



Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction

Akemi Katayama

The University of Texas at Austin

Reference Data:

Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction. In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), *JALT2006 Conference Proceedings*. Tokyo: JALT

Many language educators and researchers (e.g., Nunan; 1987; Horwitz, 1990; Schulz, 2001) maintain that matching the expectations of teachers and students is important for successful language learning. Accordingly, it is beneficial for teachers to discover their students' perceptions toward instructional practices. This paper presents and discusses the results of a questionnaire administered to 588 EFL students at several Japanese universities. 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 correction of errors and indicated a preference for correction of pragmatic errors over other kinds of errors. The most favored correction method was for the teacher to give the student a hint which might enable the student to notice the error and self-correct.

多くの語学教育者や研究者(e.g., Nunan, 1987; Horwitz, 1990; Schulz, 2001)が、語学学習で大きな成果をあげるためには、教師の指導方法が学習者に支持されていることが不可欠である、と主張している。従って、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なことである。本稿は、国公立の六大学で英語を学ぶ588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段階ライカール・スケールにより、(1)教室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、また特に不適切な表現方法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、学習者が自力で間違いが直せるようなヒントを与える直し方が最も支持されていることも明らかにされた。

The findings of some studies (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Hawkey, 2006; McCargar, 1993; Nunan, 1988; Oladejo, 1993; Schulz, 1996, 2001) show differences between teachers' teaching preferences and learners' learning preferences. Many foreign language educators and researchers support the view that a gap between teacher and student perceptions about the effectiveness of instructional practices can

contribute to unsatisfactory learning outcomes (e.g., Green, 1993; Horwitz, 1988; McCargar, 1993; Nunan, 1987; Schulz, 2001). Consequently, it is beneficial for teachers to discover their students' preferences in instructional practices. Nunan (1995) proposed that "teachers should find out what their students think and feel about what and how they want to learn" (p.140).

Making errors is an inevitable and natural process of language learning (e.g. Edge, 1989; Hendrickson, 1987). Naturally, learner errors and feedback to errors have been of great interest to foreign language teachers and researchers. Although the literature on teachers' responses to students' errors is abundant, the literature on students' perceptions regarding error correction is limited in both ESL and EFL research (e.g., Bang, 1999; Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Chenoweth, Day, Chun, & Luppescu, 1983; Oladejo, 1993). Particularly concerning Japanese ESL learners' preferences for oral error correction, there is very little research in the literature (Chenoweth, Day, Chun, & Luppescu, 1983; McCargar, 1993). Chenoweth et al. (1983) examined adult ESL learners' attitudes toward interaction with native-speaking friends. They found that these learners with different cultural backgrounds such as Japanese and Koreans had positive attitudes toward error correction. Similar results were observed by McCargar (1993) who investigated adult ESL learners' preferences for error correction in his study of cultural differences in teacher and student role expectation. The Japanese ESL learners in these studies may have different attitudes from Japanese EFL learners because these two types of learners study in different settings where the learners' levels of exposure to the English language differ.

In the EFL settings, where learners do not need English to satisfy daily life requirements, there may not be a demand for accuracy in English usage, and consequently, their preferences for error correction might be different from those of the learners in ESL settings.

Since EFL classes in Japanese universities almost always have a large number of students, it would be especially difficult for teachers to modify their preferences and practices in order to cater to each individual student's preferences. However, if successful language learning depends largely on matching the expectations of teachers and learners, it would be useful for the teachers to know their students' common preferences. When teachers cannot modify their instructional practices to match their students' preferences, they may be able to minimize conflict in expectations between teachers and students by explaining their reasons (Katayama, 2006).

This study employed a questionnaire survey and examined attitudes and preferences for classroom oral error correction among EFL students in Japanese universities.

Research design and method

Research questions

In order to investigate Japanese EFL learners' attitudes and preferences toward classroom oral error correction, the following questions were addressed.

1. What are the attitudes toward classroom oral error correction among EFL students in Japanese universities?

2. What are the students' general preferences for classroom error correction of different types of errors?
3. What are the students' general preferences for particular types of error correction methods?

Data collection instrument

A questionnaire was developed for this study to elicit information on students' attitudes regarding error correction. The questionnaire (shown in the Appendix) utilized information obtained from an extensive literature review. The original questionnaire was constructed in English and translated into Japanese. Both versions were reviewed to assess the reliability by bilingual professors of Japanese teaching in the US. The Japanese version was pre-tested and revised based on the results of the pretest. The revised questionnaire was pre-tested to reexamine some of the questions. Then, some modifications were made to the questionnaire. This version was employed in this study. The questionnaire contains four sections. The first section contained questions eliciting demographic information. The second section addressed Research Question 1 and asked the students' general opinions about the correction of oral errors in the classroom. 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 to 5-point scales, with 1 representing *strongly disagree* and 5 representing *strongly agree*. 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 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 588 respondents enrolled in 21 EFL classes at six universities located in three different cities in Japan. Regarding gender, 353 students were female and 233 were male. Two respondents did not indicate their gender. They were English literature majors (139 students), education majors (98 students), English as a foreign language majors (92 students), economics majors (77 students), medicine majors (23 students), foreign language majors (22 students), and other majors (137 students).

Data analysis

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

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 toward classroom oral error correction among EFL students in Japanese universities?

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 English.” Adding together the numbers of students who agreed or strongly agreed, 77.6% of the students agreed with the statement (Table 1). The students were given the option to explain the reasons for their rating, and 66.4% of the respondents provided reasons. The following discussion considers only those who provided optional comments. The responses were categorized, and frequencies calculated. The most frequently cited reason for this positive attitude toward error correction was that students wanted to improve their accuracy in English.

The students' strongly favorable attitudes toward receiving error correction in the present study is consistent with the results of studies among ESL students conducted by Cathcart and Olsen (1976), Chenoweth, Day, Chun, and Luppescu (1983), and McCargar (1993) as well as those conducted among EFL students by Oladejo (1993) and Bang (1999). In a more recent study (Katayama 2006), I investigated students' perceptions toward oral error correction in Japanese classrooms in the US, and found that 92.8% of the respondents expressed strongly favorable attitudes toward teacher correction. Schulz (2001) observed FL students' strongly favorable attitude toward explicit 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). Edge (1989) maintained that accuracy is important as well as fluency “because a lot of examinations are based on how accurate a student is in constructing correct pieces of language” (Edge, 1989, p. 20).

Correcting all errors vs. selective correction

Nearly half of the respondents (47.3%) disagreed with the following statement: “Teachers should correct all errors that learners make in speaking English” (Table 1). 64.6% of the respondents provided reasons. As an explanation for their response, the students most frequently stated that they did not desire all their errors to be corrected because they thought that “correcting all errors would affect students’ feelings.”

When asked whether or not they agreed with the statement, “Teachers should correct only the errors that interfere with communication,” 40% expressed agreement, 32.7% disagreed, and 27.3% neither agreed nor disagreed (Table 1), and 46.5% of the respondents provided reasons. As a reason for their preference, the students most frequently responded that they agreed with selective correction because “erroneous English is all right as long as it’s understandable.” On the other hand, those opposed to selective correction most often responded that correcting only errors that interfere with communication is insufficient.

Considering the large size of the classes in which the respondents were enrolled, it was not feasible for the teachers to correct all errors that they made. This might have affected their responses regarding the correction of all errors. In fact, 7.4% of the respondents who provided the reasons for their rating expressed that correcting all errors in large classes is impossible.

Peer correction

A total of 50.6% agreed with the following statement: “I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in group work” (Table 1). 46.7% of the respondents provided reasons. The belief that peer correction is beneficial was the most frequent reason for the positive attitude.

I postulated that EFL students in Japan have negative attitudes toward peer correction based on the assumption that the students do not expect to have their oral errors corrected because peer correction violates the concept of “ingroup harmony,” an important cultural value in Japan discussed by Gudykunst and Nishida (1993). Nakanishi (1986) notes that within a group, Japanese people try to avoid expressing their opinions that may differ or oppose those of other group members and destroy the harmonious relationship with the members. Contrary to my assumption, only 5.5% of the respondents who provided the reasons for their rating expressed that they felt uncomfortable with 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 2, the majority of the students wanted to have their errors in pragmatics (61.8%) *always* corrected.

The strong positive attitude toward correction of this type of error might be explained by the Japanese education system. Throughout junior and senior high school, students

are taught the English language primarily through grammar-oriented instruction. Graduates of this type of instruction have good knowledge of English grammar and a wide range of vocabulary. However, as Sturman (1992) comments, most of them cannot apply this knowledge to hold even a basic conversation in English. They may produce grammatically correct sentences, but may not be sure whether or not their utterances are appropriate in a specific context. This may help to explain why the students in this study showed great interest in the correction of their errors in pragmatics. Another striking finding is the strongly positive attitude toward the correction of phonological errors. Japanese phonology does not share the same features as English phonology (Vance, 1987). Therefore, the acquisition of English pronunciation, accent, and intonation patterns is difficult for many Japanese EFL learners. In addition, EFL classes are mainly taught by Japanese teachers in junior and senior high schools. Consequently, the students lack exposure to English spoken by native speakers. The students' high interest in the correction of phonological errors is very predictable as I remember when I was an EFL learner in Japan.

Regarding *vocabulary* errors, the students' strong interest in the correction of vocabulary errors could also be explained by the education they received in junior and senior high schools. In Japan, much of the training in high school is dedicated to preparing students to pass university entrance examinations. English language instruction is no exception. Test-takers are expected to have a wide range of vocabulary that is covered in entrance examinations. The English instruction in junior and senior high schools emphasizes the mastery of complex grammar and the increase of vocabulary.

The students simply memorize words and phrases instead of learning them in meaningful contexts. Consequently, they may not be confident about their use of appropriate words and phrases in a real-life setting. It is not surprising that the students in this study showed high interest in correction of vocabulary errors.

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: 1) most favored correction methods; 2) disliked correction methods; and 3) methods neither liked nor disliked. For these last methods, the respondents were fairly equally balanced in terms of positive, neutral (3 on the five-point scale), and negative responses. Therefore, no tendency in either direction could be determined.

Favored correction methods

Table 3 lists the methods of grammar correction favored by the majority of the students. These methods are listed in the order of preference based on the percentage of the respondents who gave scores of 4 and 5.

Among the ten types of correction, the most popular was the one in which the teacher gives a hint which might enable the student to notice the error and self-correct; 70% chose this method. The second most favored grammar correction was the one in which the teacher explains why the student's

utterance is incorrect; 64.1% endorsed this method. An equally popular method was the one in which the teacher points out the error and provides the correct form. A total of 64.1% of the respondents liked this correction method. One last favored method was that in which the teacher presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the student's utterance; 60.6% liked this method.

Table 4 displays the correction methods of pronunciation errors that the majority of the students favored. The students' most favored method was the one in which the teacher gives a hint which might enable the student to notice the error and self-correct; 64.4% favored this method. The second most popular correction method was the technique in which the teacher points out the error and provides the correct pronunciation; 64.1% endorsed this method. Another favored method was the one in which the teacher presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the student's utterance; 63% liked this method. One other favored method was that in which the teacher explains why the student's utterance is incorrect; 62.9% selected this method.

The majority of the respondents liked four out of the ten possible correction methods for both grammatical and pronunciation errors in different orders of preference. The most favored method of correction for both grammatical and phonological errors was the one in which the teacher gives a hint which might enable the student to notice the error and self-correct. This indirect correction method is intended to indicate that the student has made an error without embarrassing the student, allowing the student to *save face*. In large classes of Japanese universities, the students might feel more comfortable with this correction method. Another

favored method that attempts to elicit self-correction was the technique in which the teacher explains why the student's utterance is incorrect. Many researchers promote self-correction (e.g., Allwright & Bailey, 1991; Cohen, 1975; Corder, 1967; Hendrickson, 1978; Kasper, 1985; van Lier, 1988). Edge (1989) suggested that teachers should keep in mind that the best type of correction is self-correction. He noted that people usually prefer correcting themselves rather than being corrected by someone else. He further noted that "self-correction is easier to remember, because someone has put something right in his or her own head" (p. 24). Comps (2003) argued that language teachers should encourage students to self-correct in the foreign language classroom context so that they can continue to develop their skills for self-correction outside the classroom.

As these findings indicate, one of the favored correction methods was the one 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). Recasts have been frequently employed by teachers in observational studies (e.g., Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Doughty, 1994; Fanselow, 1977; Lyster, 2001; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Some studies suggest that recasts are effective on acquisition (Doughty & Varela, 1998; Long, Inagaki, & Ortega, 1998; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Morris, 2002). On the other hand, some studies have reported that recasts might be ambiguous to learners because they may be perceived as conversational moves such as agreeing and understanding (Chaudron, 1988; Truscott, 1999). Chaudron (1988) proposed that recasts could be made less ambiguous by shortening the

correct utterance to locate the error or stressing the correct form for emphasis. Even with this technique, errors or the difference between the incorrect form and the correct form may not be noticed. One of the methods which can draw the student's attention to the error is the one in which the teacher overtly points out the error and provides the correct form. The students in this study favored this method in which the error and the correct form are overtly contrasted. Gass and Varonis (1994) suggested that awareness of the correct-incorrect mismatch may lead to changes in the learners' L2 knowledge. Nevertheless, use of 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, strangely enough, the class is more prone to retain the incorrect form than the correct form when the students have heard the teacher use it. 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 any disturbance to the flow of the activity. Lightbown (1998) suggested that an intervention of less than a minute before returning to a given task may be sufficient.

Disliked correction method

As seen in Table 5, the respondents did not favor two methods of correction for *grammatical* and *phonological* errors. The least favored method was the technique in which the teacher ignores the student's errors. 88.6% rated this technique 1 and 2, with 1 representing *no good*. The students in the studies of Cathcart and Olsen (1976) and Oladejo (1993) also disliked this technique. Despite the

lack of popularity among learners, ignoring the students' errors is one of the techniques often employed by teachers in the study of Fanselow (1977). The second least favored method was the one in which the teacher repeats the original question asked of the student. This method is potentially unclear to students. They may perceive the question as a follow-up question, not as the original one. Even if they succeed in realizing that they have made errors, they may not be able to locate the errors nor correct the errors by themselves.

Methods neither liked nor disliked

Several correction methods were neither favored nor disliked by the students of this study. One of them is the method in which the teacher indicates that the student has made an error by using nonverbal behavior, such as gestures and facial expressions. Another is the method in which the teacher repeats the student's utterance up to the error, and waits for self-correction. The method in which the teacher asks the student to repeat the utterance also received this type of indeterminate response. One last method in this group was that in which the teacher simply indicates the error. All these methods to elicit self-correction except the last one could be ambiguous to students. Students may perceive the corrections as conversational moves such as agreeing or confirming, and may not be aware of their errors. Even if they can recognize their errors, they may not be able to self-correct successfully because none of these methods give them any clues to assist self-correction.

Conclusions

In Japanese universities, the English language classes are usually large. Consequently, it is impractical to spend much of the instruction time dealing with students' errors. The teachers often have the students engage in communicative tasks in pairs and groups (O'Sullivan, 1996). Inevitably, the teachers cannot observe all the errors made by the students. Even if the teachers notice errors, they may consider interrupting the students by correcting their errors as inappropriate. One obvious implication of the findings of this study is that certain differences appear to exist between the students' expectations and the teachers' pedagogical practice.

Although the sample of this study provided a varied population mix, which increased the degree of representativeness of the target population, no generalization can be drawn because the sample of this study was not a true random sample, but a 'convenient' sample. However, the findings of this study provide information that may contribute to a clearer understanding of students' perceptions of classroom error correction.

The findings of this study and previously described limitations lead to implications for future research. One recommendation is research that addresses the reasons for the students' preferences for particular correction methods as well as their preferences for classroom error corrections of different aspects of the language. The results would be of benefit to the teachers because they could provide insights that will help the teachers better understand their students' preferences. Studies on cross-cultural differences are also recommended to find out whether learners' perceptions differ across cultural contexts. In fact, some differences were

observed between the findings of this study and those of my more recent study (Katayama, 2006). For example, 92.8% of the respondents in Japanese classrooms in the US expressed their strongly favorable attitudes toward teacher correction, while 77.6% of the respondents in EFL classes in Japan did. Another difference is that American students of Japanese favored 'peer correction' more than Japanese EFL students. One might speculate that these differences are due to cultural differences.

Nunan (1987) argued, "One of the most serious blocks to learning is the mismatch between teacher and learner expectations about what should happen in the classroom" (p.177). Given that matching the expectations of teachers and learners is important for successful language learning, it can be hoped that teachers will take the time to survey their students' perceptions toward pedagogical practice. Surveys of this sort clearly send a message that the teacher is concerned about the students' needs and expectations. In addition, information about the students will help the teachers know whether their pedagogical practice meets their students' expectations. Ignoring their expectations may cause demotivation that has a negative impact on successful learning. For that reason, when circumstances do not allow the teachers to integrate students' needs and expectations into their instructional practices, they should explain their rationale to their students. Such explanations might help students develop desirable attitudes toward error correction and could minimize conflict in expectations between teachers and students (Katayama, 2006).

Table 1. Attitudes toward error correction

Item	N	Strongly Disagree 1 (%)	Disagree 2 (%)	3 (%)	Agree 4 (%)	Strongly Agree 5 (%)	Mean	SD
I want teachers to correct my errors in speaking English.	586	1.5	3.9	16.9	36.3	41.3	4.12	.93
Teachers should correct all errors that learners make in speaking English.	587	17.0	30.3	32.2	14.3	6.1	2.62	1.11
Teachers should correct only the errors that interfere with communication.	587	9.5	23.2	27.3	24.7	15.3	3.13	1.21
I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in group work.	584	4.1	14.4	30.8	34.2	16.4	3.45	1.05

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

Table 2. Types of errors students wanted to have corrected

Item	N	Never 1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	Always 5 (%)	Mean	SD
Grammar	587	2.0	9.9	35.8	32.4	19.8	3.58	.98
Phonology	586	.9	3.6	10.9	38.6	46.1	4.25	.85
Vocabulary	586	.5	3.9	18.3	47.3	30.3	4.02	.83
Pragmatics	586	.7	1.5	7.8	28.2	61.8	4.49	.76
Discourse	586	2.9	12.6	34.2	32.2	18.1	3.50	1.02

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

Table 3. Favored correction methods for grammatical errors

Correction Method	N	No Good 1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	Very Good 5 (%)	Mean	SD
T gives a hint which might enable S to notice and self-correct.	576	4.0	9.2	16.8	36.3	33.7	3.86	1.10
T explains why the utterance is incorrect.	575	4.3	11.8	19.7	29.0	35.1	3.79	1.17
T points out the error and provides the correct form.	574	3.8	9.9	22.1	32.2	31.9	3.78	1.11
T presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the S's utterance.	569	2.1	9.8	27.4	34.1	26.5	3.73	1.03

* Total does not add to 100% due to rounding

Table 4. Favored correction methods for pronunciation errors

Correction Method	N	No Good 1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	Very Good 5 (%)	Mean	SD
T gives a hint which might enable S to notice and self-correct.	569	4.4	12.1	19.2	33.6	30.8	3.74	1.15
T points out the error, and provides the correct pronunciation.	567	4.1	9.9	22.0	30.9	33.2	3.79	1.13
T presents the correct form when repeating all or part of the S's utterance.	557	2.3	8.6	26.0	34.8	28.2	3.78	1.02
T explains why the utterance is incorrect.	569	4.6	12.7	19.9	28.5	34.4	3.76	1.18

* Total does not add to 100% due to rounding

Table 5. Disfavored correction methods

Correction Method	N	No Good 1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	Very Good 5 (%)	Mean	SD
T ignores the S's error.	578	60.4	28.2	9.7	1.6	.2	1.53	.75
T repeats the original question asked of the student.								
For grammatical errors	574	28.4	33.4	19.5	12.4	6.3	2.35	1.19
For pronunciation errors	565	31.9	34.0	19.6	9.7	4.8	2.22	1.14

* Total does not add to 100% due to rounding

References

- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bang, Y. (1999). Reactions of EFL students to oral error correction. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 39-51.
- 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.
- 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.
- Comps, J. (2003). The analysis of oral self-correction as a window into the development of past time reference in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(2), 233-257.
- Corder, P. S. (1967). The significance of learner's errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 161-170.
- 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.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and correction*. London, New York: Longman.

- Fanselow, J. F. (1977). The treatment of error in oral work. *Foreign Language Annals*, 10(5), 583-593.
- 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, NW: State University of New York Press.
- Hawkey, R. (2006). Teacher and learner perceptions of language learning activity. *ELT Journal*, 60(3), 242-252.
- 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(3), 283-294.
- Kasper, G. (1985). Repair in foreign language teaching. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7(2), 200-215.
- 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.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, (pp. 177-196). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 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(3), 357-371.
- 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(3), 338-356.
- 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.
- Nakanishi, M. (1986). Perception of self-disclosure in initial interaction: A Japanese sample. *Human Communication Research*, 13(2), 167-190.
- Nunan, D. (1987). Communicative language teaching: The learner's view. In K. D. Bikram (Ed.), *Communication and learning in the classroom community*, (pp. 176-190). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

- 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.
- Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the gap between learning and instruction. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 133-158.
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preference. *TESL Canada Journal*, 10(2), 71-89.
- O'Sullivan, J. (1996). *Teaching English in Japan*. Lincolnwood, IL: Passport Books.
- 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.
- Sturman, P. (1992). Team teaching: a case study from Japan. In N. David (Ed.), *Collaborative language learning and teaching*, (pp. 141-161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55(4), 437-456.
- Vance, T. J. (1987). *An introduction to Japanese phonology*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner*. London and N.Y.: Longman.

Appendix

Questionnaire Completed by Participants

- A.** Please check the appropriate answers or write an answer in the space provided.
- University Name _____
 - Major: _____
 - Gender: 1. () Male 2. () Female
 - How long have you stayed in an English-speaking country?
_____ years _____ months
 - Do you speak English outside of class?
1. () Yes 2. () No
 - Do you want to improve your speaking skills in English?
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."
- | | | | |
|--|-----------------|--|-----------------|
| | <i>strongly</i> | | <i>strongly</i> |
| | <i>disagree</i> | | <i>agree</i> |
- I want teachers to correct my errors in speaking English.

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 English.
 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.
- | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|---------------|
| | <i>never</i> | | <i>always</i> |
|--|--------------|--|---------------|
- 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
 1 2 3 4 5
 (e.g., When offering a drink in English: "Would you

like some coffee"? is more appropriate than "Do you want to drink coffee"?)

- 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."

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 *loses* 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: "I *went* to the park." or "*Went*."
 1 2 3 4 5

	For pronunciation error: "I like <i>roses</i> best." or " Roses ." 1 2 3 4 5	P: "What color of <i>roses</i> do you like"?" 1 2 3 4 5
c)	T points out the error, and provides the correct response. G: " Go is wrong. You should say <i>went</i> ." 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: " Loses is wrong. You should say <i>roses</i> ." 1 2 3 4 5	P: "I like..." 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	i) T indicates the error. G: "No. Not go ." 1 2 3 4 5
	P: "What kind of flowers do you like best"?" 1 2 3 4 5	P: "No. Not <i>Ioses</i> ." 1 2 3 4 5
e)	T repeats the original question. G: "Where did you go yesterday"?" 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: "What kind of flowers do you like best"?" 1 2 3 4 5	P: (Using a picture of a mouth) "When you pronounce r for <i>roses</i> , your tongue should not touch the roof of the mouth. It should..." 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 <i>went</i> yesterday"?" 1 2 3 4 5	