Perceptions of JFL students toward correction of oral errors

Akemi Katayama
Department of Asian Studies, The University of Texas at Austin

Reference data:
Katayama, A. (2006). Perceptions of JFL students toward correction of oral errors.
In K. Bradford-Watts, C. Ikeguchi, & M. Swanson (Eds.) *JALT2005 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT.

Numerous language educators and researchers (e.g., Schulz, 2001) support the view that matching the preferences of learners and the practices of teachers is important for successful language learning. Therefore, it would appear beneficial for teachers to know the commonly held expectations of their students. This paper presents and discusses the results of a questionnaire administered to 249 university students enrolled in Japanese classes in the U.S. The questionnaire, utilizing 5-point Likert-scales, investigated (1) students' attitudes toward classroom oral error correction; (2) their preferences for correction of different types of oral errors; and (3) their preferences for particular correction methods. The results show that the students had strongly positive attitudes toward teacher error correction. Furthermore, they indicated a clear preference for correction of grammatical errors over other kinds of errors. The most favored correction method was for the teacher to explain why the student's utterance is ungrammatical.

多くの語学教育者や研究者(e.g., Schulz, 2001)が、語学学習を成果の多いものにするためには、学習者が教師の指導方法を支持していることが不可欠である、という見解を支持している。依って、学習者の意識調査を行うことは、教師にとって極めて有益である。本稿は、アメリカの大学で日本語を学ぶ２４９名の学生を対象にした質問紙調査の結果について報告したものである。質問紙では、5段階ライカート・スケールにより、(1)教室内での口頭の間違い直しに対する学生の態度、(2)異なる種類の間違いの間違い直しに対する好み、(3)異なる間違いの直し方に対する好み、について回答を求めた。その結果、教師による間違い直しを強く支持しているということ、また特に文法の間違いを直されることを強く希望しているということが判明した。さらに、文法の間違いを解説する直し方が最も支持されていることも明らかにされた。

Students are diverse in learning styles and preferences toward instructional practices. The findings of some studies (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; McCargar, 1993; Nunan, 1988; Oladejo, 1993; Schulz, 1996, 2001) show mismatches between teachers' views and practices and learners' preferences and expectations. Many foreign language educators and researchers support the view that when student perceptions of instructional effectiveness differ from instructor perceptions, learning may be impaired (e.g., Green, 1993; Horwitz, 1988; McCargar, 1993; Schulz, 2001). Accordingly, it is useful

for teachers to understand their students' preferences in pedagogical practices.

While the literature on teachers' responses to students' errors is extensive, the literature on students' perceptions regarding error correction in foreign language research is limited (Bang, 1999; Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Chenoweth, Day, Chun & Luppescu, 1983; Katayama, 1996; Oladejo, 1993). Specifically concerning preferences of learners of Japanese for oral error correction, there is very little research in the literature (Fujioka & Kennedy, 1997; Ueno, 1998). The purpose of the present study was to examine student attitudes and preferences toward error correction in Japanese classrooms. The specific rationale for this study was based on the following concerns. At the university where this study was conducted, activity sessions that consist of various oral communication exercises for first-year and second-year Japanese courses are taught mainly by teaching assistants (TAs). Lecturers, including myself, who supervise the TAs and periodically observe their lessons often find them to employ little error correction. The lecturers advise those TAs to correct students' oral errors and they also report to the other lecturers on the findings of the observations and advice they gave to the TAs. Based on those reports and personal conversations with the other lecturers, it appears that all the lecturers agree that the students need to acquire accuracy and their errors ought to be corrected. However, because there are no guidelines among us for error correction, the lecturers' reactions to the TAs' practices regarding error correction are inconsistent and vary depending upon the circumstances.

Given that matching the expectations of teachers and learners is important for successful language learning, it would be of value to obtain information of students' views on error correction and to utilize the information in dealing with classroom errors. Thus, in an attempt to gain insight into the students' attitudes toward error correction, a questionnaire survey was conducted.

Research design and method

Research questions

In order to investigate the students' attitudes toward error correction, the following questions were addressed.

1. What are the attitudes of university students of Japanese toward classroom error correction of spoken Japanese?
2. What are the students' general preferences for classroom error correction of different types of errors (e.g., pronunciation and grammar)?
3. What are the students' general preferences for particular types of error correction methods?

Data collection instrument

The instrument used to elicit information on students' attitudes regarding error correction was a questionnaire developed for a previous study (Katayama, 1996) that investigated attitudes of Japanese learners of English language toward error correction. The questionnaire employed in the study (shown in the Appendix) utilized information that was obtained from an extensive literature review. The questionnaire contained eight demographic

questions/statements, four open-ended questions, and twenty-seven 5-point Likert scale items.

The questionnaire consisted of four sections. The first section included questions eliciting demographic information. The second section addressed Research Question 1 and asked the students' general views on classroom oral error correction. The section contained four statements illustrating certain views that have been controversial among language researchers and educators for decades. These views included: whether or not learner errors should be corrected; when learner errors should be corrected (i.e., constantly or selectively); and who should correct errors, teachers or peers. The students were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with four different statements. Response options were coded on 5-point scales, with 1 representing *strongly disagree* and 5 representing *strongly agree*. Here, the students were given the option of explaining the reasons for their rating in order to provide this research with "useful/insightful" qualitative data (Nunan, 1992, p. 145).

The third section addressed Research Question 2 and asked about students' preferences for classroom error corrections of different aspects of the language. The students were asked how often they wanted classroom error correction of different types of errors: grammar, phonology, vocabulary, pragmatics, and discourse. Instead of the term phonology, the words "pronunciation, accent, and intonation," were used in the questionnaire. Errors in pragmatics were presented as "inappropriate expressions," and discourse errors as "organization of discourse." Participants rated each item on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing *never* and 5 representing *always* with respect to frequency of correction.

The last section addressed Research Question 3 and asked about students' preferences for particular types of error correction methods. The students were asked to rate ten different methods of error correction (shown on section D of the questionnaire in the Appendix) provided by teachers, first as feedback to students' grammatical errors, and then as feedback to students' pronunciation errors for each technique. Examples of errors were presented in English for convenience in the questionnaire. The rating for students' opinions about each method was measured on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 representing *no good* to 5 representing *very good*.

Participants

Data was collected from the students who were enrolled in Japanese classes at a large public university in the US. The questionnaire was anonymous and administered to 249 students who volunteered to participate and signed consent forms: 164 students were male and 85 students were female; 92 students had studied Japanese for one semester, 63 had studied for two semesters, 12 had studied for three semesters, 51 had studied for four semesters, and 31 had studied for five semesters or more (Table 1). Table 1 does not include the other demographic information such as length of stay in Japan because it is not considered relevant to the research questions.

Table 1. Participants

	The number of semesters students had taken Japanese					
	One	Two	Three	Four	Five or more	Total
Male	58	40	9	36	21	164
Female	34	23	3	15	10	85
Total	92	63	12	51	31	249

Data analysis

Frequency distributions were used to analyze the Likert-scale responses for (1) general attitudes toward classroom error correction in speaking, (2) general preferences for correction of different types of errors (e.g., pronunciation and grammar), and (3) general preferences for particular types of classroom error correction in speaking.

Results and discussion

The following results and discussion address the three research questions.

Attitudes toward error correction

Section B of the questionnaire addressed Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of university students of Japanese toward classroom error correction of spoken Japanese?

Whether or not errors should be corrected

The students were asked whether or not they agreed with the statement, "I want teachers to correct my errors in speaking Japanese." Adding together the numbers of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed, 92.8% of the students agreed with the statement (Table 2). The students were given the option of explaining the reasons for their rating, and 90.8% of the respondents provided reasons. The following discussion is based on only the responses by those students who provided the optional comments. The responses were categorized, and frequencies calculated. The reason most frequently cited for this positive attitude toward error correction was that students wanted to improve their accuracy in Japanese.

The students' strongly favorable attitudes toward receiving error correction in the present study conform with the results of studies conducted among ESL students by Cathcart and Olsen (1976), Chenoweth, Day, Chun, and Luppescu (1983), and McCargar (1993) as well as those among EFL students conducted by Oladejo (1993), Katayama (1996), and Bang (1999). Possible influence of the curriculum on student attitudes might account for these observed positive attitudes toward error correction. Schulz (2001) observed FL students' strongly favorable attitude toward grammar instruction and error correction, and speculated that "perceptions could be the result of the way FLs are taught or tested (i.e., with predominantly form-focused, discrete-point tests) or both" (Schulz, 2001, p. 255). The same can be said of the likely effects of the mainly accuracy-based testing in the language classes the respondents here were taking.

Correcting all errors vs. selective correction

As seen in Table 2, 62.3% of the participants endorsed the statement, "Teachers should correct all errors that learners make in speaking Japanese," and 86.3% of the respondents provided reasons. 'Accuracy' was the reason

Table 2. Attitudes toward error correction

1 = strongly disagree 5 = strongly agree

Item	N	1 & 2 (%)	3 (%)	4 & 5 (%)	Mean	SD
I want teachers to correct my errors in speaking Japanese.	249	3.2	4.0	92.8	4.58	.77
Teachers should correct all errors that learners make in speaking Japanese.	249	13.2	24.5	62.3	3.70	1.02
Teachers should correct only the errors that interfere with communication.	247	56.7	21.9	21.5	2.52	1.10
I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in group work.	249	16.8	20.1	63.0	3.69	1.13

* Total does not add to 100% due to rounding

most frequently cited for why the students favored the correction of all errors. When asked whether or not they agreed with the statement, "Teachers should correct only the errors that interfere with communication," 56.7% expressed disagreement, 21.5% agreed, and 21.9% neither agreed nor disagreed as seen in Table 2," and 68.8% of the respondents provided reasons. The reason most frequently mentioned to not employ selective correction was that correcting only errors that interfere with communication is not sufficient.

Burt (1975) argued that learners can be more motivated and self-assured to learn the target language when teachers target their corrections only at the errors that hinder communication. In contrast, Vigil and Oller (1976) argued that "as long as the affective messages conveyed to the student are predominantly positive, frequent instances of negative cognitive feedback are not likely to do any harm" (Vigil & Oller, 1976, p.295). The findings of the present study support this claim. The majority of respondents in this study expressed negative attitudes toward selective error correction. A surprising finding was that a majority of the students agreed with the notion that teachers should correct all errors that learners make in speaking. In the present study, each Japanese class had about fifteen students, and this number is double in lecture sessions of first- and second-year Japanese. Therefore, it was not feasible to attempt to correct every error that the students made in speaking Japanese.

Peer correction

A total of 63% agreed with the statement, "I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in group work" (Table2), and 75.1% of the respondents provided reasons. That peer correction is helpful was the most frequently stated reason for the positive attitude.

Cohen (1975) suggests that peer correction may improve the learners' ability to recognize errors. Bruton and Samuda (1980) observed that ESL adult learners were correcting each other successfully in group work. A finding of this study

validated the popularly believed notion that peer correction is very beneficial in the language classroom (Walz, 1982 has this view). It should be noted, however, that the students were more positive toward teacher correction than peer correction, as shown in Table 2, where an overwhelming (92.8%) majority of the students favored teacher correction, while only 63% favored peer correction.

Types of errors students wanted to have corrected

Section C of the questionnaire addressed Research Question 2: What are the students' general preferences for classroom error correction of different types of errors (e.g., pronunciation and grammar)?

As can be seen in Table 3, the majority of the students wanted to have their grammatical errors (63.1%) and vocabulary errors (57.9%) corrected *always*.

A number of foreign language educators have suggested that errors that hinder the intelligibility of a message should receive the highest attention for correction. (e.g., Burt & Kiparsky, 1974; Hanzeli, 1975). What type of errors then interfere with communication? This question remains unresolved. Studies on comprehensibility of errors have provided a variety of conflicting results (e.g., Chastain, 1980; Gynan, 1985). While the research on comprehensibility of errors indicates a lack of agreement on what type of errors impede communication, there is more agreement on teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors. A review of the literature on teachers' treatment of errors reveals that teachers correct grammatical errors less often than other types of errors (Chaudron 1986; Courchêne, 1980; Fanselow, 1977; Lucas, 1975; Lyster, 2001; Salica, 1981). Language learners appear to have different preferences in their priorities for the correction of error types than do language teachers. The students of Japanese in the present study indicated that grammatical errors should receive the highest attention, closely followed by vocabulary errors. The students of English as a second language and English as a foreign language in other studies also expressed positive attitudes toward the correction of grammatical errors (Bang, 1999; Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Oladejo, 1983). One possible explanation for these students' positive attitudes toward the correction of grammatical errors

Table 3. Types of errors students wanted to have corrected

Item	N	Never 1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	Always 5 (%)	Mean	SD
Grammar	249		0.8	6.4	29.7	63.1	4.55	.65
Vocabulary	247		2.0	6.1	34.0	57.9	3.92	1.00
Pragmatics	249	1.2	3.6	15.3	36.7	43.1	4.48	.70
Phonology	249	1.2	7.2	24.5	32.1	34.9	4.17	.90
Discourse	249	2.0	4.1	22.1	40.2	31.6	3.95	.94

* Total does not add to 100% due to rounding.

is that the students are aware of the teachers' expectations. In the Japanese program at the university here, grammar is an important component of the curriculum. In fact, formal grammar instruction is provided in lecture sessions twice a week in the courses of first- and second-year Japanese. As might be expected, the test materials emphasize grammar. Therefore, it would be reasonable to assume that the students' perceptions may be influenced by these instructional practices.

Methods of classroom error correction

The last section of the questionnaire addressed Research Question 3: What are the students' general preferences for particular types of error correction methods? Based on the results of respondents' rating on the five-point scale, the methods were categorized into three types: most favored correction methods; disliked correction methods; and methods neither liked nor disliked.

For these last methods, a large proportion of the respondents chose 3 on the five-point scale, and the rest were fairly equally balanced in terms of positive and negative responses, and no tendency in either direction could be determined.

Most favored correction methods

Table 4 lists the methods of grammar correction that the majority of the students liked. These methods are listed in the order of preference based on the percentage of the respondents who gave scores of 4 or 5. The most favored among the ten types of correction was the one in which the teacher explains why the student's utterance is incorrect. A total of 84.5% of the respondents liked this correction method. The second most popular type of grammar correction was the one in which the teacher presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the student's

Table 4. Most favored correction methods for grammatical errors

1 = no good 5 = very good

Item	N	1 & 2 (%)	3 (%)	4 & 5 (%)	Mean	SD
T explains why the utterance is incorrect.	246	4.9	10.6	84.5	4.36	.87
T presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the S's utterance.	248	2.4	16.1	81.5	4.26	.84
T gives a hint which might enable S to notice and self-correct.	247	6.9	11.7	81.4	4.19	.97
T points out the error, and provides the correct form.	243	20.1	21.0	58.9	3.60	1.27

utterance; 81.5% liked this method. A third popular method was the one in which the teacher gives a hint which might enable the student to notice the error and self-correct; 81.4% chose this method. The fourth most favored method was that in which the teacher points out the error, and provides the correct form, with 58.9% endorsing this method.

Table 5 displays the methods of pronunciation correction that a majority of the students liked. The students' most favored technique was the one in which the teacher gives a hint which may enable the student to notice the error and self-correct; 80.2% liked this method. The second most favored correction method was the technique in which the teacher explains why the student's utterance is incorrect; 78.7% liked this method. Another popular method was the one in which the teacher presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the student's utterance; 76.5% selected this method. One other popular method was that in which the teacher points out the error, and provides the correct pronunciation; 58.1% endorsed this method.

The majority of the students favored the same four out of the ten possible correction methods for both grammatical and pronunciation errors, although in different orders of preference. One of the methods is the technique in which the teacher presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the student's utterance. Lyster and Ranta term this type of correction "recast" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.46). The findings of some studies showed that teachers frequently employed recasts (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Doughty, 1994; Fanselow, 1977; Lyster, 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Some studies suggest that recasts have a positive effect on acquisition (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Long, Inagaki & Ortega; 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Morris, 2002).

Table 5. Most favored correction methods for pronunciation errors

1 = no good 5 = very good

Item	N	1 & 2 (%)	3 (%)	4 & 5 (%)	Mean	SD
T gives a hint which might enable S to notice and self-correct.	242	5.0	14.9	80.2	4.18	.95
T explains why the utterance is incorrect.	245	6.1	15.1	78.7	4.22	.96
T presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the S's utterance.	243	2.9	20.6	76.5	4.10	.85
T points out the error, and provides the correct pronunciation.	241	20.3	21.6	58.1	3.56	1.26

* Total does not add to 100% due to rounding

Nevertheless, some researchers have pointed out that recasts may be ambiguous to learners because they may be perceived as conversational moves such as agreeing and understanding (Chaudron, 1988; Truscott, 1999). Chaudron proposed that recasts could be made less ambiguous by shortening the correct utterance to locate the error and/or by placing a stress for emphasis. With this technique, however, some students still may not realize that an error has been made or the difference between the erroneous form and the correct form.

One method which can draw the student's attention to the error is when the teacher overtly points out the error and provides the correct form. The students in this study liked this method. Whether or not to use the learner's error when providing correction has been one of the greatest concerns in error correction. Grew (1964) claimed that teachers should never give the incorrect form because "for some strange reason the class is more apt to retain the wrong form than the right, when it has heard the teacher use it" (Grew, 1964, p. 86). Although we may appreciate Grew's claim, such explicit correction can save time. It not only locates the error but also gives the correct form, and therefore minimizes the disruption of the flow of the activity. Gass and Varonis (1994) suggested that awareness of the correct-incorrect mismatch may lead to changes in the learners' L2 knowledge.

Two methods that attempt to elicit self-correction were also liked by the students in this study. One is the method in which the teacher explains why the student's utterance is incorrect. The other is the technique in which the teacher gives a hint which might enable the student to notice the error and self-correct. Many researchers have proposed that language learners could benefit more from self-correction for their interlanguage development than from being provided with correct forms (e.g., Cohen, 1975; Corder, 1967; Hendrickson, 1978; Kasper, 1985; van Lier, 1988). Ellis (1994) suggested that students are less likely to respond negatively to self-correction than to teacher correction. Although correction methods that attempt to elicit self-correction appear to be ideal, caution needs to be exercised in deciding when and how to employ these methods. In classrooms, especially in big classes, class time should be used efficiently. More specifically, error correction should be provided in an unambiguous and non-confusing manner to minimize wait time and to promote self-correction, and, more importantly, to facilitate the students successful self-correction.

Disliked correction method

The only correction method for which a majority of the students gave the scores 1 and 2, with 1 representing *no good* was the technique in which the teacher ignores students' errors; 92.3% rated this technique 1 or 2. The students in the studies of Cathcart and Olsen (1976) and Oladejo (1993) also rejected this technique. Despite its lack of popularity among learners, ignoring the students' errors is one of the techniques often employed by ESL teachers in the study of Fanselow (1977).

Methods neither liked nor disliked

Several correction methods were neither favored nor disliked by the students of this study. One is the method in which the teacher repeats the student's utterance up to the error, and

waits for self-correction. Another is where the teacher asks the student to repeat the utterance. The method in which the teacher repeats the original question was also neither clearly favored nor disliked by the students. One other method receiving this type of indeterminate response is that in which the teacher indicates that the student has made an error by using nonverbal behavior, such as gestures and facial expressions. One last method in this group was that in which the teacher simply indicates the error. All these self-correction eliciting methods except the last one are potentially unclear to learners. Students may misunderstand the corrections to be conversational moves and may not realize that they have made errors. Even if they succeed in recognizing their errors, they may not be able to self-correct successfully because none of these methods give them any hints about the correct forms.

Conclusions and implications

The purpose of this study was to identify students' general attitudes and preferences toward classroom error correction in the target population in order to utilize the information obtained from the study. Results revealed that there was a gap between the TAs' practices and the students' expectations concerning frequency of error correction. The majority of the students wanted the teachers to correct all the oral errors they make. Although correcting all errors is not feasible in activity sessions where most of the class time is spent in pair-work, the lecturers can at least encourage the TAs to correct the errors more often. The students also expressed highly favorable attitudes toward correction of grammatical errors. The lectures can incorporate this finding into their lecture sessions by having the students engage in extensive form-focused drills and exercises. Additional oral practice and correction of grammatical errors would help students increase accuracy. The findings of the students' preferences toward various correction methods also provides helpful guidance to the lecturers and the TAs in this study. In light of the fact that the literature reveals that there is no hard evidence for what types of correction methods are more effective than others, and that the effects of error correction on learners may depend on relevant factors such as the learners' attitudes toward being corrected as suggested by Major (1988), it could be argued that correcting students' errors with the methods they like may be a sensible choice.

The findings of this study cannot be generalized to other instructional settings because all the respondents represented a single institution, and thus did not provide a varied population mix. Despite this drawback, the findings of this study provide information that may contribute to a clearer understanding of students' perceptions toward classroom error correction. The students expressed strongly positive attitudes toward teacher correction of oral errors. They also expressed highly favorable attitudes toward correction of oral grammatical errors. These findings echo the results of the several other cited studies on correction preferences among students of English and other foreign languages. This suggests the possibility of confirming general attitudes of language learners toward error correction through replicated studies. Further studies are also recommended because few studies have investigated the correction methods that language learners prefer. The studies should be conducted with students of different languages in different learning

settings. Studies on cross-cultural differences are also recommended to find out whether learners' perceptions differ across cultural contexts. For example, Japanese learners of English may regard criticisms as face-threatening as perceived by Japanese people in a study by Cole (1993, cited in Gudykunst & Nishida, 1993) and may have different preferences toward error correction from those of the American students' in this study.

Given that matching the expectations of teachers and learners contributes to successful language learning, it can be hoped that teachers will take the time to survey their students' perceptions toward instructional practices. Disregarding their expectations may have a negative impact on students' motivation. Therefore, when the situation does not allow teachers to incorporate students' needs and expectations into their instructional practices, they should explain their reasons for this inability to their students. Conflict in expectations between teachers and students could be at least partially minimized by such an explanation.

Akemi Katayama has been teaching Japanese in the US since 1993. She is currently teaching at the University of Texas at Austin. Her interests include second language acquisition and language pedagogy.

References

Bang, Y. (1999). Reactions of EFL students to oral error correction. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics,* 3, 39-51.

Bruton, A., & Samuda, V. (1980). Learner and teacher roles in the treatment of oral error in group work. *RELC Journal,* 11(2), 49-63.

Burt, M. K. (1975). Error analysis in the adult EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly,* 9(1), 53-63.

Burt, M. K., & Kiparsky, C. (1974). Global and local mistakes. In J. H. Schuman, & N. Stenson (Eds.), *New frontiers in second language learning* (pp. 71-80). Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Cathcart, R. L., & Olsen J. W. B. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. In J. F. Fanselow, & R. H. Crymes (Eds.), *On TESOL* '76, 41-45. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Chastain, K. (1980). Native speaker reaction to instructor-identified student second-language errors. *The Modern Language Journal,* 64(2), 210-215.

Chaudron, C. (1986). Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in French immersion classes. In R. D. Richard (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 64-84). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chenoweth, N. A., Day, R. R., Chun A. E., & Luppescu, S. (1983). Attitudes and preferences of ESL students to error correction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 6(1), 79-87.

Cohen, A. D. (1975). Error correction and the training of language teachers. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59, 414-422.

Cole, M. (1989). A cross-cultural inquiry into the meaning of face in the Japanese and United States cultures. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, San Fransisco, CA.

Corder, P. S. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics,* 5, 161-170.

Courchêne, R. (1980). The error analysis hypothesis, the contrastive analysis hypothesis, and the correction of errors in the second language classroom. *TESL Talk,* 11(2), 3-13, 11(3), 10-29.

Doughty, C. (1994). Fine-tuning of feedback by competent speakers to language learners. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistic 1993* (pp. 96-108). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fanselow, J. F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals,* 10(5), 583-593.

Fujioka, N., & Kennedy, J. J. (1997). The views of non-native speakers of Japanese toward error treatment in Japanese introductory college classes. (ED 408826).

Gass, S. M., & Varonis, E. M. (1994). Input, interaction, and second language production. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 16, 283-302.

Green, J. M. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal* 77(1), 1-10.

Grew, J. H. (1964). Toward better classroom teaching. *The Modern Language Journal,* 48(2), 82-88.

Gudykunst, W. B, & Nishida, T. (1993). Interpersonal and intergroup communication in Japan and the United States. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Communication in Japan and the United States* (pp. 149-214). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gynan, S. N. (1985). Comprehension, irritation and error hierarchies. *Hispani*a 68, 160-165.

Hanzeli, V. E. (1975). Learner's language: Implications of recent research for foreign language instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 59, 426-432.

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

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal* 72, 283-294.

Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7, 200-215.

Katayama, A. (1996). *Correction of classroom oral errors: Preferences among university students of English in Japan*. Master's thesis, Portland State Univ.

Long, M. H., Inagaki, S., & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal,* 82, 357-37.

Lucas, E. (1975). *Teachers' reacting moves following errors made by pupils in post-primary English as a second language classes in Israel*. Master's thesis, School of Education, Tel Aviv University.

Lyster, R. (2001). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning,* 51(1), 265-301.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19, 37-66.

Mackey, A., & Philp. J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal,* 82, 338-356.

Major, R. C. (1988). Balancing form and function. *International Review of Applied Linguistics,* 26(2), 81-100.

McCargar, D. F. (1993). Teacher and student role expectations: Cross-cultural differences and implications. *The Modern Language Journal,* 77(2), 192-207.

Morris, F. A. (2002). Negotiation moves and recasts in relation to error types and learner repair in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals,* 35(4), 395-404.

Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner-centered classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (1992). *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preference. *TESL Canada Journal*, 10(2), 71-89.

Salica, C. (1981). *Testing a model of corrective discourse*. Master's thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

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,* 29(3), 343-364.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia. *The Modern Language Journal,* 85(2), 244-258.

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 55(4), 437-456.

Ueno, J. (1998). Learning styles and error correction: How do learning styles affect students' perceptions towards error correction in a foreign language classroom*?* (ED429452).

van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London and N.Y.: Longman.

Vigil, N. A., & Oller, J. W. (1976). Rule fossilization: A tentative model. *Language Learning*, 26, 281-295.

Walz, J. C. (1982). *Language in education: Theory and practice*. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Appendix

Questionnaire completed by participants

A. Please check the appropriate answers or write an answer in the space provided.

1. Major: _____
2. Gender: 1. ( ) Male 2. ( ) Female
3. Have you studied a foreign language? 1. ( ) Yes 2. ( ) No
4. If yes, what language(s) did you study? _____
5. How long did you study it/them? _____ years _____ months
6. How long have you stayed in Japan? _____ years _____ months
7. Do you speak Japanese outside of class? 1. ( ) Yes 2. ( ) No
8. Do you want to improve your speaking skills in Japanese? 1. ( ) Yes 2. ( ) No

B. The following questions concern correction of spoken errors. For each question, make your choice based on your foreign language learning experience up until now including in high schools and private conversation classes.

If you *strongly disagree* to a statement, circle "1." If you *strongly agree*, circle "5."

		strongly disagree				*strongly agree*
a)	I want teachers to correct my errors in speaking Japanese.	1	2	3	4	5
	Please try to provide the reason for your choice.	_____				
b)	Teachers should correct **all** errors that learners make in speaking Japanese	1	2	3	4	5
	Please try to provide the reason for your choice.	_____				
c)	Teachers should correct **only** the errors that					

interfere with communication. 1 2 3 4 5

Please try to provide the reason for your choice. _____

d) I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in group work. 1 2 3 4 5

Please try to provide the reason for your choice. _____

C. How often do you want to have your errors corrected? If you prefer *never*, circle "1." If you prefer *always*, circle "5." Circle the appropriate number for each item.

		never				*always*
a)	grammar	1	2	3	4	5
b)	pronunciation, accent, & intonation	1	2	3	4	5
c)	vocabulary (words, phrases) usage	1	2	3	4	5
d)	inappropriate expressions (e.g., When offering a drink in English: "Would you like some coffee"? is more appropriate than "Do you want to drink coffee"?)	1	2	3	4	5
e)	organization of discourse (e.g., how to negotiate or persuade)	1	2	3	4	5

D. Teachers' reactions to students' errors in speaking the target language are various. The following a) - j) are examples of correction techniques. They are sometimes used in combination. However, please rate them as individual methods here. If you think a method *no good*, circle "1." If you think a method *very good*, circle "5."

The ENGLISH language has been chosen here for convenience.

*Example of **grammatical** error:*

Teacher: "Where did you go yesterday"?

Student: "I ***go*** to the park."

*Example of **pronunciation** error:*

T: "What kind of flowers do you like best"?

S: "I like ***l***oses best."

		no good				*very good*
a)	Teacher (T) ignores Student's (S) error.	1	2	3	4	5
b)	T presents the correct response or part of the response.					
	For grammatical error:	1	2	3	4	5
	"I ***went*** to the park." or "***Went***."					
	For pronunciation error:					
	"I like ***r***oses best." or "***R***oses."	1	2	3	4	5
c)	T points out the error, and provides the correct response.					
	G: "***Go*** is wrong. You should say ***went***."	1	2	3	4	5
	P: "***L***oses is wrong. You should say ***r***oses."	1	2	3	4	5
d)	T indicates that an error occurred by nonverbal behavior, such as gesture and facial expressions.	1	2	3	4	5
e)	T repeats the original question.					
	G: "Where did you go yesterday"?	1	2	3	4	5
	P: "What kind of flowers do you like best"?	1	2	3	4	5
f)	T asks S to repeat the utterance.					
	G: "Please say that again."	1	2	3	4	5
	P: "Please say that again."	1	2	3	4	5
g)	T gives S a hint which might enable S to notice the error and self-correct.					
	G: "Where did you say you ***went*** yesterday"?	1	2	3	4	5

	P: "What color of ***r***oses do you like"?	1	2	3	4	5
h)	T repeats S' utterance up to the error, and waits for self-correction.					
	G: "I…"	1	2	3	4	5
	P: "I like…"	1	2	3	4	5
i)	T indicates the error.					
	G: "No. Not ***go***."	1	2	3	4	5
	P: "No. Not ***l***oses."	1	2	3	4	5
j)	T explains why the response is incorrect.					
	G: "***Go*** is the present tense. You need the past tense here."	1	2	3	4	5
	P: (Using a picture of a mouth) "When you pronounce ***r*** for ***r***oses, your tongue should not touch the roof of the mouth. It should…"	1	2	3	4	5