is important because it was a landmark paper that helped spark the debate over the effectiveness of CF, also called error correction. Truscott (1996) called for written grammar correction to be "abandoned" in English language learning classrooms (p. 361). He cites multiple studies (Kepner, 1991; Krashen, 1992; Smeke, 1984) in which the findings found grammar correction to be ineffective, sometimes even having "significant harmful effects" (Truscott, 1996, p. 360). Though he does take time to gather a diverse array of studies, trying to minimize variables like L1 influence and type of correction so that his claims seem more valid, he makes no reference to any studies that oppose his position. This may explain the outcry from researchers like Ferris, who wanted to search for a more balanced view on error correction. At the very least, this landmark paper in which Truscott

argues that one of the main reasons for the false belief that grammar correction works is because there hasn't been enough "explicit discussion" about it, actually served to do just that— since then, much research has been conducted in an effort to find clear answers (Bitchener & Knock, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Sheen, 2007). In trying to refute Truscott's claims against error correction, Ferris is a well-known classroom-based researcher and champion of written corrective feedback (see Ferris, 1999; 2004). She suggests that we should take a cyclical view on it, further conducting and revising "replicable studies" (Ferris, 2004) to shed more light on the methodological problems, ethical issues, and the varied way that researchers have measured "effectiveness" in the past, which has fueled the error correction accuracy debate (Ferris, 2004; Sheen, 2007).

The Current Study

This study aims to answer the question regarding how CO150 teachers can give written CF efficiently and effectively outside of class. The study is in line with Ferris' view that more replicable research studies about written CF are necessary. Since Ferris is an often-cited expert in the field of written corrective feedback, her work seemed a logical place to begin exploring the effectiveness of written CF in the English composition context. It was decided to use Ferris' (2002) grammar intervention recommendations to determine if these materials can meet the needs of CO150I students. In order to investigate this problem, the study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. Does written corrective feedback using Ferris' Error Analysis instrument help advanced L2 writers' to improve their accuracy in the short term (from one draft to the next)?

2. Ferris' model of one-on-one 'mini lesson' instruction help advanced L2 writers' to improve their accuracy in the short term?
3. What do students think about the overall effectiveness of the instrument and mini lesson (together referred to as "the intervention" or the student-friendly "the project")?

Method

Participants

Four students (1 male, 3 females) were selected to be asked to participate in this study (see Table 1). Participants were chosen based on their classroom teacher's recommendation that they fit the following needs analysis:

1. their grammar was far below the class average, and was negatively affecting their work based on the previous two assignments (academic essays);
2. their motivation for learning in general was high; and
3. they were not struggling overly-much to keep up with the course content, and could therefore afford to focus on an additional element of writing.

Students were 18-20 years old. Three of them had spent six months or less in the U.S., and one of them had spent five years in the United States, attending U.S. public high school. All students' L1s are Chinese, and they have spent a range of 8-13 years studying English in school. Three of them responded to the question "Improving my English grammar is important" on the Likert scale 1-4 with 4 (strongly agree), and one responded 3 (agree). The names of the students have been changed to protect their privacy.

Procedure

Instruments: An informational survey made of short answer and 1-4 Likert scale questions was given via email at the beginning of the study (see Appendix A). After completing this, each student's first draft analysis essay (EA 1) was collected and analyzed for errors. This was done by categorizing and presenting student errors using an adaptation of Ferris' (2002) Student Summary Report Form (see Appendix B). Using the original Report Form as a base, I added:

1. Noun Form (NF) error, to distinguish these from Noun ending errors (N)
2. Word Choice (WC) for the wrong use in-context of a correctly formed word
3. Sentence Structure (SS), which was the biggest category

The further differentiation of some error categories was done in an effort to increase the instrument's readability for students' independent use. SS included improper commas usage, in addition to missing or additional words, improper word order, and other "hard-to-classify problems related to syntax" (Ferris, 2002, p. 115). The category definitions and examples from Ferris (2002) were used to classify this study's terms (see Appendix G).

Data Collection: occurred in one section of a CO150 International class spring semester of 2013. The study began on March 18th with participant selection and a pre-study survey, and ended May 1st when the post-study surveys were sent out via email. A breakdown of the time-frame is depicted in Table 1.

Table 1

Breakdown of the Study Timeframe

Date	Actions Conducted
March 18 th	Participants selected; Survey 1 completed
March 29 th	Error Analysis 1 (EA 1) conducted on Stakeholder Analysis rough draft
April 1 st	EA 1 given to participants
April 14 th	Error Analysis 2 (EA 2) was conducted on Stakeholder Analysis final draft
April 22 nd -26 th	Mini Lessons and Error Analysis 3 (EA 3) were administered
May 1 st	EA 2 and EA3 were given to participants; post-study survey were sent out

Students received their Error Analysis 1 five days before their final draft was due. Each error was marked according to Ferris' direct written corrective feedback model (2002, p. 204).

Specifically, I corrected each grammar error directly, using the corresponding symbol on the Student Summary Report Form, making sure to demonstrate the correction for the student the first time the error was made (see Appendix C). After marking each error in its appropriate category, total errors were counted for each category. Then, the total number of errors in all categories were added to get the TOTAL errors made. The error frequency ratio was calculated by dividing the total number in each category by the TOTAL errors made. Numbers were rounded to the nearest hundredth so that students could easily read their results. The highest 2-3 error categories were ranked on the right-hand side to indicate that these were the priority for students to focus on. The TOTAL error frequency ratio was found by dividing the TOTAL number of errors by the total number of words in the paper. The total number of words was

counted by the Microsoft Word word count feature, and did not include quotations or the bibliography, since these were not authentically written by the participant. For an example of an analysis received by a student, see Appendix D.

The students were told to use the error analysis to help correct their final drafts, but no instruction on metalinguistic awareness of terms was given. This was due to the time constraints of a regular CO150 class, which requires a method for correcting grammar that students can do independently. Orally explaining each metalinguistic grammar category for each student, taking up regular class time, was therefore not practical. Students were told to do the best they could with what they were given. They were also reassured that they would be able to ask questions during the upcoming mini lesson. Final draft essays (EA 2) were then collected and the error analysis procedure was repeated.

Based on the results of the first two error analyses, a target structure was selected for what Ferris calls a “mini lesson,” the structure of which was based on Ferris’ (2002) sample mini lesson sequence (p. 97). Participants met with me one-on-one for 1 hour, which was broken down in the following way:

1. 10 minutes: standardized open-ended interview questions (see Appendix E)
2. 30 minutes: mini lesson (based on Ferris, 2002, p. 138) consisting of:
 - a. Explanation of grammar rule
 - b. Guided practice exercise (from Azar & Hagen, 2009)
 - c. Guided practice exercise (from own essay final draft)
 - d. Independent practice free-writing sample (20 minutes)

Azar and Hagen's grammar book, chosen to supplement Ferris, is the selected Academic English Program textbook at CSU, meaning that many of the CO150 teachers are familiar with it. A grammar textbook was needed to supplement the suggestions found in Ferris (2002) because she does not have a specific protocol or activities. This study's free-writing sample was a handwritten twenty-minute exercise in response to the prompt: *How has your family influenced you?* At the end of the mini lesson I collected the free writing samples and used them to conduct the third error analysis (EA 3). Students were then given the final informational survey over email, which focused on their general attitude about the study and their feelings towards the Error Analysis instrument and the mini lesson (see Appendix F).

Data Analysis: can be separated into qualitative and quantitative parts. The qualitative data analysis was analyzed from individual participants' explanations of their attitudes toward writing and grammar based on their short answer survey questionnaires (see Appendices A and E). In addition, during the mini-lessons that each student participated in, I conducted a semi-structured interview (see Appendix E) and informal observations, specifically focusing on the students' verbal attitudinal explanations regarding grammar and writing. These notes were examined and used to supplement explanation of the qualitative results.

Occurring concurrently with the qualitative analysis, the quantitative error analyses began by following the method for analyzing the Error Forms as stated in Ferris (2002, p. 123). First, I counted the total number of errors in each category, and recorded this on the Error Analysis (EA) Form. The errors were first analyzed individually by finding the error frequency ratio (EFR), which is, according to Ferris, calculated by dividing the number of errors in each category by the TOTAL number of errors in the paper. Then, the TOTAL number of errors was

divided by the total number of words to get the EFR of each whole paper. These were then used to compare student change individually and as a group (see Table 2). Calculating the EFR instead of using simple error totals was done to account for the fact that simple error counts may be misleading, because length of text is not accounted for. For example, Ferris explains that as a rough draft is expanded, students are more likely to “make more total errors” (2002, p. 92). By examining the EFR rather than the number of errors, the difference in word count between EA 1, 2, and 3 is better accounted for. After the EFRs were calculated the EFR categories were compared to determine which grammar category would be most beneficial to target during the mini lesson for each student. Following Ferris’ model, Sentence Structure (SS) and Word Choice (WC) categories were characterized as “untreatable” and were therefore not selected as a target structure, even if their EFR was the highest. Total EFR scores were compared in EA 1 and EA 2, and the difference between them was found to measure the amount of change from rough draft to final draft (either + positive or – negative), as indicated in Table 2. The difference between the target structure in EA 2, the sample done most directly before the mini lesson, and EA 3, done immediately after the mini lesson, was also compared in the same way (see Table 3). Finally, a selected quantitative portion of the survey questions were compiled using the 4 point Likert scale with the average self-reported amount of time students said they spent working on EA 1 for EA 2 (see Tables 2 and 3).

At the end of the study, these mixed-method results for each individual participant were finally compiled together and compared as a whole. The data examined individually and together included: the 3 writing sample error analyses, the qualitative data gathered from the

mini lesson interviews, and the 2 surveys. Together, this data was used in order to determine the suitability of the Ferris (2002) model for CO150 students.

Results and Discussion

The findings and discussion are separated into two parts, Phase A and B, which correspond to research questions 1, and 2 and 3.

Phase A

- a.) Does written corrective feedback using Ferris' Error Analysis instrument help advanced L2 writers' to improve their accuracy in the short run?

Although significance was not determined, and therefore the extent of improvement is not certain, the analysis of all four participant's TOTAL error frequency ratios in Table 2 shows that each participant improved from the first draft to second.

Table 2

Amount of change from EA1 to EA2

Overall Error Frequency Ratio				
Participant	EA 1 (rough)	EA 2 (final)	Amount of Change	Time Spent w/ Instrument
Zack	.139	.037	.102	1.5 hours
Josie	.073	.052	.021	1.5 hours
Evelyn	.105	.047	.058	2.0 hours
Cherise	.135	.130	.005	0.5 hours

This means that the instrument is able to help students improve their overall grammatical accuracy. This finding is further supported by student response from the surveys. All students answered either agree or strongly agree in response to the question *receiving error analyses from my teacher helped me improve my grammar*, which shows that students agree that the instrument helped them improve as well.

To help explain the varying degrees of progress as seen in Table 2, students oral explanations during the mini lesson can help. Evelyn stated:

It's really helpful. [It] helped me to find out the grammar mistakes, and let me know the biggest problem I had about grammar. I used the analysis to improve my paper. I also knew the place I need to pay an extra attention to when I am writing in English.

However, Cherise, who had the least amount of overall EFR progress, was the least certain of how to use the tool, stating "I looked over it and made some changes. I kinda get it." She was also the least familiar with the metalinguistic terms that the instrument uses to label and classify errors. Interestingly, it was noted through observations during Phase B that Zack had the highest knowledge of metalinguistic terms, and also showed the most improvement. Based on the table and explanations, it was found that students like Cherise who have a low understanding of the language used to describe grammar rules are the least likely to show improvement using Ferris' instrument, even when given an example correction. Therefore, certain cognitive competences like grammatical metalanguage may be necessary for Ferris' instrument to be effective.

However, Josie was unfamiliar with most of these terms in English, but did understand the concepts. She explained during the mini lesson that she had to look up the metalanguage

trms in Chinese, which helped her understand and use the code. She explained that “It was helpful—Easy to make corrections, but for SS and WC I have no idea.” Therefore, it may not be the metalanguage that is necessary, but the grammatical knowledge. Josie was able to use an English/Chinese dictionary and teach herself what the English grammar meant in Chinese, achieving .016 EFR, more progress than Cherise. Josie’s case also points out that independent learning strategies also may have affected the outcome of these results. In addition, Cherise only spent $\frac{1}{3}$ of the time using the instrument than either Josie or Zack, which may be another reason that affected her overall EFR.

Phase B

- b.) Does Ferris’ model of one-on-one ‘mini lesson’ instruction help advanced L2 writers’ to improve their accuracy in the short run?

Table 3 shows that all participants improved in the targeted grammatical category directly after the given mini lesson. Evelyn and Josie in particular seemed to benefit from this, which is reflected in their attitudinal survey and observations, as discussed below.

Table 3

Amount of change from EA2 to EA3

Target Structure Error Frequency Ratio			
Participant	EA 2 (final)	EA 3 (post mini lesson writing sample)	Amount of Change
Zack	.29	.25	.04
Josie	.20	0	.20
Evelyn	.11	0	.11
Cherise	.46	.35	.11

c.) What do students think about the overall effectiveness of the instrument and mini lesson?

All students responded either agree or strongly agree on the item *Meeting with my teacher one-on-one to talk about one part of grammar helped me improve*. The mini lesson seemed to work for some students better than others. Evelyn explained that the least helpful thing about using the error analysis instrument only was that “after I corrected the mistakes, there is nobody can tell me if I correct it in a right way.” Therefore, it was valuable to “also have a one-on-one appointment to communicate with the English teacher.” Josie agrees, adding “I need a teacher to help me with my grammar [because] it is difficult for me to see the errors in my paper without another person pointing them out.” This suggests that the suitability of Ferris’ model may depend on what type of learning style the student prefers. If the student prefers independent learning, the instrument by itself may be more effective. Interestingly, Evelyn and Josie also progressed by using the instrument in Phase A, without the opportunity to negotiate for meaning.

Overall, the mini lesson was found to be difficult to schedule, a large time commitment for both teacher and student, and, according to some students, possibly not as valuable for some participants as Phase A. Zack stated “I think I understand the [grammar] rule, it is where in my article (essay) I should put it that I can’t know,” and therefore “I think I don’t need to meet [for a mini lesson] again. But I will use the analysis.” Cherise shared similar views, explaining that her high school teacher “always tells me that I need an s at the end of words, so I know these rules already. It’s just knowing *when* the word need an s and when it doesn’t that I don’t get.” This suggests that mini lessons were found to be less suitable in general for CO150 than

the error analysis instrument, especially if the grammatical problem for the student is a matter of usage rather than knowing the rule. They may also be less suitable for the students and teacher because of the amount of time they require for each student is twice as long as it takes for the teacher to conduct one error analysis. The most suitable option when using Ferris' intervention may be to stop making mini lessons mandatory, and save them for students who are less familiar with metalinguistic grammar terminology, or who feel they learn better with face-to-face instruction.

Summary and Conclusions

Summary

The results of this study give a practical direction to move towards in solving the problem of how grammar instruction can fit into the already rushed CO150I curriculum. Based on these four participants, the results of this study indicated that Ferris' (2002) model of grammar intervention, especially Phase A, may be suitable for CO150 international students.

Overall, participants appreciated the extra support with grammar, and had positive attitudes about the potential of the intervention being able to help other students struggling with grammar problems in CO150. For most of them, word choice and sentence structure errors were the most prevalent, yet Ferris recommends little for word choice and nothing for syntactical errors, generally encouraging the student to "ask a native speaker for help with this" (Ferris, 2002, p. 142). Based on the interviews and surveys, the benefits and weaknesses of the overall intervention are summarized in Table 4:

Table 4

Participant feedback on overall intervention

Participant	Benefit	Explanation	Weakness	Explanation
Josie	Clear way to measure progress	“Participating in this project can really help students to improve grammar.”	Instrument not designed for ‘untreatable’ errors	“The least helpful thing about the project was it didn’t help with sentence structure.”
Zack	Tool for prioritization	“I recommend people who are not good in grammar attending this project. Then they can know which part is their weakness in grammar.”	Instrument not designed for ‘untreatable’ errors	“This project doesn’t help my mistakes about sentence structure.”
Evelyn	Gives detailed feedback	“I think it’s a very good chance that we can get a very detailed feedback about grammar. And we can also have a one-to-one appointment to communicate with the English teacher.”	Must feel confident learning independently when using instrument	“After I corrected the mistakes, there is nobody can tell me if I correct it in a right way.”
Cherise	Motivational	“All right! I improved! And I didn’t have any run-on sentences!”	Must have knowledge of grammatical category metalanguage	“If you don’t know what the little symbols mean it’s confusing to know how to fix it.”

Limitations and Future Research

This study was designed to help teachers and students shed some light on the complicated issue of written CF for meaning-reducing grammatical errors. As a classroom-based study, it was necessary to allow the methodology to be flexible enough that the study would be most beneficial to students individually, which meant there was a small sample size because of

the amount of time for both the researcher and the students. By hand-picking a small number of participants according to the needs analysis, there may be a skewed outcome based on the participants' high motivation. What works for these students may not be able to apply to less motivated participants. The small sample size was a severe limitation of the generalizability of the results because *t*-tests to determine if the EFR results were significant or not were unable to be conducted on such a small participant pool. This means that there was no way to be certain of the validity of the effectiveness of the written CF. In the future, the intervention should be replicated with more students to add further insight about the consistency of the results.

Another methodological weakness in the study occurred in the interview process. Due to the rescheduling of the interviews because of inclement weather, there was not time to gather a handwritten writing sample before the mini lesson. Comparing instead the final draft essay with the EA 3 short response was not ideal, because the length of the samples were so different. If this study were to be done again, I would have had students write a short response pre- mini lesson, conducted the lesson, and then given them twenty minutes to edit their work. In this way, the procedure would be more similar to the rough draft/final draft procedure in Phase A.

The nature of CO150 assignments allow only for two drafts, the rough and final, before moving on to an entirely new genre of writing. As Ferris points out, "Various written genres may elicit different linguistic structures" (2002, p. 92). Therefore, this study (which was originally intended for short and long term) was only able to investigate the effect of Ferris' intervention model in the short term (from one draft to the next). Further studies focusing on the long term effects (from beginning to end of semester) of the same model would be valuable

for CO150 students and teachers, though the changing genres would have to be taken into account.

Conclusion

Overall, this mixed methods classroom-based research case study in CO150I found that the Ferris (2002) intervention model, especially the error analysis instrument (Phase A), can be suitable to help a selective type of student (highly motivated to work independently on grammar, and comfortable with the class content already) to improve their “treatable” grammatical errors from one assignment to the next. While this is a good starting point in investigating how we can help our CO150 students improve their meaning-interfering grammatical errors, more research on the suitability of the Ferris (2002) intervention should be done to increase the insight and reliability of the results.

References

- Azar, B.S., & Hagen, S.A. (2009). *Understanding and using English grammar* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Longman.
- Bitchener, J. & Knoch. (2008). The value of written corrective feedback for migrant and international students. *Language Teaching Research Journal*, 12, 409–31.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12, 267–96.
- 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. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (2004). The “grammar correction” debate in L2 writing: Where are we, and where do we go from here? (and what do we do in the meantime ...?). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 49-62.
- Ferris, D. (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: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D.R. & Hedgcock, J.S. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process, & practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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.
- Kepner, C.G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 305-313.
- Krashen, S.D. (1992). Comprehensive input and some competing hypotheses. In R. Courchene, J.I. Glidden, J. St. John, & C. Thieren (Eds.) *Comprehension-based second language teaching* (pp. 19-38). Ottawa, Canada: University of Ottawa Press.
- Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255–283.
- Smeke, H.D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign language annuals*, 17, 195-202.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46, 327-369.

Appendix A
Pre-study Survey (Survey 1)

Grammar Survey

I have made this survey so that I can get a better idea of how to help you.

If you would like to participate in my research project, *your answers will NOT affect your grade in any way.*

No one but me will see your answers.

Please answer all of the questions as truthfully as you can. You do not need to write more than can fit into the space provided.

1. What is your first language?
2. Do you feel confident writing essays in your first language? Explain.
3. How many years have you been studying English in school?
4. What English academic writing experience do you have? (in your home country, EAP/IEP classes at CSU, C0130, etc.)
5. What is the hardest thing about English grammar? Explain.
6. What things do you do to help yourself with English grammar?

(Don't forget to complete page 2!)

Please answer the questions using numbers 1-4 according to the scale:

Strongly Agree Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4	3	2	1

For example:

#	Question	Your Answer
Ex:	I like writing.	3

#	Question	Your Answer
1.	English grammar is easy for me.	
2.	Improving my English grammar is important to me.	
3.	I learn English grammar in the English class I am in now.	
4.	I feel confident writing essays in English.	
5.	I ask native English speakers for help with English grammar.	
6.	I ask my classmates for help with English grammar.	
7.	I can learn English grammar on my own.	
8.	I need a teacher to help me with English grammar.	
9.	I check my writing assignments for grammar mistakes.	
10.	I ask someone else to check my writing assignments for grammar mistakes.	

Finished! Please **email** this back to me at: djancin@gmail.com

Appendix B
Student Summary Report Form

Error Type	# of Errors	Error Ratio	Top 2 Most Frequent Ranking
subject-verb agreement errors (SV)			
plural and possessive noun ending errors (N)			
noun form error (NF)			
article-‘a’, ‘the’, ‘an’ error (art)			
verb tense error (VT)			
verb form error (VF)			
sentence fragment (SF)			
run-on sentence (RO)			
word choice error (WC)			
sentence structure (SS)			
TOTAL:			

(adapted from Ferris, 2002, p. 123; 133-116)

Appendix C
Example error corrections on a first draft paper

half a million birds a year, according to a Fish and Wildlife estimate” (Fears). Lots of
 wind turbines are located on mountain because of strong wind. Unfortunately, lots of
 “bat and migratory birds” need to travel through those mountains (Karol).
 According to Darryl Fear, bird protectors query that, even there is a law “protecting
 eagles and a host of migrating birds”, “Over nearly 30 years, none of the nation’s 500
 wind farms, where 35,000 wind turbines operate mostly on private land, have been
 prosecuted for killing birds” (Fears). Bird protectors think those laws is no more than
 a paper, and government should make some force policy to supervise manufacturers
 to build wind turbine in area where birds rarely pass (Fear).

NIC

Appendix D

Example of student-received Error Analysis 1 (EA 1) form and instructions

Error Analysis 1**Name:** Zack**Date:** March 29th, 2013**Assignment:** 1st draft SA

*I have analyzed your Stakeholder Analysis rough draft, carefully looking **for grammar mistakes only**. Please note that I **only** commented on grammar, not on content or ideas.*

This error analysis is the 1st step. If you do not understand what the error types are exactly, this is ok. We will talk about them during our one-on-one meeting after your final Stakeholder Analysis is due.

*Please look at your paper. Next to each error, I have marked the error type: (SV,N, NF, art, VT, VF, SF, RO, WC, SS). I have tried to give an example of each error by writing the correction near the error type. I have **not** written all of the corrections (it is your job to correct your own paper). I have marked ALL of the grammatical errors in your paper. (Don't worry! Most of these errors are minor. Only errors that have a question mark ? near the error type have made the meaning unclear.)*

Use this feedback and do your best to correct the grammatical errors in your paper.

Error Type	Number of Errors	Error Ratio*	Top 2 Most Frequent Ranking
subject-verb agreement errors (SV)	2	.02	
plural and possessive noun ending errors (N)	31	.28	2
noun form error (NF)	9	.08	
article-'a', 'the', 'an' error (art)	35	.32	1
verb tense error (VT)	4	.04	
verb form error (VF)	1	.01	
sentence fragment (SF)	2	.02	
run-on sentence (RO)	0	NA	
word choice error (WC)	8	.07	
sentence structure (SS)	19	.17	
TOTAL:	111	.149	744 (words)

Appendix E
Standardized Open-Ended Interview Questions Asked During Phase B

1. How did you use the error analysis? Did it help you?
2. Do you have any questions about any of the information on the analysis?
3. Do you have any questions about any of the things written on your paper?
4. How long did you spend using it to correct the grammar on your paper?

Appendix F
Post-study Survey (Survey 2)

Final Grammar Survey

Thank you for participating in this project! This is the FINAL thing you need to do for it. Please fill this out as **TRUTHFULLY** as possible. I am the only one who will see your answers. As always, your classroom grade will not be affected in any way.

Please answer the questions using numbers 1-4 according to the scale:

Strongly Agree Disagree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
4	3	2	1

For example:

#	Question	Your Answer
Ex:	I like writing.	3

#	Question	Your Answer
1.	English grammar is easy for me.	
2.	Improving my English grammar is important to me.	
3.	I think my grammar has improved this semester.	
4.	I feel confident writing essays in English.	
5.	I ask native English speakers for help with English grammar.	
6.	Receiving error analyses from my teacher helped me improve my grammar.	
7.	Meeting with my teacher one-on-one to talk about 1 part of grammar helped me improve.	
8.	I learned something new about English grammar.	
9.	I check my writing assignments for grammar mistakes.	

Please answer all of the questions as truthfully as you can. You do not need to write more than can fit into the space provided.

a.) Overall, what was the most helpful thing about this grammar project?

a.) Overall, what was the least helpful thing about this grammar project?

b.) Would you recommend participating in this project to a friend? Why/why not?

Finished! Please **email** this back to me at: **djancin@gmail.com**

Thank you for your participation and the time you put in to this! Please ask me if you have any questions.

Appendix G
Ferris (2000) Error Category Definitions

Appendix A to Chapter 4: Explanation of Error Types

1. **Word choice:** includes errors in which the meaning of one word is wrong or unclear in this context. Also includes wrong verb or auxiliary, modal, preposition, or relative pronoun. Does not include spelling errors, other pronoun errors, article/determiner errors.

Examples:

- (a) *In addition of the challenge . . .* [Possible correction: *to*]
- (b) *My English doesn't have a very good prove.* [Possible correction: *improvement(?)*]
- (c) *I couldn't speak English as fluently as they were.* [Possible correction: *did*]

2. **Verb tense:** includes missing or erroneous verb tense markers. Also includes modals when they clearly mark tense (*would/will; can/could*). Does not include mood (subjunctive/conditional) or voice (passive/active).

Examples:

- (a) *I attend my first year of high school.* [Possible correction: *attended*]
- (b) *Even though I have faced many struggles, I did not give up.* [Possible correction: *faced*]

3. **Verb form:** includes a wide range of errors in formation of the verb phrase not specific to time or tense markings (e.g., ill-formed passives, conditionals, and subjunctives; misuse of modals, infinitives, gerunds)

Examples:

- (a) *They hope can find happiness.* [Possible correction: *to find*]
- (b) *We should let her knows it.* [Possible correction: *know*]

All categories and most examples are from Ferris et al. 2000 research corpus. See also table 1 and figure 12.

4. **Word form:** includes all other non-verb related errors in which the word is in the wrong lexical category for the context

Examples:

- (a) *We **choice** to live with happiness.* [Possible correction: *choose*]
(b) *... to live **unhappy** in this country ...* [Possible correction: *unhappily*]

5. **Subject-verb agreement:** includes an error in either noun or verb form leading to lack of agreement in number (singular/plural). Does not include other noun ending or verb form errors (see numbers 3 and 7).

Examples:

- (a) *The age limit really **concern** the younger immigrants.* [Possible correction: *concerns*]
(b) *In America **there's** too many rules that limit your personal freedom.* [Possible correction: *there are*]

6. **Articles/determiners:** includes errors involving unnecessary or missing article or determiner, wrong article or determiner, or a determiner that does not agree in number with noun

Examples:

- (a) *You need a driver's license and **a** insurance.* [Possible correction: *zero article*]
(b) *I am from **different** universe.* [Possible correction: *a different universe*]

7. **Noun endings:** includes missing, unnecessary, or ill-formed plural or possessive markers

Examples:

- (a) *Stereotype **are** one of the biggest problems.* [Possible correction: *stereotypes*]
(b) *My **uncle death** reminded me of my grandmother's funeral.* [Possible correction: *uncle's*]

8. **Pronouns:** includes pronouns that do not agree in number or case with referent or that have no apparent antecedent. Includes only personal pronoun reference, not relative pronouns (see number 1).

Example:

*We should let **she** know before it's too late.* [Possible correction: *her*]

9. **Run-ons:** includes run-on sentences and comma splices (two or more independent clauses with no punctuation or conjunction to separate them or separated by only commas). Does not include teacher-originated suggestions to combine or separate sentences for stylistic purposes only.

Examples:

- (a) *Chinese people don't like to talk about their personal experience in life, people from Vietnam like to speak loud.* [Possible correction: **add and after life**]
- (b) *I lived in Mexico for fourteen years, I came to the United States without knowing a single word of English.* [Possible correction: **add and or so after years or change the comma to a semicolon**]

10. **Fragments:** includes either dependent (adverbial, noun, or relative) clauses standing alone as sentences or clauses missing a subject or verb

Example:

One stereotype is that the Islamic religion treats women so bad. Which is not true.

11. **Punctuation:** includes punctuation errors not related to run-ons, comma splices, or fragments (e.g., apostrophes, quotation marks, underlining, capitalization, commas, semicolons, colons, question marks)
12. **Spelling:** includes all errors in spelling except those coded into other specific categories (e.g., word choice, determiners, punctuation)
13. **Sentence structure:** includes missing and unnecessary words, word order, and other hard-to-classify problems related to syntax. Does not include run-ons, fragments, or comma splices.

Examples:

- (a) *... so I think that can be a problem for immigrants because for most of them they not legal in this country, so that makes them feel unhappy in this country.* [Possible corrections: **... because most of them are not legal ...**]
- (b) *You can even walk in the streets because there's always somebody is going to say something or do something to you.* [Possible correction: **... somebody who is going ...**]

14. **Informal:** includes use of informal transitional expressions such as "Well" or other lexical choices reflecting an inappropriately casual register (e.g. *guys, kids*)