Dissertation Title:
The effectiveness of computer-based materials
as a means of teaching the English article system

Researcher:
Fei-Yu Chuang
University of Warwick, UK
F-Y.Chuang@warwick.ac.uk

Research Supervisor:
Dr. Hilary Nesi

Fei-Yu Chuang

_____

Summary:

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of a set of electronic self-access grammar materials as a means of treating the article misuse of Chinese students on a British higher education foundation programme. It consists of a materials refinement, materials trialling, and materials evaluation. This final report will mainly document the process and results of the materials evaluation conducted between June and August 2005.

Materials Evaluation

A materials evaluation was conducted between June and August 2005, in which 24 Chinese college students participated. 15 students (the experimental group) volunteered to use the materials one hour per week for five consecutive weeks, and 9 others served as the control group. The evaluation aimed to investigate the effectiveness of the materials in improving students' use of the English article system as well as students' responses to the GrammarTalk materials. It collected the students' proofreading pre-test, immediate post-test vs delayed post-test data, and pre-treatment vs post-treatment essay writing. Students' responses to the materials were also collected through a questionnaire, and data analysis was conducted subsequently. The process of the evaluation study is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The process of the evaluation study

Step	Date	The Control Group	The Experimental Group
1	Fri 7th Feb	Pre-treatment essay writing, Proofreading pre-test	Pre-treatment essay writing, Proofreading pre-test
2	Fri 11th Feb 1-2 pm	No treatment	GrammarTalk Session 1
3	Mon 14th Feb 9-10 am	No treatment	GrammarTalk Session 2
4	Mon 21st Feb 9-10 am	No treatment	GrammarTalk Session 3
5	Mon 7th March 9-10 am	No treatment	GrammarTalk Session 4
6	Mon 14th March 9-10 am	No treatment	GrammarTalk Session 5
7	Fri 18th March 1-2 pm	No treatment	GrammarTalk Session 6 (extra session in case of earlier problems)

8	Fri 18th March 4:30 pm	Immediate post-test	Immediate post-test Questionnaire survey
9	Maybe a month later (Beginning of April)	Delayed post-test	Delayed post-test
10	After the delayed post-test (April ~ May)	No treatment	Providing further opportunity for the students to use the materials on a self-access basis
11	May	Post-treatment essay writing	Post-treatment essay writing
Data Analysis and Report			
12	June ~ August	The two sets of data (pre-treatment vs post-treatment essays, proofreading pre-test vs post-test) will be analysed	
13	August ~ September	Preparation of final report	

Data analysis

This section briefly reports on the analysis of three two sets of data (proofreading pre-test, immediate post-test vs delayed post-test, pre-treatment vs post-treatment essays , and questionnaire data) and the results as follows.

Proofreading pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test

Data from the three proofreading tests were processed (the proofreading text can be seen in Appendix 1). Invalid cases (cases with missing scores) were first excluded from the data set, and the remaining samples (11experimental cases and 7 control cases), although quite small, were analysed using SPSS. A t-test was calculated to assess whether the mean test scores of the two groups are statistically different in the pre-test, immediate post-test and delayed post-test respectively. No significant differences were found between the two groups in the three test scores.

The results show that the materials did not seem to be effective in improving students' use of the English article system. This might have resulted from the three reasons below.

- The students did not fully understand the materials because of their low English proficiency level. GrammarTalk was designed based on the writing of Chinese foundation students with a proficiency level of IELT 6.0 or equivalent, and was then piloted on different groups of Chinese ESL learners with proficiency levels no lower than IELT 6.0. The participants of the evaluation study, however, had an average proficiency level of IELT 5.5. Their lower proficiency level could possibly hinder them from fully understanding the instructions, questions and feedback provided in the materials. This speculation was made based on the evidence that the students showed difficulties in understanding grammar terms in the exercises when using GrammarTalk. This implies that the explicit knowledge (e.g. grammar rules) they have formulated is likely to be incorrect, which can reduce the effectiveness of the materials. To test this speculation, a follow-up case study was carried out (see below).

- The article system is not an easy area to treat. A longer treatment may be necessary. In addition to self-study materials, it would be desirable to provide supplementary face-to-face sessions to help students clarify their misconceptions about articles
- The proofreading text was too difficult for the students

Pre-treatment vs post-treatment essays

Because the results of pre- and post- proofreading tests were not significantly different, it was predicted that the difference in article use between pre-treatment and post-treatment essays would not be significant. In order to probe the reasons why the students' use of articles did not seem to improve through the use of GrammarTalk, my research plan was slightly altered and the pre-treatment vs post-treatment essay comparison was cancelled. Instead, effort was spent on a case study in which a student (P) was interviewed regarding the errors she made in her essay writing and proofreading tests. She was also asked to state the grammar rules she formulated from using the materials.

Case study

Four types of errors (marked in red) from P's essay and proofreading tests were selected for examination. P described why she used the article in each case, and the results are summarised as follows.

Error 1 (in P' essay writing)

> *Many young people look forward to the New Year celebrations because they can eat traditional food…*
>
> *Many Chinese people think the traditional New Year's celebrations are very important for them. They will wear the new clothes. Children will say the lucky sentence to adults….*

Student P explained why she used *the* in the first sentence of her essay (*Many young people look forward to the New Year celebrations because…*). She said that the celebrations were specific to her, as she is very familiar with Chinese New Year celebrations. She used *the* in *They will wear the new clothes* because she thought that *the new clothes* referred to the clothes specially bought during the Chinese New Year, not other new clothes bought for other occasions. She used *the* in *Children will say the lucky sentence to adults*, because she thought that the lucky sentence was specific and she knew exactly what it was.

The results show that the student misunderstands the functions of the definite article, *the*. She has a vague idea of what *the* is used for, but her understanding is incorrect. She thinks that *the* should be used when a noun is specific to the writer; she uses *the* in *the New Year celebrations*, *the new clothes* and *the lucky sentence* because these three things are specific to her. It shows that she does not know *the* involves both the writer's and reader's knowledge of the thing in question. Treatment is needed to help her to build the concept that *the*, the identifier, is used to define something which is known both to the writer and the reader in the discourse. In other words, she needs to learn to distance herself from the things she is familiar with, and to consider the reader's knowledge of them as well.

Error 2 (in P's essay writing)

> *The technology is improving a lot in these days. I think the industrialisation will give us some good things.*

P said that *technology* was a noncount noun in this instance, but she did not mention its specificity. She did not mention the rule that *the* cannot be used with a non-specific noncount noun, either.

The results show that P is not aware of specific and non-specific references and the form for non-specific noncount nouns.

Error 3 (in P's proofreading test)

> *In the free societies (society), people are free to choose how to travel.*

P said that the two patters, "∅ + plural" and "the + singular noun", were the same in this instance (i.e. *in free societies* vs *in the free society*). She did not mention the specificity/non-specificity of the noun, *societies*, in this context.

The results show that P does not know clearly the use of different forms of generic/non-specific count nouns. She does not pay enough attention to the specificity or non-specifcity of a noun, either.

Error 4 (in P's proofreading test)

> *People cannot be coerced onto the public transport, they have to be enticed, and the automobile is formidable competitor. In order to reduce the traffic congestion and air pollution…*

P said that she did not know if transport is countable or uncountable. She said that she did not know the words 'competitor' and 'congestion', including their countability.

The results show that P makes the errors because she does not know the meaning or countability of the three nouns (transport, competitor and congestion).

The grammar rules Student P formulates

To help pinpoint P's problems with the article system, she was asked to use each unit of the materials and state the rules she had formulated. Her formulated rules are in italics, as follows:

- Unit: "Specific or nonspecific? Definite or indefinite?"

  > *A person who knows the object or the thing, then it is specific.*
  > *On the contrary, if a person doesn't know the object or the thing, it is nonspecific.*
  > *Specific can use "the".*
  > *Nonspecific can use "a/an".*
  > *And "definite" means the conversation or the article has a clear focus.*
  > *Indefinite is unclear about the focus.*

Comments on P's rules:

Her formulated rules are incorrect as she seems to consider only the writer's knowledge of the thing in question instead of both the writer's and the reader's knowledge.

- Unit: Generic and nonspecific (nuncount nouns)

  "Generic" is "general", and "specific" is "particular".

  In the sentence, "Cars have greatly boosted communication and make everyday life more convenient", there is no "the" immediately before "Communication" and "everyday life" because they are uncountable.

  Comments on P's rules:
  The grammar rules P has formulated are fine. However, when explaining the reason why "communication" and "everyday life" do not take *the*, P does not seem to consider if the two nouns are generic or specific.

- Unit: Bare count noun errors

  When we regard a thing as generic, we need to add "s" to form a plural noun. If we regard a thing as specific, then we need to add "a/an/the" before the noun.

  Comments on P's rules:
  P's understanding is incomplete.   She does not mention what a bare count noun is and the different forms for generic/non-specific count nouns.

- Unit: the and proper nouns/special words

  This unit talks about unusual nouns or proper nouns. Some of them should add "the" before them; some of them don't need that.
  However, I think that it is not very clear when I have to add the or not. For example, "the" UK and Britain. Why before UK we have to add "the", but we needn't add the before Britain?

  Comments on P's rules:
  P has asked a very good question about the use of *the* with special nouns or proper nouns. As the use of *the* in proper nouns can sound quite arbitrary to English language learners, this area is very problematic for them.

- Unit: Uniqueness

  Uniqueness is a particular thing or subject that nothing else is like it, so we have to add the definite article before the noun. Also, when we describe one thing that we already know, we have to add "the" before it.

  Comments on P's rules:

P's understanding of uniqueness is correct. However, she still does not mention the key concept of the writer's and reader's knowledge when describing the function of the definite article, *the*.

Students' responses to GrammarTalk

The students' responses to GramarTalk were gathered through a questionnaire (see Appendix 2) and their Learner Journal. The results suggest that students were fairly positive about the materials although the design might need further improvements (such as easy navigation and clear screen layout). The detailed results can be found in Appendix 3 and 4.

Conclusion

GrammarTalk does not seem to be effective in improving the participants' understanding of the English article system although the participants are fairly positive about the materials. It is still too early to draw a definite conclusion on the effectiveness of the materials as the sample size was quite small, the time the participants spent on the materials was quite limited and the students' English proficiency level was not the ideal level. However, some important findings are drawn from the study. First, students seem to have problems with the concept that the definite article, *the*, involves both the writer's and reader's knowledge of the thing in question. Second, the use of *the* with proper nouns or special groups of words is very problematic for learners. Third, self-study materials do not seem to be sufficient for teaching the English article system. Apart from using the GrammarTalk self-study materials, supplementary face-to-face sessions should be provided to help students clarify their misconceptions about articles.

References

Abbs, B., Freebairn, I., & Barker, C. (2000). *Snapshot (Intermediate students' book).* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Allport, D. (1979) Conscious and unconscious cognition: A computational metaphor for the mechanism of attention and integration. In L. Nilsson (Ed.), *Perspectives on Memory Research.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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.

Atkinson, D. (1987). The mother tongue in the classroom: A neglected resource? *ELT Journal, 41*(4), 241-247.

Atkinson, R., & Shiffrin, R. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. In K. Spense (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory.* Vol 2. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Auerbach, E. (1993) Reexaming English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterl*y, *27*(1), 9-32.

Ausubel, D. P. (1963). *The psychology of meaningful learning.* New York, NY: Grune & Stratton.

———. (1974). Adults versus children in second-language learning. *The Modern Language Journal,* 58, 420-23.

Bald, W-D, Cobb, D., & Schwarz, A. (1986). *Active grammar.* Essex: Longman Group Limited.

Batstone, R. (1994). *Grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, R. (1974). Error analysis: A recent pseudoprocedure in applied linguistics. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25-6, 35-49.

Bell, J., & Gower, R. (1992). *Matters (Upper Intermediate).* Harlow: Longman Group Limited.

Berry, R. (1993). *Collins COBUILD English guides (3): Articles.* London: HarperCollins Publishers.

Bialystok, E. (1978). A theoretical model of second language learning. *Language Learning, 28*(1), 69-83.

Bickerton, D. (1981). *Roots of language.* Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Press.

Bley-Vroman, R. (1983). The comparative fallacy in interlanguage studies: The case of systematicity. *Language Learning, 33*, 1-17.

Bolitho, R., & Tomlinson, B. (1980). *Discover English*. Oxford: Heinemann International Publishing.

Borg, S. (1999). The use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom: A qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(1), 95-126.

Brock, M. N. (1993). Three disk-based text analysers and the ESL writer. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 2*(1), 19-40.

Brown, C. M. (1988). *Human-computer interface design guidelines*. Ablex, NY.

Brown, R. (1973). *A first language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burton-Roberts, N. (1976). On the generic indefinite article. *Language, 52*, 427-448.

Byrd, P., & Reid, J. M. (1998). *Grammar in the composition classroom: Essays on teaching ESL for college-bound students*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Cardelle, M., & Corno, L. (1981). Effects on second language learning of variations in written feedback on homework assignments. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*, 251-261.

Carroll, J. B. (1964). *Language and thought*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Cato, J. (2001). *User-centered web design*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1985). Making informed decisions about the role of grammar in language teaching. *TESOL Newsletter, 1*, 4-5.

——————. (1991) Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(3), 459-480.

Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Celce-Murcia, M. and E. Olshtain (2000) *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chalker, S. (1984). Why can't someone write a nice simple grammar? *ELT Journal, 38*(2), 79-85.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12*, 267-296.

Chapelle, C. A. (1998). Multimedia CALL: Lessons to be learned from research on instructed SLA. *Language Learning and Technology, 2*(1), 22-34.

Chen, J. F. (1997). Computer generated error feedback and writing process: A link *TESL-EJ, 2*(3). [electronic document] Available at http://www.latrobe.edu.au/education/celia/tesl-ej/ej07/a1.html (Accessed 14/08/04).

Clarke, A. (1997). *The principles of screen design for computer based learning materials.* Sheffield: Department for Education and Employment.

Cook, V. J. (1993). *Linguistics and second language acquisition.* Macmillan, Basingstoke.

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5*, 161-69.

———. (1971). Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 9*(2), 147-59.

———. (1973). *Introducing applied linguistics*. London: The Penguin Group.

———. (1974). Error analysis. In J. Allen & S. P. Corder (Eds.), *The Edinburgh course in Applied Linguistics* 3. London: Oxford University Press.

———. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cunningham, S., & Moor, P. (1998). *Cutting edge (intermediate).* Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

Dagneaux, E., Denness, D., & Granger, S. (1998). Computer-aided error analysis. *System, 26*(2), 163-174.

Dalgish, G. M. (1985). Computer assisted ESL research and courseware development. *Computers and Composition, 2*(4), 45-62.

DeKeyser, R. M. (1998). Beyond focus on form: Cognitive perspectives on learning and practicing second language grammar. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 42-63). Cambridge University Press.

Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly, 8*, 129-36.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eastwood, J. (1999). *Oxford practice grammar.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eisenstein, M. (1987). Grammatical explanations in ESL: Teach the student, not the method. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings*. Rowley, MA.: Newbury House.

Ellis, N. (1995). Consciousness in second language acquisition: A review of field studies and laboratory experiments. *Language Awareness, 4*, 121-146.

Ellis, R. (1988). Are classroom and naturalistic acquisition the same? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 11*, 305-28.

———. (1990) *Instructed second language acquisition.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

———. (1991). *Second language acquisition and language pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

———. (1993). "Talking shop: Second language acquisition research: How does it help teachers? An interview with Rod Ellis. *ELT Journal, 47*(1), 3-11.

———. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. (1995). Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*, 87-106.

———. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 39-60.

———. (2001). Investigating form-focused instruction. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Form-focused instruction and second language learning* (pp. 1-46). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

———. (2002). Methodological options in grammar teaching materials. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos (Eds.), *New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms* (pp. 155-179). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fazio, L. L. (2001). The effect of corrections and commentaries on the journal writing accuracy of minority- and majority-language students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 235-249.

Felix, S. (1981). The effect of formal instruction on second language acquisition. *Language Learning, 31*, 87-112.

Ferris, D. R. (1995). Teaching ESL composition students to become independent self-editors. *TESOL Journal, 4*(4), 18-22.

Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing, 8*(1), 1-11.

———. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor, MI:

The University of Michigan Press.

Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes. How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 161-84.

Fortune, A. (1992). Self-study grammar practice: Learners view and preferences. *ELT Journal, 46*(2), 350-355.

———. (1998) Survey review. *ELT Journal, 52*(1), 67-80.

Fotos, S. (1993). Consciousness raising and noticing through focus on form: Grammar task performance versus formal instruction. *Applied Linguistics, 14*(4), 126-41.

——. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language use through grammar consciousness raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*, 323-51.

——. (1998). Shifting the focus from forms to form in the EFL classroom. *ELT Journal, 52*(4), 301-307.

Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(4), 605-28.

Frantzen, D. (1995). The effects of grammar supplementation on written accuracy in an intermediate Spanish content course. *Modern Language Journal, 79*, 329-44.

Frantzen, D., & Rissell, D. (1987). Learner self-correction of written compositions: What does it show us? In B. VanPattern, T. R. Dvorak, & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Foreign language learning: A research perspective* (pp. 92-107). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Fries, C. C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Fries, C. C., & Pike, K. L. (1949). Coexistent phonemic systems. *Language, 25*(1), 29-50.

Frodesen, J. (1991). Grammar in writing. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 264-76). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (1998). *True to life (upper intermediate).* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gass, S. (1988). Integrating research areas: A framework for second language studies. *Applied Linguistics, 9*, 198-217.

——. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (1983). *Language transfer in language learning.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

——. (1994). *Second language acquisition.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ghadessy, M. (1976). An error analysis of the writings of Iranian Freshmen students learning English – A pilot study. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 14*, 71-81.

Gonzalez-Lloret, M. (2003). Designing task-based CALL to promote interaction: EN BUSCA DE ESMERALDAS. *Language Learning and Technology, 7*(1), 86-104.

Granger, C. & Beaumout, D. (1988). *New generation 3*. Oxford: Heinemann International.

Granger, S. (1993). International corpus of learner English. In J. Aarts, P. de Haan, & N. Oosidijk (Eds.), *English language corpora: Design, analysis and exploitation* (pp. 57-71). Papers from the Thirteenth International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Nijmegen, Amsterdam.

Granger, S., Meunier, F. & Tyson, S. (1994). New insights into the learner lexicon: A preliminary report from the international corpus of learner English. In L. Flowerdew & A. K. K. Tong (Eds.), *Entering text* (pp. 102-113). Language Centre, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Green, P. S., & Hecht, D. (1992). Implicit and explicit grammar: An empirical study. *Applied Linguistics, 13*(2), 168-184.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar.* New York, NY: Edward Arnold.

———. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Edward Arnold.

Hammarberg, B. (1974). On the insufficiency of error analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 12*, 185-192.

Hammerley, H. (1975). The deduction induction controversy. *Modern Language Journal, 59*, 15-18.

Harley, B. (1998). The role of focus-on-form tasks in promoting child L2 acquisition. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 156-174). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Hegelheimer, V., & Chapelle, C. A. (2000). Methodological issues in research on learner-computer interactions in CALL. *Language Learning and Technology, 4*(1), 41-59.

Hemard, D. P. (1997). Design principles and guidelines for authoring hypermedia language learning applications. *System, 25*(1), 9-27.

———. (2003). Language learning online: Designing towards user acceptability. In U. Felix (Ed.), *Language learning online: Towards best practice* (pp 21-42). Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal, 62*, 387-398.

——————. (1980). The treatment of error in written work. *Modern Language Journal, 64*(2), 216-221.

Hewings, M. (1999). *Advanced grammar in use: A reference and practice book for advanced learners of English.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Hubbard, P. (1996). Elements of CALL methodology: development, evaluation and implementation. In M. Pennington (Ed.), *The power of CALL* (pp.15-32)*.* Houston, TX: Athelstan.

Huebner, T. (1985). System and variability in interlanguage syntax. *Language Learning*, *35*, 141-63.

Hulstijn, J. H. & Hulstijn, W. (1984). Grammatical errors as a function of processing constraints and explicit knowledge. *Language Learning, 34*(1), 23-43.

Jacobs, G., & Rodgers, C. (1999). Treacherous allies: Foreign language grammar checkers. *CALICO Journal, 16*(4), 509-530.

James, C. (1980). *Contrastive analysis.* Harlow, Essex: Longman Group Limited.

——. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis.* London: Longman.

Janopolous, M. (1992). University faculty tolerance of NS and NNS writing errors. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 109-122.

Jarvis, H. (1997). The role of IT in English for academic purposes: a survey of provision on pre-sessional courses at British universities. *ReCALL, 9*(1), 43-51.

Jeffries, S. (1985). English grammar terminology as an obstacle to second language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 69*(4), 385-90.

Kay, S., & Jones, V. (2001). *Inside out (upper intermediate).* Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Kellerman, E., & Sharwood Smith, M. (Eds.). (1986). *Crosslinguistic influence in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Pergamon Institute of English.

Kepner, C. G. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-language writing skills. *Modern Language Journal, 75*(3), 305-313.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning.* Oxford: Pergamon.

——————. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford:

Pergamon.

————. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications.* London: Longman.

Kulik, J., & Kulik, C. (1987). Review of recent research literature on computer-based instruction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 12*, 222-30.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across Culture.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal, 66*(2), 140-149.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. Harlow: Longman.

Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for teaching. *System, 25*(4), 465-477.

Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals, 24*, 203-218.

Lennon, P. (1991). Error: Some problems of definition, identification and distinction. *Applied Linguistics, 12*, 180-95.

Levy, M (1999). Design processes in CALL: Integrating theory, research and evaluation. In K. Cameron (Ed.), *Media design and applications* (pp. 83-107). Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Levy, M., & Garton, J. (1994). Adapting a grammar checker for learner writers. *ReCALL, 6*(2), 3-8.

Lewis, M. (1986) *The English Verb: An Exploration of Structure and Meaning.* Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Li, D. C. S., & Chan, A. Y. W. (1999a). *Assessing crosslinguistic influence from Chinese to English: Toward a taxonomy of interlingual errors in Hong Kong Chinese ESL learners' interlanguage.* An unpublished project Report. Hong Kong City University.

——. (1999b). Helping teachers correct structural and lexical English errors. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 79-102.

——. (2001). Form-focused negative feedback: Correcting three common errors. *TESL Reporter, 34*(1), 22-34.

Liou, H-C. (1991). Development of an English grammar checker a progress report. *CALICO Journal, 9*(2), 57-70.

——. (1992) An automatic text-analysis project for EFL writing revision. *System, 20*(4), 481-492.

Long, M. (1983). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of the research. *TESOL Quarterly, 17*, 359-382.

———. (1991) Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Marshall, C., Nelson, C., & Gardiner, M. M. (1987). Design guidelines. In M. M. Gardiner & B. Christie (Eds), *Applying cognitive psychology to user-interface design* (pp. 221-278). New York, NY: Wiley.

Master, P. (1983). *Teaching the art of the article*. Paper presented at the 17th Annual TESOL Convention, Toronto, Canada.

———. (1986). Teaching the English article system to foreign technical writing students. *The Technical Writing Teacher, 13*(3), 203-210.

———. (1990). Teaching the English articles as a binary system. *TESOL Quarterly, 24*(3), 461-478.

———. (1994). The effect of systematic instruction on learning the English article system. In T. Odlin (Ed.), *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar* (pp. 229-252). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

———. (1997). The English article system: Acquisition, function, and pedagogy. *System, 25*(2), 215-232.

———. (2002). Information structure and English article pedagogy. *System, 30*, 331-348.

McEldowney, P. L. (1977). A teaching grammar of the English article system. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 15*(2), 95-112.

McEnery, T., Baker, J. P., & Wilson, A. (1995). A statistical analysis of corpus based computer versus traditional human teaching methods of part of speech analysis. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 8*, 259-274.

McGowen, B., & Richardson, V. (2000). *Clockwise (pre-intermediate)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milton, J. (1998). Exploiting L1 and interlanguage corpora in the design of an electronic language learning and production. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 186–198). London: Longman.

———. (2001). Elements of a written interlanguage: a computational and corpus-based study of institutional influences on the acquisition of English by Hong Kong Chinese students. In G. James (Ed.) *Research reports, volume two.* Language Centre, the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Milton, J., & Chowdhury, N. (1994). Tagging the interlanguage of Chinese learners of English. In L. Flowerdew & A. K. K. Tong (Eds.), *Entering text* (pp. 127-143).
Hong Kong: The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Mugglestone, P. (2000). *Opportunities (intermediate)*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Murphy, R. (1994), *English grammar in use (2ⁿᵈ ed.).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nagata, N. (1996). Computer vs. workbook instruction in second language acquisition. *CALICO Journal, 14*, 53-75.

Nanjaiah, R. (1994). *A linguistic study of Errors.* Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Nemser, W. (1974). Approximative systems of foreign language learners. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Error analysis* (pp. 55-63). London: Longman Group Limited.

Niemiec, R., & Walberg, H. (1987). Comparative effects of computer-assisted instruction: A synthesis of reviews. *Journal of Educational Computing Research, 3*, 19-37.

Nitta, R., & Gradner, S. (2005). Consciousness-raising and practice in ELT coursebooks. *ELT Journal, 59*(1), 3-13.

Norris, J., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning, 50*, 417-528.

Nunan, D. (1998). Teaching grammar in context. *ELT Journal, 52*(2), 101-109.

Nutta, J. (1998). Is computer-based grammar instruction as effective as teacher-directed grammar instruction for teaching L2 structures? *CALICO Journal, 16*(1), 49-62.

Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, R. L., Hollaway, M. E., & Murillo, D. (1992). Language learning styles: research and practical considerations for teaching in the multicultural tertiary ESL/EFL classroom. *System, 20*(4), 439-445.

Palmer, H. E. (1939). *A grammar of spoken English on a strictly phonetic basis (2nd en.).* Heffer, Cambridge.

Papp, S. (2004). The use of learner and reference corpora to foster inductive learning and self-correction in Chinese learners of English. Paper given at the '*Meeting the Needs*

of the Chinese Learner in Higher Education' Conference. University of Portsmouth, 17-18 July 2004.

Pavesi, M. (1986). Markedness, discourssal modes and relative clause formation in a formal and informal context. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8*, 38-55.

Pennington, M. C. (1992). Beyond off-the-shelf computer remedies for student writers: alternatives to canned feedback. *System, 20*(4), 423-437.

Petrovitz, W. (1997). The role of context in the presentation of grammar. *ELT Journal, 51*(3), 201-207.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes? *Language Learning, 44*(3), 493-527.

Polio, C., Fleck, C., & Leder, N. (1998). "If only I had more time": ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 7*, 43-68.

Richards, J. C. (1973). Error analysis and second language strategies. In J. W. Oller, Jr. & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Focus on the learner: Pragmatic perspectives for the language teacher* (pp. 114-135). New York, NY: Newbury House.

———. (1974). *Error analysis, perspectives on second language acquisition.* London: Longman Group Limited.

Richards, J. C., & Sampson, G. P. (1974). The study of learner English. In J. C.
Richards (Ed.), E*rror analysis, perspectives on second language acquisition* (pp. 3-18)*.* London: Longman Group Limited.

Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly, 20*, 83-95.

Robinson, P. (1996). Learning simple and complex rules under implicit, incidental rule-search conditions, and instructed conditions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 27-67.

Rutherford, W. (1987). *Second language grammar: Learning and teaching.* New York, NY: Longman.

Rutherford, W., & Sharwood Smith, M. (1985). Consciousness raising and Universal Grammar. *Applied Linguistics, 6*, 274-82.

Santos, T. (1988). Professors' reactions to the academic writing of nonnative-speaking students. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 69-90.

Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. *Language Learning, 24*(2), 205-14.

Schachter, J., & Celce-Murcia, M. (1977). Some reservations concerning error analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 11*(4), 441-51.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*(2), 129-158.

———. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlanguage pragmatics* (pp. 21-42). New York, NY: Oxford University.

———. (1994). Implicit learning and the cognitive unconscious: Of artificial grammars and SLA. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and explicit learning of languages* (pp. 165-209). London: Academic Press.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Schweers, C.W. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 37*(2). [On-line document] Available at http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol37/no2/p6.htm (Accessed 3/11/04).

Scott, M. (1999). *Wordsmith tools (version 3).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seliger, H. (1979). Inductive method and deductive method in language teaching: A re-examination. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 13*, 1-18.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10* (3), 209-231.

———. (1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman Group UK Limited.

Semke, H. D. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Langauge Annuals, 17*, 195-202.

Shaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal, 73*(4), 395-403.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1981). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics, 2*, 159-69.

Sharwood Smith, M. (1988). Consciousness-raising and the second language learner. In W. E. Rutherford & M. Sharwood Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching: A book of readings.* London: Longman.

Shepherd, J., Rossner, R., & Taylor, J. (1984). *Ways to grammar.* London: Macmillan.

Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal, 23*, 103-110.

Sinclair, J. (Ed.). (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. (1993). Foreword. In R. Berry (Ed.), *Collins COBUILD English guides (3): Articles.* London: HarperCollins Publishers.

Sinclair, J., Hanks, P., Fox, G., Moon, R., & Stock, P. (Eds). (1994). *Collins COBUILD English language dictionary.* London: HarperCollins Publishers.

Soars, L., & Soars, J. (1996). *New headway English course (intermediate students' book).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sorace, A. (1985). Metalinguistic knowledge and language use in acquisition-poor environments. *Applied Linguistics, 6*(3), 239-254.

Spada, N. (1997). Form-focused instruction and second language acquisition: A review of classroom and laboratory research. *Language Teaching, 30*, 73-87.

Stern, H. H. (1992). *Issues and options in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strevens, P. (1969). *Two ways of looking at error analysis.* ERIC: 037 714.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensive input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House,

———. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swan, M. (1994). Design criteria for pedagogic language rules. In M. Bygate, A. Tonkyn, & E. Williams (Eds.), *Grammar and the language teacher.* London: Prentice Hall. 45-55.

———. (1995). *Practical English usage (2nd ed.).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, G. (1986). Errors and explanations. *Applied Linguistics, 7*, 144-66.

Thomson, A. J., & Martinet, A. V. (1980). *A practical English grammar (3rd ed.).* Oxford: Oxford University Press

———.(1986). *A practical English grammar (4th ed.).* Oxford: Oxford University Press

———. (1986). *A practical English grammar exercises 1.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thornbury, S. (1997). Reformulation and reconstruction: Tasks that promote "noticing". *ELT Journal, 51*(4), 326-335.

————. (1999). *How to teach grammar.* Harlow: Longman.

————. (2001). *Uncovering grammar.* Harlow: Longman.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*, 327-69.

Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

—. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Vann, R., Meyer, D., & Lorenz, F. (1984). Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*, 427-40.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to content and form in the input: An experiment in consciousness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12*, 287-301.

————. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction in second language acquisition.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Warden, C. (1995). Expert system impact on writing errors in Taiwanese business English classes. *CAELL Journal, 6*(2), 22-29.

Warden, C., & Chen, J. (1995). Improving feedback while decreasing teacher burden in R.O.C. ESL business English writing classes. In P. Bruthiaux, T. Boswood & B. Du-Babcock (Eds.), *Explorations in English for professional communications* (pp.125-137). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong.

Warden, C., Chen, J., & R. Reynolds (2000). PC evaluation and impact of PC-based software in evaluating EFL business writing error types: A Java-based interactive paper. *Computers and composition.* [Online document] Available at http://www.cyut.edu.tw/%7Ewarden/java/choices.htm (Accessed 15/08/04).

Watts, N. (1997). A learner-based design model for interactive multimedia language learning packages. *System, 25*(1), 1-8.

Wei, Y. (2003). *Investigating Chinese HEFP students' target needs: How to help Chinese students both in China and in the UK prior to entering British tertiary education.* Unpublished MA dissertation. CELTE, University of Warwick.

Wei, Y. H., & Davies, G. D. (1997). Do grammar checkers work?. In J. Kohn, B. Ruschoff, & D. Wolff (Eds.), *New horizons in CALL: Proceedings of EUROCALL 96.* Szombathely, Hungary: Daniel Berzsenyi College.

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact.* New York, NY.

Whitman, R. L. (1974). Teaching the article in English. *TESOL Quarterly, 8*(3), 253-262.

Williams, J. (1995). Focus on form in communicative language teaching: research findings and the classroom teacher. *TESOL Journal, 4*, 12-16.

Yao, Y., & Warden, C. (1996). Process writing and computer correction: Happy wedding or shotgun marriage? *CALL Electronic Journal 1*(1). [On-line journal] Available at http://jaltcall.org/cjo/5_98/call_EJ/Warden1.html (Accessed 15/8/04).

Yates, R., & Kenkel, J. (2002). Responding to sentence-level errors in writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 11*(1), 29-47.

Yip, V. (1995). *Interlanguage and learnability: From Chinese to English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

The prospectus of the Warwick Higher Education Foundation Programme (2003). University of Warwick.