Error reduction strategies in composition writing and teaching styles of language teachers in asist

Alexis A. Enriquez
Doctor of Education Major in Educational Management
Institution: Abra State Institute of Sciences and Technology
Address: Bangued Campus, Bangued, Abra, Philippines
E-mail: aenriquez@asist.edu.ph

Irene Claire Herida
Master of Arts in English
Institution: Abra State Institute of Sciences and Technology
Address: Bangued Campus, Bangued, Abra, Philippines

ABSTRACT
This study determined the respondents' list of errors, as well as syntactic rules, lexical rules, mechanics, and the best writing strategies, such as modeled, guided, and independent writing, as well as their teachers' diverse teaching styles. For modeled writing, comma splice had 14 occurrences, while run-on had 0 instances, however for modeled writing, comma splice had 15 occurrences, while run-on sentences had 8 occurrences. Comma splice appeared 31 times in the independent writing, whereas run-on appeared 18 times. In modeled writing as for lexical rules, inconsistency of tense had the highest number of instances (47), whereas misused pronoun had the lowest number of occurrences (9). Still, in guided writing, inconsistency of tense has the largest frequency (50), followed by misused pronoun (eight). In independent writing, there were 32 instances of incorrect subject-verb agreement, but only two occurrences of misused prepositions. As to mechanics, for modeled writing, misspelling had 37 occurrences, while incorrect capitalization had 23 and incorrect punctuation had 21. Misspelling received 30 in guided writing, whereas incorrect capitalization received 7. Misspelling occurred 110 times in independent writing, whereas incorrect punctuation occurred 49 times. Although there was no significant difference in the errors made by respondents when creating compositions utilizing the various writing strategies—modeled, guided, and independent—there was a significant difference in syntactic rules and mechanics. For syntactic rules, modeled and independent writing have -.351 and guided and independent writing have -0.255, which are both greater than the index of 0.209. However, guided and independent writing had -0.452, which was higher than the mechanics index of 0.298. The facilitator had the highest frequency of three, while expert, formal authority, and delegator had the same two, and the personal model had only one. This suggests that the Laboratory High School language instructors place a premium on the teacher and student interactions personal aspect. A facilitator, according to Grasha (1995), directs and encourages students to ask questions, explore options, give alternatives, and encourage them to create criteria to make informed decisions. His ultimate purpose is to help them develop the ability to take initiative, behave independently, and be responsible. He consults with students on their projects and attempts to provide as much support and encouragement as possible. Furthermore, facilitator model teachers are more likely to focus on activities. This teaching method emphasizes student-centered learning, and students are given significantly greater responsibility for satisfying the needs of various learning tasks. Teachers frequently make activities for the group which requires active practicing, to solve problem and peer partnership. The personal model was the least popular of the teaching techniques employed by language instructors in their classes. Teachers who teach in a demonstrator or personal model style are more likely to provide teacher-centered lessons that emphasize demonstration and modeling. This sort of instructor serves students via a

role model to display procedures and their skills as a guide or coach in assisting them to develop and apply the skills with a knowledge. The study concluded that independent writing can reduce errors in syntactic rules and mechanics but not in lexical rules. In addition, the facilitator as a language teacher's teaching style contributes to the decrease of syntactic rules and mechanics errors. Teachers should be encouraged to look into alternative error reduction writing strategies in order to acquire valuable feedback and use it for better and enhanced classroom instruction as a result of the findings and conclusions.

Keywords: modeled strategy, guided strategy, independent strategy, writing, error reduction.

1 INTRODUCTION

The English language is spoken all throughout the world, and it has brought people and countries closer together. It is a tool for talking with people and one of the most important languages in the world. Many people in the arts, sciences, politics, and economics speak this language. If one aspires to cope with world events, he must learn English so that he can communicate with people both orally and in writing. Listening, speaking, reading, writing, and viewing are the five macro-skills that make up languages. Every learner should be exposed to these skills in such a way that he or she can speak effectively and confidently. As a result, among these skills, writing remains a conundrum for language teachers. Composition writing is one of the macro-skills that students should master. It is being built so they may express their ideas and thoughts, something they cannot always do when speaking. It also provides an outlet for them to express or state their inner sentiments and experiences. However, writing involves not only ideas and thoughts, but also grammatical structures, sentence patterns, spelling, punctuation marks, the proper use of verb tenses, the proper use of prepositions, and even the proper word choice. Most students, however, find it difficult to compose papers devoid of numerous forms of faults. Making mistakes is one of the most inescapable aspects of life. In the course of learning a language, students benefit from their mistakes by receiving feedback that allows them to make fresh tries that get closer to their desired goals. As a result, they use errors as a weapon to better their writing skills. It is critical to distinguish between students' mistakes and errors when writing. Teachers, including myself, have been known to mistake one for the other.

Brown (2000) defines a "mistake" as a failure to use a recognized system appropriately, whereas a "error" is a noteworthy variation from adult grammar of a native speaker, demonstrating the learner's inter-language ability.

Errors and mistakes are distinct, according to Mourtaga (2004), because an error cannot be self-corrected and is caused by a learner's insufficient knowledge of the target language, but a mistake can be addressed. A mistake might be self-centered, but an error is systematic, according to Gass and Selinker (2001).

Even native English speakers make errors, making writing a challenging endeavor and skill to

master. It is a time-consuming process that necessitates meticulous language and mechanics. Teachers have found it incredibly difficult to motivate students to study, develop ideas, and organize them into an understandable or comprehensible piece of writing, as Dagdag (2002) points out. Students appear to have no idea how to study, and they also exhibit evidence of being unable to think or write beyond the phrase. As a result, many teachers are opposed to writing instruction.

As a result, the researchers sought to get involved in finding ways to reduce student errors. They intended to see how effective strategies like freewriting and strategy-based writing, which includes modeled, guided, and independent writing, were. They were interested in learning the best effective technique for teaching writing and honing students' skills.

Different strategies are employed to guide students in their writing activities in order for them to be able to avoid, minimize, and possibly eliminate errors.

In freewriting, one creates a paragraph by writing sentences on anything comes to mind. The writer writes without care for spelling, punctuation, or other aspects of writing, and makes no changes. If the writer cannot think of anything to write about, they write that they cannot think of anything till they come up with anything else. The writer is free to deviate from the theme, following his or her thoughts wherever they may go. A writer may undertake a targeted free write at times, allowing a chosen theme to structure their thoughts. Expanding on this theme, the mind may wander to draw connections and form more abstract perspectives on the subject. This allows a writer to go deeper into a topic before placing thoughts in a more basic framework.

Modeled Writing— The teacher thinks, creates, and writes aloud. The most teacher-directed strategy is modeled writing, in which the teacher writes in front of the students, producing the text and managing the pen. More crucially, the teacher "thinks aloud" about writing methods and skills all of the time. This allows students to hear the thought that goes along with the writing process. Choosing a topic, organizing your ideas, writing your rough copy utilizing a strategy, deleting repetitious information, and proofreading to rectify grammar or spelling issues are just a few examples. Students listen and watch during Modeled Writing with the explicit expectation that they will use these tactics on their own at some point in the future.

Guided Writing— While the teacher supervises the process, students design and write in small groups. In guided writing, the teacher advises the entire class or a small group of students with similar requirements while they compose a composition. While the teacher offers a structured lesson that guides the students through the writing process, the students take on the actual drafting responsibilities. The teacher keeps a tight eye on the students, which is why this technique works best in small groups. With a little teacher assistance, guided writing allows each student to generate his or her own work. The teacher's role in this strategy is to: 1) Observe and assess students' writing; 2) Meet with individuals or small groups

who have similar needs; 3) Actively prompt, coach, and guide individual students' writing skills; 4) Respond as a reader; 5) Ask open-ended questions; 6) Extend students' thinking in the process of composing; and 7) Foster writing independence

Independent Writing— While the teacher confers and supervises the students' progress, they create and write. In an independent writing paradigm, the student is in command of the drafting. Students produce sentences, paragraphs, stories, and essays using the writing process. The teacher keeps track of the students' development and intervenes as necessary. Writing centers, writing workshops, journal writing, and letter writing are all examples of ways to adopt this strategy. By providing chances for students to engage in authentic, purposeful writing, responding to the substance of students' writing, and aiding students with the revision and editing process, the teacher remains active. Under this technique, the student's role expands as he or she takes greater ownership of both the process and the product. In some circumstances, the student may choose themes and substance, as well as genre. Finally, the student should be in charge of his or her own revision and editing.

2 OBJECTIVES

General Objective:	To look into the best writing strategies for the group of respondents and to look into the effect of the different teaching styles of teachers.
Specific Objectives:	1) To list the errors committed by the students along: 　　a) syntactic rules 　　b) lexical rules, and 　　c)mechanics 2) To examine the teaching styles of the Language Teachers in the Laboratory High School Department

3 METHODOLOGY

To explain the answers of the students and teachers, the researchers used descriptive and experimental methods of investigation, as well as other error reduction procedures. The study used frequency counts, ANOVA, and the Scheffe test as statistical techniques.

Table 1. Frequency of Error Committed by the Respondents in Composition writing Exposed to Different Strategies

Errors	Strategies						Total	
	Modeled		Guided		Independent			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Syntactic Rules								
Comma Splice	14	6.60	15	7.14	31	12.60	60	8.98
Run-on	-	-	8	3.81	18	7.32	26	3.89
Sub-Total	**14**	**6.60**	**23**	**10.95**	**49**	**19.92**	**86**	**12.87**
Lexical Rules								
Inconsistency of Tense	47	22.17	50	23.81	20	8.13	117	17.51
Wrong Subject – Verb Agreement	44	20.75	41	19.52	32	13.01	117	17.51
Wrong Word Choice	10	4.72	21	10.00	20	8.13	51	7.63
Wrong Verb Form	5	2.36	10	4.76	20	8.13	35	5.24
Misused Preposition	2	0.94	-	-	-	-	2	0.30
Misused Pronoun	9	4.25	8	3.81	6	2.44	23	3.44
Sub-Total	**117**	**55.19**	**130**	**61.90**	**98**	**39.84**	**345**	**51.65**
Mechanics								
Wrong Capitalization	23	10.85	7	3.33	48	19.51	78	11.68
Misspelling	37	17.45	30	14.29	43	17.48	110	16.47
Wrong Punctuation Used	21	9.91	20	9.52	8	3.25	49	7.34
Sub-Total	**81**	**38.21**	**57**	**27.14**	**99**	**40.24**	**237**	**35.48**
Overall Total	**212**	**100.00**	**210**	**100.00**	**246**	**100.00**	**668**	**100.00**

According to the table, the respondents made mistakes in composition writing when employing modeled, guided, and independent writing styles.

With the syntactic rules, for the modeled writing, comma splice occurred 14 times, while run-on occurred zero times; for the guided writing, comma splice occurred 15 times, while run-on sentences occurred 8 times. There are 31 incidences of comma splice and 18 cases of run-on in the independent writing.

For modeled writing, inconsistency of tense with 47 instances and misused pronoun with 9 occurrences were the most common for lexical rules. In the guided writing, there were 50 instances of tense inconsistency, and 8 instances of misused pronouns. For independent writing, there were 32 instances of incorrect subject-verb agreement and 12 instances of misused preposition.

As to mechanics, for modeled writing, misspelling had 37 occurrences, incorrect capitalization had 23, and incorrect punctuation had 21 occurrences. Misspelling occurred 30 times in guided writing, whereas incorrect capitalization occurred 7 times. Misspelling occurred 110 times in independent writing, whereas incorrect punctuation occurred 49 times.

Table 2. ANOVA Summary Table on the Differences in the Errors Committed by the Respondents in Composition Writing When Grouped According to Different Strategies

Errors	F-Comp Value	F-Crit Value	F-Prob	Decision
Syntactic Rules	4.575	3.028	0.011(p<0.05)	Significant
Lexical Rules	0.810	3.029	0.446(p>0.06)	Not Significant
Mechanics	3.447	3.028	0.033(p<0.05)	Significant
As a Whole	**1.185**	**3.028**	**0.307(p>0.05)**	**Not Significant**

There was no significant difference in the errors made by the respondents in composition writing while using the different writing methods, namely modeled, guided, and independent, but there was a significant difference in syntactic rules and mechanics when using the different writing strategies.

Table 2a. Scheffe Test on the Significant Differences in the Errors Committed by the Respondents in Composition Writing When Grouped According to Different Strategies in terms of Syntactic Rules

Groups	Guided	Independent
Modeled	-0.096	-0.351*
Guided	-	-0.255*

S* = 0.209

The table shows that for syntactic rules, modeled writing and independent writing had -.351 and guided writing and independent writing had -0.255. This simply states that independent writing was more effective in eliminating errors in syntactic rules in writing than the modeled technique.

Table 2b. Scheffe test on the Significant Differences in the Errors Committed by the Respondents in Composition Writing When Grouped According to Different Strategies in terms of Mechanics

Groups	Guided	Independent
Modeled	0.247	-0.204
Guided	-	-0.452*

S* = 0.298

According to the table above, the difference between guided and independent writing is -0.452. This is higher than the mechanics index, which is 0.298. This means that for error reduction in mechanics, independent writing with a guided strategy outperformed the modeled technique.

Table 3 Teaching Styles of the Language Instructors

Teaching Styles	F	%
Expert	2	20
Formal Authority	2	20
Personal Model	1	10
Facilitator	3	30
Delegator	2	20
Total	10	100

With a frequency of three, the facilitator is the most common teaching technique, followed by expert, formal authority, and delegator with two each, and personal model with one. This simply implies

that the language instructors at Laboratory High School value the human part of teacher-student connections. Grasha (1995) defines a facilitator as someone that guides and supports students to ask questions, explore choices, and present alternatives, by encouraging students to find criteria for making notified decisions. His goal is to assist students in by developing their ability to take charge, act independently, and be accountable. He gives students advice on their projects and tries to be as supportive and encouraging as possible.

Facilitator model teachers are also more likely to concentrate on activities. Students are given much more responsibility for meeting the needs of various learning activities under this teaching technique, which stresses student-centered learning. Teachers commonly create group activities that demand active learning, peer interaction, cooperation, and problem-solving. The personal model was the least used of the language instructors' teaching methods in their classes. Teachers who teach in a demonstrator or personal model manner are more likely to use demonstration and modeling in their sessions. This type of educator organizes the model of role to students by observing skills and procedures by way of a coach or guide of students to help develop and apply during training the skills and knowledge.

4 CONCLUSIONS

Findings delivered the following conclusions were drawn:

1.   Independent writing can be used to decrease errors in syntactic rules and mechanics, but not for lexical rule error reduction.

2.   Facilitator as a language teacher's teaching style contributes to the elimination of syntactic rules and mechanics errors.

RECOMMENDATION

With the above conclusions, the following recommendation is hereby forwarded:

1.   Teachers are advised to investigate different error reduction writing tactics in order to gather useful feedback and improve their classroom instruction.

REFERENCES

1. Abisamra. (2003). An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speakers English Writings.

Retrieved fromhttp://abisamra03.tripod.com/nada/languageacqerroranalysis.html.

2. Alley, M. (1987). The Craft of Scientific Writing. New York. Prentice-Hall.

3. Al-bakri, L. M. (1998). Error analysis of spelling mistakes committed by English majors at Yarmouk University. Unpublish master's thesis. Yarmouk University,   Irbid,   Jordan.

4. Al-Mutib, Saleh. (1989). Punctuation and reading comprehension among seventh and eighth-grade students in a university lab school: an assessment. Ph.D. Florida   State University Order No. AAD90-04988 Source DAI P3195 Vol 50/10-A.

5. Awad, Ahmed. (2012). The Most Common Punctuation Errors Made by the English and the TEFL Majors at An-Najah National University. An - Najah Univ. J. Res.   (Humanities).   Vol.   26(1), 2012.

6. Bataineh, R.F. (2005). Jordanian Undergraduate EFL Students' Errors in the Use of the Indefinite. Asian EFL Journal, March 2005, Volume 7. Issue 1, Article 5

7. Bhatia, Aban T. (1974). An error analysis of students' compositions. IRAL. Vol. 12/4.