Unified Coded Error Correction for Grammatical and Mechanical Inaccuracies among Grade 10 Students

Princess Alexa B. Repala, L.P.T.

princessalexa.repala@deped.gov.ph

Public School Teacher, Unson National High School, Pagsanjan, Laguna 4008 Philippines

Abstract

This study focused on Unified Coded Error Correction for grammatical and mechanical inaccuracies among selected Grade 10 students. Specifically, it aimed to determine the most persistent errors in grammar and mechanics and the level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error correction to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to the familiarity of error codes and flexibility in marking.

The research involved 30 selected Grade 10 Students by the Purposive Sampling technique. A pretest was administered through an essay that diagnoses the respondents' grammatical and mechanical errors. Then, an experimental that uses the unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical inaccuracies was applied. Lastly, a posttest was also administered through an essay which measures improvement after given a treatment. In addition, a questionnaire was distributed for determining the level of implication in terms of Familiarity of Codes and Flexibility in Marking.

The Error chart by Johanna Klassen was used for determining the frequency of persistent errors found in the essay, and one group was designed for the pretest and post-test, also for the questionnaire with regards to the familiarity of codes and flexibility in marking to determine its level of implication of the use of the said correction codes.

The results of the study revealed that the most persistent error in mechanics was capitalization; while in grammar were the use of pronouns, the use of the incorrect verb, and the use of adjectives among modifiers, under prepositions and word order. Under lexical items and connectors were omission and redundancy.

Therefore, the null hypothesis, "There is a significant difference in the pretest and posttest scores of Grade 10 students with the use of unified code error correction" was rejected. It means that the use of unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical accuracies had a positive effect, seeing that errors were lessened in the post-test.

The findings showed that the use of Unified Coded Error Correction has a significant impact on the decision-making of the curriculum planners, teachers, learners, future researchers, and writers. The results will be a basis for the use of correction codes to improve written works.

Keywords: Coded Error Correction; Grammar; Mechanics; Unified approach

1. Main text

Introduction

Filipino learners are exposed to English as L2 or second language as early as Grade 1, focusing on oral fluency. In fact, from Grade 4 to 6, it is gradually introduced as the language of instruction and Filipino. Then,

both will become the primary mode of instruction in Junior High School (JHS) and Senior High School (SHS). In particular, Cabigon (2015) mentioned that English is the principal medium of instruction in education and the language of trade and law. Even at home, the use of English in conversations of Filipino families is regular. It can be in straight English or incorporated with the Filipino language, more known as Taglish.

Children nowadays, especially those with gadgets and the internet, can easily access shows, games, and even social media, wherein L2 is also used. They even acquire some prosodic features of the language, such as accent, tone, and stress. However, errors in students' output or written works are prevalent in writing, which is understandable since it is not the learner's L1 or mother tongue. Pamatmat (2016) found that this is due to the first language interference (L1) during the students' period of learning the target or desired language and is also considered a natural phenomenon in learning a second language, just like how Filipino students experience. In addition, Jugo (2020) mentioned that language anxiety is also a factor in learning the language. She found out that speaking activities are the primary source of high anxiety, followed by error correction and communication with native English speakers. Writing activity, negative self-perception, and non-comprehension sources moderate English language anxiety.

Thus, corrective feedback on the students' work will allow them to know what areas they need to improve, even their strengths and weaknesses. In this challenging school year wherein, face-to-face learning was replaced with distance learning for the safety of everyone, it is alarming that errors and mistakes in writing are heightened since the students and teachers can only communicate less, unlike before.

This paper studied Unified coded error correction to improve the grammatical and mechanical inaccuracies of selected Grade 10 students.

Theoretical Framework

Some theories advocated by the following authorities served as a basis for formulating a conceptual frame of reference for this study.

The first theory in which the study is anchored is the Error Analysis. In the 1960s, a branch of Applied Linguistics called Error Analysis evolved to show that learner errors were not only random but also significant. They represented specific universal strategies as well as the learner's native language. These strategies respond to Contrastive Analysis Theory, which indicates that native language interference was the primary source of errors in second language learning. On the one hand, Applied Error Analysis is concerned with the organization of remedial courses and the development of appropriate materials and teaching practices based on theoretical error analysis findings" (Erdogan 2005). In addition, the field of error analysis can be defined as dealing with the contrasts in how people learning a language speak and how adults who are native speakers of the language utilize it.

Moreover, Norrish (1983) suggested a systematic deviation occurs when a student has not learned something and cannot recall it. The concept of "interlanguage," the idea that second language learners have absorbed, sprang from this. A mental grammar is a natural language system that may be described using linguistic rules and concepts (Long et al., 2003). Interlanguage combines the speaker's mother tongue and the target language.

In connection with the study, error analysis was utilized, and the students were viewed as active participants in the learning process. Though they commit mistakes in their writing, this is viewed positively and significantly since they are continuously trying to express their ideas despite repetitive inaccuracies. Furthermore, a strategy is used for the learners to get the improvement and feedback they need using Unified Coded Error Correction. Meanwhile, this has also been founded on the Contrastive Analysis theory. The respondents are not native speakers of English at all but second-language speakers; thus, there is a native language interference when they write compositions. Lastly, the interlanguage theory is exhibited upon why the learners repeat their errors, and that is because of fossilization. Their errors are fossilized in phonological, morphological, or syntactic features in speech, which are different in the target language's rules even after

prolonged exposure or instruction of TL.

Statement of the Problem

The study aims to use Unified Coded Error Correction to treat grammatical and mechanical errors of selected Grade 10 Students.

Specifically, it aims to answer the following questions:

1) Determine the most persistent writing error in terms of:

    1.1 grammar;

- nouns
- verbs
- modifiers
- prepositions
- syntax
- lexical items
- connectors

    1.2 mechanics;

- capitalization
- punctuation
- style

2) What is the level of improvement on the selected Grade 10 written output with the use of unified coded error

    correction?

3) What is the level of implication of the teacher's use of unified coded error correction to English 10 learners

    writing inaccuracies with respect to:

- Familiarity of Error Codes
- Flexibility in Marking

Research Methodology

The purpose of a research design is to guarantee that the evidence you gather allows you to clearly address the research topic. As cited by Oberiri (2017), quantitative research design as defined by Aliaga and Gunderson (2002) is "the explanation of an issue or event through the collection of numerical data and analysis using mathematical approaches, particularly statistics." Quantitative research, according to Hendraswari (2016), uses a statistical technique to explore and explain occurrences. According to Ary et al. (2010: 26), experimental research entails examining the impact of systematic modification of one variable on another one. The experimental treatment, often known as the manipulated variable, is the variable that is modified.

Experimental research is used to test hypotheses in order to determine cause and effect correlations. The ultimate goal of experimental research is to see if a specific strategy or method of doing anything is "better" than the "older" or more traditional one that has been the normal practice in the past (Lodico et al, 2006: 12).

Pre-experimental design, real experimental design, factorial design, and quasi-experimental designs are all examples of experimental research designs (Ary et al,2010: 302). Because a one-group pretest-posttest approach provides little or no control of extraneous variables, this study used a pre-experimental design. To determine the outcome of the treatment, this study used pre- and post-testing. Three steps are commonly involved in a one-group pretest and post-test design: (1) administering a pretest to measure the dependent variable, (2) applying the experimental treatment X to the subjects, and (3) administering a posttest to measure the dependent variable once more. By comparing the pretest and post-test scores, differences due to the application of the experimental treatment are subsequently analyzed (Ary et al, 2010: 303).

The procedures of the pre-experimental research with one-group pretest-posttest design in this research were described as follows:

1. Administering a pretest through an essay (Y1) which diagnoses the respondents grammatical and mechanical errors

2. Applying an experimental that was using the unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical inaccuracies

3. Administering a posttest through an essay (Y2) which measures improvement after given a treatment.

Applying one group pretest-posttest, the researcher wanted to find out whether the use of unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical inaccuracies of grade 10 students will be effective to improve their written work.

The respondents of the study are the selected thirty (30) Grade 10 students of Unson National High School who were classified as developing learners based from their English grade.

The respondents in the study were determined using the Purposive Sampling technique. According Crossman (2020), a purposive sample is a non-probability sample that is selected based on characteristics of a population and the objective of the study. The study follows the purposive convenience sampling technique in which the participants were easily reachable and willing to take part in the present study. Purposive sampling was employed in this study among the thirty selected Grade 10 Students of Unson National High School.

Data were collected using questionnaires, which entails the essay and the survey. The questionnaires were administrated to the respondents at Unson National High School, Pagsanjan District in, Pagsanjan Laguna using printed questionnaires to gather the data. The distribution of the questionnaires were conducted by the author and with the assistance and approval of the principal of Unson National High School.

The questionnaires were prepared and designed by the researcher herself based on the study research questions. English was the language used in preparing the questionnaires.

for educators to converse in, it was utilized to prepare the interviews.

Required letter and permit to conduct the study were first secured. A letter of approval addressed to the office of Schools Division Superintendent (SDS), and to the school head of Unson National High School in Pagsanjan District, in Laguna for the permission of conducting the study. The conduct survey with the respondents was scheduled. Afterwards, analysis of the data results were done using quantitative method. The error codes used are shown in Appendix D and the grammatical and mechanical error correction guidelines are shown in Appendix E.

The responses on the questionnaire were tabulated and will be statistically treated for the following reasons: To determine the level of implication of the teacher's use of unified coded error correction to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to:

o   Familiarity of Error Codes
o   Flexibility in Marking

The following summated scale points and adjectival interpretation were referred for Familiarity of Error Codes and Flexibility in Marking.

5- Strongly Agree
4- Agree
3- Moderately Agree
2- Disagree
1-Strongly Disagree

For the rate of Improvement in the pre-test and post-test:

Range	Verbal Interpretation
0.80-1.00	Poor
0.60-0.79	Fair

0.40-0.59	Good
0.20-0.39	Remarkable
0.00-0.19	Exceptional

Results and Discussion

Table 1. Most Persistent Writing Error in terms of Mechanics

Statement	Pre-test		Verbal Interpretation	Post-test		Verbal Interpretation
	f	%		f	%	
Capitalization	50	42.37	Good	7	21.88	Remarkable
Punctuation	29	24.58	Remarkable	8	25.00	Remarkable
Style						
Faulty Parallelism	10	8.47	Exceptional	6	18.75	Exceptional
Too Informal	15	12.71	Exceptional	6	18.75	Exceptional
Lacks Paragraph Unity	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Improve Thesis Statement	3	2.54	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Transitions Needed	11	9.32	Exceptional	5	15.63	Exceptional
Improve Topic System	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Total	**118**			**32**		

Table 1 illustrates the most persistent writing error in terms of Mechanics. As per the pre-test, learners' errors in "Capitalization" have the highest frequency of 50, a percentage of 42.37, with a verbal interpretation of "Good." On the other hand, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Lacks Paragraph Unity" and "Improve Topic System."

The writing errors in terms of Mechanics for the pre-test were at a total of 118 compared to the post-test, which only had 32 errors that show significant improvement.

As per the post-test, learners' error in "Punctuation" got the highest frequency of 8, a percentage of 25, with a verbal interpretation of "Remarkable." Just like in the pre-test, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Lacks Paragraph Unity," "Improve Thesis Statement," and "Improve Topic System."

Based on the results above, Capitalization is the most persistent error in mechanics. Despite this, the students' 118 errors in Pre-Test decreased in Post-Test with only 32 errors which improved significantly by 27% and is verbally interpreted as "Remarkable Improvement".

Likewise, Anwar (2015), in his study for Saudi students, concluded that capitalization errors, like other errors, must be addressed in ESL EFL language programs. According to the study's findings, capitalization errors are a critical area of error in Saudi students' EFL writing, and these errors are spread across all significant capitalization categories. The study provides evidence that capitalization errors account for a significant portion of Saudi students' EFL composition errors, just like in the findings of this study in which Capitalization is a critical challenge for Filipino learners.

Table 2. Most Persistent Writing Error in terms of Grammar as to Nouns

Statement	Pre-test		Verbal Interpretation	Post-test		Verbal Interpretation
	f	%		f	%	

Statement	f	%	Verbal Interpretation	f	%	Verbal Interpretation
Agreement Pronouns	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0	Exceptional
Article Problems	1	5.00	Exceptional	1	33.33	Remarkable
Number Problem	10	50.00	Good	0	0.00	Exceptional
Shift in Person	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Use Pronoun	9	45.00	Good	2	66.67	Fair
Pronoun Reference Unclear	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Total	**20**			**3**		

Table 2 illustrates the most persistent writing error in terms of Grammar as to Nouns. As per the pre-test, learners' errors in "Number Problem" have the highest frequency of 10, a percentage of 50.00, with a verbal interpretation of "Good." On the other hand, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Agreement Pronouns" and "Pronoun Reference Unclear."

The writing errors in terms of Grammar as to Nouns for the pre-test were at a total of 20 compared to the post-test, which only had three errors that show significant improvement.

As per the post-test, learners' error in "Use Pronouns" got the highest frequency of 2, a percentage of 66.67, with a verbal interpretation of "Fair." In the post-test, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Agreement Pronoun," "Number Problems," "Shift in Person," and "Pronoun Reference Unclear."
Based on the results above, "Use Pronoun" is the most persistent error in terms of Grammar as to Nouns. Despite this, the students' 20 errors in Pre-Test decreased in Post-Test with only three errors which improved significantly by 15% and are verbally interpreted as "Exceptional Improvement."

Similarly, Riadussulhi (2017) discovered that learners make pronoun errors due to intralingual and interference error factors. In his study, Mustaqim (2018) concluded that such errors are caused by learners' lack of understanding in distinguishing types of pronouns, unclear explanation, lack of interest, and lack of attention to teacher explanation.

Table 3. Most Persistent Writing Error in terms of Grammar as to Verbs

Statement	Pre-test		Verbal Interpretation	Post-test		Verbal Interpretation
	f	%		f	%	
Agreement in S-V	4	12.50	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Use Infinitive	3	9.38	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Modal Problem	2	6.25	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Use Present Participle	1	3.13	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Use Past Participle	2	6.25	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Change Voice	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Incorrect Verb Form	19	59.38	Good	3	75.00	Fair
Wrong Verb Tense	3	9.38	Exceptional	1	25.00	Remarkable
Total	**34**			**4**		

Table 3 illustrates the most persistent writing error in terms of Grammar as to Verbs. As per the pre-test, learners' errors in the "Incorrect Verb form" have the highest frequency of 19, a percentage of 59.38, with a verbal interpretation of "Good." On the other hand, no students were reported to have errors in the "Change Voice." The writing errors in terms of Grammar as to Verbs for the pre-test were at a total of 3 compared to the post-test, with only four errors showing significant improvement.

As per the post-test, learners' error in "Incorrect Verb Form" got the highest frequency of 3, a

percentage of 75.00, with a verbal interpretation of "Fair." In the post-test, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Agreement S-V," "Use Infinitive," "Modal Problem," "Use Present Participle," "Use Past Participle," and "Change Voice."

Based on the results above, "Incorrect Verb Form" is the most persistent error in terms of Grammar as to Verbs. Despite this, the students' 34 errors in Pre-Test decreased in Post-Test with only four errors which improved significantly by 11.67 % and are verbally interpreted as "Exceptional Improvement."

Meanwhile, according to Wee (2009), the respondents have the most difficulty mastering the SVA. They make the most omission and addition errors that show concord of having the verb agreeing with the subject. The omission of -s/-es/-ies had the highest number of omission errors.

Table 4. Most Persistent Writing Error in terms of Grammar as to Modifiers

Statement	Pre-test		Verbal Interpretation	Post-test		Verbal Interpretation
	f	%		f	%	
Use Adjective	5	83.33	Poor	0	0.00	Exceptional
Use Adverb	1	16.67	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Dangling Modifier						
Displaced Modifier	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Total	**6**			**0**		

Table 4 illustrates the most persistent writing error in terms of Grammar as to Modifiers. As per the pre-test, learners' errors in "Use Adjective" have the highest frequency of 5, a percentage of 83.33, with a verbal interpretation of "Poor." On the other hand, no students were reported to have errors in "Displaced Modifier." The writing errors in terms of Grammar as to Modifiers for the pre-test were at a total of 6 compared to the post-test, with no errors showing significant improvement.

As per the post-test, learners' errors in all areas are cleared. In the post-test, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Use Adjectives," "Use Adverb," "Dangling Modifier," and "Displaced Modifier."

Based on the results above, "Use Adjective" is the most persistent error in terms of Grammar as to Modifiers. Despite this, the students' six errors in Pre-Test decreased in Post-Test with zero errors which are verbally interpreted as "Exceptional Improvement."

In a similar case, Maulida (2009) discovered that Indonesian students face similar difficulties using adjectives in his research. Aside from mother-tongue interference, he attributed it to the students' lack of more profound knowledge of grammar rules and their lack of mastery of adjective rules.

Table 5. Most Persistent Writing Error in terms of Grammar as to Prepositions and Syntax

Statement	Pre-test		Verbal Interpretation	Post-test		Verbal Interpretation
	f	%		f	%	
Prepositions	6	25.00	Remarkable	0	0.00	Exceptional
Syntax						
Sentence Fragment	3	12.50	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Run-on Sentence	2	8.33	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Subject Verb needed	3	12.50	Exceptional	2	33.33	Remarkable
Wrong Word Order	10	41.67	Good	4	66.67	Fair
Total	**24**			**6**		

Table 5 illustrates the most persistent writing error in terms of Grammar as to Prepositions and Syntax.

As per the pre-test, learners' errors in "Word order" have the highest frequency of 10, a percentage of 41.67, with a verbal interpretation of "Good." On the other hand, the minor error committed by students was "Run-on sentence," with a frequency of 2, a percentage of 8.33, with a verbal interpretation of Exceptional."

The writing errors in terms of Grammar to Modifiers for the pre-test were at a total of 24 compared to the post-test, which only had six errors that showed significant improvement.

In the post-test, students were reported to have the most errors in the area "Wrong word order," having a frequency of 4, a percentage of 66.67, and a verbal interpretation of "Fair."

Based on the results above, "Wrong Word Order" is the most persistent error in terms of Grammar as to Prepositions and Syntax. Despite this, the students' 24 errors in Pre-Test decreased in Post-Test, with six errors verbally interpreted as "Exceptional Improvement."

Similarly, according to Kusumawardhani (2019), the errors found in the Indonesian learners' English narrative composition, the majority of them made word order errors because (1) the learners did not understand and master the target language and (2) the learners did not understand and master the target language. As a result, they continued to construct sentences in their mother tongue, and the learners' mother tongue influenced them greatly in developing the target language.

Table 6. Most Persistent Writing Error in terms of Grammar as to Lexical Items and Connectors

Statement	Pre-test		Verbal Interpretation	Post-test		Verbal Interpretation
	f	%		f	%	
Lexical Items						
Omit/Redundant	32	43.24	Good	8	47.06	Good
Spelling	17	22.97	Remarkable	2	11.76	Exceptional
Word Choice	15	20.27	Remarkable	6	35.29	Remarkable
Connectors						
Incorrect Connective	7	9.46	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Link/Combine	0	0.00	Exceptional	0	0.00	Exceptional
Add Relative Pronoun	3	4.05	Exceptional	1	5.88	Exceptional
Total	**74**			**17**		

Table 6 illustrates the most persistent writing error in terms of Grammar as to Lexical Items and Connectors. As per the pre-test, learners' errors in "Omission and Redundancy" have the highest frequency of 32, a percentage of 43.24, with a verbal interpretation of "Good." On the other hand, students did not commit any errors in "Link/Combine."

The writing errors in terms of Grammar as to Lexical Items and Connectors for the pre-test were at a total of 74 compared to the post-test, which only had 17 errors that show significant improvement.
As per the post-test, learners' error in "Word choice" got the highest frequency of 6, a percentage of 35.29, with a verbal interpretation of "Remarkable." In the post-test, no students were reported to have errors in the areas "Incorrect Connective" and "Link/Combine."

Based on the results above, "Omission and Redundancy" is the most persistent error in terms of Grammar as to Lexical Items and Connectors. Despite this, the students' 74 errors in Pre-Test decreased in Post-Test, with 17 errors verbally interpreted as "Remarkable Improvement."

Similarly, Ahmadvand (2008) sought to examine the errors made by Iranian EFL students in their written productions. He collected the necessary data from the various productions of approximately 40 learners at the pre-intermediate and intermediate levels. According to his findings, the most common errors were

omissions, additions, and regularizations. Moreover, according to data, negative transfer accounted for only 30% of all errors, and other factors caused the majority of the errors because of misinformation. As a result, it was demonstrated that negative transfer from Persian to English in written productions is neither the only nor the most significant source of errors. Indeed, Ahmadvand's (2008) findings are striking. L1's role in the acquisition of English as a target language was reduced.

Table 7. Significant Difference in the Pre-Test and Posttest Scores of Grade 10 students with the use of Unified Code Error Correction

Test	Mean	Computed t value	Critical value	t	p-value	Analysis
Pre-Test	7.459	4.006	2.028		0.000	Significant
Posttest	1.513					

Table 7 presents the significant difference in the Pre-Test and Posttest scores of Grade 10 students with the use of Unified Code Error Correction.

From the observed mean scores of the test as well as the positive value of the computed t value, it can be inferred that the errors for the posttest are less frequent. Furthermore, having the computed t value greater than that of the critical t value which is 2.028 and a p-value of 0.000 which is less than the significance alpha 0.05, the test is proven to be significant.

The information above suggests that at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference in the pre-test and posttest scores of Grade 10 students with the use of unified code error correction" is rejected. Thus, it calls for the acceptance of the alternative which incites that there is a significant difference. It means that the use of unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical accuracies has a positive effect, seeing that errors were lessened in the post test.

The results likewise support the study of Pamatmat (2016) and Ferdouse that students prefer coded feedback to uncoded feedback. Thanks to the correction codes, they have ample opportunity to learn about and correct their mistakes. The study also shows that students benefit significantly from the error correction process because they must practice it regularly. Their teacher's correction symbols serve as inspiration for them. When they receive direct cues from their teacher, they feel obligated to complete their assignments correctly. As a result, the process of error correction engages the students. They are constantly correcting, rewriting, and submitting their written work to their teacher, which significantly improves their overall writing skill.

Table 8. *Level of Implication of the Teachers' Use of Unified Coded Error to English 10 Learners Writing Inaccuracies with Respect to Familiarity of Error Codes*

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
The codes are easy to understand.	4.03	0.72	Agree
The codes are easy to remember.	3.23	0.57	Moderately Agree
The codes made me realize the kind of error I committed.	4.47	0.78	Strongly Agree
I would like to answer more exercises about the codes so I can memorize its use and purpose.	3.50	0.78	Agree
I am willing to use the codes for peer-assessments in writing so I	3.83	0.75	Agree

can be acquainted with it more.

Overall Mean = 3.81
Standard Deviation = 0.83
Verbal Interpretation = High

Table 8 illustrates the level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to familiarity of error codes. Among the statements above, "The codes made me realize the kind of error I committed" yielded the highest mean score of (M=4.47, SD=0.78) and was remarked Strongly Agree. This is followed by "The codes are easy to understand" mean score of (M=4.03, SD=0.72) and was remarked Agree. On the other hand, the statement "The codes are easy to remember" yielded the lowest mean score (M=3.23, SD=0.57) and was remarked Moderately Agree.

Overall, the level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to familiarity of error codes attained a mean score of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.83 and was verbally interpreted as High among the respondents. Based from the data, it can be inferred that utilizing a coded system and having it familiarized by students will positively improve their written compositions. Therefore, teachers need to teach the error codes and let the students practice using it to achieve mastery.

The results likewise support the study of Pamatmat (2016) and Ferdouse (2013) which confirmed that utilizing correction codes is useful in error correction, as Makino stated that using error codes is a successful strategy in helping students activate their linguistic competence.

Table 9. *Level of Implication of the Teachers' Use of Unified Coded Error to English 10 Learners Writing Inaccuracies with Respect to Flexibility in Marking*

Statement	Mean	SD	Remarks
The use of the unified coded error correction is less time consuming.	3.93	0.87	Agree
Using the coded error correction, immediate feedback is given.	3.90	0.84	Agree
The codes make it easier for me to understand the nature of error I committed.	4.27	0.83	Strongly Agree
With the use of the codes, peer-assessment is easier.	3.73	0.78	Agree
Revising my written work is easier because of the unified coded error correction.	3.70	0.92	Agree

Overall Mean = 3.91
Standard Deviation = 0.86
Verbal Interpretation = High

Table 9 illustrates the level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to flexibility in marking. Among the statements above, "The codes make it easier for me to understand the nature of error I committed" yielded the highest mean score of (M=4.27, SD=0.83) and was remarked Strongly Agree. This is followed by "Using the coded error correction, immediate feedback is given" mean score of (M=3.90, SD=0.84) and was remarked Agree. On the other hand, the statement "Revising my written work is easier because of the unified coded error correction" yielded the lowest mean score (M=3.70, SD=0.92) and was remarked Agree.

Overall, the level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to flexibility in marking attained a mean score of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.86 and was verbally interpreted as High among the respondents. It Is inferred that using the coded error correction help the students understand the nature of their mistake and helps them in correcting their

inaccuracies.

The results likewise support the study of Pamatmat (2016) and Ferdhouse (2013) adding that given the utilization of the error codes, teachers have to make sure that students understand clearly grammar rules.

Summary of Findings

Different significant points were found after the conduct of the research. Based on the different findings of the study, the following findings are hereby enumerated based on the statement of the problem:
1. The most persistent error in mechanics is Capitalization.
2. The most persistent error in grammar as to noun is the use of Pronouns.
3. The most persistent error in grammar as to verbs is incorrect verb form.
4. The most persistent error in grammar under modifiers is the use of adjectives.
5. The most persistent error in grammar under prepositions and syntax is wrong word order.
6. The most persistent error in grammar under lexical items and connectors is omission and redundancy
7. There is a significant difference in the pre-test and posttest scores of Grade 10 students with the use of unified code error correction" is rejected. It means that the use of unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical accuracies has a positive effect, seeing that errors were lessened in the post test.
8. The level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to familiarity of error codes attained a mean score of 3.81 and a standard deviation of 0.83 and was verbally interpreted as High among the respondents.
9. The level of implication of the teachers' use of unified coded error to English 10 learners writing inaccuracies with respect to flexibility in marking attained a mean score of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.86 and was verbally interpreted as High among the respondents.

Conclusion

Based on the different findings of the study, the following conclusion is stated based on the statement of the problem:

The researcher therefore concludes that the null hypothesis "There is no significant difference in the pre-test and posttest scores of Grade 10 students with the use of unified code error correction." is rejected. Thus, it calls for the acceptance of the alternative which incites that there is a significant difference. It means that the use of unified coded error correction to treat grammatical and mechanical accuracies has a positive effect, seeing that errors were lessened in the post test.

Recommendations

From the said conclusion, the following recommendations were presented:
1. A unified approach to error correction can be a flexible marking system. It will eventually reduce overcorrection, unwanted abbreviations and symbols, and hurtful marginal comments or a combination of approaches by teachers.
2. Teachers should practice providing appropriate feedback on written work to encourage students to take some responsibility for their learning.
3. More research in the area of coded feedback to students' written work should be undertaken to familiarize teachers in a more practical approach to error correction; thus, reducing the problem of determining "which" error to correct and "how" to correct errors.
4. Teachers should create a list of correction codes that students can manage and use more effectively. This will cause students to lose interest in reading and learning from the marked compositions. As a result, teachers must explicitly teach them and provide students with ample

practice until they master the meta-linguistic terms and knowledge required to understand the corrections. Students will be able to develop accuracy if a system of marking codes is used consistently, as suggested by (Ferris & Roberts 2001). Their understanding of the system is reinforced throughout the grading periods through lessons.

5. English educators can practice using the correction codes with a smaller group, for example his or her advisee for gradual improvement and mastery. If there are significant results, a larger group of students can participate in the unified coded error correction.

References

Algahzo, K.M. et al (2020). Grammatical Errors Found in English Writing: A Study from Al-Hussein Bin Talal University. International Education Studies; Vol. 13, No. 9; 2020 ISSN 1913-9020 E-ISSN 1913-9039 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

Anwar M. (2015). Evaluating Capitalization Errors in Saudi Female Students' EFL Writing at Bisha University. SSRN Electronic Journal. 10.2139/ssrn.2834445.

Apuke, O. (2017). Quantitative Research Methods: A Synopsis Approach. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (Kuwait Chapter) 6. 40-47. 10.12816/0040336.

Bacon, N. (2022). Style in Academic Writing. The Well-Crafted Sentence: A Writer's Guide to Style Third Edition; Due Date: Jun 29, 2022

Brundage, D. et al. (2003). Newfoundlandese if you please. Acting on Words: An Integrated Reader, Rhetoric, and Handbook.

Challay, S. et al (2019). A Study of the Errors in the Use of Capitalization Among Junior Secondary School Pupils in Bo District. International Journal of Social Sciences and Management. Sc. Manage. Vol. 6, Issue-4: 90-96

Dimaculangan, N. (2017). The Struggle of an ESL Learner: Delving into Learning Orientation, Motivation, and Strategies" International Journal of Research (2017). www.journalijar.com.

English Language Lesson: Modifiers – Adjectives and Adverbs. English Grammar: ESL Resources. p.1

Ellis R. (2008). Explicit Form-Focused Instruction and Second Language Acquisition. The Handbook of Educational Linguistics (pp.437 – 455)

Ferdouse, F. (2013). Learning from mistakes: Using Correction Code to improve Student's Writing Skill in English Composition Class. Stanford Journal of English. 7-62-86.

Gotesdiner G. (2016). Language and Grammar I. Nouns Study Guide

Hendraswari, M. (2016). The Effectiveness of Using Song Toward the Eight Grade Students' Vocabulary Mastery at MTsN Tunggangri in Academic Year 2015/2016. Student Registered Number. 2813123103. 2016.

Jugo, R. (2020). Language Anxiety in Focus: The Case of Filipino Undergraduate Teacher Education Learners. Education Research International Volume 2020, Article ID 7049837, 8 pages https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/7049837

Kusumawardhani P. (2019). Recognizing Word Order Errors In Efl's English Narrative Composition: A Morphology Perspective. Bilingualism, Language, and Education Studies (BLESS), Vol. 1, No. 2, July 2019

Josephine, E. (2019). Kinds of Nouns. 10.13140/RG.2.2.19517.82409.

Kamikawa, M. (2017). Prepositions: "Of," "At," and "For". San José State University Writing Center

Makino, T. (1993). Learner self-correction in EFL Written Compositions. ELT Journal 47 (4), 337-341

Maulina, Murni & Idris, Nuny. (2020). Word Order Errors in Phrase Structure in BIPA Students' Essays. 10.2991/assehr.k.200325.102.

Mikics, D. (2007). A New Handbook of Literary Terms. Yale University Press, 2007.

Muin, F. (2019). An Introduction to Linguistics. Chapter 7 SYNTAX.

Ozkayran, A. et al (2020). Analysis of Higher Education Students' Errors in English Writing Tasks. Advances in Language and Literary Studies 11(2):48

Pamatmat, F. (2016). Unified Approach in Correction of Errors among Student's Written Work. International Research Journal of Social Sciences.

Pathan, A. K. (2021). The Most Frequent Capitalization Errors Made by the EFL Learners at Undergraduate Level: An Investigation. Scholars International Journal of Linguistics and Literature. SSN 2616-8677 (Print) |ISSN 2617-3468 (Online). Scholars Middle East Publishers, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Salamin, A. & Farrah, M. & Zahida, R. & Zaru, N. (2016). An Investigation into Punctuation and Capitalization Errors Made by Hebron University EFL Students. Al-azhar University Research Journal. 18. 333-352.

Sentences: A Case Study of Thai EFL Students. English Language Teaching; Vol. 10, No. 3; 2017 ISSN 1916-4742 E-ISSN 1916-4750. Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education

Sermsook K. and Pochakorn R. (2017). An Analysis of Errors in Written English

Strunk, W. (2022). The Elements of Style. English Grammar Handbook.

Wenyuan G. (2018). Five Basic Types of the English Verb. West Career & Technical Academy. Las Vegas, Nevada. July 20, 2018

Williams, J. et al. (2022). Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace 12th Edition