

# Learner attitudes toward error correction in a beginners English class

Yohanna Abarca Amador  
Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica  
yohabaam@yahoo.es

Recibido: 11-XII-07 / Aprobado: 28-III-08

## Abstract

*This study was conducted among twenty-three college students of English who were asked their preferences for twenty error correction techniques. The techniques were presented mostly in dialogue form as they actually take place in the classroom. The study shows that the students preferred those techniques in which they are explicitly told what their mistake was. In light of this, the students favored correction by their teacher, not their peers in the language class. The students also showed their preference for the techniques in which they are given the opportunity to repeat the correct model provided by the teacher and thus repair their faulty speech. The study concludes that these techniques provide a type of corrective feedback that encourages students to participate in the correction of their spoken errors, a classroom activity that leads to acquisition of the foreign language.*

## Resumen

*Actitudes hacia la corrección de errores de los estudiantes de una clase de nivel principiante de inglés*

Yohanna Abarca Amador

*Este estudio se realizó con veinte estudiantes universitarios de Inglés a quienes se les preguntó sobre sus preferencias por veinte técnicas de corrección de errores. Las técnicas se presentaron en su mayoría en forma de diálogo tal y como ocurren en la clase. El estudio muestra que los estudiantes prefirieron aquellas técnicas en las que se les informa explícitamente sobre su error. A este respecto, los estudiantes favorecieron la corrección por parte del profesor, no por sus compañeros de clase. Los estudiantes también mostraron su preferencia por las técnicas que les permite repetir el modelo correcto por parte del profesor y así corregir sus problemas de habla. El estudio concluye que estas técnicas proveen un tipo de retroalimentación correctiva que motiva a los estudiantes a participar en la corrección de sus errores orales, una actividad en clase que conduce a la adquisición de la lengua extranjera.*

### KEY WORDS:

corrective feedback, error correction techniques, language teaching and learning, peer correction, second language acquisition, repair, repetition, teacher-student interaction.

### PALABRAS CLAVE:

retroalimentación correctiva, técnicas de corrección de errores, enseñanza y aprendizaje de los idiomas, corrección por parte de los compañeros de clase, adquisición de la lengua extranjera, reparación, repetición, interacción entre profesores y estudiantes.



## INTRODUCTION

Language teachers are often faced with the responsibility of correcting student's errors. This is not an easy task. Deciding when to correct a student, or what correction technique is the most appropriate one has long been discussed in the language teaching profession. Therefore, foreign language teachers should keep in mind that the purpose of correction is to help learners advance in their learning process rather than put them on the spot. Along these lines, error correction is seen as conducive to foreign language acquisition within a classroom environment that facilitates learning. As College teacher of English as a foreign language, the author has had the opportunity of teaching different levels of English teaching majors, where correction of spoken errors is a frequent duty while

students are involved in different conversational activities.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Many theories of corrective feedback propose that not all errors should be corrected or at least not immediately. A number of techniques can be used depending on the task and the skill practiced. In the article "Using Written Feedback in EFL Composition Classes," Muncie (2000:155) cites Lynch who suggests that teachers should "offer learners a variety of feedback types." The more techniques of feedback, the more chances of success they will have. However, speaking from experience, the author has noticed that the majority of the students favor explicit and immediate correction. In other words, their expectations in terms of correction seem to be very different from what theories

say. Actually, students' expectations for correction of spoken errors by their foreign language teachers have ended up in what Matz Rosen (1993) called "error-hunt", which in the teaching of spoken language implies being on the look for students' errors and then proceed to correct them.

Some researchers, Sullivan and Lingren (2002), for example, argue that students tend to focus more on correcting mistakes and problems than on developing learning techniques such as self-assessment and reflection which will give them skills to become more effective autonomous learners. In light of this, in his article "Error and Corrective Feedback Updated Theory and Classroom Practice" Ancker (2000) refers to a consistent pattern of error expectations. In his study, 76% of the students interviewed in different countries

conveyed that the teacher should always correct their mistakes; otherwise, "they wouldn't learn to speak English correctly." For teachers, the opposite was true: 75% of the English teachers interviewed in Ancker's study agreed that "errors shouldn't always be corrected because in doing so the student's confidence and motivation could be negatively affected" (p.22).

Furthermore, within the domain of error correction, peer correction is one of the techniques that many authors favor as complementary to the teacher's correction. The role of evaluator for Muncie "adds an authoritarian dimension to the teacher's attempt at collaboration" (p.48). If only the teacher corrects in the class dependence may be encouraged instead of autonomy. However, I have found suspicion on the part of the students when they have to do any activity in which peer correction is involved. According to Rollinson (2005), although both research and practice have generally supported the use of peer feedback, many teachers and most students are not convinced of its usefulness. Rollinson states that students may often feel that only the teacher—or a person that is in a better inter-language stage than his or hers—is qualified to correct them (p. 23). In the author's own experience this is also true. She has found that, most students do not welcome feedback from a peer who is more or less at his or her own proficiency level. Interestingly, Norton (2005) suggests that working in pairs "potentially affects linguistic performance if one candidate (a non-native speaker of English who took the Cambridge English Speaking Tests for her study) has higher linguistic ability than the other, or if candidates know each other.

In her article "A Vygotskian Approach to Evaluation on Foreign Language Learning Contexts," Machado (2000) talks about the use of scaffolding: helping the child get help from an adult when s/he is not able to perform the task. Furthermore, Donald (cited by Machado) shows that scaffolding—one way in which learners acquire new linguistic structures—can be obtained through collaborative work among peers of the same level of competence in L2 settings, not just through a more capable peer or expert, the teacher or a native speaker, for example. As can be seen from these authors, the idea that the language teacher is the only one who is capable of giving feedback is quite a common belief.

None of these techniques in this study encourages the repetition of the teacher's correct model by the student. In fact, the author believes with Burling (1992) that "anyone who did no more than imitate what others had said would talk only in the limited sense that a parrot is said to talk" (p. 351). In other words, learners' imitation of correct models does not suffice to strengthen the hypotheses that they construct about the language in time. On the contrary, the expansion of an error by means of a correction technique allows the teacher to treat the error through conversational exchanges, information adjustments and opportunities for repairing faulty language, rather than a mere provision of the correct model: an acquisition-rich environment (Lightbown and Spada: 1995). It is probable that in such an environment, the learner will be more willing to take the risk of being wrong and will feel freer and more uninhibited to produce the language of his or her level of proficiency (Richard-Amato,

1988: 37).

Furthermore, these techniques attempt to trigger learners' expectations and assumptions about the target language at the corresponding level of instruction. From this viewpoint, correction is seen as an opportunity for the teacher to provide feedback about the language, which could make the student aware that (1) some form in his or her utterance is anomalous and (2) repair of that anomalous form is expected. Thus, errors are not an indication of the learners' failure to learn the language. Instead, they are to be seen both as windows to the language acquisition process and overt reflections of a learner's internalized knowledge of the language.

Along these lines, the present study endorses Murphy's belief (2003) that "teachers need to support learners' efforts, guide them, and provide cues for improvement" (p. 116). It also proposes that teachers' interruption of the students' discourse to provide correction might not only lead to a breakdown in communication but also might put the student on the spot and thus inhibit his or her desire to convey the oral message. In Seligson's words: "If we are too negative about them [errors], students won't say anything, so we need to be careful how we react." Along the lines of Seligson, Loewen (2007) suggests that "too much error correction can also shift the primary focus from communication to linguistic forms." In sum, errors in the foreign language classroom, as in life, must be seen as being conducive to a process, not a penalty.

The extensive literature available on the topic of error correction is considerably beyond the scope of this study, which is based mainly

on studies dealing with the treatment of spoken errors and its implications in the English as a foreign language class. It is clear, though, that both language researchers and teachers have long shown interest in the implications of error correction research. However, there is still a need for determining which error correction techniques are the most successful at dealing with learners' spoken errors. In light of this, the present study seeks to determine which error correction techniques students prefer when being corrected for errors of spoken language.

#### METHODOLOGY

This paper reports on the results of a small-scale survey that was completed by 23 beginners of English from the University of Costa Rica's School of Modern Languages. The group was composed of 8 males and 15 females who took the LM-1001 Integrated English Course during the second semester of 2006. From these students, 18 were taking the course as a requirement for the English as a Foreign Language major; 3 students wanted to switch to another major and 2 students needed the course for their jobs. The survey consisted of two parts. In the first part, the students had to answer 6 questions in which they had to write their comments on some aspects related to correction in class. In the second part of the interview, the students were presented with 20 different correction techniques, illustrated by a dialogue that included the teacher-student, student-student interaction in which an error took place. In order to show their preferences for these techniques, the students were asked to circle the letter (A) if they completely agreed with the situation, (B) if they agreed with the situation, (C) if they were neutral

about the situation, (D) if they disagreed, and (E) if they completely disagreed with the situation.

### RESULTS

#### FIRST PART OF THE SURVEY

In the first part of the survey, the students had to answer 5 open questions related to error correction in the class. In the first question they were asked whether they were corrected when they made a mistake in the classroom. The twenty-three students answered that they were. The second question was about how frequently they were corrected. In this case, 47.9% of the students answered that they were frequently corrected, 39% of the students said they were sometimes corrected, and the 13% of the students said they were always corrected. In the third question, the students had to explain what they did after they were corrected by the instructor. In this case, 65.2% of the students answered that they repeated the word in the "right" way, and 17.4% of the students reported that they wrote down the right form or tried to correct themselves. The other 13% of the students pointed out that they only tried to remember the correct form. Question 4 was designed to ask the students whether they agree with correction of their errors by the teacher. In this case, all of the students agreed with being corrected by the teacher. Of the 23 students, 69.6% of the students said that correction is the only way to speak the language correctly. The rest of the students stated that correction by the teacher would help them to pronounce the language correctly, acquire new knowledge and skills and improve oral production. Also, they claimed that correction was "the teacher's job."

Question 5 was designed to find out about the students' attitudes toward correction by their peers. Only 52.2% agreed that their peers were supposed to participate in correcting others in class, 30.4% of the students implied that peers should not correct them, and 17.5% answered that the peer correction was not reliable because all of the students shared the same level of proficiency. Five students said that peer correction was acceptable, given the fact that they were learning together. Therefore, for them, peer correction was acceptable by correcting each other since they could improve their learning. Finally, three students mentioned that peer correction was appropriate only if (1) the teacher agreed with the participation of other classmates in correction, and (2) the other student was a much better learner.

#### SECOND PART OF THE SURVEY

In the second part of the survey, the students were given 20 different correction techniques. The techniques included an example in dialogue form, which included an error, and the teacher's corresponding reaction to this error. In each situation the students were asked to choose among five options in order to test their reaction to the correction technique used by the teacher:

- (A) Completely agree
- (B) Agree
- (C) Neutral
- (D) Disagree
- (E) Completely disagree.

What follows is a description of each correction technique and the twenty situations within which the teacher-student interaction takes place in the presence of an error.

Situation 1: The teacher asks the

student to repeat after her so that the student can correct the answer. Example:

Teacher: On the desk, there are ...  
 Student: \*tree books<sup>1</sup>  
 Teacher: Repeat, please.  
 Student: Three books.  
 Teacher: Very good.

A= 56.52%
B= 39.14%
C= 4.34%
D= 0%
E= 0%

(\*) denotes the presence of anomalous language in the student's utterance.

This situation, which involves repetition as a correction technique, had a high percentage of acceptances among the students who participated in the study. More than 95% of them either completely agreed or disagreed with the correction technique used by the teacher.

Situation 2: When the student fails in giving the right answer, the teacher asks another student to answer for him or her. Example:

Teacher: What is a workaholic?  
 Student 1: \*It's a person that ...  
 Teacher: Can someone help to complete the sentence?  
 Student 2: It's a person that works too much.  
 Teacher: It's a person that works too much.

A= 13.04%
B= 26.08%
C= 34.80%
D= 17.40%
E= 8.70%

Again, it is interesting to notice how the reactions toward peer correction are divided, since 60.88% of the students were either neutral or in disagreement with peer correction. Only the 39.12% of them agreed with this technique.

Situation 3: The teacher must interrupt the student when s/he makes a mistake to correct him/her. Example:

Teacher: What is your schedule?  
 Student: My sche .... sche ....  
 Teacher: Schedule.  
 Student: Schedule.

A= 26.08%
B= 56.52%
C= 8.70%
D= 8.70%
E= 0%

In this case, 82.6% of the students either completely agreed or agreed with being interrupted by the teacher to be corrected.

Situation 4: The teacher must emphasize the error and provide the correct form. Example:

Teacher: Where are the keys?  
 Student: They are \*on the backpack.  
 Teacher: In the backpack.

A= 60.80%
B= 39.14%
C= 0%
D= 0%
E= 0%

Situation 5: The professor must ignore the student's errors, accepting them without making comments.

A= 0%
B= 0%
C= 0%
D= 21.73%
E= 78.27%

Situation 6: The teacher must model the correct answer when a student makes a mistake without explicitly giving the correct form. Example:

Teacher: What did she buy?  
 Student: She \*buy a t-shirt.  
 Teacher: She bought a t-shirt.

A= 13.04%
B= 30.44%
C= 26.08%
D= 30.44%
E= 0%

Situation 7: The teacher must use certain words or phrases to warn the students about a mistake. Example:

Be careful ! What? Attention! Repeat, please.

A= 17.40%
B= 69.56%
C= 13.04%
D= 0%
E= 0%

Situation 8: The teacher must repeat the student's error and then correct it in a similar context. Example:

Teacher: Where was his family?  
 Student: \*on the house.  
 Teacher: Not on the house. His family was in the house.

A= 30.44%
B= 43.48%
C= 17.38%
D= 8.70%
E= 0%

Situation 9: The teacher must indicate to the student that he or she has made a mistake by repeating the sentence to him/her until getting to the word that precedes the mistake. Example:

Student: She wrote an interesting \*history.  
 Teacher: She wrote an interesting ... (the teacher does not complete the sentence)  
 Student: Story.

A= 30.40%
B= 43.48%
C= 21.74%
D= 4.34%
E= 0%

Situation 10: The teacher must use gestures to indicate the student that he or she has made a mistake.

Example:

Student: I \*go to the beach last Friday.

Teacher: (moving her hand backwards to indicate past tense)

Student: I went to the beach last Friday.

A= 8.70%
B= 52.18%
C= 30.44%
D= 4.34%
E= 4.34%

Situation 11: The teacher must repeat the student's mistake using emphasis. Example:

Student: He had stole a lot of money.

Teacher: Stole? (with emphasis)

Student: Stolen.

A= 17.40%
B= 43.48%
C= 26.08%
D= 13.04%
E= 0%

Situation 12: The teacher must simply correct the student and not expect the student to repeat. Example:

Teacher: Which ones do you prefer?

Student: The \*pants blue.

A= 4.34%
B= 8.69%
C= 26.08%
D= 56.52%
E= 4.34%

Situation 13: The teacher must inform the student the reason why he s/he is mistaken. Example:

Student: She has \*a black hair.

Teacher: The word "Hair" doesn't need an article in this case."

Student: She has black hair.

A= 73.92%
B= 26.08%
C= 0%
D= 0%
E= 0%

Situation 14: The teacher has to give the student a clue to the right form. Example:

Student: Drinking too much is good for you health.

Teacher: Is it good?

Student: I mean. It's bad.

A= 30.44%
B= 52.17%
C= 13.04%
D= 4.34%
E= 0%

Situation 15: The teacher must repeat the question so that the student can correct his or her mistake. Example:

Teacher: How old are you?

Student: I \*have 20 years old.

Teacher: How old are you?

Student: I am 20 years old. (with emphasis)

A= 13.04%
B= 43.48%
C= 26.08%
D= 17.34%
E= 0%

In Situations 13, 14 and 15 most of the students agreed with (1) being informed about why they were mistaken or with (2) having some hint to help them find the mistake and thus correct themselves in a more independent way. These three types of corrective feedback are intended to help the students to correct themselves.

Situation 16: The teacher must translate the incorrect sentence to Spanish so that the student can see how weird it sounds in English. Example:

Student: The movie was \*frightened.

Teacher: *La película estaba asustada.*

Teacher: The movie was frightening.

A= 8.69%
----------

B= 13.04%
C= 47.82%
D= 17.34%
E= 13.04%

Situation 17: The teacher has to ask the student questions so that he/she figures out which word he/she does not know how to say. Example:

Student: The bank can give him a ...

Teacher: What for?

Student: To pay his debts.

Teacher: OK, the bank can give him a loan for that.

A= 21.73%
B= 47.82%
C= 30.44%
D= 0%
E= 0%

Situation 18: The teacher has to provide variations of the same word so that the student can choose the appropriate form. Example:

Teacher: How did she feel?

Student: She felt very ...

Teacher: scared, scary, scare

Student: Scared

A= 26.08%
B= 43.48%
C= 17.34%
D= 8.69%
E= 4.34%

Situation 19: The teacher has two provide two versions in English, one correct and one incorrect so that the student can choose the appropriate form. Example:

Student: I like to study \*in the night.

Teacher: How does one say in English? \*In the night? Or at night?

Student: At night.

A= 17.34%
B= 43.48%
C= 30.44%
D= 8.69%
E= 0%

Situation 20: The teacher has to

remain silent to indicate to the student that he/she has made a mistake. Example:

Teacher: Where are you going to-night?

Student: I \*going to the movies.

Teacher: (no response)

Student: I am going to the movies. (with emphasis)

A=	0%
B=	8.64%
C=	0%
D=	60.88%
E=	30.44%

### ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS

The students' answer to the first question is consistent with a number of research studies conducted on error correction: students believe that they are always corrected for their errors in the foreign language classroom. Interestingly, the students reported different fre-

quencies of correction. This leads to conclude that (1) their teacher corrected some students more frequently than others, or (2) some students have a higher level of proficiency which to a certain extent prevents correction.

In relation to the third question— what they did after being corrected—the students' responses were not unified, which suggests another opportunity for research in this area??? which will be suggested in the next section. When asked about the participation of peers in the correction of their errors, the students' perceptions differed greatly. In general, the students contended that they would rather be corrected by the teacher than a fellow student.

On the basis of the 5 questions included in the first part of the questionnaire, it can be concluded

that, in these students' opinion, error correction by the teacher is an asset, while peer correction was not highly endorsed. There seems to be a preconceived notion that feedback from their peers might be incorrect. Yet, another assumption is that this type of correction could put the student who receives correction on the spot or be laughed at. Notwithstanding, it can be argued that the most potent argument against peer correction is the answer to the fourth and fifth questions: the teacher is the one person to correct in the classroom. This attitude is consistent with many research studies in error correction. Apparently, the teacher is regarded as some sort of a commanding figure who has been given the right to correct learner errors.

The analysis of the second of the questionnaire??? reflects some interesting consistencies with the



first part of the research. For example, the results for Situation 1 which suggests that repetition of the right form is the most frequent action taken by the students after being corrected by their teacher. By the same token, peer correction was found to be both unreliable and embarrassing. Also, the students reported their preference toward immediate correction. Yet, as was said elsewhere in this paper, overt immediate correction is not regarded as beneficial and should be used with discretion on the part of the teacher. The expectations of these do not match with the notion that the teacher must not interrupt the student in the presence of an error to provide the correct form immediately.

The responses in Situations 4 and 5 show that for 100% of the students it is quite important to be explicitly told both where their mistakes are and which correct form is to be used. These ideas are connected with commonly heard comments by students' (anecdotal evidence) in the sense that the teacher's job is to correct them in order to learn the language properly. In Situation 6, 56.52% of the students were either neutral or disagreed with not being explicitly corrected. Only 43.48% agreed with this technique, which might imply that the students are hesitant to receive an implicit type of correction. Probably, they are afraid of not grasping the "right form" if the instructor doesn't provide the right model. On the other hand, in Situation 7, 86.96% of the students agreed with the use of words to warn about a mistake. This technique is another example of an explicit way of showing that a mistake has been made.

In like manner, Situations 8 through 11 confirm students' preference for all kinds of explicit er-

ror correction techniques. It seems that they welcome all indicators of mistakes either verbal or nonverbal. If we compare these figures with those in Situations 4 and 5, we can clearly see that the more explicit the corrective feedback, the more the students agree with it. Besides, in Situation 12 more than 60% of the students did not agree with not repeating the correction after the teacher. Again this is consistent with responses to the first part of the survey where repeating the "right form" was one of the most salient activities done after being corrected.

Situations 13, 14 and 15 are an interesting example of students preference for error corrections. These situations are sound alternatives to more explicit forms of corrective feedback in the class. It could be argued that the students' stated preference for the three situations lies on the fact that they give students an opportunity for successful repair of faulty speech. Understandably, they favor interactions that will bring about improvements in the language.

On the other hand, Situation 16, Using Spanish translation, does not seem to be very appealing for these students. Most of them had a neutral opinion or disagreed with having the mistake translated into Spanish. It might be concluded that listening to their mistake translated to their first language could be a cause of embarrassment for the students involved in this particular situation. Besides, students are not used to translations into the native language in the classroom in foreign language courses. Teachers do not often endorse translation either.

Almost 70% percent of the students favor this correction technique shown in Situation 17. In

this case, the teacher strives to elicit information from the student in this situation to find out the word or phrase he or she does not know or is incorrectly using. This technique gives the students a chance to negotiate meaning, which represents a challenge for the students. Again, they seem to be in favor of opportunities to correct their mistakes with the teacher's help and thus convey the right message. This also seems to be the case of Situation 18. In this situation, 70% of the students agreed with having variations of a word in order to choose the right form. This technique encourages the student to find the correct form without having the instructor give the answer away immediately. In this way, the correction is made with the teacher's guidance as well as the student's participation. This is an important finding because, as shown in Situations 17, most of the students tend to favor techniques in which they will have an opportunity to (1) correct themselves in a more autonomous way, and (2) show that they are capable of improving their learning.

In Situation 19, 61% of the students interviewed agreed with having two versions of the anomalous form (right or wrong) in order to choose the right one. The responses for this technique are also consistent with those for 17 and 18. The students are given an opportunity to correct themselves. Again, the majority of interviewees favor corrections in which they, as learners, had a chance to actively take part in the correction and not just listen to corrective feedback from the teacher and do nothing.

In Situation 20, 91% of the interviewees disagreed with the correction technique in which the teacher uses silence to indicate that an error has taken place. In this case,



the student has to infer which the error is. In a group of beginners, this situation might be confusing, since as shown through their responses for the situations analyzed above, these students favor correction techniques in which (1) the correct model is explicitly given by the instructor, or (2) they are given enough elements to make a decision about the right form to be used. Furthermore, students' responses to the use of Situation 20 might indicate that they dislike correction forms in which they have to be completely responsible for repairing anomalous language.

### SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The presented study seeks to find out about students' opinion concerning their preferences for different techniques of error correction in the classroom. However, it would be interesting to see if their responses match their attitudes when they are corrected. In other words most of the students argued that they were corrected when they made a mistake. It would be interesting then to conduct an observational study in order to determine if the teacher actually corrects them and how frequently. If the study was conducted in three different classes, the observation would still be more telling, since it could shed light on teachers attitudes toward correction. Furthermore, when asked what they did after they were corrected, the students said that they repeated the right model, tried to correct themselves or wrote down the right form. It would have been interesting to confirm these expectations with their actual reaction after the teacher provided the right model. The study could be carried out with a group of students only, yet the author believes that a comparison of these variables in

three groups, for example, would provide more interesting evidence regarding students' opinions about correction, their actual reactions at the moment they are corrected by the teacher and if there are any differences in the way the participating teachers deal with errors and error treatment.

### CONCLUSION

The results obtained show the students' preferences for some of the error correction techniques presented in this study. In general terms, the students agreed with those situations in which they were explicitly told what their mistake was. Consequently, many of them consider that the teacher is the one who should correct errors, which justifies the students' hesitance towards peer correction. Also, among the techniques that most students favor are those in which they repeat the correct model provided by the teacher. Interestingly, this type of feedback provision is not endorsed by more modern methods. However, it can be concluded from the results that these students feel confident if they are (1) clearly informed about their errors and (2) given the opportunity to correct them immediately. Understandably, the majority of the students also favored those correction techniques which included clear clues or choices for them to correct themselves. On the basis of the findings, it is suggested that teachers should use correction techniques to encourage learners to participate in the correction of faulty spoken language. In other words, overt immediate correction, with no participation by the students in some sort of a "corrective interaction" is not conducive to foreign language acquisition nor does it provide opportunities for the development of autonomous learning.

## APPENDIX

### Cuestionario

1. Muchas gracias por su cooperación al responder al siguiente cuestionario. Sus respuestas son confidenciales y se utilizarán solamente para propósitos de investigación.

2. Esta no es una evaluación de su curso o del desempeño de su profesor. Este es un cuestionario sobre sus preferencias respecto a la corrección de errores al hablar en la clase de inglés LM-1002.

Información general:

Sexo: M \_\_\_ F \_\_\_

¿Está usted empadronado en la carrera de Inglés?

Sí \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

¿Por qué está usted llevando este curso?

Es un requisito \_\_\_\_\_

Trabajo \_\_\_\_\_

Otro \_\_\_\_\_

Cuando usted comete un error al hablar, se le corrige en este curso?

Sí \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Si la respuesta es sí, ¿qué tan a menudo lo corrige su profesor?

siempre \_\_\_\_\_

frecuentemente \_\_\_\_\_

algunas veces \_\_\_\_\_

rara vez \_\_\_\_\_

nunca \_\_\_\_\_

Por lo general, ¿qué hace usted después de ser corregido(a)?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

¿Está usted de acuerdo en que el profesor corrija sus errores? ¿Por qué?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

¿Deben sus compañeros participar en la corrección de sus errores? ¿Por qué?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Instrucciones

Encierre en un círculo la letra A, B, C, D o E al final de cada ejemplo de corrección indicando que tan de acuerdo está usted con lo expresado en ese ejemplo. Por favor conteste todas las preguntas. Las letras siguientes corresponden a las categorías de respuestas.

A = Completamente de acuerdo  
 B = De acuerdo  
 C = Neutral  
 D = En desacuerdo  
 E = Completamente en desacuerdo

Nota: El (\*) indica un error.

1. El profesor pide al estudiante que repita lo que él dijo para que el estudiante pueda corregir la respuesta.

A B C D E

Teacher: On the desk, there are ...  
 Student: \*tree books.  
 Teacher: Repeat, please.  
 Student: Three books.  
 Teacher: Very good.

2. Cuando un estudiante falla al dar la respuesta correcta, el profesor le pide a otro estudiante que proporcione la respuesta correcta.

A B C D E

T: What is a workaholic?  
 S1: It's a person that ...  
 T: Can someone help?

S2: Works too much..  
 T: It's a person that works too much.

3. El profesor debe interrumpir al estudiante cuando este comete un error para corregirlo.

A B C D E

T: What is your schedule?  
 S: My sche ... sche ...  
 T: Schedule.  
 S: Schedule.

4. El profesor debe enfatizar dónde se encuentra el error y proveer la forma correcta.

A B C D E

T: Where are the keys?  
 S: They are \*on the backpack.  
 T: In the backpack.

5. El profesor debe ignorar los errores de los estudiantes, aceptándolos sin hacer comentarios.

A B C D E

6. El profesor debe modelar la respuesta correcta cuando un error se comete sin hacer la corrección de forma explícita.

A B C D E

T: What did she buy?  
 S: She \*buy a t-shirt.  
 T: She bought a t-shirt.

7. El profesor debe usar ciertas palabras para advertir a los estudiantes sobre un error.

A B C D E

Be careful. What? Attention.

8. El profesor debe repetir el error del estudiante y luego corregirlo en un contexto similar.

A B C D E

T: Where was his family?

S: \*on his house.  
 T: Not on his house. His family was in his house.

9. El profesor debe indicar al estudiante que ha cometido un error repitiéndole la oración hasta llegar a la palabra que precede el error.

A B C D E

S: She wrote an interesting \*history.  
 T: She wrote an interesting ... ("interesting" precedes the error)  
 S: Story.

10. El profesor debe usar gestos para indicar al estudiante que ha cometido un error.

A B C D E

S: I \*go to the beach last Friday.  
 T: (moving the hand to the back to indicate the past)  
 S: I went to the beach last Friday.

11. El profesor debe repetir el error del estudiante usando énfasis.

A B C D E

S: He had \*stole a lot of money.  
 T: Stole? (emphasis)  
 S: Stolen.

12. El profesor simplemente hace la corrección y no espera que el estudiante repita.

A B C D E

T: Which ones do you prefer?  
 S: The pants \*blue.

13. El profesor debe informarle al estudiante sobre la razón de su error.

A B C D E

S: She has \*a black hair.  
 T: The word "hair" doesn't need an article in this case.  
 S: She has black hair.

14. El profesor debe darle al estudiante una pista sobre cuál es la forma incorrecta,

A B C D E

S: Drinking too much is good for your health.

T: Is it good?

S: I mean; it's bad.

15. El profesor debe repetir la pregunta que obtuvo una respuesta incorrecta para que el estudiante sea capaz de corregir su error.

A B C D E

T: How old are you?

S: I \*have 20 years old.

T: How old are you?

S: I am 20 years old.

16. El profesor debe traducir la oración incorrecta al español para que el estudiante pueda notar lo extraño que suena en inglés.

A B C D E

S: The movie was \*frightened.

T: La película estaba asustada.

S: The movie was frightening.

17. El profesor debe hacer preguntas al estudiante para descubrir cuál es la palabra que el estudiante no sabe cómo decir.

A B C D E

S: The bank can give him a ...

T: What for?

S: To pay for his debts.

T: Ok, the bank can give him a loan for that.

18. El profesor debe dar variaciones de una palabra para que el estudiante pueda escoger la forma correcta.

A B C D E

T: How did she feel?

S: She felt very ...

T: Scared, scary, scare

S: Scared.

19. El profesor debe dar dos versiones en inglés, una correcta y una incorrecta para que el estudiante pueda elegir la forma apropiada.

A B C D E

S: I like to study \*in the night.

T: How does one say in English?

\*in the night? Or at night?

S: At night.

20. El profesor debe permanecer en silencio para indicarle al estudiante que ha cometido un error.

A B C D E

T: Where are you going tonight?

S: I \*going to the movies.

T: (no response)

S: I am going to the movies.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancker, William. 2000. Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum* 38. (4).

Burling, Robbins. 1992. *Patterns of Language: Structure, Variation, Change*. New York: Academic Press.

Lightbown, Patsy M. & Nina Spada. 1995. Focus-on-Form and Corrective Feedback in Communicative Language Teaching. In *Readings on Second Language Acquisition*.

H. D. Brown & Susan Gonzo (eds.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Lovelock, Clive. 2002. Instant Feedback for Learner Training: Using Individual Assessment Cards. *English Teaching Forum* 40. (4).

Loewen, Shawn. Error correction in the second language classroom. *Clear News*. 11. (12).

Machado De Almeida Matos, Andrea. 2000. A Vygotskian approach to evaluation in foreign language learning contexts. *ELT Journal* 54. (4).

Matz Rosen, Lois. 1993. Developing Correctness in Student Writing: Alternatives to the Error-Hunt. In *Linguistics for Teachers*. Linda Miller Cleary and Michael D. Linn (eds.). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Muncie, James. 2000. Using written teacher feedback in EFL composition classes. *ELT Journal* 54. (1).

Murphy, John. 2003. Pronunciation. In David Nunan (ed.). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Norton, Julie. 2005. The paired format in the Cambridge Speaking Tests. *ELT Journal*. 59. (4).

Richard-Amato, Patricia A. 1988. *Making It Happen: Interactions in the Second Language Theory. From Theory to Practice*. New York: Longamn.

Rollinson, Paul. 2005. Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal* 59. (1).

Seligson, Paul. 1997. *Helping Students to Speak*. London: Richmond Publishing.

Sullivan Kirk & Eva Lindgren. 2002. Self-assessment in autonomous computer-aided second language writing. *ELT Journal* 56. (3).