TEACHERS' PERCEPTION ON STUDENTS' LEXICOGRAMMATICAL ERRORS IN THEIR E-MAIL WRITING IN SECOND SEMESTER ROOM DIVISION CLASS IN BALI TOURISM INSTITUTE BASED ON TEACHERS' GENDER AND LEVEL OF EXPERTISE

Luh Eka Susanti[1], Ni Nyoman Padmadewi[2], I Gede Budasi[3]

[1,2,3] Program Studi Bahasa Inggris, Program Pascasarjana
Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha
Denpasar, Indonesia

e-mail: spygirl_shinoda@yahoo.com, dewi@ninyomanpadmadewi.org,
yaysurya8@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aimed at 1) analyzing the forms of the students' lexicogrammatical errors, 2) analyzing the teachers' correction on the students' lexicogrammatical errors, and 3) describing the teachers 'perception on the students' lexicogrammatical errors whether it is a normal thing as a part of learning or as an obstacle which hinder the students' progress. The subjects were two English teachers and second semester Room Division students. This study was designed in the form of descriptive qualitative research and the instruments being used were human instrument, questionnaire, and interview. The findings show that 1) there were 19 categories of errors that occurred in the students' writings, 2) both of the subjects used direct correction, but there were some similarities and differences in the forms and the functions, and 3) the teachers' perceptions were classified into 4 major points, namely perception on writing and its problems, perception on the nature of lexicogrammatical errors, perception on the value of errors, and perception on the sources of errors.

Keywords: lexicogrammatical errors, teachers' correction, teachers' perception

INTRODUCTION

Communication can be done in both spoken and written form. Through speaking, producing utterances face to face with the audience or talking on the phone are two ways of making communication. Meanwhile, written communication can be done through symbols and letters. The letters can be in the form of hand-writing or typed (e.g. email). If the interlocutors can respond directly to the utterance when it is through spoken communication, different thing occurs in written communication. The interlocutors' facial expression response cannot be noticed directly. Therefore, if there are any problems occur, there will be less quick response for the written communication, not as quick as spoken one. Some problems in written form might be because of the audiences do not get the meaning since the letter (as a form of written communication) does not clearly convey the real meaning, wrong choice of words, too many complex sentences, and many more.

There are a numbers of letters which act as a form of written communication. Correspondence letter is one of them which connect two parties for doing communication. It is written by people in connection with their work, even when the subjects of the letters have nothing to do with the trades or professions or vocations of the writers. Since business writing is utilized in a formal manner, formality of language is highly considered. Formality is a critical element of how business writing is conducted today. In fact, each document has to be considered as a legal

document, and should be considered an important facet of a company or organization's communication system. There are at least four kinds of correspondence letter, namely 1) memos, 2) letters, 3) faxes, and 4) electronic mail (email). Amongst four types of correspondence letter, email is used globally nowadays leaving others behind although the rest are still utilized.

As one form of correspondence letter, email could be sent and received fast. It is a product of the higher technology the human create. E-mail enables computer users to send messages and data quickly through a local area network or beyond through the Internet. Some components in writing email are subject header, salutation, main message, and leave-taking. Email has different format based on its situation whether it is used for formal or non-formal case; it is simply the same as writing a letter. In line with the formality of the email, formal email will be a standard in this research since the scope will be in replying guests' email. As a formal email, the language used will be in written form Standard English.

In a classroom setting especially in learning second language, writing task is one of activities that the students feel reluctant to do so. There are a numbers of factors leads to writing problems (Levine, 2002): 1) attention problems, 2) spatial ordering problems, 3) sequential ordering problems, 4) memory problems, and 5) higher-order cognition problems. Additionally, most students' writing contains lexicogrammatical errors which cover lexical (vocabulary) and grammar as well. Some lexicogrammatical errors found in the students' writing are wrong word order, subject – verb agreement and incorrect sentence structure. These errors need to be corrected in order not to have the same mistakes with the same context. Here, the teachers' role is highly needed as a corrector. Correcting the students' error is a kind of feedback the teacher can provide. According to Brookhart (2008), the teacher should consider the focus in giving feedback. It means that the teachers emphasize those things which

are covered to be given the feedback. As a corrector, the teachers need to check and correct the students' performance both in oral and written production. In writing, the teachers check their writing task, identify the errors and revise them. Each teacher will have different ways of correcting the students' writing task. These different ways of correcting have its different purposes. There are a number of ways the teachers do correction of the students' writing. Some of them just give mark/score without any specific correction, some will circle the words or sentences or any errors without giving any hints why those things are wrong, and the rest will provide the correction with short explanation.

The students' errors have a close connection with teachers' perception; how the teachers will view the students' cognitive by judging their writing. There are a number of related definitions by some experts. Hornby in Moloi (2009) coins perception as people's belief something based on their understanding. The object will be analyzed in the recent research is the English teachers' perception on the students' errors in their writing. It is about the value and assumption about teaching and learning the teachers build up over time and bring them into the real practices, to be specific writing task. Another expert states that someone's perception depend on three aspect, namely physical, psychological and physiological perspectives (Allport in Adediwura & Tayo, 2007). Last but not least, a process in which people attach meaning based on their experience, could be past or present, is also called as perception (Eggen and Kauchak in Adediwura & Tayo, 2007).

In this recent research, the perception means the way the teachers' judge or evaluate the students' writing which indicate their assumption of what the error is. How the teachers judge the students' writing will be a standard for them to perceive and give scoring. It is important for the teachers to set the standard in order to know students' cognitive and progress in learning. Also, it is essential that the teachers' perception is

explored in the context of education to trigger the teachers to think critically and reflect on their perception of their teaching and assessment. The students' work is influenced by their own learning and understanding on the concept and also by the teachers' as the students' model. Different teachers will perceive errors and mistakes the students produce in different way. In one hand, errors are viewed as a normal thing as a series of process in learning development. The students will learn and experience by having errors. In other words, the students will not learn if there are no errors. Therefore, by making errors, their monitor will stimulate their self-correction in order to realize those mistakes and will not repeat it for further learning.

In the other hand, errors are viewed as obstacles which can block their process of learning. It is said as obstacles since the students produce wrong sentences or utterances which cannot be accepted based on Standard English. This party believes that mistakes would not foster the students' development, but it would hinder their ability to do more progress instead. If those mistakes are perpetually done without any corrections, it will be permanently stored in their mind which results in fossilization. Fossilization would leave a foot print in the students' way of thinking and it is hard to change. Therefore, information and knowledge the students perceive must be selectively filtered.

In accordance with the phenomenon above, the researcher conducted a study about the teachers' perception toward lexicogrammatical errors produced by the students based on gender of level of expertise. In addition, thing that the researcher analyzed was the students' hand-writing email of replying guests' email. Here, the email was not typed since it showed the students' ability to write without computer help. Further, vocational school was chosen since the syllabus already contains specific materials for the specific purpose, so the English used here is English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Additionally, Room Division Class was selected since it is the class that the materials mostly contain English in written form, to be specific replying guest' email. As the researcher's pilot study showed that some of the Room Division students were having difficulty in writing and replying the email since this email belongs to formal correspondence letter in which the formality of the language and good grammar as well needs considering. They did not know what words suitable for any formal situations and the use of correct grammar. This research was carried out in Room Division Class in Bali Tourism Institute Nusa Dua (STPND) Bali on purpose to investigate the form of the students' lexicogrammatical errors, how the teachers correct the errors, and how the teachers perceive the errors based on the teachers' gender and level ofexpertise; whether they are normal or obstacles for the students' process of learning.

TYPE OF ARTICLE

The article is based on a qualitative research which was conducted in Room Division Class in Bali Tourism Institute (STP Nusa Dua Bali).

METHOD

The subjects in this research were two English teachers and students of second semester Room Division Class. The English teachers were chosen based on a number of criteria; 1) they are teacing the same class as a team-teaching, 2) they are different in terms of gender, 3) they are different in terms of level of expertise, and 4) they are different in terms of length of teaching experience.

The data collection gained from two major sources; the students and English teachers. From the students, the data were collected in three meetings. The first meeting, the students were requested to reply a guest's e-mail asking about hotel facilities and its rates in March 2013. Having replied the e-mail, in the second meeting the students were asked to reply the second e-mail from the same guest

who made a reservation and asked for special request. The students wrote two kinds of reply. One of them informed that the rooms were available and the rest gave alternative (offering another room) since the requested rooms were already occupied. After being corrected by the teachers, the questionnaire were distributed t the students and the questions consisted of 31 statements to cross check and validate the teachers' correction and the result of questionnaire for teachers in the third meeting. From the English teachers, the data were collected in two meetings. In the first meeting, both male and female teachers were given copies of the students' paper. Each of them received three copies of the students' e-mail reply. At the same time, the teachers were given questionnaire which consisted of 71 statements they needed to respond based on the forms of lexicogrammatical errors found in the students' writing, they way they corrected the students' errors, and their perception on the errors. In the second meeting, the teachers were interviewed at different setting in purpose to clarify their questionnaire response.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

There were 19 categories found in lexicogrammatical errors, namely: 1) misspelling, 2) subject-verb agreement, 3) incorrect word order, 4) pluralisation, 5) punctuation, 6) omission (be, v-ing), 7) addition (be, v-ing), 8) omission of preposition, 9) addition of preposition, 10) error in using preposition, 11) article, 12) unnecessary words, 13) double marking, 14) incorrect verb form, 15) errors in degree of comparison, 16) capitalization, 17) part of speech, 18) vocabulary, and 19) others.

In the first reply (hotel information and room rates), there were 14 students (12.5 %) did the misspelling and it was repeated in the same writing by a student. Meanwhile, the error with the least frequency were error in using degree of comparison (EW 15), error in using appropriate part of speech (EW 17), and

error in category of 'others' (EW 19). Each of them was done by 1 student (0.89 %).

In addition, there were also some categories which had the same frequency, namely error in Subject – Verb Agreement (EW 2) and incorrect word order (EW 3) (6.25 %), addition of preposition (EW 9) and error in using preposition (EW 10) (5.36 %), and unnecessary word (EW 12) and using double marking (EW 13) (2.68 %). The only category in which the students had no error in it was vocabulary (EW 18) since the students used appropriate vocabulary to state the hotel information such as the facilities and room rates.

In the second reply (confirming guest's reservation), incorrect part of speech (EW 14) was the most frequent error to occur. It was found that the students incorrectly used parts of speech. When it should be noun, there was a verb written. As an illustration, *'Thank you for your confirm…'*; the word *'confirm'* is a verb which was improperly used. It must be replaced with its noun which is *'confirmation'*. This kind of error was done by 14 students (13.33 %).

For the errors with the least frequency were pluralisation (EW 4), omission of preposition (EW 8), and using appropriate article (EW 11). There was only 1 student (0.95 %) did the error for each category. Pluralisation is an example of intralingual. Intralingual is a source of error when the students learn the target language since the target language gives strong impact to the learning process (Brown, 2000). Besides, omission of preposition referred to the absence of compulsory preposition which is meaningfully needed to complete the sentence (Dulay, et al., 1982;154). Meanwhile for the using of appropriate article, this category can be categorized into either omission or addition; it depended on what error it was.

There were also some categories which had the same frequency of occurrence; the categories which were done by 2 students (1.9 %) for each were S – V agreement (EW2), addition of 'be' and V-ing (EW 7), and part of speech (EW 17). Also, the categories done by 9

students (8.57 %) for each were misspelling (EW 1), capitalisation (EW 16), and others (EW 19). The categories which were found no error were double marking (EW 13) and degree of comparison (EW 15).

In the third reply (giving alternative room), the category of error occured the most was vocabulary which was done by 21 students (14,28 %). There were many words the students wrote which were inappropriately used dealt with the content. Although two words referred to the same meaning, the usage can be totally different. As an illustration, the word *'bring'* in the following sentence was inappropriate to use. *'We can bring the room for you…'* The word *'bring'* in the sentence meant that 'provide'. That word would be best replaced with *'offer'*, so the sentence would be *'We can offer you the room…'*. It can happen due to the students' lack of knowledge. The more reading that they do, the more vocabulary they will have.

The category of error with the least frequency was omission of preposition (EW 8). Omission referred to the absence of compulsory element in a phrase or sentence (Dulay, et al., 1982;154). Related to the kind of error, the compulsory element in this case referred to the preposition. To illustrate (see the example in EW 8), there was a missing *'of'* in the sentence *'…four types ___room'*. Due to the omission of preposition, the sentence became grammatically incorrect.

There were a number of categories which had the same frequency of error, namely incorrect word order (EW 3), double marking (EW 13), degree of comparison (EW 15), and part of speech (EW 17) with 2 students (1.36 %) did the errors in each category. Besides, there were also other categories in which the error was done by 7 students for each (4.76 %), such as error in using appropriate preposition (EW 10) and error in using appropriate article (EW 11).

Below are the frequencies of all types of errors in first, second, and third reply.

Table 1.1
Frequency of Errrs in All Categories for First, Second, and Third E-mail

SYMBOL	MEANING	FREQUENCY
EW 1	Wrong Spelling	42
EW 2	Subject – Verb Agreement	20
EW 3	Incorrect Word Order	13
EW 4	Pluralisation	13
EW 5	Punctuation	23
EW 6	Omission (be, V-ing)	39
EW 7	Addition (be, V-ing)	15
EW 8	Omission of Preposition	7
EW 9	Addition of Preposition	19
EW 10	Error in Using Preposition	21
EW 11	Article	12
EW 12	Unnecessary Word	16
EW 13	Blend	5
EW 14	Incorrect Verb Form	35
EW 15	Errors in Using Degree of Comparison	3
EW 16	Capitalization	27
EW 17	Part of Speech	5
EW 18	Vocabulary	34
EW 19	Others	15
TOTAL		364

Based on table 1.1, there were 19 categories of errors have been found in the studnets' writing, included fist, second, and third e-mail. Errors in degree of comparison (EW15) was the category with the least frequency of errors; meanwhile errors in spelling the word was the category with the most frequency of errors.

Meanwhile for the e-mail format, the errors were classified into six major parts: 1) formality of language use, 2) subject header, 3) salutation, 4) message (body), 5) leave-taking, and 6) style of writing.

Starting to correct the students' writing, Male English Teacher with Post-Graduate Program (Subject 1) did not classify them into their cognition. The students' writings were taken based on the position whoever on the top of the list. No student was set to be an example or a base to correct other students. As a result, it was not always the cleverest student with a good mastery of grammar and vocabulary be on the top of the list or be the first student for being corrected. The top list paper was not always those high achievers and the bottom list paper was not always those low achievers.

Subject 1 did not concern on grouping the students based on their activeness and participation in the classroom. High achieving students got the same treatment when their writings were corrected. It was believed that any student who was good in speaking is not always good in writing, or vice versa. Therefore, no students' grouping means no subjectivity in correcting.

Writing rubric was occasionally used when correcting the students' paper. It was not always used every time S1corrected the students' writing. Using rubric was based on a consideration of the level of the content difficulty. If the writing covers some terminologies and refers to specific purposes (e.g. confirming guest's reservation, confirming booking cancelation), writing rubric would be used. However, if the writing was only about the students' experience of daily life, Subject 1 preferred only corrected without using the rubric. Although rubric was occasionally used, but it was realized that rubric takes an important role to be a basic standard to determine the high-, average-, and low-achieving students. It is a standard to group the students' cognition based on a number of descriptors, such as content, rhetorical control, lexicogrammatical ability, and mechanics.

In correcting the students' writing, only red - ink pen was preferred used.

Based on the interview, it was used since the colour would be very contrast to the students' black – ink pen. In case if there was no red – ink pen, other colours would be used. The important thing was those colours would have different colours with the students' pen. It was done S1 believes that by using red-ink pen or other contrast colours with the students' would give effect to the students themselves that their writings have been corrected. Additionally, if there were errors in their writing, it would be seen clearly through the correction written in red-ink pen or those other colours. Therefore, the students realize that they have made errors in their writing.

A number of ways of correction were used by Subject 1; 1) circling, 2) underlining, 3) crossing, 4) writing question mark (?), 5) drawing an arrow, 6) drawing striped line, 7) drawing vertical line, 8) underlining with arrow, and 9) coding.

If Subject 1 did not concern on grouping the students' writings based on their cognition, Subject 2 preferred to do grouping. It was done to ease her to do correction. The grouping resulted on the teacher's mind-set which was already settled before correcting and giving scores. Afterward, the highest achiever would be the first student would whose the writing to be corrected. The highest achiever's writing then would be a base to assess other students'. It acted as an example as a standard for others' writings. It was assumed that the students who were good in grammar and vocabulary mastery would have good skills in writings. Therefore, to ease the teacher to do correction, the writings were grouped. As a result, the high achiever took the top list position; meanwhile the lowest achiever would have the bottom list.

For Subject 1, rubric functioned as a standard to do scoring, whether the students' writing belong to any group based on several descriptors. On the contrary, Subject 2 used writing rubric rarely. Therefore, the standard scoring was not based on the rubric, but the high achiever student. Based on the interview, the use of rubric as a standard was realized important to set the score and to

which category the students belong to, but the teacher preferred to set high achieving student as the standard in correcting the writing.

In addition, there was no specific ink must be used in correcting the students' writing. It was not a must for Subject 2 to use red – ink pen when correcting. Any colours though it was black- ink pen (which was the same with the students' pen) remained the same function. Being so contrast with the students' ink was not taken into a consideration to be a priority to give both comment and correction. S2 believed that all of other comments or note beside the students' handwriting referred to teacher's correction although it was written in black – ink pen or other colours whish were the same as the students'.

Although the same class was taught by two different teachers, it did not guarantee that the students' writings would be treated with the same kinds of correction. Ways of correction by Subject 2 were 1) circling, 2) underlining, 3) crossing, 4) writing question mark (?), 5) drawing an arrow, 6) writing " ^ ", and 7) giving direct correction for pluralisation and punctuation.

Two subjects had different ways in correcting the students' writing. Subject 1 provided coded for several kinds of errors, such as Sp. for spelling, Prep. for preposition, etc. Also, repetition of errors was only identified once. Meanwhile, providing correction in every single error the students made belong to S2 such as by circling, drawing an arrow, crossing, and many more. Additionally, the most important thing was S2 always gave correct answers close to the correction. Amongst five representative students who were interviewed, they preferred to be corrected directly, without any codes. There were a number of considerations, listed as follows.

1. Subject 2's corrections were easily identified.

Unlike Subject 1's correction which mostly in code, Subject 2's correction was easily identified since the location of errors were clearly notified.

2. No need to figure out the errors.

Some codes such as Sp. and Prep., were used by Subject 1 which was not so familiar for the students. Some of the students directly knew what the errors were, but the rest were still guessing what the codes referred to, even they did not know that the code meant correction. However, if the words or phrases were directly corrected and provided with right answer, the students easily knew kinds of errors they made.

3. Easily know the correct answer.

By giving right answer, it automatically signed that there was an error. Besides, the students did not need to find and figure out the correct answer. If the corrections were in codes and they consulted with friends or dictionary, they were afraid that what they believed as the correct answer would be wrong, so they thought that providing the right answer would be better option. On the contrary, one said that if they found the right answer by themselves, the right answer would be longer lasted in their memory instead of being spoon-fed by the teachers.

The similarities found between Subject 1 and Subject 2 were in terms of doing the correction. The corrections were both of them circled, crossed, and drawing an arrow on the students' writing.

The differences found between Subject 1 and Subject 2 were in terms of 1) ways to start the correction (grouping the students' writing), 2) using writing rubric, 3) setting the standard, 4) using the coloured-pen to do correction, and 5) ways in correcting the students' writing. Some corrections were used by both teachers were 1) underlining, 2) crossing, and 3) giving question mark (?). Meanwhile, there were also some corrections provided by male English teacher but no provided by female English teacher such as 1) drawing striped line, 2) drawing vertical line, 3) underlining with arrow, and 4) coding. However, 1) writing " ^ " and 2) giving direct correction for pluralisation and punctuation were two kinds of correction provided by Subject 2 which were not provided Subject 1.

Teachers' perception was categorized into 1) perception on writing and its problems, 2) perception on the

nature of lexicogramatical error, 3) perception on value of error, and 4) perception on sources of errors.

Perception on writing and its problems covers the frequency of writing, outlining before writing, and the students' writing problems. The male English teacher assumed that writing did not always a product of something, so daily writing exercise also belonged to writing. However, female English teacher required the students to do writing as a product of a learning something, therefore, it must be in the forms of paragraphs or a text. In addition, the frequency of writing was about once to three times in a semester. Lastly, the students' writing problems were majorly divided into two main categories; 1) pre-writing problems, and 2) during-writing problems.

The nature of lexicogrammatical errors included the strategy of teaching grammar and vocabulary as well, and also how important they are in writing. Lexicogrammatical ability was not a prior concern for S1 since there were a lot of dimensions also need to be taken into consideration, such as content, rhetorical control, and mechanics. Therefore, a long text with voluminous errors was acceptable as long it exercised the students' writing. On the contrary, a short text with minimum errors would be highly appreciated by Subject 2. Lexicogrammatical skill in writing took the highest point over others dimensions.

From the value of error, Subject 1 (male; post-graduated program) assumed that errors were normal and natural to happen since it was a part of learning process. The students would learn by making errors and it could enhance their critical thinking. However, Subject 2 (female; under-graduated program) assumed that errors were an obstacle for the students to do progress in learning. The errors blocked their learning development and if it was not corrected and revised, the errors would fossilize.

There were three sources of errors, namely: 1) environment (the students' friends, spoken style, and teachers' model), 2) guide book, and 3) the influence of native and target language.

The first source came from the students' environment which includes friends, spoken style, and teachers' model. The surroundings took an essential part in influencing the students' language learning. As an illustration, the students imitated their friend (who is high-achiever) in speaking English. They just imitated without filtering whether the English the high-achiever produce was either right or wrong. Their surroundings were closely related with spoken style.

Speaking and writing were two related skills in learning language, to be specific English. Although they were related, they remain different. When the students were having chat with their friends, the language use was informal. Therefore, "we're", "can't", "it's", etc were common to say. In addition, in informal writing such as personal letter, those words are allowed to use. However, in replying guests' e-mail, they are not allowed to use since the formality of language use would be different. Further, politeness was highly considered in formal writing. Therefore, "would you like" is preferred to use better than "do you" in questioning.

Teachers' model was the last aspect to cause the errors which came from the students' environment. Although teacher acted as a source of knowledge, it did not mean that all of the information could be directly accepted without being filtered. The students' critical thinking was highly needed, furthermore they were already in university level which required them to process the information before getting the information stored.

Based on the interview, both teachers have experienced giving misconception o the students. Mostly, it was about teaching grammar and structure. Fortunately, the students realized and the teachers clarified the concept in the following meeting. Nowadays, teachers are not the main source of knowledge anymore since the high developing technology increasing and globally wide spreading. Therefore, it is suggested that all information must be processed and filtered.

Errors, besides came from the students' environment, were also caused by the guide book the students used. The guide book referred to any book the students used to facilitate their learning. If the guide book with some errors in English became the basic source of knowledge, the students would imitate the errors. Therefore, the guide book also needed to be selectively chosen to minimize the students' error.

The last source of knowledge was added by Subject 2 in which the students' native and target language also influence the students' chance to make errors. The students' native language influences the students' language learning happened when doing translation. The structure in native language affects the structure in target language (English). As a result, it could be a source of errors in grammar and word order. As an illustration, "saya lapar" (native) becomes "I am starving" (not "I starving"). It occurred since every language in this world has its own structure. It is known as *interlingual*.

It was not only the students' native language influence the target language, misconception within the target language also became source of errors. For example, the concept of pluralisation. Not all of the nouns can be added "s" marker in plural noun. A chair becomes some chairs, an ox becomes some oxen, a box becomes some boxes, a knife becomes some knives, etc. It occurred because imperfect learning of the target language. It is known as *intralingual*.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

There were 19 categories found in lexicogrammatical errors, namely: 1) misspelling, 2) subject-verb agreement, 3) incorrect word order, 4) pluralisation, 5) punctuation, 6) omission (be, v-ing), 7) addition (be, v-ing), 8) omission of preposition, 9) addition of preposition, 10) error in using preposition, 11) article, 12) unnecessary words, 13) double marking, 14) incorrect verb form, 15) errors in degree of comparison, 16) capitalization, 17) parts of speech, 18) vocabulary, and 19) others.

Meanwhile for the e-mail format, the errors were classified into six major parts: 1) formality of language use, 2) subject header, 3) salutation, 4) message (body), 5) leave-taking, and 6) style of writing.

A number of ways to do correction were used by male teacher with Post Graduate Degree (Subject 1) were 1) circling, 2) underlining, 3) crossing, 4) writing question mark (?), 5) drawing an arrow, 6) drawing striped line, 7) drawing vertical line, 8) underlining with arrow, and 9) coding.

Meanwhile, a number of ways used by the female teacher with Under Graduate Degree (Subject 2) were 1) circling, 2) underlining, 3) crossing, 4) writing question mark (?), 5) drawing an arrow, 6) writing " ^ ", and 7) giving direct correction for pluralisation and punctuation.

Teachers' perception were classified into 1) perception on writing and its problems, 2) perception on the nature of lexicogrammatical errors, 3) perception on value of errors, and 4) perception on sources of errors.

In short, Subject 1 (male; post-graduated program) assumed that errors were normal and natural to happen since it was a part of learning process. The students would learn by making errors and it could enhance their critical thinking. However, Subject 2 (female; under-graduated program) assumed that errors were an obstacle for the students to do progress in learning. The errors blocked their learning development and if it was not corrected and revised, the errors would fossilize.

This research is expected to provide various corrections on the students' errors for other teachers. Other teachers can adopt and adapt the ways of correction such as direct and indirect provided in this research. Additionally, the researcher expected that this study would provide information to other researchers in related discipline who are interested in conducting research in related field. As an illustration, other dimensions in writing could be

explored with more subjects to obtain more valid and reliable data.

REFERENCES

Adediwura, A., Tayo, B. 2007. *Perception of Teachers' Knowledge, Attitude and Teaching Skills as Predictor of Academic Performance in Nigerian Secondary Schools*. Obafemi Awolowo University.

Brookhart, S.M. 2008. *How to Give Effective Feedback to your Students*. Taken from http://www.edupress.org/feedback/effective

Brown, Douglas. 2000. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco State University: Longman

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

Moloi, Lisemelo. 2009. *Exploring the Perception of English Second Language Teacher about Learner Self-Assessment in Secondary School*. University of Pretoria

Levine, M. 2002. *Difficulties with Writing*. Taken from http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/misunderstoodminds/index