

Selective Direct and Indirect Feedback on Grammatical Error Reduction

Ana Louella N. Navarro, John Harry S. Caballo, Cristy Grace A. Ngo

Faculty, The University of Mindanao, Davao City, Philippines

Abstract: The purpose of this study was to compare two feedback strategies - Selective Direct Feedback (SDF) and Selective Indirect Feedback (SIF) - in reducing grammatical errors in the writing of senior high school Humanities and Social Science students. The participants were 120 senior high school Humanities and Social Science students whose essays were evaluated for grammatical errors before and after receiving SDF and SIF from their teacher. The results showed that both SDF and SIF led to a significant decrease in grammatical errors in the students' writing. However, the reductions in errors were not significantly different between the two feedback methods.

Keywords: Education, Error Correction, Selective Direct Feedback, Selective Indirect Feedback.

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a critical skill that students must develop for academic and professional success (Alamis, 2010). It is one of the four fundamental language domains, along with reading, speaking, and listening. It plays a major role in language learning as students need strong writing abilities to demonstrate their competence on examinations (Afrin, 2016; Gatcho & Ramos, 2020). However, many students struggle and regard it as the most complex language skill to master (Maysuroh et al., 2017; Gatcho & Ramos, 2020).

Studies from universities around the world have revealed various challenges students face with writing. Teachers at the University of Qatar noticed weak writing skills among English learners in their courses. It was discovered that most of the grammatical errors students made were related to verbs, relative clauses, articles, fragments, noun modifiers, and prepositions (Al-Buainain, 2011). A study in Bangladesh found spelling mistakes to be the most common issue. Students made errors including letter omission, addition, transposition, and substitution. Another major problem was improper tense usage, with students unaware of mixing present and past tense within paragraphs or sentences. Additional errors were found in subject-verb agreement, punctuation, fragments, prepositions, numbers, pronouns, word usage, and capitalization (Afrin, 2016). In Indonesia, Habibi et al. (2017) identified seven key problems: poor organization/illogical sequence, word choice issues, grammatical errors, spelling issues, supporting idea confusion, punctuation issues, and capitalization issues. Research in Pakistan revealed students struggled with logical thinking, intended expression, and repeating ideas in academic writing (Arif et al., 2020). Moreover, studies in Metro Manila found most students' writing problems related to verbs, nouns, and prepositions (Gatcho & Ramos, 2020).

Errors occur when learners try to produce language beyond their current level of knowledge. Harmer (1998) and Perera (2018) share similar ideas about the two major causes of errors. One is interference from the native language, and the second is developmental errors. Interference from the native language refers to the influence exerted by a learner's first language over their acquisition of a second language (Perera, 2018). Meanwhile, Derakshan and Karimi (2015) define interference as errors caused or triggered by the first language while using a second language. On the other hand, developmental errors are the products of conscious and

subconscious processing which often distorts a rule when the learner assumes how a language works (Harmer, 1998; 2007). In the field of Second Language Acquisition, whether teachers should correct errors in student outputs has long been debated. Some studies have shown considerable positive effects, while others have shown no significant change in students' writing competency (Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2011).

The effectiveness of error correction has been questioned by many researchers. Pan (2010) found that some studies show error correction has minimal significance on students' second language accuracy compared to providing teacher comments or allowing no feedback at all. In addition, Truscott (2007) shared the idea that correction acts as a distraction from developing important skills like expressing ideas. Alroe (2011) mentioned studies by Cohen and Robbins (1976) and Hendrickson (1979) who held views similar to Truscott, stating that error correction can have negative effects on learners. However, they noted that the problem lies more in how correction is implemented rather than the practice itself. Related to this debate, Chkotua (2012) noted that Eskey (1983) and Horowitz (1986) raised concerns about whether strict adherence to process approaches would sufficiently address the challenges faced by authors struggling with language acquisition and developing their proficiency. Parallel to this idea, Hunt (1992), mentioned by Diab (2006), stated that feedback should focus on content and organization while avoiding form-focused feedback. Hunt recommended peer reviews and student-teacher conferences as two valuable alternative feedback methods to traditional error correction.

Despite the contradictions from many, Ferris (2003), Ashwell (2000), Cardelle and Corno (1981) have shown a positive correlation between student writing accuracy and teacher's error feedback (cited in Pan, 2010). Although there have been many studies conducted to unravel the truth behind the effects of error correction on writing skills, they are still far from being conclusive and each study is greatly significant to different groups of people attached to error correction (Diab, 2006). Learners and teachers also have specific roles to play in error correction to effectively impact writing competency. Learners play a big part in the learning process. Icy (2005) posited that students are eager to receive corrections from their teacher, believing it will benefit them. It is also believed that the corrections students receive make them aware of their strengths, which they can use to overcome weaknesses (Abdul, 2014). Thus, for successful transfer of learning, learners must help teachers set expectations in the classroom. They should monitor and allow students to monitor their own progress, paying close attention to common errors and learning to be self-reliant (Jimena et al., 2005). Furthermore, In the study of Alfonso (2016), students reported committing errors due to a lack of grammar knowledge. In this case, corrections may be ineffective because as Hattie and Timperley (2007) stated, "feedback has no effect in a vacuum." This means if students are unfamiliar with the material, teacher corrections will not impact them since they cannot relate to the new information. Given this, the teacher's role in correction is crucial.

Teachers should not disregard what students think and feel about their desired methods of learning. With the right attitude, when teachers help students develop a mindset appreciating the benefits of personalized error correction, writing skills can improve (Wang, 2010). Lewis (2002) also stated that giving feedback benefits not only students but also teachers by providing insight into student progress, and indirectly evaluating teaching quality (as cited in Abdul, 2014). Ferris (2003) noted that matching the learning styles of students in a class and the teaching style of the instructor can help improve learning, attitude, behavior, and motivation (as cited in Hamouda, 2011). Otherwise, failure can discourage students from writing (Diab, 2006). Highlighting this, Huang (2002) mentioned Corder's (1967) proposition that error analysis benefits three aspects: researchers/linguists, language teachers, and the learners themselves.

Studies have suggested various strategies to address writing problems. Students were taught using a process approach where they were encouraged to learn writing through pre-writing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing stages (Maysuroh et al., 2017). Other suggested strategies included strengthening students' vocabulary, emphasizing grammar training, providing

stylistic knowledge, and conducting outline training in writing classes. These recommendations were based on an analysis that found four key mistakes in students' writing: morphology, syntax, stylistic, and structure errors (Yapin, 2010). Furthermore, critical reading and frequent teacher feedback were recommended to help overcome academic writing challenges (Arif et al., 2020). In addition, Aliakbari and Toni (2009) investigated which of three correction methods - indirect coded correction feedback, indirect uncoded error correction, or direct correction feedback - would most affect students' grammatical accuracy.

The existing literature on writing challenges faced by students and the effectiveness of error correction in enhancing writing skills has provided valuable insights into various aspects of language learning. In this study, the researchers utilized two correction strategies, Selective Direct Feedback (SDF) and Selective Indirect Feedback. The findings of the study may give teachers more information on how to use error correction strategies that can lessen the grammatical errors of students. Furthermore, it can also discover which error correction would be better to use to see more improvement in the outputs of the students.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Error Correction

Error correction may be done in many ways such can be: comprehensive, selective, direct, and indirect error correction, all of which have been studied and used in numerous ways.

Hyland (2006) explained that despite the positive view of students toward the feedback given by teachers, its impact on the development of writing competency remains unclear whether in an immediate impact on revisions to drafts or on the longer-term development of their writing skills. Recently, however, a growing body of literature has been noticed with regard to the efficacy of error correction on the written outputs of students. Minor interest was given to surface errors in acquiring the first language, yet, have been a focus of SLA research for some time (Greenslade & Felix-Brasdefer, 2006). Evidence has also been observed that points to the improvement of language accuracy especially when students were asked to revise their outputs (Ashwell, 2000; Fathman & Whalley, 1990; Ferris, 1999, 2006; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; cited in Farrokhi and Sattapour, 2011). Moreover, Hosseiny (2014) has also referenced old and more recent studies such as those of Ferris, 1999, 2006; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Chandler, 2003 which considered that error correction promotes accuracy in grammar among students.

Selective Error Correction

The difference between comprehensive from selective corrective feedback has been discussed by Andersson (2015) as he defined comprehensive corrective feedback (unfocused) which refers to the feedback teachers use as they check errors students commit in a writing activity; while selective corrective feedback (focused) relates to selecting the errors that need to be corrected by the teachers. In addition, comprehensive feedback is what most ESL and EFL teachers practice. However, Truscott (2001) has opposed through a statement that error correction is 'time-consuming and extremely unpleasant' which could end with a lower quality of correction. Students dread seeing a pool of red ink on their outputs and this becomes quite discouraging that even the most highly motivated students could not be expected to adequately deal with every error in their work.

Lee (2005) also shared the same sentiments that excessive attention to errors could prove to be frustrating on the students' side and exhausting for the teachers. These reasons push the idea that correction must be selectively done. Farrokhi and Sattapour (2011) have also proven that Selective (focused) CF can be more effective in improving the students' grammatical accuracy. Meanwhile, in the study of Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, and Takashima, (2008), it was explained that selective error correction can either be highly focused or less focused. In highly focused correction, it will focus on a single target (e.g., preposition); while the less focused will have more than one target nonetheless limitations are still set (e.g. preposition, verb tenses,

connectives). This means that zeroing in on students' errors could result in less time for feedback on other areas such as coherence and organization, but students can attend more to their errors and supply the corrections needed, with a better understanding of the rules. Nevertheless, it was further suggested that if attention and understanding are needed for acquisition, then Selective Error Correction will rear positive results.

On the other hand, debates have also emerged regarding the effectiveness of direct and indirect strategies. Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad (2012) have mentioned that direct and indirect feedback has taken the most consideration from researchers up to date.

Indirect Error Correction

It was also discussed that the use of Indirect Error Correction allows students to engage themselves in problem-solving and it activates them to think deeply about the error they have committed. In addition, Sivaji (2012) has mentioned that there should be equal involvement on the parts of the teachers and students. Hyland (2006) has also expressed that even if feedback cannot be held responsible for language accuracy; it can still be a significant aspect. Because there is a lack of explicitness in Indirect Feedback, it can encourage students to reflect and self-edit, although students with lower proficiency may find it hard to identify how to correct their errors (Ferris & Hedgcock, 2005; cited in Hyland, 2006). In the review of Lee (2004), numerous studies have seen the long-term benefits of Indirect Error Correction to students' writing competency through increased student engagement and attention to forms and problems (Ferris, 2003).

Direct Error Correction

On the other hand, people who take sides with Direct Error Correction believe that it is more immediate and more 'explicit' (cited in Alimohammadi and Nejadansari, 2014). This becomes a way to allow students to understand their errors and get involved in the process of correcting their papers by themselves. Experts in the field of English as a second language strongly suggest that indirect kind of feedback leads students to work on problems on their own which assures a more lengthened acquisition, which is more desirable (Reid, 1998; as cited in Ferris and Roberts, 2001). Chandler (2003) has claimed that Indirect Error Correction has the potential to fail for it offers insufficient information to the learners; whereas Direct Error Correction provides instant internalization of the correct form as provided by their teachers. However, cited in Lee (2004), Ferris (2002) has continued to believe that may bring harm as teachers could misinterpret students' meaning and put words into their mouth, but when errors are untreatable (cannot be self-corrected like syntax and vocabulary errors) this type of error correction is appropriate.

Meanwhile, Hendrickson (1980) advocates a combination of direct and indirect error correction; in a way, each kind of method has its pros and cons. Followers of the indirect method believe that it is useful since it engages students in a problem-solving situation and activates them to think deeply about an error. Supporters of the direct method, on the other hand, believe that through direct feedback students are less confused and argued that direct feedback is more immediate and more explicit and helps students apply a similar rule on problems appropriate to the one on which feedback is provided. In the study conducted by Bitchener and Knoch (2008), after a comparison was made as to which five studies were better – direct or indirect, pointed out that two studies reported no difference, two of them favored indirect while, and one in favor of the direct one (cited in Hashemnezhad, 2012). Hosseiny (2014) cited other research that found no difference between the two approaches: Frantzen, 1995; Robb, Ross, & Shortreed, 1986; and others that have reported an advantage for indirect feedback: Ferris, 2006; Lalande, 1982; and yet those that have found direct correction to be most effective in their comparisons (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010; Chandler, 2003; van Beuningen et al., 2008).

Research Questions

The main objective of this research was to compare the level of grammatical errors committed by senior high school students using two correction strategies, Selective Direct Feedback (SDF) and

Selective Indirect Feedback (SIF). Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of grammatical errors committed by senior high school students in a writing subject before and after the teacher uses Selective Direct Feedback?
2. What is the level of grammatical errors committed by senior high school students in a writing subject before and after the teacher uses Selective Indirect Feedback?
3. Is there a significant difference between the level of improvement of the grammatical errors committed by the students when the teacher uses:
 - 3.1. Selective Direct Feedback;
 - 3.2. Selective Indirect Feedback?

METHOD

Research Design

This study was quantitatively grounded on the characteristics that were measurable by number, and utilizing the descriptive-comparative research design. According to Creswell (2009), the quantitative approach uses post-positivism claims for developing knowledge and utilizes strategies of inquiry including experiments and surveys, data collection on predetermined that rear statistical data. Meanwhile, descriptive research relies on observation which can take place through surveys and fact-finding questions of different kinds. the researcher made use of this design for the major purpose of describing the status quo of affairs and comparing it (Kothari, 2004). Further, the study also incorporated comparative design which means to compare different parallel situations over which the researcher has no control over (Walliman, 2017). It aims to obtain similarities and differences between events, methods, techniques, and others (Rajasekar et al, 2006).

Participants

In this study, the respondents were 120 Humanities and Social Sciences Strand (HUMSS) students of the K-12 program offered in three different schools in Davao City. Out of the four academic strands, HUMSS was chosen because of its nature where many of its subjects require advanced writing skills. The respondents were chosen using a purposive sampling technique also called judgment sampling. This is the most common sampling technique as it offers convenience (Acharya et al., 2013). Employing this technique intends deliberate choice of participants bearing the qualities needed for the study. This technique is also done nonrandomly and does not require any theories or a particular number of participants (Etikan et al., 2016).

Research Instrument

This study used student outputs which were checked using a rubric as a research instrument. Students' outputs were 10-sentence essays and were used by the researcher as the basis of comments in relation to tracking the grammatical errors made by the students. Outputs were checked by interraters who were chosen with the help of a set of criteria. To aid interraters in checking student drafts, and adapted a rubric with a 5-point scale with 5 being the highest and 1 as the lowest. The rubric was adapted from O'Malley & Pierce, 1996, originally from the Virginia Department of Education. Also, the researcher adapted the following scale of the scoring rubric for the mechanics of the study from 'The Effectiveness of Indirect Error Correction Feedback on the Quality of Students' Writing' (Muth'im & Latief, 2014).

Procedure

Importantly, before data were gathered, the researcher first secured copies of the informed consent from the Research Ethics Committee to be given to students. It was followed by writing a letter of permission to the Department of Education, and then a letter of permission to school heads or supervisors. When approved, the researcher discussed with the teachers holding the class an intervention to make the sessions seamlessly part of their lessons. After this, the

researcher met the students and explained the study and its purpose before they were asked to write a 10-sentence essay on the topic “Where do I See Myself 10 Years from Now”. Subsequently, the collected essays were given to the interraters for checking. From the total of 120 essays, 60 were corrected using Selective Direct Feedback and the remaining half with Selective Indirect Feedback, and the scores were then carefully recorded. Another session was scheduled with the students through their teachers, and then the researcher returned the papers and instructed the participants on what to do in the next phase. Finally, the second set of essays was corrected by the interraters for them to identify the scores for comparison.

In order to answer the statements of the problem of this study, three statistical tools, namely: Mean Scores and Paired t-tests for independent and dependent samples were used.

As explained by Ali and Bhaskar (2016), the mean is the sum of all scores and is divided by the number of scores and it could be affected by the extreme variable. This follows the formula of mean and the result answered the first and second statements of the problem regarding the level of the grammatical errors committed by the senior high students in the writing test before and after the teacher used the two aforementioned strategies. In the study, there were two groups formed according to the strategies used, one for Selective Direct Feedback and another for Selective Indirect Feedback. Each group wrote two drafts of essays which were rated by interraters. To identify the mean, the scores for each set per group were added and the total was divided by the number of corrections.

Paired T-test is commonly used when measurements are done on the same groups before and after a treatment was made (Ali and Bhaskar, 2016). Also, this test is commonly applied to studies with a competing hypothesis and an alternative hypothesis. In this study, this test was used to determine whether the mean difference between two sets of observations was zero. The difference between the two observations of SDF and SIF was calculated, similarly, the mean score of the first draft was compared to the mean score of the second draft and was done for both groups. Once the averages of all sets were determined, scores of the two sets per group were then compared using the T-test for the dependent sample, also known as paired t-test. This is one kind of null hypothesis used to “test if the population means estimated by two dependent samples differ significantly.

Independent T-test is also used in the context of an examination of variance for arbitrating the significance of more than two sample means at one and the same time (Kothari, 2004). The t-test for independent samples was administered after comparing the scores of SDF and SIF groups to be able to fully understand the results of the two strategies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section deals with the presentation, analysis, and interpretation of data. The first part describes the level of grammatical errors of senior high school students in writing courses before and after the teacher used selective direct feedback, and the level of grammatical errors of senior high school students in writing courses before and after the teacher used selective indirect feedback. The second part accounts for the differences in the level of improvement in the commission of grammatical errors when the teacher used selective direct feedback and selective indirect feedback.

Table 1. Writing Before and After the Use of Selective Direct Feedback

Selective Direct Feedback	Grammatical Errors in Writing		
	Mean	SD	Description
Before the Use of SDF	2.79	.88	Moderate
After the Use of SDF	2.47	.82	Low

Table 1 shows the level of grammatical errors in the writing outputs of senior high school

students before and after the teacher used selective direct feedback. It shows that before the teacher used Selective Direct Feedback, the level of grammatical errors committed by senior high school students in essay writing was moderate with a mean of 2.79. This result corroborates the findings of the study of Sivaji (2012) and Sheen (2011; cited in Hosseiny, 2014), which showed similar results after the use of direct feedback on students' output pointing at variance in the mean values of the first outputs which reared a higher mean compared to the second outputs. Moreover, the change between the pre-and post-use of the SDF on the written outputs of the learners supports the studies of Sheen (2007), Hashemnezhad and Mohammadnejad (2012), and Van Beuningen et al., (2008) who found clear proof that Direct Feedback, especially metalinguistic correction has positive effects compared to other forms of error correction strategies. Andersson (2011) cited Sheen (2011) also pinpointed that Selective Error Correction is directed to more gains in linguistic accuracy. In addition, the more explicit the feedback is the bigger the benefit is for the students.

Table 2. Writing Before and After the Use of Selective Indirect Feedback

Selective Direct Feedback	Grammatical Errors in Writing		
	Mean	SD	Description
Before the Use of SDF	2.33	.87	Low
After the Use of SDF	2.08	.80	Low

Table 2 shows the level of grammatical errors before and after the teacher used selective indirect feedback. The mean of the grammatical errors in the essays of senior high school students before the teacher used Selective Indirect Feedback reveals that grammatical errors in writing are low with a mean of 2.33. The grammatical errors of the senior high school students are still low after the teacher used Selective Indirect Feedback with a mean of 2.08. This result supports the study of Erel and Bulut, (2007), which discovered that errors made in the first outputs of students under the Indirect Error correction were lower. Despite an already low mean, after the outputs were checked using the Indirect Error correction it came out that the errors still gradually decreased similar to the results of the above-named study. Eslami (2014) also corroborates the idea that Indirect Error has an effect on students' accuracy in writing.

Table 3.1. Difference in Writing Grammatical Errors before and after Selective Direct Feedback and Indirect Feedback

(Using Paired t-Test)

	Committed Writing Errors	Paired t-Test of Difference in Grammatical Errors at $\alpha = .05$ (2-tailed)				
		Mean	t	df	Sig (2-tailed)	Remarks
Pair 1	Before Selective Direct Feedback -	.32	3.89	59	.00	Significant
	After Selective Direct Feedback					
Pair 2	Before Selective Indirect Feedback -	.25	3.69	59	.00	Significant
	After Selective Indirect Feedback					

Table 3.1 presents the paired t-test of differences in grammatical errors in essay writing of senior high school students before and after the teachers used the Selective Direct Feedback and Selective Indirect Feedback. It shows that there is a significant difference in the mean of grammatical errors students committed in essay writing before and after the teachers used Selective Direct Feedback ($t = 3.89, p < .05$). It means that the mean of grammatical errors in essay writing before the teachers used Selective Direct Feedback significantly differs from the mean of grammatical errors committed by senior high school students in essay writing after the teachers used Selective Direct Feedback. Further, it also shows a positive mean difference of .32

which can be interpreted as the grammatical errors in writing have decreased after the teacher used the Selective Direct Feedback. The finding of this study is similar to that of Sivaji (2012) which also showed a positive difference between the first and the second serial output of the students. Direct Error Correction appears to many as a better kind of error correction.

As Jalaludin (2015) and Magno and Amarles (2011) stated through Direct Corrective Feedback students provide more engagement and guidance in correcting their errors, especially to lower-level learners. Further, Sheen (2007) has also posited that this kind of corrective feedback is also effective in the acquisition of specific grammar areas (as cited in Magno & Amarles, 2011). Moreover, Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggest that Direct Corrective Feedback is probably better than Indirect Corrective Feedback for students with low levels of proficiency in writing (cited in Jalaluddin, 2015).

Similarly, there is a significant difference in the means of grammatical errors in essay writing done by senior high school students before and after the teachers used the Selective Indirect Feedback ($t = 3.69, p < .05$). This shows that the grammatical errors in the writing of the senior high school before the teacher used the Selective Indirect Feedback significantly differ from the mean of grammatical errors committed after the teachers used the Selective Indirect Feedback. Additionally, the positive mean difference of .25 supports the finding about the grammatical errors in writing that decreased after the teacher used Selective Indirect Feedback. It has been previously mentioned that there were studies that showed the effectiveness of Direct Error Correction; this study is one that shows its positive effect. This aligns with the study of van Beuningen et al. (2008) claiming that students would benefit more from Indirect Error Correction given the nature of this correction which engages students to immerse themselves in the process of learning and understanding the errors to enable them to self-edit their outputs.

Table 3.2. Difference of Writing Grammatical Errors in Essays Written before and after Teachers Used Selective Direct Feedback and Indirect Feedback

(Using Independent t-Test)

Committed Writing Errors	T-test for Equality of Means in Grammatical Errors at $\alpha = .05$ (2-tailed)				
	Mean Difference	t	df	Sig (2-tailed)	Remarks
Difference in grammatical errors between (Selective Direct Feedback – Selective Indirect Feedback) before they were used	.45	2.81	118	.006	Significant
Difference in grammatical errors between (Selective Direct Feedback – Selective Indirect Feedback) after they were used	.38	2.59	118	.011	Significant
Grammatical errors change committed between (Selective Direct Feedback – Selective Indirect Feedback)	.07	.629	118	.530	Not significant

Meanwhile, table 3.2 shows the results of the independent t-test conducted to determine if the means of the grammatical errors committed by senior high school students significantly differed in terms of the two types of feedback used in this study. With a .45 means difference, it shows that there is a significant difference between grammatical errors committed by the senior high school students, which related the two types of feedback ($t = 2.81, p < .05$) before they were used by the teachers.

Furthermore, there is also a significant difference between grammatical errors when a comparison was made between grammatical errors committed after Selective Direct Feedback

against the Selective Indirect Feedback ($t = 2.59, p < .05$) was used with a mean difference of .38. However, the mean difference of grammatical errors committed with the use of the Selective Direct Feedback and Selective Indirect Feedback ($t = .629, p > .05$) is .07, which means that there is no significant difference found. This finding supports the result of the previous studies, Bitchener (2010) acknowledged the findings of Robb et al. (1986) and Semke's (1984), which proved that there were no significant differences between Direct and Indirect Error Correction. In addition, Chandler (2003) claimed the positive effects of both strategies on the writing skills of students (cited in Alimohammadi & Nejadansari, 2014) which was also substantiated by Bitchener and Knoch (2010), Chandler (2003), and van Beunigan (2008).

The results of this study only reiterated the Noticing Hypothesis by Schidmt (2001) and the Monitoring Hypothesis of Krashen's (1982) SLA Theory. The use of the error correction strategies allows the students to become aware of the errors they have committed, as a result, there was a decrease in the errors committed by students. This supported the Noticing Hypothesis which indicated that learners should constantly notice grammatical forms in order to acquire skills. Moreover, consistent with the Monitor Hypothesis, the previous knowledge of the students regarding the rules of the language has also helped in allowing the students to self-correct as they found incongruencies between their outputs from the metalinguistic rules held in their memories. However, it was incontestable that not all errors were corrected because there were still factors that could have affected how the learners corrected the errors; thereby, learners should know the rules of grammar, should focus on correctness, and should have enough time to be able to correct.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the impact of selective direct feedback and selective indirect feedback on the grammatical errors of senior high school students in writing courses. The findings revealed a significant decrease in grammatical errors after the implementation of both feedback strategies. The comparison between the two types of feedback showed a significant difference in the mean of grammatical errors committed by senior high school students. However, when comparing the changes in grammatical errors after the use of selective direct feedback and selective indirect feedback, no significant difference was found. This suggests that both Selective Direct and Indirect Feedback strategies contribute to the grammatical error reduction of senior high school students.

REFERENCES

1. Abdul, M. I. (2014). The effectiveness of indirect error correction feedback on the quality of students' writing. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)*, 5(2), 244-257.
2. Acharya, A. S., Prakash, A., Saxena, P., & Nigam, A. (2013). Sampling: Why and how of it. *Indian Journal of Medical Specialties*, 4(2), 330-333.
3. Afrin, S. (2016). Writing Problems of Non-English Major Undergraduate Students in Bangladesh: An Observation. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 04, 104-115.
4. Alamis, M. M. (2010). Evaluating students' reactions and responses to teachers' written feedback. *Philippine ESL Journal*, 5(1), 40-57.
5. Al-Buainain, H. (2011). Students' Writing Errors in EFL: A Case Study. *QNRS Repository*, 2011(1), 2601.
6. Alfonso, V. S., & City, T. (2016). Common Errors Committed by Freshman Education Students in their Written English Compositions and their Relationship to some Selected Variables.
7. Ali, Z., & Bhaskar, S. B. (2016). Basic statistical tools in research and data analysis. *Indian journal of anesthesia*, 60(9), 662.
8. Aliakbari, M., & Toni, A. (2009). On the Effects of Error Correction Strategies on the

- Grammatical Accuracy of the Iranian English Learners. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 99-112.
9. Alimohammadi, B., & Nejadansari, D. (2014). Written corrective feedback: focused and unfocused. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(3), 581.
 10. Alroe, M. J. (2011). Error correction of L2 students' texts—theory, evidence, and pedagogy. *Asian EFL Journal Professional Teaching Articles*.
 11. Andersson, S. (2015). Comprehensive or Selective Feedback, that is the Question. *A Literature Review Focusing on Writing Strategies in an EFL/ESL Classroom*.
 12. Arif, A., Shah, S.H., Fakhra, & Ali, A.I. (2020). An Investigation on Academic Writing Problems Encountered by Undergraduate Students of Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Sanghar Campus. *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics*.
 13. Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of second language writing*, 9(3), 227-257.
 14. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207-217.
 15. 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(3), 267-296.
 16. Chkotua, M. (2012). Foreign language learners' errors and error correction in writing class. *Journal of Education*, 11-15.
 17. Creswell, J. W. (2009). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach. Los Angeles: *University of Nebraska–Lincoln*.
 18. Diab, R. (2006). *EFL university students' preferences for error correction and teacher feedback on writing*. *TESL Reporter*, 27-51.
 19. Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). *The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context*. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
 20. Erel, S., & Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: *A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context*. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi Sayı*, 22(1), 397-415.
 21. Eslami, E. (2014). *The effects of direct and indirect corrective feedback techniques on EFL students' writing*. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 445-452.
 22. Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American journal of theoretical and applied statistics*, 5(1), 1-4.
 23. Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2011). The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback on Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners. *Theory & Practice in Language Studies*, 1(12).
 24. Ferris, D. (2003). Response to student writing: Implications for second language students. *New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc*. Retrieved January 05, 2016, from https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=0bKRAgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gb_s_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false
 25. 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

26. Gatcho, A. R., & Ramos, E. T. (2020). Common Writing Problems and Writing Attitudes among Freshman University Students in Online Learning Environments: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, 1(1), 49–66.
27. Greenslade, T. A., & Felix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). *Error correction and learner perceptions in L2 Spanish writing*. In Selected Proceedings of the 7th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as First and Second Language (pp. 185-194).
28. Habibi, A., Wachyuni, S., & Husni, N.H. (2017). *Students' Perception on Writing Problems: A Survey at One Islamic University in Jambi*. Ta'dib: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam.
29. Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of students and teachers' preferences and attitudes towards correction of classroom written errors in Saudi EFL context. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3), 128.
30. Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach English*. Longman.
31. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
32. Hashemnezhad, H., & Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A Case for Direct and Indirect Feedback: The Other Side of Coin. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 230-239.
33. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). *The power of feedback*. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
34. Hendrickson, J. M. (1980). *Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research and Practice*. In K. Croft (Ed.), *Readings on English as a Second Language* (pp. 153-173). Boston: Little, Brown, and Co.
35. Hosseiny, M. (2014). The role of direct and indirect written corrective feedback in improving Iranian EFL students' writing skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 668-674.
36. Huang, J. (2002). *Error analysis in English teaching: A review of studies*. *Journal of Chung-San Girls' Senior High School*, 2(2), 19-34.
37. Hyland, F. (2006). The Impact of Teacher Written Feedback on Individual Writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255-286.
38. Jalaluddin, M. (2015). Role of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback in improvement of Hindi students' writing skills. *American International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*.
39. Jimena, E. D., Tedjaatmadja, H. M., & Tian, M. (2005). *Error correction: A bridge to grammatical accuracy in L2 writing*. In International Conference on Language and Communication and Culture: "Dialogs and Contexts in Focus. Bangkok.
40. Kothari, C. (2004). *Research Methodology Methods and Techniques (Second Revised Edition)*. India. Retrieved October 09, 2017, from <http://www.modares.ac.ir/uploads/Agr.Oth.Lib.17.pdf> (Two-way ANOVA in SPSS Statistics, 2013)
41. Lee, I. (2004). Error correction in L2 secondary writing classrooms: The case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285-312.
42. Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: What do students think? *TESL Canada Journal*, 1-16.
43. Magno, C., & Amarles, A. (2011). Teachers' feedback practices in second language academic writing classrooms. *The International Journal of Educational and Psychological Assessment*, 6(2).
44. Maysuroh, S., Maryadi, L.I., & Supiani (2017). *Students' English Writing Process and*

Problems: A Case Study at Hamzanwadi University.

45. Pan, Y. C. (2010). The effect of teacher error feedback on the accuracy of ELF student writing. *TEFLIN Journal*, 1(1), 57-77.
46. Perera, N. (2018). *The role of error*. Retrieved September 2018, from TKT Cambridge: <https://www.tktcambridge.com/module-one/the-role-of-error/>
47. Sivaji, K. (2012). *The effect of direct and indirect error correction feedback on the grammatical accuracy of ESL writing of undergraduates*.
48. Truscott, J. (2001). Selecting errors for selective error correction. *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics*, 27(2), 93-108.
49. Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272.
50. Van Beuningen, C. G., De Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2008). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on L2 learners' written accuracy.
51. Walliman, N. (2017). *Research methods: The basics*. Routledge.
52. Wang, P. (2010). Dealing with English majors' written errors in Chinese universities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 194-205.
53. Yapin, J., Haiying, C., & Yukuo, W. (2010). The problems and the countermeasures of college English writing teaching. *2010 International Conference on Education and Management Technology*, 574-577.