

Effectiveness of the Error Correction Strategies in Improving Senior High Students' English Writing in China^{*}

XIAO Dan

Southwest University, Chongqing, China

QIU Feng

Chengdu Hi-Tech Dayuan School, Chengdu, China

Errors are inevitable in senior high students' writing practice. However, it is worthwhile improving students writing through teaching intervention in English writing class. The researchers of this study turn the research perspective to the error correction strategies and put forward a framework of error correction in which the preparation work before the correction process and the reviewing work after the correction process are emphasized besides the correction stage, and each stage has the respective aim and theoretical bases. The effectiveness of this framework is testified through an empirical study. The findings of the research are supposed to contribute a new perspective to the teaching of English writing in senior high schools.

Keywords: errors, error correction strategies, English writing, senior high students

Introduction

English writing plays a significant role in language learning, because it is the only level that could truly reflect a learner's language proficiency (LIU, 1999). However, for most senior middle school students in China, English writing, among the four basic skills, is the most difficult skill for them to master. One of the reasons may be that writing places high demands on accuracy, fluency, coherence, and organization compared with other language skills; another reason may be that the English teachers lack proper methodologies in English writing teaching. For most English teachers, they feel it is a headache to teach English writing and it is very unpleasant and burdensome to correct students' English writings. Even though teachers spend a lot of time in correcting errors in students' writing, it usually has little effect in improving students' writing skill.

True, there are many previous studies on errors and the correction strategies in English writing, through a careful study, but it can be easily found that there are still many problems in the real English writing teaching practice.

Firstly, although errors in English writing have always been a focus in second language research and teaching, those researches mainly focus on the clarification of errors in students' English writing and the reasons to explain those errors. Errors at the surface level, such as grammatical errors and substance errors, catch

^{*} This paper is one of the research results of the project "Constructing Teacher Research Group for Teacher Learning in Higher Education" sponsored by 2013-2014 Higher Education Scientific Research of Chongqing Higher Education Association (Grant No. CQGJ13B320) and the project "Cognitive research in intercultural language teaching" sponsored by Chongqing liberal arts key base, 2014 (Grant No. 20500710).

XIAO Dan, associate professor, Ph.D. candidate, College of International Studies, Southwest University.

QIU Feng, teacher, Chengdu Hi-Tech Dayuan School.

teachers' attention easily, while unity, coherence, and language idiomaticity are always ignored during the assessing procedure.

Secondly, teachers' correction work is not effective enough. Some teachers usually grade students' composition generally and give simply comments without highlighting the errors; while others only single out and correct those mechanical errors such as spelling or grammar errors without pointing out whether the expression and coherence is acceptable or not by native speakers. On the whole, teachers lack strategies to correct students' English writing.

Thirdly, even though teachers adopt some correction strategies in editing the English compositions, the situation is not quite satisfactory. The error correction work usually follows the routine procedure and mainly focus on "how to correct", with the three steps: self-correction, peer-correction, and teacher correction, but these correction strategies are separated from each other, without melting into a whole system.

The above-mentioned problems give the rational for the study which is aimed at exploring an effective way to improve students' writing. In this paper, a framework of error correction is proposed, and the effectiveness of this framework is testified through an empirical study. The findings of the research are supposed to contribute a new perspective to the teaching of English writing in senior high schools.

Theoretical Framework

Several theoretical bases are mentioned for establishing the framework of the study, namely, the *National English Curriculum Standards* (NECS) in China, the washback effects of National Matriculation English Test (NMET), social constructivism, and learning strategies.

The National English Curriculum Standards (NECS)

NECS provides the foundation in planning and organizing teaching, compiling teaching materials, and testing the teaching effect. In NECS, the requirements for English writing in senior high schools expand from Band-6 to Band-9. For the senior high school graduates, they are required to reach the objectives of Band-8, which requires that students be able to write a coherent and well-organized passage, expressing ideas and attitudes clearly; to write a summary of a text; to write paragraphs or reports based on the words or diagrams given.

Apart from the English writing objectives, NECS puts forward high demands in judging the quality of English writing for senior high students. It states that teachers should score the English compositions from the following five aspects: the key points of content, the language use, organization and fluency, format, and register with five-band rating scale.

The Washback Effects of National Matriculation English Test (NMET)

In the NMET, English writing is one of the most important and difficult section. The goal of English writing in NMET is to assess students' ability to produce a grammatically correct and coherent text on a given topic with key content points listed. After the examination, the writing task is holistically scored by trained raters on a five-band rating scale.

The washback effect of NMET is always a research focus to teachers because writing is not only the purpose but also the means of language learning. The term "washback" is generally defined as the effect of testing on

teaching and learning. According to the Washback Hypothesis of Alderson and Wall (1993), test will influence what teachers teach, how teachers teach, the rate and sequence of teaching, the degree and depth of teaching, and the attitudes to the content and method of teaching; at the same time, test will influence what learners learn, how learners learn, the rate and sequence of learning, the degree and depth of learning, and the attitudes to the content and method of learning. Just as Heaton (2000) mentions, testing has been one of the greatest single beneficial forces in changing the direction of language teaching in many areas and in encouraging the more responsive teachers to examine not only their own teaching methods but also the language they are teaching.

Social Constructivism

Social constructivism emphasizes that learning takes place in a socio-cultural environment and views learners as active constructors of their own learning environment. In this theory, learners are not viewed as isolated individuals, but as active participants. It emphasizes the importance of what learner brings to the learning situation as meaning-maker and problem-solver. Besides, it admits the dynamic nature of the interaction between teachers, learners, and tasks, and provides a view of learning as arising from interactions with others.

One fundamental concept in social constructivism is the idea of “scaffolding”, which metaphorically refers to the support provided by others, such as teachers, peers, parents, or reference resources like dictionary. Thus, efficient scaffolding enables students to achieve great progress forward in their language learning activities.

Another important theory links with the concept of scaffolding is what Vygotsky (1978) calls the learner's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). By this he is referring to the range of tasks and activities which the student can achieve with scaffolding, but which may be beyond his current abilities if he is unassisted (Vygotsky, 1978). From the ZPD theory, it is known that working with another person, either the teacher or a more competent peer at the level that is just above the learner's present capabilities is the best way for the learner to move into the next level.

Learning Strategies

Learning strategies are the operations employed by the learners to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information. More specifically, learning strategies are “the special actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (Oxford, 1990, p. 8). Appropriate language learning strategies may promote proficiency improvement and self-confidence building.

Clarification and summarizing are no doubt the very helpful strategies for cognitive study. Making a written summary of the newly gained information is helpful in catching the important language points and developing a clear mind (WU, 2002). These cognitive strategies can effectively reduce the difficulty in learning a large amount of information and speed the learning process (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

Framework of Error Correction for the Research

With the above theories as the foundation, a framework of error correction (see Table 1) is put forward by the researchers of this study. This framework can be divided into three stages, and each stage has been supported by different theories.

Table 1

Framework of Error Correction

Procedure	Steps	Aims	Theoretical bases
Awareness-raising	Discussion about the topic and provision of the necessary input.	Being aware of the standards and criteria in scoring the English composition	(1) <i>English Curriculum Standards</i> (2) The washback effect of NMET
Correction strategy	(1) Self-correction (2) Peer-correction (3) Teacher-correction	(1) For autonomous study (2) For cooperation & communication (3) For evaluation & feedback	Social constructivism (scaffolding & mediation)
Records-keeping	Classification Summarizing	For reviewing	Learning strategies

The stages and steps in the framework of error correction are as follows:

Stage 1: to raise students' awareness

According to the NECS and the NMET, the criteria for scoring English compositions usually concern the fulfillment of the content, language, and organization. Therefore, with this guiding principle, teachers should make students aware of the key points of the content, constructing the language expression and organization.

Stage 2: to combine correction strategies together

After finishing their compositions, students follow three steps to revise their product.

First, students will be provided opportunities to do self-correction, which is a means for autonomous study. The technique of self-correction enables students to activate their linguistic competence and improve their linguistic creativity. However, it is only more efficient in correcting the writing errors in surface level, but less efficient in deep level ones.

Second, after the self-correction, students can exchange their compositions with their partners. Through this cooperative activity, students can get some fresh ideas from their partners, and more importantly, they may point out some errors committed by their partners and they can avoid these kinds of errors in their own writings. The shift from self-correction to peer-correction is useful for students to consider the outside world and be more sensitive to others' point of view. Consequently, writing tasks turn out to be communicative activities and become more meaningful to students.

Third, teacher-correction is indispensable. Self-correct and peer-correction can be better achieved with teachers' feedback. Teachers' job is to identify students' unrecognizable problems such as coherence and appropriateness, and provide remedy if necessary. At the end of the correction stage, teachers should evaluate the writing as a whole and provide immediate feedback.

According to the "Zone of proximal development" theory, students can best absorb the knowledge that is just beyond their current level. If the errors found by students themselves or peer correctors belong to this type, these errors can be avoided consciously in their future writing and consequently, their knowledge system will be enlarged in a natural way. Teachers' job at the correction stage is to function as the "scaffolding" or "mediation"—to provide help when it is necessary.

Stage 3: to keep records after the revising

At this stage, students should summarize the errors from their own writing and make clarification of these errors in documents. As more and more errors will be accumulated from their own output, the documents will be more important because these documents can reflect the longitudinal progress of the learning process. Furthermore, students can review these documents at regular intervals. According to "Ebbinghaus Forgetting

Curve", information will be forgotten very quickly without immediate reviewing.

Research Design

The error analysis is regarded as the methodology in dealing with the errors in students' English compositions and in testifying the effectiveness of the framework of error correction.

Research Question

According to the aim of this study, the following question is investigated:

Can the proposed framework of error correction effectively prevent errors so as to improve students' English composition?

Subjects

In order to testify the effectiveness of the proposed framework of error correction, an empirical study is carried out. It is one of the key schools in Chongqing. The participants of this research are composed of 100 students from two classes of Grade 2 from a senior high school, Chongqing, China with the same English teachers. Class A is the experimental class in which participants are instructed formally in how to use the framework of error correction to improve their writing proficiency. Class B is the control class in which participants are instructed in the traditional way. Students continue to take the previous revising procedure and technique without any trying of the proposed framework.

Research Instruments

The method used in this research is a combination of quantitative and qualitative studies, in which the empirical study is in the dominant position while the descriptive studies serve as the supplement. The instrument for quantitative study is the writing tasks and that for qualitative study is the questionnaire and interview.

All the participants are asked to write compositions with the same requirements. These requirements are similar to those in the writing tests in NMET. After finishing the writing tasks, all the valid compositions are read, corrected and scored by the same English teacher, who is well qualified in English teaching. Using the data collected from participants' writing in the pre-test and post-test, the researcher in this research makes the error identification and classification. Then, SPSS 13.0 is used to process these data in order to examine the research hypothesis.

Between the pre-test and the post-test is a teaching intervention during which students altogether wrote eight compositions.

The questionnaire used in the present research is cited from the GU Yu-hong's (2006), with some questions concerning the peer-correction (items 15, 16) and the record-keeping (item 20) added to the questionnaire in the present study. Altogether, there are 20 items in this questionnaire to elicit the participants' true situations in English writing. On the whole, this questionnaire can be divided into four parts (see Table 2).

Altogether, there are 10 questions in this interview. Questions 1-4 are designed to inquire students' specific improvement in English writing. Question 5 is about the methods in improving students' writing competence. Question 6 concerns students' opinions to teacher's feedback. Questions 7-8 are related to students' attitude toward record-keeping. The last two questions are about students' overall improvement and suggestions to English writing teaching.

Table 2

Layout of the Questionnaire

Dimensions	Items
Learning background	1-5
The preparations in pre-writing	6-8
The strategies used in while-writing	9-13
The correction strategies in post-writing	14-20

Research Procedure

The whole process of the empirical study extends over four months, and it includes the following periods: the pre-test, the survey, the teaching intervention, the post-test, and the interview.

The experiment (teaching intervention) was carried out after the pre-test for Class A and it lasted 16 weeks. Every two weeks, students from both classes were asked to write a composition with the same requirements. Altogether, eight compositions were written during the teaching intervention.

Results and Discussion

What follows are the reports and interpretation of the results of the research. It mainly includes: the analysis of the questionnaire, the analysis of the errors in the pre-test and post-test, and the analysis of the interview.

Analysis of the Questionnaire

The result of the questionnaire offers the background information of the participants and indicates the space of the improvement in the teaching of the English writing. According to students' responses, it can be easily found that the practice in English writing in senior high school is far from enough. Before writing, students are not fully activated, and in the writing process, students who adopt some useful writing strategies are relatively few. This means that students are more likely to commit more errors in the English compositions as the preparation work in before-writing is poor and the writing strategies in while-writing are not satisfied enough. According to the survey, the number of students who do self-correction and peer-correction is quite limited and most students mainly rely on teacher's correction. Furthermore, after getting the feedback, no matter from peers or teacher, most students have no habit of keeping records. This means that few students incline to summarize and reflect.

Analysis of the Errors in the Pre-test and Post-test

In the teaching intervention, participants are required to write an English composition every two weeks (altogether eight compositions) and the procedure in the proposed framework is strictly followed during the process of English writing. When the teaching intervention is over, a post-test (to write an English composition titled with "An English Editor Wanted") is carried out, which is compared to the pre-test (to write an invitation letter). To compare the number of errors in the pre-test and the post-test can reflect whether the framework of error correction can facilitate students' writing competence.

Classification of the writing errors. According to different principles, errors can be classified into different categories. Here, James' (2001) criteria of categorizing errors are followed.

According to James, there are four levels of language: the level of substance, the level of lexicon, the level of grammar, and the level of cohesion. Each level can be further divided into sub-levels. Errors can occur at each

level of language.

In addition to the above four levels of error, the researchers here add another level according to the requirement of the study, that is, the content (see Table 3), because NMET points out that the criteria for scoring English compositions include the fulfillment of the content, besides language and organization. Therefore, according to the needs of the present study, the unfulfillment of the points of the content is regarded as another type of error.

Table 3

Five Levels of Errors

1. Substance	2. Lexicon	3. Grammar	4. Cohesion	5. Content
(1) punctuation (2) spelling	(1) word choice (2) collocation	(1) morphology (2) syntax	(1) references (2) substitution (3) ellipsis (4) conjunction (5) lexical coherence	key points

From the table above, it can be found that the levels 1-3 are concerned with language, and the level 4 concerns organization, while level 5 is at the level of content. The consideration of the above aspects can just satisfy the requirements for scoring the English compositions in NMET. Some examples of the respective type of errors are presented here.

Substance errors. Substance errors can be divided into two types: spelling and punctuation. This kind of errors is common in beginners' writings and is relatively easy to overcome. Here are some examples:

Example (1) An English Editor Whanted (Wanted)

Example (2) First, you should choose beautiful articles from magazines and Internet. Than, you should choose and edit students' articles. (Then)

Lexical errors. Lexical errors in this paper mainly refer to the semantic or conceptual errors in lexis where the subjects use forms that exist in the target language but these forms do not represent the meanings they wish to express. Statistics in this study show that lexical errors account for the highest proportion of the total errors. This means that vocabulary is of essential importance in language learning. Lexical errors mainly involve two types, namely, errors in word choices and those in collocations. Here are some examples:

Example (3) You must be willing to spend more free time do something for other students. (doing)

Example (4) You are willing to devote yourself spare time to the edition work. (your)

Grammatical errors. Grammar has traditionally been discussed in terms of morphology and syntax aspects. In this paper, morphological errors mainly refer to morphological markers of plurality, lenitive, third-person singular, and so on. Syntax errors include errors of phrase, clause, sentence, and ultimately paragraphs, such as disordered sentences, dangling modifiers, wrong sentence patterns, wrong verb tense, and so on. Here are some examples:

Example (5) If you become a editor, you will have some tasks. (an)

Example (6) Join us will never be wrong. (Joining)

Cohesion errors. Here cohesion refers to the "cohesive ties", a term created by Halliday and Hasan (2007) which involves such contents as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical coherence.

An examination of the sample compositions shows that cohesion errors are a recurring problem in students' writing and can be an obstacle to their success in writing. Unfortunately, unlike grammatical errors which can be easily corrected, cohesive errors are often more difficult to handle as they involve a chunk of units, such as a series of sentences or paragraphs. Because of the difficulties in correcting these errors, students sometimes do not get sufficient insights into their errors. Here are some examples:

Example (7) Choose the articles *what* are suitable for students from magazines or webs. (which)

Example (8) *For another*, you must be good at English and Art. (For another thing)

Content errors. According to the needs of the present study, the unfulfillment of the points of the content is regarded as another level of error. Some students may miss this point, while others may miss another point.

Data of the pre-test and post-test. After the English teacher's correction of the errors in the pre-test and post-test, the researcher carefully classified the errors into different categories.

Table 4

Numbers of Errors in the Pre-test and Post-test

Error types	Pre-test		Post-test	
	EC	CC	EC	CC
Substance	65	70	41	64
Lexicon	146	150	117	148
Grammar	108	100	84	94
Cohesion	49	50	34	45
Content	18	22	11	21
Total	386	392	287	372

Note. NE stands for numbers of errors, EC for experimental class, CC for control class.

From Table 4, it can be easily found that all subjects are most likely to commit lexical errors. Grammatical errors rank the second, and then follow substance errors and cohesion errors. Though the proportion is the least, students still have some problems in fulfilling the requirements for content of English writing. Although the proportions are a little different among different groups in different tests, on the whole, the ranks for each type of errors are still the same. This means that students' performances at the lexical and grammatical levels in English writing are most unsatisfying and need more efforts to be improved.

In order to see whether there is significant difference between the subjects from the experimental class (EC) and control class (CC), the researcher conducts Independent-Samples T-test here (see Tables 5 and 6).

In order to see whether there is significant improvement in the experimental class after four-month training program, the researcher uses the errors in the post-test to conduct Independent-Samples T-test (see Tables 7 and 8).

Table 5

Group Statistics of the Errors in Pre-test

	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
EC	50	7.7200	3.48197	0.49242
CC	50	8.4200	3.80166	0.53764

Table 6

Independent Samples Test of the Errors in Pre-test

	T-test for Equality of Means						
	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% CID	
						Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	-0.960	98	0.339	-0.70000	0.72906	-2.14680	0.74680
Equal variances not assumed	-0.960	97.253	0.339	-0.70000	0.72906	-2.14694	0.74694

Note. CID stands for confidence interval of the difference.

Table 7

Group Statistics of the Errors in Post-test

	<i>N</i>	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error mean
EC	50	5.7400	2.51372	0.35549
CC	50	8.000	3.68114	0.52060

Table 8

Independent Samples Test of the Errors in Post-test

	T-test for Equality of Means						
	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean difference	Std. error difference	95% CID	
						Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	-3.585	98	0.001	-2.26000	0.63039	-3.51000	-1.00900
Equal variances not assumed	-3.585	86.536	0.001	-2.26000	0.63039	-3.51307	-1.00693

Here is the descriptive statistics of the pre-test and post-test:

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics of the Two Tests in Two Classes

	EC			CC			<i>p</i> -value (2-tailed)
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	
Pre-test	50	7.7200	3.48197	50	8.4200	3.80166	0.339
Post-test	50	5.7400	2.51372	50	8.000	3.68114	0.001

Note. *SD* stands for standard deviation.

Table 9 shows the statistic analysis of the errors in the pre-test and post-test between the experimental class and control class. For the pre-test, the statistics in this table reveals that the mean for experimental class is 7.7200 and 8.4200 for control class. Standard deviations for both classes are 3.48197 and 3.80166. The t-test shows that the whole level of the two classes before experiment has no obvious difference. In other words, the two classes started almost from the same level.

In the post-test, the means for the experimental class and control class are respectively 5.7400 and 8.000, which means that the participants in the experimental class commit fewer errors than the participants do in the control class in the post-test. For the experimental class, there is an obvious decrease (1.98), and the t-test shows that the progress has achieved the significance level with $p = 0.001$. However, there is only a slight change for the

control class (0.42), which does not reach the statistic requirements.

The above data show that after employing the framework of error correction in English writing for four months, students commit fewer errors in the experimental class than the students do in the control class. In other words, the writing competence of the students in the experimental class is better than that of the students in the control class. Therefore, it can be naturally concluded that the framework of error correction can effectively prevent errors in senior high students' English composition.

Analysis of the Interview

This interview was conducted at the end of the post-test in order to further explore students' psychological process in using the framework of error correction to prepare or revise the compositions, and 20 individuals were randomly selected from the experimental class and were interviewed. The whole process of interview was recorded.

The first four questions are about the specific improvement in English writing. *"After the discussion, I can fully understand the requirements and get to know what I will write down."* *"The pre-writing discussion helps me to make a clear organization."* *"If the teacher helps us to comprehend the topic, I will make few mistakes in the writing."* Most interviewees believe that the discussion before writing is very helpful in improving the performance in organization and content, and it benefits the grammar and vocabulary to some degree. As far as the correction strategies are concerned, most participants think that self-correction is most helpful in improving the performance at the surface level, such as grammar and vocabulary. *"I can find some spelling mistakes and a few grammatical errors."* *"I usually focus on the accuracy of the diction."* Many subjects say that they pay comparatively more attention to vocabulary, including ways of enlarging their vocabulary, the accuracy of word choosing, and the understanding of the undertone and usage of the new words. At the same time, most interviewees agree that peer-correction works better in improving the performance in organization and content while teacher's correction can cover the whole aspects, from the surface level to the deep level.

For question No. 5 (the methods in improving students' writing competence), almost all the interviewees admit that the preparation work and the correction process are very crucial.

Student A said: *"I like the pre-writing discussion. In this discussion, my mind is opened and everyone can brainstorm a lot."* *"Discussion before the writing is fun. I can exchange my thoughts with others"*, student B said. The interview shows that if the English teacher leads the students to discuss the topic and carry out the brainstorming procedure, they will not be afraid or even hate to write the English compositions.

Moreover, the introduction of some sentence patterns or useful expression is very helpful in lowering down the anxiety before the writing practice. The preparation work can help students have a lot to say in the writing process instead of using some empty words. Someone said: *"If teacher tells us some works and phrases, my writing will be better."* Another said: *"If we prepare well, I can write well because I have a lot to say."*

In the interview, many students give high praise to the correction work. One student said: *"If I can correct some spelling and grammatical errors after I check my own writing, I can have a sense of achievement. It feels good."* *"It is hard to make no mistake in my writing... My peer can find some errors in my composition that I can not find."* *"If my partner or the teacher points out some errors in my writing, I can remember that better and avoid make the same mistake again."* In this interview, students admit that committing errors is inevitable in their

compositions, but the combination use of the different correction strategies is very helpful in getting rid of those errors.

Furthermore, many students show their special interest in the afterwards work, such as the whole class discussion and the exhibition of the excellent copies. Students find that the exhibition of the excellent compositions can stimulate their interest and impulse to make more improvement in their own work.

Question 6 is about students' opinions to teacher's feedback. More than half of the interviewees hope that the English teacher can point out all the errors in their compositions and it is much better if these errors are corrected by the teacher so that they can avoid the same kind of errors in their future writing. *"I hope teacher can mark all the errors in my writing."* *"If teacher could tell me the right forms, not just underline the mistakes, it is much better."* On the whole, interviewees show great interest in teacher's feedback. Many students express that they seldom pay attention to the correctness of the sentences except the part that the teacher has crossed out. Consequently, they may continue to commit the same error again without being aware of it if the error is not obviously picked out by the teacher. *"Unless teacher tells me there is something wrong in my sentence, I can hardly notice that."* *"If the teacher does not point out my error, I will take it as the right form and continue to make sentence in the same way."*

Questions 7-8 concern students' attitude toward record-keeping. Half of the students find that it is a useful and practical way to learn from their own errors. *"To summarize the errors from my own writing is really helpful. I can learn from my own errors."* *"After I have a regular review with the records, my English is better."* If students insist on summarizing the errors from their own writing and making clarification of these errors in documents, they can effectively avoid committing the same errors again. Furthermore, if they review those records regularly, the learning rate will be speeded up in a considerable way.

Questions 9-10 are about students' overall improvement and suggestions to the teaching of English writing. Many interviewees acknowledge that the four-month teaching intervention is very helpful in improving their English writing competence. As one student says: *"The English writing teaching in this semester is good."* *"I make a lot progress in my English writing."* More than half of them admit that they used to leave their writing products aside after they finish the work, partly because they are lazy and partly because they do not realize the significance of doing self-observation and fail to regard it as a good opportunity to make full use of the different feedback from others. *"I used to take a quick glance at teacher's feedback and then leave it aside."* *"I seldom do self-correction before, but now I know the benefit of that."* But with the teaching intervention, they gradually find the effectiveness in using the correction strategies. *"I find the benefit of self-correction and peer-correction that I did not notice before."* Obviously, the flexible adoption of the three different correction strategies helps students benefit a lot in improving their writing ability and consequently speed up the learning process in foreign language acquisition.

Conclusion

The present study attempts to explore whether the proposed framework of error correction can improve the English writing teaching in senior high school. According to the results of the findings, it is revealed that the framework of error correction can effectively prevent errors in senior high students' English writing. In other words, the proposed framework of error correction can considerably improve senior high students' English

writing competence. Although this study has some limitations, it can help the teachers in senior high schools adjust their teaching plan in their future teaching of the English writing.

References

- Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 115-129.
- GU, Y. H. (2006). *An Analysis on errors made by senior high school students in English writing and some pedagogical suggestions* (Master's thesis). Shanghai International Studies University, Shanghai.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (2007). *Cohesion in English*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Heaton, J. B. (2000). *Writing English language tests*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- James, C. (2001). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research.
- LIU, R. Q. (1999). *Research methods in foreign language teaching*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Mass.: MBT Press.
- WU, B. H. (2002). *English learning strategy*. Beijing: People's Education Press.