

Classroom Practice: Error Correction at Tertiary Level

Galina Kavaliauskienė, Lilija Anusienė, Ligija Kaminskienė

Abstract. Feedback is generally defined as a process of sharing observations, concerns and suggestions with intention of improving both personal and organizational performance. The importance of feedback in language learning/ teaching is a matter of debate among practitioners. The research into the effects of feedback is far from conclusive. Teachers' and students' expectations toward feedback are found to be opposing, and the most frequent reason given is its negative impact on students' confidence and motivation.

The most common feedback refers to error correction either in writing or speaking. Recent theory on language acquisition claims that not all errors should be corrected. This is based on the fact that errors are normal and unavoidable during the learning process. The reasons for errors are numerous: interference from the native language, limited knowledge of the target language, its complexity, or even fossilization at a certain level of competence in the second language.

This paper examines learners' attitudes toward feedback in various class activities and ongoing changes of their opinions, if any, at tertiary level. The results have demonstrated that feedback is a helpful tool for linguistic development. Learners particularly appreciate error correction in writing activities, but not so much in speaking activities. Contrary to some teachers' beliefs of error correction being ineffective and undermining learners' self-esteem, students support just the opposite view. The oral, paper-written and electronic feedback to various classroom activities is discussed.

Key words: *feedback; error correction; class activities; English for Specific Purposes.*

Introduction

Feedback has been used in language teaching/ learning for a long time, but its benefit has been questioned by some language teachers. Currently feedback seems to undergo a revival stage as a useful teaching device. It is thought that feedback can help develop all four language skills: learning grammar, developing oral communication and improving writing skills. However, there is not much research into feedback usefulness at tertiary level. This paper investigates the usefulness of feedback by examining learners' attitudes and drawing conclusions at its suitability at tertiary level.

The aim of the research: to explore learners' ongoing (longitudinal) attitudes to feedback as a language learning tool and compare the benefits of electronic, oral and paper-written correction of errors.

The research methods used: a survey of learners' perceptions of teachers' feedback in various class activities, statistical treatment of students' responses using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS) in order to establish the level of significance for the statistically small sample of participants, and analysis of various types of feedback provided by either teachers or peers.

The participants in this study are the students who study English for Psychology at the Faculty of Social Policy, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The intended outcome of the research is to draw conclusions on the value of longitudinal feedback in language teaching/ learning at tertiary level.

Literature review

It is generally accepted that one of the essential elements in the English classroom is feedback, which may be defined as information supplied to trainees concerning some aspect of their performance on a task, by a peer or a tutor, with a view to enhancing their practice.

Feedback encompasses not only correcting learners, but also assessing them. Both correction and assessment depend on mistakes being made, reasons for mistakes, and class activities.

According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (1999, p.746), "a mistake is an action, opinion or word that is not correct (wrong), and error is the state of being wrong in belief or behavior".

In linguistics, the definitions of "mistake" and "error" are rather diverse. H. D. Brown (1994, p.205) quoted by W. Ancker (2000, p.21), claims:

"a mistake is a performance error that is either a random guess or a slip, it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. An error is a noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learner".

J. Edge (1989, p.37) suggests dividing mistakes into three categories: slips, errors and attempts. "Slips" are mistakes that students can correct themselves; "errors" are mistakes which students cannot correct themselves; "attempts" are student's intentions of using the language without knowing the right way. In this article, similarly as in (Edge, 1989, p.37), either the most common linguistic term "error" or the students' preferred term "mistake" will be used interchangeably.

Error correction remains one of the most contentious and misunderstood issues in foreign language teaching, and there is no consensus about its application (Ancker, 2000, p.24). In research articles, it is often referred to as feedback, so the latter term will also be used interchangeably.

Errors are part of the students' interlanguage, i.e. the version of the language which a learner has at any stage of development, and which is continually reshaped on the way towards language mastery (Harmer, 2000, p.100). The term "interlanguage" was coined by L. Selinker (1972, p.209). Interestingly, learners' interlanguages contain rules that are different from the native speakers' competence. The students may temporarily produce sentences that deviate from native correctness.

It is generally believed that by making the students aware of the mistakes they make and by getting them to act on those mistakes in some way, the students will assimilate the corrections and eventually not make those mistakes in the future. Some researchers (McGarrell and Verbeem, 2007, pp.37-46) suggest that feedback on L2 writing falls somewhere between two extremes – evaluative or formative feedback. Evaluative feedback typically passes judgement on the draft, reflects on sentence-level errors, and takes the form of directives for improvement on assignments. Formative feedback, which is sometimes referred to as facilitative or intermediate feedback, typically consists of feedback that takes an inquiring stance towards the text. It often consists of questions intended to raise awareness of the reader's understanding of the meaning of the text as a means to encourage substantial revision on the next draft. It should be noted that the nature of teacher feedback differs widely among teachers and classes. Generally speaking, the factors involved include course objectives, assignment objectives, marking criteria, individual student expectations, strengths, weaknesses, and attitude toward writing.

Recent theory on language acquisition and teaching methodology supports the idea that not all errors should be corrected, which is based on the fact that errors are normal and unavoidable during the learning process. Current theories of how people learn languages suggest that habit formation is only one part of the process. There are many reasons for errors to occur. One obvious cause is such as interference from the native language, or an incomplete knowledge of the target language, or its complexity. Spelling is often problematic for nonnative speakers of English. Finally, fossilization occurs when a person reaches a satisfactory level of competence in the second language.

Feedback is considered to be more effective when a number of conditions are met (Brandt, 2008, pp.37-46): 1. The setting is psychologically safe. 2. Information is gathered from a number of sources, e.g. learners, teachers. 3. Feedback is focused and contains relevant, meaningful, concrete information, specific data and irrefutable evidence. 4. It is descriptive rather than evaluative, if it aims at teaching but not testing. 5. The recipient is able to select the way it is conveyed. 6. It contains a moderate amount of positive feedback with a selected and limited amount of negative feedback. 7. It allows for response and interaction.

The research into the effects of error correction is far from conclusive. On the one hand, J. Truscott (1996, pp.327-

369) suggests that error correction of grammar, spelling, punctuation is ineffective and should be abandoned. On the other hand, C. G. Kepner (1991, pp.305-313) argues that feedback on content and organization is very important. Surprisingly, little research has explored important aspects of teachers' and students' preferences for feedback in error correction. The survey (Leki, 1991, pp.203-218) of 100 students' preferences for error correction claims that students equate good writing in English with error-free writing; moreover, learners expect and want all errors in their papers to be corrected. Additionally, in a survey of 47 students' attitudes towards classroom feedback procedures, H. Enginarlar (1993, pp. 193-204) reports that students perceive surface-level error correction as effective teacher feedback. In the study investigating 824 students' and 92 teachers' beliefs about error correction and the benefit of a focus on form in language learning, R. Schulz (1996, pp.343-364) reports some discrepancies among teachers as well as between teachers and students; specifically, students are generally more receptive to receiving corrective feedback in both written and spoken language than teachers. A follow-up study that compares R. Schulz's data (1996, p.343-364) with responses elicited from 607 foreign language students and 122 teachers in Colombia reveals relatively high agreement between students as a group and teachers as a group across cultures on most questions (Schulz, 2001, pp.343-364). D. Nunan (1993, p.91) presents a study that examines the relationship between the attitudes of students and teachers to the various activities. The data show a clear mismatch between learners' and teachers' views in all but one activity, namely, conversation practice. Error correction in D. Nunan's book (1993, p.95) receives quite a high priority of 7 on the scale of 10 among students, and very low priority of 2 on the scale of 10 among teachers. In the early case studies of feedback to writing compositions (Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1994, pp.155-177), teachers and students had different perceptions as to what to be corrected. The comparison of teachers' and students' preferences for error correction is analyzed by R. L. Diab (2006, pp.2-13), who reveals various discrepancies between instructors' and students' preferences to error correction as well as differences in beliefs among instructors themselves. According to R. L. Diab' recommendations, teachers must incorporate classroom discussions on error correction in order to help their students understand how feedback is intended to improve their writing.

The issue of grammar correction in the writing classroom through the eyes of L2 writers is addressed in a recent study by Sang-Keun Shin (2008, pp.358-365). Five students of advanced English proficiency participated in the study and volunteered to provide their opinion on the type of error feedback they prefer to receive. The participants support the idea of teacher's error feedback to be indirect rather than direct. These findings suggest that the perception of feedback might be a culture related phenomenon.

Teachers' and students' expectations of error correction are examined by W. Ancker (2000, pp.20-25). In his survey, 25% of 802 teachers and 76% of 143 students believed that all errors should be corrected. The most frequent reason given by teachers for not wanting correction was the negative impact of correction on students' confidence and motivation (affective

filter). The most frequent reason given for wanting correction was the importance of learning to speak English correctly. According to W. Ancker (2000, pp.20-25), the most important implication of his data is that something should be done to rectify the opposing expectations of teachers and students about how errors should be handled. Teachers may think they are doing the right thing by not correcting immediately and frequently, but students may assume their teachers do not know English well enough to give appropriate feedback and do not care how well their students learn English.

The use of peer feedback in the English writing classroom has been generally supported as a potentially valuable aid for its social, cognitive, affective, and methodological benefits. The affective advantage of peer response over teacher response is that it is less threatening, less authoritarian, and more supportive, but students judge it as less helpful; however, 80% of peers' comments were considered valid, and only 7% seen as potentially damaging (Rollinson, 2005, p.23).

Electronic feedback has drawn researchers' interest for more than two decades (Allah, 2008: online). Incorporating e-feedback along with face-to-face modes has been shown to yield the best results in terms of quality of feedback and impact on revisions. This technique involves students' learning preferences, which have positive influence on learning. In peer e-feedback, the teacher should encourage students to comment on many of their coursemates' papers. Even though computers are becoming more and more an integral part of the writing classrooms, English teachers should deal with integrating electronic feedback with a balance of enthusiasm and caution (Allah, 2008, online). Rushing to adopt new trends without careful planning before and during e-feedback sessions can negatively influence students' performance in the writing classroom.

There is not much research into feedback on oral production. Many learners fail to notice their own mistakes in impromptu speaking. Error feedback and its effect on noticing errors in verbal production are explored by H. Sakai (2004, online). Particular attention is paid to recasts, i.e. feedback defined as reformulation of L2 learners' erroneous utterances by the interlocutor. Recasts are found more effective in prompting the noticing of errors.

An innovative way of providing feedback for students on their written assignments is suggested by R. Stannard (2008, online source), who introduces video feedback, i.e. teacher's recorded video which can be sent to students, who will view a 'live' recording of the tutor correcting their work. Each student can play back the video and listen and watch as the tutor goes through their written assignments. According to R. Stannard (2008, online), several organisations including Coventry University and Edinburgh University have begun their own research into application of video feedback. R. Stannard's arguments are: 1) Feedback is often misunderstood by students because it is often unclear what the tutor has written or corrected. 2) There is a lack of learners' interest in the feedback process, so teachers need to find new ways of providing feedback that will bring it back into the centre of learning. 3) Students are keen on conferencing. 4) Teachers do not always correctly interpret the mistakes their students have made and this leads to students being confused about the suggested corrections. 5)

Feedback is context based. 6) The amount of information that can be conveyed in the written form is very limited. Teachers tend to give short, inadequate feedback in many cases.

This concise review of the background literature demonstrates the necessity of examining the ongoing (developing) feedback. In other words, it is a matter of great relevance to teachers to find out how students' views on error correction develop during the course of learning ESP and what trends are dominant. It is important to study if learners need the same types of feedback at the beginning and by the end of the course.

Respondents and methods

The participants in this study were two groups of students of the 1st and two groups of the 2nd year, specializing in psychology at Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, studying English for Specific Purposes (ESP). There were 46 respondents aged 18 to 20. They were predominantly females at the intermediate and upper-intermediate English levels. The first sample refers to the academic year 2006-2007 (26 students), and the second one – to the academic year 2007-2008 (20 students). The amount of time spent by students in L2 environment was 4 hours per week for 2 semesters, which amounts to about 130 hours of English instruction.

In this study, research employed a brief survey, which was designed in accordance with the accepted standards of surveys in Social Sciences (Dornyei, 2003, pp.17-67). It was administered to all four groups of learners in 2006, 2007 and 2008. After the administration of the survey, analysis of responses was conducted. Questionnaire return rate was complete – all sheets were returned, which simplified the analysis. All the statements were rated on the Likert scale of five possible answers: 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – not sure, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree. The survey statements are presented in the Appendix. The obtained data were statistically processed, interpreted and described further on.

Results and discussion

The participants' responses to the survey on their attitudes to feedback are summarised in Table 1. The columns show the percentages of students for the statements in the survey. Learners rated each statement according to the five-point Likert scale by circling the appropriate number: 1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – not sure, 4 – agree, 5 – strongly agree. For the sake of clarity, both positive responses “strongly agree” and “agree” and negative responses “strongly disagree” and “disagree” are added up. This approach does not distort the data. On the contrary, it allows to show the findings in a compact way. The first percentage refers to the students' responses obtained in the academic year 2006-2007, and the second percentage – in 2007-2008, respectively. Although the findings refer to the longitudinal (ongoing) research, the number of the students in the first academic year is 26, and in the second academic year it is only 20: 5 students were awarded scholarships to study in different EU countries, and 1 student decided to change the specialization and study somewhere else. The first figures

in the columns refer to the responses of the 1st year psychology students (academic year 2006-2007, number of students 26), and the second figures refer to the responses of the 2nd year psychology students (academic year 2007-2008, number of students 20).

1st Statement. Making mistakes in learning English is natural - it shows linguistic development.

The second row of Table 1 demonstrates the participants' opinions on making mistakes in language acquisition. The majority of participants, 65% of the 1st year students versus 70% of the 2nd year students, feel that mistakes in learning are unavoidable. Moreover, in the interviews they claim it is important to think about one's own mistakes in order to learn from them. The percentage of doubters in the first year is rather high – 35% in comparison to Table 1.

10% in the second year. What is rather unexpected is the percentage of the 2nd year students (20%) who responded negatively to this statement. The point they make is that mistakes do not imply linguistic development.

2nd Statement. Students prefer teacher's immediate correction of errors.

As many as 90% of the 2nd year learners support this statement contrary to 62% of the 1st year students, and a fifth of them is either not sure or disagree with this idea. From the practical viewpoint, it is impossible for teachers to correct mistakes immediately, particularly in conversation classes. Any interruption of communication might ruin the activity. The misleading perception of usefulness of immediate correction lies in respondents' experience at school, where some teachers feel it is their duty to make corrections as soon as possible. As it has been mentioned in the literature review section, the idea of immediate correction seems to be evaluative rather than formative, which is preferable.

3rd Statement. The teacher's correction of spelling, grammar, pronunciation is generally ineffective.

Essentially, a great majority of 88% versus 85% of participants disagree with ineffectiveness of correction, which implies that majority believe in its effectiveness. The number of uncertain responses varies from 8% (2 students) among the first year students to 15% (3 students) in the second year, and only 4% (1 person) think it is ineffective.

4th Statement. I find it hard to notice my own mistakes.

The findings for this statement are rather scattered. Surprisingly, 70% of the 2nd year students support it, and 25% – oppose it. The responses of the 1st year learners spread widely: 34% – opponents, 47% – supporters, and 19% – are uncertain. This statement refers to personal information from each respondent, so the difference of opinions is quite natural.

5th Statement. Teachers should correct students' every mistake in speaking.

Two-thirds of the 2nd year students are uncertain about mistake correction in speaking, which is a rational viewpoint, with 25% supporting and 15% opposing it. The responses of the 1st year students differ widely: 42% are against it, 27% - for, and the rest 31% are uncertain. Such distribution of the latter perceptions might be interpreted by the immaturity

and lack of experience in learning ESP by the newcomers to university.

6th Statement. Teachers should correct students' every mistake in writing.

Table 1. Students' responses to the survey statements. ('ay' means 'academic year')

Survey statements on feedback	Disagree	Not sure	Agree
1. Making mistakes in learning English is natural – it shows linguistic development	0 1 st ay 20% 2 nd ay	35% 1 st ay 10% 2 nd ay	65% 1 st ay 70% 2 nd ay
2. Students prefer immediate teacher's correction of errors	19% 1 st ay 5% 2 nd ay	19% 1 st ay 5% 2 nd ay	62% 1 st ay 90% 2 nd ay
3. Teacher's correction of spelling, grammar, pronunciation is generally ineffective	88% 1 st ay 85% 2 nd ay	8% 1 st ay 15% 2 nd ay	4% 1 st ay 0 2 nd ay
4. I find it hard to notice my own mistakes	34% 1 st ay 25% 2 nd ay	19% 1 st ay 5% 2 nd ay	47% 1 st ay 70% 2 nd ay
5. Teachers should correct students' every mistake in speaking	42% 1 st ay 15% 2 nd ay	31% 1 st ay 60% 2 nd ay	27% 1 st ay 25% 2 nd ay
6. Teachers should correct student's every mistake in writing	7% 1 st ay 0 2 nd ay	12% 1 st ay 5% 2 nd ay	81% 1 st ay 95% 2 nd ay
7. The teacher's correction of student's oral errors in front of the class undermines the learner's self-esteem	34% 1 st ay 45% 2 nd ay	42% 1 st ay 45% 2 nd ay	24% 1 st ay 10% 2 nd ay
8. The teacher's individual correction of student's written mistakes is useful for learning ESP	4% 1 st ay 0 2 nd ay	8% 1 st ay 0 2 nd ay	88% 1 st ay 100% 2 nd ay

Students' attitudes to developing writing skills are predominant among other language skills and are conditioned by the examination requirements, which include writing a summary of ESP texts. Statistics of responses reflects that: 81% of the 1st year learners, who are not aware of writing difficulties to the full extent, against 95% of the 2nd year learners, who practiced writing various types of summaries and are aware of potential pitfalls. Students keep making the same common mistakes (grammar, spelling, etc.) that have been repeatedly pointed out to them. It is widely accepted that there are two distinct causes for the errors: L1 interference

and developmental errors (Harmer, 2000, p.99). These errors are part of the students' interlanguage – the version a learner has at the current stage of development.

7th Statement. Teacher's correction of student's oral errors in front of the class undermines learner's self-esteem.

Students do not seem to worry over undermining their self-esteem: their responses are similar and either negative or uncertain. This is good news to teachers – error correction is not expected to affect learners' motivation or willingness to perfect language skills.

8th Statement. Teacher's individual correction of student's written mistakes is useful for learning ESP.

The vast majority of students feel positive about usefulness of individual error correction as it facilitates personal learning. A personalized learning of the language and getting relevant feedback to one's performance are very important to develop language awareness.

Thus it seems that learners' responses are quite straightforward and unambiguous. To prove the point, however, the study

must rely on statistical evaluation of the data as the number of respondents in this research is limited. Next section briefly describes the statistical procedure and its findings.

Statistical processing of the data

The obtained results have been processed statistically in order to determine how comparable and reliable the data are. Similarly as in our previous paper on alternative assessment of performance (Kavaliauskienė et al., 2007, p.78), internal consistency reliability was calculated by computing Cronbach Alpha coefficient, which was 0.80 in a good agreement with theory (Dornyei, 2003, p.115). The experimental findings have been processed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The details of computation procedure are described elsewhere (Kavaliauskienė et al., 2007, p.79), so we avoid a repetition for the sake of brevity.

The Means and Standard Deviations for the responses of the 1st and 2nd year students have been computed, and the t-test in data analysis has been applied in the same way as in our previous research. The data of statistical treatment are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations (SD), Two-tailed significance levels p , and their interpretations

Survey statements on feedback	Means and SDs for the 1st year learners	Means and SDs for the 2nd year learners	Two-tailed significance level p	Interpretation of obtained value of p
1. Making mistakes in learning English is natural – it shows linguistic development	3.73 0.64	3.60 0.78	$p = 0.05$	$p < 0.10$ there is no difference
2. Students prefer immediate teacher's correction of errors	3.46 0.75	4.10 0.49	$p = 0.009$	$p < 0.01$ there is a difference
3. Teacher's correction of spelling, grammar, pronunciation is generally ineffective	1.69 0.65	1.71 0.69	$p = 0.425$	$p < 0.50$ there is no difference
4. I find it hard to notice my own mistakes	3.19 0.92	3.55 0.83	$p = 0.039$	$p < 0.05$ there is a small difference
5. Teachers should correct students' every mistake in speaking	2.77 0.70	3.10 0.88	$p = 0.007$	$p < 0.01$ there is a difference
6. Teachers should correct student's every mistake in writing	4.31 0.85	4.55 0.80	$p = 0.137$	$p < 0.5$ there is no difference
7. The teacher's correction of student's oral errors in front of the class undermines the learners' self-esteem	2.88 0.79	2.60 0.64	$p = 0.039$	$p < 0.05$ there is a small difference
8. The teacher's individual correction of student's written mistakes is useful for learning ESP	4.23 0.62	4.40 0.68	$p = 0.07$	$p < 0.10$ there is no difference

The first column in Table 2 reproduces the survey statements. The second and third columns display Mean values (first line) and Standard Deviations (SDs, second line). The third column in Table 2 shows the values of p for each statement. The interpretations of these p values are presented in the fifth column. If p values are below 0.01, it means that there is a difference between learners' responses in two streams. The difference is small, if $p < 0.05$. If the significance level is rather high, i.e. $p < 0.10$, it indicates that there is no significant difference between the responses, or, in other words, the Means are statistically close. Therefore, there is no difference in responses of the 1st and 2nd year students to the statements 1, 3, 6 and 8, but there is a small difference

in responses to the statements 4 and 7. However, there are differences in responses to the statements 2 and 5, i.e. the Means are not statistically close.

Thus, statistical processing of survey responses in the cases of small samples ensures the most reliable interpretation of the obtained data.

Classroom practice: teacher's and peers' feedback

Feedback can be very helpful both in oral and written work. However there are important points to bear in mind. During communicative activities, such as making Power Point Presentations, giving short talks on ESP themes or participating

in class discussions, teachers should not interrupt students to point out their errors, because intervention may raise stress levels and hinder communication. Consequently, recording mistakes is helpful – it is easy to forget what students have said. Mistakes should be dealt with later, after the activity has ended. It is a good idea for teachers to focus on errors without indicating who made them and asking students to rectify the errors. According to our observations, peer correction works well in classes with a friendly and cooperative atmosphere. Otherwise remedial work may lead to undermining the learners' self-esteem and cause more damage than gain. Our practice has proved that some proficient learners tend to dominate over remedial activities and make critical remarks on less proficient learners' performance.

Feedback on written work depends on the specific tasks. In our classes, we practiced either paper correction or electronic feedback. Paper correction includes teacher's responses to learners' submitted summaries. This kind of feedback is individualized: the teacher codes or corrects mistakes, writes comments on contents, interpretation register, etc. It is greatly appreciated by students who often raise questions, ask for clarification and rewrite the drafts.

Electronic feedback is used by students who write comments in peers' weblogs. All our learners have created their own weblogs which have been used for contributing written assignments and are incorporated into one of this article author's weblog at the following sites:

<http://kavaliauskiene.blogspot.com>

<http://gkavaliauskiene.blogspot.com>.

Written work which is open to public scrutiny motivates learners to take it seriously. Students' written work and peers' comments may be viewed online. It should be noted that generally students avoid writing negative remarks. As a rule, they try to find positive aspects in each case and usually find subtle ways to praise peer's work. We, teachers, evaluate our students' writing, but do not write any comments online: usually oral feedback on observed errors is provided individually during self-assessment interviews with each learner on her/his success and achievements in various activities. The basic principle of giving written feedback is to keep in mind that it is designed to teach and help learning. Unfortunately, some learners fail to correct their mistakes online in spite of being aware that their written work in weblogs is open to public scrutiny. Students' common reason is the shortage of time.

Conclusions

Learners believe that in order to improve language skills, it is expedient to receive teacher's feedback on written work both on paper and submitted electronically. Students' attitudes to ongoing (in subsequent two academic years) feedback do not differ significantly. Students at tertiary level prefer immediate correction of errors in spite of its impracticality and consider individual correction of mistakes by teacher as useful.

The main implications of this study for teachers are to monitor each student's performance in class activities closely

and provide individual feedback on oral and written errors. Teachers are advised to modify their techniques of providing correction to avoid undermining a learner.

References

- Allah, L. F., 2008. Electronic Feedback: Is It Beneficial for Second Language Writers? *Teaching English with Technology, A Journal for Teachers of English*, no. 8 (3). Available at: <http://www.iatefl.org.pl/call/calln132.htm> [Accessed February 2009]
- Ancker, W., 2000. Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice. *English Teaching Forum*, no. 38 (4), pp.20-25.
- Brandt, C., 2008. Integrating Feedback and Reflection in Teacher Preparation. *ELT Journal*, no. 62 (1), pp.37-46.
- Cohen, A. D., Cavalcanti, M. C., 1994. Feedback on Compositions: Teacher and Students Verbal Reports. In: B. Kroll, ed. *Second Language Writing, Research Insights for the Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dornyei, Z., 2003. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Edge, J., 1989. *Mistakes and Correction*. London, New York: Longman.
- Enginarlar, H., 1993. Student Response to Teacher Feedback in EFL Writing. *System*, no. 21(2), pp.193-204.
- Harmer, J., 2000. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. England: Longman.
- Kavaliauskienė, G., Kaminskienė, L., Anusienė, L., 2007. The Challenges for ESP Learners: Alternative Assessment of Performance and Usefulness of Class Activities. *Kalbų studijos*, no. 10, pp.75-81.
- 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*, no. 75 (3), pp.305-13.
- Leki, I. 1991. The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-level Writing Classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, no. 24 (3), pp.203-18.
- McGarrell, H., Verbeem, J., 2007. Motivating Revision of Drafts Through Formative Feedback. *ELT Journal*, no. 62 (1), pp.37-46.
- Nunan, D., 1991. *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, 1999. 9th Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rula L.Diab, 2006. Error Correction and Feedback in the EFL Writing Classroom. *English Teaching Forum*, no. 44 (3), pp.2-13.
- Sakai, H., 2004. Roles of Output and Feedback for L2 Learners' Noticing. *JALT Journal*, no. 26(1). Available at: <http://www.jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/2004/05/index> [Accessed January 2009].
- Sang-Keun Shin, 2008. 'Fire your Proofreader!' Grammar Correction in the Writing Classroom. *ELT Journal*, 62 (4), pp.358-365.
- Selinker, L., 1972. Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, no. 10, pp.209-231.
- Schulz, R. A., 1996. Focus on Form in the Foreign Language Classroom: Students' and Teachers' Views on Error Correction and the Role of Grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, no. 29 (3), pp.343-64.
- Schulz, R. A., 2001. Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback. *Modern Language Journal*, no. 85 (2), pp.244-58.
- Stannard, R., 2008. A New Direction in Feedback. *HLT Magazine*, no. 6.
- Truscott, J., 1996. The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, no. 46 (2), pp.327-69.
- Rollinson, P., 2005. Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class. *ELT Journal*, no. 59 (1), pp.23-30.

Galina Kavaliauskienė, Lilija Anusienė, Ligija Kaminskienė

Auditorinė praktika: grįžtamasis ryšys specialybės kalbos studijose

Santrauka

Grįžtamasis ryšys apibūdinamas kaip stebėjimo rezultatų ir siūlymų teikimas tarp asmenų norint geriau atlikti asmenines ir organizacines užduotis. Grįžtamojo ryšio svarba mokant kalbų nėra vienareikšmiai vertinama dėstytojų, o jo tyrimai nėra galutiniai. Dėstytojų ir studentų požiūriai į grįžtamąjį ryšį yra prieštaringi. Dažniausia dėstytojai neigiamai vertina grįžtamojo ryšio įtaką studentų motyvacijai ir pasitikėjimui savo gebėjimais.

Dėstytojo grįžtamasis ryšys taikomas, kai būtina taisyti rašybos ar kalbėjimo klaidas. Pastarųjų metų kalbų mokymosi teorijos teigia, kad ne visos klaidos taisytinos. Tai remiasi teiginiu, kad klaidos mokantis yra neišvengiamos – tai yra normalus reiškinys. Klaidų atsiradimo priežastys būna įvairios: gimtosios kalbos interferencija, ribotas užsienio kalbos mokėjimas, kalbos sudėtingumas ar net fosilizacija pasiekus tam tikrą kompetencijos lygį.

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami universiteto studentų požiūriai į grįžtamąjį ryšį mokantis specialybės anglų kalbos ir nustatoma, kaip keičiasi jų nuomonės mokantis specialybės kalbos. Gauti rezultatai rodo, kad grįžtamasis ryšys yra veiksmingas būdas skatinti lingvistinį vystymą. Studentai labiausiai vertina rašto darbų klaidų taisymą, bet mažiau vertina klaidų taisymą pasisakymuose. Priešingai negu dėstytojai, studentai mano, kad klaidų taisymas yra efektyvus ir nekenkia žmogaus savigarbai. Straipsnyje aptariami dėstytojo grįžtamojo ryšio teikimo formos – popieriuje bei kurso draugų pastabos elektroninėje erdvėje.

Pagrindinė šio tyrimo išvada skirta dėstytojams: stebėti kiekvieno studento pažangą ir teikti geranorišką rašto ir kalbėjimo klaidų taisymą. Dėstytojai privalo tobulinti savo klaidų taisymo metodikas taip, kad studentai nejaustų streso ar jaudulio.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2009 01

Parengtas spaudai 2009 04

About the authors:

Galina Kavaliauskienė, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania.
Address: Mykolas Romeris University, Ateities Str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania.
E-mail: gkaval@mrui.lt

Lilija Anusienė, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania.
Address: Mykolas Romeris University, Ateities Str. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania.
E-mail: lilijaa@gmail.com

Ligija Kaminskienė, Prof. Dr., Vilnius University, Lithuania.
Address: Vilnius University, Universiteto Str. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania.
E-mail: ligija.kaminskiene@gmail.com

APPENDIX

Questionnaire: Students' Perception of Various Types of Feedback

Rate the following statements according to the scale by writing the appropriate number:

1 – strongly disagree, 2 – disagree, 3 – not sure, 4 –agree, 5 – strongly agree.

- A) Making mistakes in learning English is natural – it shows linguistic development.
- B) Students prefer immediate teacher's correction of errors.
- C) Teacher's correction of spelling, grammar, pronunciation is generally ineffective.
- D) I find it hard to notice my own mistakes.
- E) The teachers should correct students' every mistake in speaking.
- F) The teachers should correct student's every mistake in writing.
- G) Teacher's correction of student's oral errors in front of the class would undermine learner's self-esteem.
- H) The teacher's individual correction of student's written mistakes is useful for learning ESP.

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.14.43338