ORAL ERROR TREATMENT IN EFL CLASSES WITH NATIVE-LIKE INTERACTIONS

Mehmet BOYNO

Freelance Researcher, PhD, boyno.m@hotmail.com

Eyyup AKIL

University of Gaziantep, MA, Foreign Languages School, e-akil@hotmail.com

Ferhat DOLAŞ

University of Vienna, MA candidate, Applied Linguistics and TEFL,ferhatgarfi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Foreign language learning requires competences in the main skills more than vocabulary and grammar. Many errors occur in speaking. The present study aims to answer the following research questions: 1) Do teachers focus on meaning or form? And to what extent are the interactions in the classrooms native-like? 2) What types of oral errors are focused on in the classrooms? When are they treated? What types of correction are supplied? We took into consideration three sorts of teachers: native, second language and foreign language speaker teachers. We audio-recorded each teacher's three 40-minute English classes for 9th Graders. Following this, we analyzed the transcriptions of the data gathered. The study reveals that the ranking of the teachers having native-like interactions is as the native, second language, and foreign language speaker. Also, the ranking of the teachers are in variety when the type of errors and that of correction are in question.

Key Words: types of oral errors, oral error treatment, native-like, EFL, classroom interaction

ANA DİLE BENZER ETKİLEŞİM İÇEREN YABANCI DİL OLARAK İNGİLİZCE DERSLERİNDE SÖZLÜ HATALARA MÜDAHALE

ÖZET

Yabancı dil öğrenme, kelime ve gramer bilgisinden ziyade ana becerilerde yeterlilik gerektirmektedir. Konuşma sırasında bir çok hata ortaya çıkmaktadır. Mevcut çalışma şu sorulara cevap bulmayı amaçlamıştır; 1) Öğretmenler anlamamı yoksa yapıyamı odaklanmatadır? Sınfta gerçekleşen etkileşim ne ölçüde anadilde iletişime yakın? 2) Sınfta ne tür sözlühatalara odaklanılmktadır? Hatalar ne zaman düzeltilmektedir? Ne tür düzeltmeler yapılmaktadır? Çalışmamızda üç tip öğretmeni dikkate aldık: anadili İngilizce

Mehmet BOYNO, Eyyüp AKIL, Ferhat DOLAŞ

olan, ikinci dili İngilizce olan ve yabancı dili İngilizce olan öğretmenler. Her bir öğretmenin dokuzuncu sınıflara olan kırkar dakikalık derslerini kaydettik. Daha sonra, elde edilen verileri analiz ettik. Bulgular, anadile yakın etkileşim sağlayan öğretmenlerin sıralamasının anadili İngilizce olan, ikinci dili İngilizce olan ve yabancı dili İngilizce olan öğretmen şeklinde olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, öğretmenler hata türleri ve bu hataları düzeltme tarzlarına göre çeşitlilik göstermişlerdir.

AnahtarKelimeler: sözlühatatürleri, sözlühatalaramüdahale, anadileyakın, yabancıdilolarakİngilizce, sınıfetkileşimi

INTRODUCTION

The main reason for learning a foreign language is to communicate in it (Chastain, 1976) in a native-like manner (Richards, 1991). In other words, the person to learn a foreign language should learn it in a way that he can communicate in it easily like a native speaker. To achieve this prior objective of a foreign language class, teachers should employ activities where main skills, namely, reading, listening, writing, and speaking, should be dealt with more than merely drilling, for it is these skills which are needed to communicate in a language.

The main language skills are classified in two groups; receptive skills and productive skills. The former incorporates reading and listening, while the latter incorporates writing and speaking. Performing well in the productive skills is much more difficult than performing in the receptive skills (Karaata, 1999). It is because they require the learner to produce something in the target language (henceforth, TL). Thus, making errors while writing and speaking in the TL is more probable than while reading and listening. If writing and speaking should be compared in terms of their difficulty, since the person should do the thinking and the utterance simultaneously, one might expect more oral errors.

Error treatment is one of the crucial aspects of language learning and teaching process. Students may also learn from their errors. Nonetheless, different language teaching methods have their treatment procedures. Some treat the oral errors immediately while some ignore them completely.For instance, in the Grammar-Translation Method and the Audio-Lingual Method, no errors remain untreated and even receive immediate correction. The Direct Method and Silent Way is for, if possible, self-correction or peer-correction. In suggestopedia, teachers mostly correct errors gently with a soft voice while they are expected to correct their students with a less attention to errors in Communicative

Language Learning where fluency is viewed superior to accuracy (Allwright and Bailey, 1994; Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Not only do the methods have different ways of treating students' errors, but different kinds of teachers, namely, native speaker (henceforth, NS) from the USA, non-native speakers (henceforth, NNS), namely, second language speaker (henceforth, 2LS) from Nigeria, and foreign language speaker (henceforth, FLS) from Turkey, have their own tendencies while treating their students' oral errors.

The present study aims to investigate the ways of oral error treatment of the three different kinds of teachers mentioned above, teaching at two private high schools in Gaziantep to see which teacher's classes include more native-like and communicative interactions. For this reason, each teacher's three 40-minute English classes for 9th Graders were audio-recorded and analyzed in order to answer the following research questions:

1. Do teachers focus on meaning or form? And to what extent are the interactions in the classrooms native-like?

2. What types of oral errors, phonological, grammatical, lexical, content, or discursive, are focused on in the classrooms? When are they treated; immediately, delayed, or postponed? What types of correction are supplied; self, peer or teacher?

LITERATURE REVIEW

While experiencing any piece of learning, that of foreign language in the present case, it is impossible to avoid making errors. Instead of stepping back from learning in the case of making errors, one should keep in mind that his errors may lead him to success if treated appropriately (DePorter and Hernacki, 2000). Thus, error treatment is a crucial issue. It relies on such factors as the lesson type, course objectives, learners' attitude and individual differences, teacher'sviews of language learning and error treatment, his preferred techniques, his personality type and experience as well as culture (Chenoweth, 1983, in Mosbah, 2007; Mosbah, 2007). The literature incorporates a good number of studies investigating the frequencies of the errors committed

by students in the English as a foreign language (henceforth, EFL) classroom. Some of them may be listed as follows:

Chaudron (1986b, cited in Allwright and Bailey, 1994) ➔phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, discourse and content

Jimenez (2006) ➔ grammatical, phonological, lexical, unsolicited use of L1 and content

translation and unsolicited use of L1

Mntambo (1995) ➔ lexical, phonological, morpho-syntactical, discourse and content

Kivela (2008) ➔ phonological, grammatical, lexical and semantic (in elementary EFL lessons)

Lyster and Ranta (1997, cited in Taipale, 2012) ➔ grammatical, lexical, phonological and use of L1

Yang (2010)   ➔phonological, lexical, silence, factual, morphological, and syntactical

Jabbari and Fazilatfar (2012) ➔ grammatical, phonological, lexical or unsolicited use of L1

Taipale (2012) ➔grammatical, phonological, lexical, translation, use of L1, utterances containing multiple errors

Additionally, Mings (1993) classifies the errors from the ones the most severe to the least as follows: the most severe errors for correction are the ones that obstruct communication between learners and others. The second most severe errors are the ones that may cause learners' future impairment in communication, and the third most severe errors are the ones that are committed most frequently. Concerning the seriousness of the errors, Mosbah (2007) refers to the literature that Chastain (1980), Delisle (1982), Hughes and Lascaratou (1982), Brock et al. (1986) and Sheorey (1986) consider lexical errors graver than grammatical ones as the former cause lack of comprehensibility. Chun et al. (1982) adds factual and discoursal errors to this list on the contrary to Ensz (1982) who found grammatical errors to be the least tolerable. As for the errors that teachers correct as they consider them serious, the ranking differs as follows:

Chaudron (1998, mentioned in Jimenez, 2006) ➔ discourse, content, lexical, grammatical and phonological

Lyster (1998, cited in Jimenez, 2006) ➔ phonological, lexical, grammatical and unsolicited uses of L1.

Mason (2002, Hampl, 2011) ➔ discourse, content, lexical, phonological and grammatical

Kivela (2008) ➔ phonological, lexical, grammatical and semantic

Jabbari and Fazilatfar (2012) ➔ L1 use, grammatical, lexical and pronunciation

Taipale (2012) ➔ translation, lexical, use of L1, grammatical, phonological and multiple errors

Different types of oral error treatment, a crucial component of foreign language learning (Chastain, 1976), have been recommended by different learning theories. The following chart indicates this difference. What is important here in this chart for this study is which type allows native-like interactions to occur. In order to be able to answer this question, interactions with NSs in real life should be taken into account in terms of how the oral errors are treated there. In real life, if the errors made do not interrupt the communication, they are mostly ignored. In these conversations, NSs deal with lexical errors more than grammatical errors (Mosbah, 2007). Taking this statement as the criterion in this field, it is the interactional view of learning which should be followed to have native-like interactions in the foreign language (henceforth, FL) classrooms. This type of view emphasizes that errors not causing any breakdown in the negotiation of meaning can be ignored, and that repairs, if any, should be self- or peer-repairs rather than direct teacher-repairs.

Mosbah (2007) and Park (2010) show that students are more ready for oral error corection than their teachers expect them to be. This may be partially becuase students may need to realize their places between their interlanguage and the target language (Park, 2010) and partially because they wish to see the cause of their errors (Lee, 2002). Hence, Park is for the idea of providing them with corective feedback. Yet, it is a big question whether or not students' errors should be corrected, and, even if so, who should correct them when.

There are some studies such as Selinker (1972) who warns that untreated errors could end in fossilization which is not desired in EFL teaching. Accordingly, by realizing the errors made and being treated, one can improve his proficiency in the TL (van Patten, 1992). However, Truscott (1999, cited in Hampl, 2011) warns that oral error correction does not necessarily help learners to speak more grammatically. On the other hand, it might be time-consuming for teachers to correct all the oral errors in the classroom. For this reason, like Hampl, Jimenez (2006) suggests that teachers should give up correcting grammatical errors altogether. Parallel to this, some researchers urge that errors should be treated only once they prevent the flow of communication. It is these kinds of errors that cannot be self-corrected without scaffolding (Chastain, 1976; Friermuth, 1998; Taipale, 2012).

As mentioned earlier, both in conversations with native English speakers and in those in the first language, errors are generally ignored when they do not prevent the flow of the communication. At this point, Jimenez (2006) puts forward the close relationship between meaning-focused instruction and communicative language teaching which avoids direct, explicit attention to language form for the sake of effective communication, interaction, and understanding the meaning of the message.

In order to be able to achieve native-like interactions, the first point to highlight is what kinds of errors should be treated and what kinds of errors should be ignored. When the aim is to achieve fluency rather than accuracy, then, the errors to be focused on should be those which interrupt the communication. For this reason, in Burt and Kiparsky's (1972, mentioned in Freiermuth, 1998) terms, global errors, which indicate communicative errors, should be dealt with instead of local errors, which reveal some linguistic errors.

The second concern is who is going to correct the errors. In this respect, the best approach is to allow the student to self-correct first. If that doesn't work, the alternative correction type is peer correction. If no one seems to know, then the teacher can give the correction/answer. Furthermore, Freiermuth (1998) informs that self-correction and peer correction are superior to teacher correction since they lead to be not only

increasingly accurate but also increasingly independent as English speakers. Also, Shehadeh (1999) underlines self-initiated, self-completed repair and content and pragmatic repair for success in language learning.In other words, the more self-initiated, self-completed content and pragmatic repair, the more native-like the interaction will be. In a parallel way, Schegloff et al., (1977) and Schegloff (1979, mentioned in Shehadeh, 1999) emphasize the cline in conversations can be mentioned as follows:

– Normal conversation ➔ self-initiated and self-completed repair

– Non-normal conversation ➔ other-initiations and other-completions

– In NS/NS discourse (Schegloff et al., 1977) and NS/advanced NNS discourse (Kasper 1985), the vast majority of repair is content and pragmatic repair rather than linguistic (phonological, lexical, morpho-syntactic) repair.

On the contrary to Yang's (2010) finding that students feel more confident in communicating in English when their errors are tolerated, Park (2010) proves that students seek immediate teacher correction or even peer correction but hesitate to correct their own errors. This finding corresponds well with Bruton and Samuda (1980) who declared that peers immediately corrected lexical errors mostly and that self-correction was rather rare. Additionally, Kivela (2008) found out that most of the errors were corrected by teachers (mostly phonological ones) while peer and self-correction were equally distributed. Jimenez (2006), on the other hand, ranks most error treating agents as teacher, peer and self. As Jimenez comments on few self-corrections as learners' not being ready, or lacking confidence to treat their errors,Friermuth (1998) views self-correction as an excellent way to correct errors and teacher-correction as the last and least way to do so. Namely, peer-correction is in the middle on the continuum.

Last but not least, when to correct the errors is another point to ponder about. Freiermuth (1998) mentions that "immediate error correction does not guarantee that the learners have grasped the meaning nor understood the gravity of the error."

Concerning different kinds of teachers' treating errors, the literature incorporates some studies witnessing none or very few differences between the error treatment applications of NS and NNS teachers. For instance, Lucas (1975), whose participant NS and NNS teachers corrected all the grammatical errors, did not find any differences between NS and NNS teachers in terms of tolerance to students' oral errors. Parallel to this, Mosbah (2007) views fewer differences than similarities between NS and NNS teachers in their treatment of errors. His both NS and NNS participant teachers, who considered lexical errors more serious than the other types of errors, tolerated grammatical and phonological errors since they do not mostly spoil the flow of communication. On the other hand, he acknowledges that the NS teachers ignored sentence level errors more than the NNS teachers do. In short, both teacher types are alike in their ways of treating errors but the NS teachers are more tolerant than the latter, which might be caused by their beliefs about and their practices of error treatment.

Unlike, Politzer (1978, cited in Mosbah, 2007) indicates that NS teachers treat errors in the following order: vocabulary, verb morphology, word order, gender, phonology and case ending. Also, Kivela (2008) and Hampl (2011) reveal that NS teachers and experienced teachers tend to be more tolerant of the errors, especially the linguistic ones, for the sake of intelligibility, which leads to communicative classrooms, and that NNS teachers tend to focus on accuracy in grammar. Additionally, Lyster (1998, in Hampl, 2011) indicates that NNS teachers are apt to correct grammatical and lexical errors more than phonological ones. Moreover, Mntambo's (1995) NNS participant teachers treated all the content errors while ignoring most of the linguistic ones although linguistic errors were superior in number to their counterparts.

As a reason for these details, Mntambo (1995) sheds light on the fact that sometimes NNS teachers fail to recognize their students' linguistic errors. What is more, Mosbah (2007) highlights the fact that teachers, themselves, are aware that they do not know the available corrective feedback moves sufficiently. In line with this, Yang (2010) reveals that teachers take into account their own teaching beliefs when treating their students' errors, and encourages teachers not to prevent

students from making speaking errors but to value the corrective feedback.

METHODOLOGY

The present study aims to investigate the ways of oral error treatment of three different kinds of teachers, namely, an NS, a 2LS, and an FLS teacher, teaching EFL at two Private High Schools in Gaziantep to see which teacher's classes include more native-like and communicative interactions. In this study, the 2LS teacher is considered different from the FLS teacher owing that the former has to communicate in English officially in his country while the latter does not have such an opportunity while learning and developing her English. In order to answer the research questions presented in the introduction part, each teacher's three 40-minute English classes for 9th Graders were audio-recorded and analyzed. The students constructing the sampling of this study are supposed to be at the intermediate level. And it was generally observed that these three teachers preferred studying reading passages and talking about them. In addition, the FLS teacher employed some drilling concerning some grammatical structures.

The analysis of the recorded classes was performed following a quantitative approach. Therefore, the number of errors committed, treated and ignored, and who treated them when, were counted and explained in percentages while presenting some sample transcriptions.

FINDINGS

In this section, some tables are given revealing the numbers and percentages of the participants, including both the students and the teachers, and their committing and treating the errors.

Table 1: Number of the errors committed by the students

type of error	status	type of teacher			Total
		NS	2LS	FLS	
phonological	committed	120	230	227	577

	treated	68	94	60	222
	%	57	41	26	39
grammatical	committed	96	54	66	216
	treated	38	24	26	88
	%	40	44	39	41
lexical	committed	41	9	40	90
	treated	32	3	25	60
	%	78	33	63	67
content	committed	5	23	6	34
	treated	5	21	4	30
	%	100	91	67	88
discursive	committed	9	20	20	49
	treated	7	19	19	45
	%	78	95	95	92
total	committed	271	336	359	966
	treated	150	161	134	445
	%	55	48	37	46

Table 1 reveals that most of the errors were committed by the students in the FLS teacher's classes (359) while very few errors (271) were committed by the students in the NS teacher's classes. The 2LS teacher's students committed 336 errors. This might have two reasons: the students might be more familiar to the subjects being studies during

the NS teacher's classes observed, or, somehow, learners may learn English better from NS teachers. Additionally, the majority of the errors in all classes were phonological ones (n= 120 for NS teacher, n= 230 for 2LS teacher and n= 227 for FLS teacher), and the minority of them were content errors in NS teacher (n= 5) and FLS teacher's (n= 6) classes, and lexical errors in 2LS teacher's (n= 9) classes. This might illustrate the foreign language classes at schools in Gaziantep.

161 out (48%) of 336 errors committed in the 2LS teacher's classes were treated by any of the participants. Meanwhile, 150 out of 271 errors (55%) were treated in the NS teacher's classes. The number of the treated errors in the FLS teacher's classes was 134 out of 359 (37%). Namely, it was the NS teacher's classes where most of the errors were treated in terms of their percentages (55%). Seeing the case from the other side of the coin, most of the errors were ignored in the FLS teacher's classes (63%; 225 out of all 359 errors). This might be because the FLS teacher and her students do not pay attention to the errors committed in the classroom as much as the Ns and 2LS teachers and theirs students do. On the other hand, only 121 of the NS teacher's students' errors (45%) were ignored while 175 errors (52%) were ignored in the 2LS teacher's classes (Table 1).

In addition, most of the corrected errors by any participant were content and discursive ones in all teachers' classes. Apparently, the teachersallowed these errors to be corrected since they viewed content and discursive errors more urgent than the others. They might have been cautious not to lead any misunderstanding in the communication in their classes.

Table 2: Errors treated by the teachers

	Phonological		Grammatical		Lexical		Content		Discursive		Total	
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
NS	54/120	45	26/96	27	16/41	39	3/5	60	5/9	56	104/271	38

	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
2LS	67/230	29	17/54	32	0/9	0	4/23	17	5/20	25	93/336	28
FLS	36/227	16	14/66	21	9/40	23	3/6	50	4/20	20	66/359	18

It is the NS teacher who treated most of the errors (38%) when compared to the other two teachers. The FLS teacher treated only 18% of the errors (Table 2). This might be either because she ignored them for the sake of communicative interaction or because she hesitated to deal with her students' errors.

Table 3: Errors treated by the students

	Phonological		Grammatical		Lexical		Content		Discursive		TOTAL	
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
NS	6/120	5	11/96	12	8/41	20	1/5	20	1/9	11	27/271	10
2LS	10/230	4	5/54	9	0/9	0	8/23	35	7/20	35	30/336	9
FLS	11/227	5	2/66	3	5/40	13	0/6	0	2/20	10	20/359	6

It is the NS teacher's students who committed most of the self-corrections (10%). The 2LS teacher's students committed 30 self-corrections (9% of 336 errors). And the FLS teacher's students committed 20 self-corrections, which means 6% out of 359 errors (Table 3). The FLS teacher's students may be insufficiently encouraged to correct their own errors. Or, maybe they are not trained enough to initiate and treat their errors. On the other hand, the NS and 2LS teachers' students prove more self-confident and feel free to correct their own errors, the percentages of which are still not at a sufficient level.

Table 4: Errors treated by peers

	Phonological		Grammatical		Lexical		Content		Discursive		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
NS	8/120	7	1/96	1	8/41	20	1/5	20	1/9	11	19/271	7
2LS	17/230	7	2/54	3	3/9	33	9/23	39	7/20	35	38/336	11
FLS	13/227	5	10/66	15	11/40	28	1/6	17	13/20	65	48/359	13

In terms of peer correction, it is the FLS teacher whose students committed most peer-corrections (n= 48, 13% of 359 errors). She was followed by the 2LS teacher, whose students committed 39 peer-corrections (11% of 336 errors). Then comes the NS teacher, whose students committed 19 peer-corrections (7% of 271 errors) (Table 4). The NS teacher's students might be more trained not to interrupt their peers when compared to their equivalents. As for the 2LS and FLS teachers' students who committed errors, their peers tended to interrupt frequently and immediately not giving them enough time to correct themselves, which may be taken as the lack of the teacher's classroom management.

Table 5: Error treatment timing

	Immediate		Delayed		Postponed		TOTAL
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
NS	98	65	52	35	0	0	**150**
2LS	133	83	28	17	0	0	**161**
FLS	94	70	40	30	0	0	**134**

None of the errors received postponed correction by any of the participants in any class. Majority of theimmediate corrections were committed in the 2LS teacher's classes (83%). The second teacher in this line is the FLS teacher (70%). The errors committed in the NS teacher's

classes received fewest immediate corrections (65%). Parallel to these findings, the errors committed in the NS teacher's classes received most of the delayed corrections (35%). The errors committed in the FLS teacher's classes received 40 delayed corrections (30 %). Fewest delayed corrections were experienced in the 2LS teacher's classes only (17%) (Table 5). In this sense, the NS teacher's classes seem to be more fluency-career in comparison with those of the 2LS and FLS teachers.

All in all, the participant students of the present study committed phonological, grammatical, lexical, discursive, and content errors while speaking English. Lack of knowledge, lack of understanding and hesitation might be the main reasons for these errors. Some of them were corrected by the agent student, by a fellow student and by the teacher. The corrections took place at different times: immediate, and delayed. None of them were postponed. The sources of initiations were encountered in three ways: teacher-initiation, peer-initiation and self-initiation.

The following are some of the transcriptions which exemplify the ways in which the errors were committed and treated. In these transcriptions, T stands for the teacher, Ss for the students, and S for any individual student.

Transcription 1: Did the Whites have their wedding cake made by the local bakery?

S1	: Please, help …
S2	: me, my…?
S3	: yourself.
S2	: yourself.
S4	: Did the Whites have their wedding cake made by the local bakery? No, they made it…
S5	: herself
S6	: itself.
T	: They made it…
S6	: itself.
Ss	: themselves.

S4   : themselves.

T   : themselves. Yes.

The second student corrects his own grammatical error while saying 'me/my…' and also causes a discursive error correction when he completes the first student's hesitation. The third student commits a lexical error correction when she replaces the wrong word uttered by the previous student. The fourth student also hesitates and interrupts his own sentence. The fifth one corrects this discursive error. The sixth student corrects the fifth student's lexical error (itself). The teacher pinpoints the present error and Ss correct the other student's error (themselves). All the corrections are immediate.

Transcription 2: The man was going his home.

T   : Yes. But (.) how did he find the letter? (.)

S1   : Erm. (.) (turning the pages of the book.)

Ss   : (laughing) (.)

S1   : The man was going his home.

T   : Hhhhımmm.

S1   : And (.) erm. Xxxxx (inaudible). (.) Ha (Oh), Dupin.

T   : Yes. Yes.

S1   : Dupin was going minister's house.

T   : Yes.

S1   : And he saw a letter on erm on table.

T   : A box.

S1   : In a box. (.) Erm. Pardon / pa:rdon/. Letter (.) Letter holder.

T   : Letter holder. Yes. He saw the letter in a letter holder.

The first student cannot remember a character's name then recalls it: Dupin. This is a kind of content error received an immediate self-initiation self-repair. The second student causes some grammatical errors which are not treated at all (going his home, going minister's house: missing –to- and –the-). The teacher explains a key word (a box), causes a delayed teacher-initiated self-repair to lexical error (table-letter holder).

And the first student causes a phonological error (pardon) which remains untreated.

Transcription 3: Did you buy those books for Don?

S1 : Did you buy those books for Don? No, I bought them for myself.

S2 : Why is Sandra wearing a bandage /bandog/…

S3 : bandage.

S2 : bandage/bandog/… (Skips over another exercise) Your daughter is very clever, is isn't she?

T : Isn't she?!

Ss : (murmuring)

S3 : Yanlışyeriokuyorsun.

Ss : (murmuring)

S2 : Hocam, kaçtakaldık?

S4 : Kaçtayız? (.)

S5 : Yedi.

S6 : Sıfıryediucuolanvarmı?

S7 : Altıdadeğil mi?

S8 : Six, six.

S9 : Altı, hocam.

S2 : Six'deyiz, hocam, ya.

S10 : Six.

S2 : Why is Sandra …

S11 : wearing

The third student supplies an immediate peer-repair to the second student's phonological error (bandage). But the second student continues his same error. This time he receives no treatment. The second student corrects his own grammatical error immediately when he says 'is isn't'. But he is following the wrong exercise, which can be considered as a kind of content error which is initiated and corrected by the teacher. The second student's hesitation causes a breakdown in the conversation, and

this discursive error receives a peer correction. All the corrections are immediate.

Transcription 4: They usually go to the cinema on Saturday.

T : Yes?

S1 : They erm they usually go to the cinema on Saturday. They either go to the London, stay in Brighton or go on some other ex...

T : excursions, excursions. Thank you.

The first student causes a grammatical error while saying 'the London', which receives no treatment. The student's having difficulty in pronouncing the word 'excursion' was treated by the teacher immediately.

Transcription 5: Do you want to say something about…?

T : Do you want to say something about…? Yes?

S1 : The verbs dress, wash, and shave are not normally used but we use them we use reflexive pronouns with with these verbs when we tell

S3 : want to show, want to show

S1 : want to show that somebody and something did with a relative pronoun

T : Yes. Thank you.

The second student's uttering a wrong word (tell) causes a lexical error which is treated by another student immediately. The first student says 'relative' instead of 'reflexive'. This lexical error remains untreated. The first student's last sentence is rather ambiguous. This discursive error also remained untreated.

Transcription 6: They have never been to the ballet before.

S1 : They have never been to the ballet before. It's it's the

T : It's the first time

S1 : It's the first time

S2 : they have

S1 : they have been

T : they have been

Ss   : to the ballet.

T   : It's the first time they have been. Yes.

The first student's hesitation caused a breakdown in the conversation. This discursive error was treated by the teacher. The first student paused, and the second student repaired this discursive error. The teacher initiated the students commit a treatment to a discursive error (to the ballet). All are immediate.

Transcription 7: Next page, Aslı.

T   : Next page, Aslı.

S1   : The the first (inaudible)

Ss   : (murmuring)

S2   : Arkasayfa.

T   : (refers to the right exercise) The kettle … Look at the next page. Six. The kettle…

S1   : switches each other

T   : switches itself

S3   : itself

S1   : itself

T   : off

S1   : when the water has boiled.

T   : has boiled.

The first student was confused with where they were leading. This content error was treated by another student. The first student's lexical error 'each other' was treated by the teacher. These corrections are immediate.

Transcription 8: He didn't take it as soon as he saw it.

S1   : He didn't take it as soon as he saw it.

T   : Right.

S1   : Then he went home and write erm as it write at the moment. (.) And changed them (.) writing into it erm (.) he was clever than him, more clever.

T   : Yes. I'm more clever than you. Yes. But how did he get the letter? What did he do so he could pick up the letter and take it?

The first student's lexical error (more clever) was treated by herself. She also uttered 'write' instead of 'wrote'. This grammatical error was not treated. These (as – at the moment) were untreated lexical errors. Also the second sentence of the student was ambiguous, but this discursive error was not treated.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the classes observed, some reading passages were studied by means of both summarizing the texts and asking and answering the questions. There were also some drilling exercises concerning some grammatical structures (tag questions, reflexive pronouns). It must be for this reason, along with students' being intermediate students, that most of the errors in total were phonological ones followed by grammatical, lexical, discursive and content errors (see Table 1). This finding corresponds well with that of Kivela (2008), who carried out a study with elementary students. In addition, fewest errors were committed in the NS teacher's classes (n=271). While 2LS teacher's students committed 336 errors, the FLS teacher's students committed most of the errors (n=359).

As mentioned before, in order to be able to have native-like interactions in the classroom, the teachers should focus on meaning more than form. In other words, the teachers' main interest while treating the students' errors should be that if the meanings of the students' utterances are correct and if they do not affect overall comprehension, their errors concerning linguistics in terms of phonology, grammar and vocabulary, can be ignored as Burt and Kiparsky (1972, mentioned in Freiermuth, 1998) suggests. In this sense, Table 1 reveals that most of the tolerance (63%) comes from the FLS teacher's classes. While the 2LS teacher is second in line, the NS teacher is third. Yet, the rankings of the corrected errors for the participant teachers in accordance with their percentages out of all the errors are as follows: content, discursive, lexical, phonological, and grammatical for the NS teacher; discursive, content, grammatical, phonological, and lexical for the 2LS teacher; and discursive, content, lexical, grammatical, and phonological for the FLS teacher. Although all the findings in this sense are very close to each other, as Lucas (1975) and Mosbah (2007) suggest, one may interpret that

it is the NS teacher's classes which seem to provide more native-like conversations, and that it is the 2LS teacher's classes which seem to provide fewest native-like conversations (see Table 1).

In terms of the question who treated the errors, the criterion is having self-correction most, and peer correction more than teacher correction (Freiermuth, 1998; Omaggio 1986, in Freiermuth, 1998). However, the findings concerning this item are confusing since in terms of self-correction the ranking is as follows: the NS teacher, 2LS teacher, and the FLS teacher (see Table 3). Yet, concerning the peer correction, the ranking is as follows: the FLS teacher, the 2LS teacher, and the NS teacher (see Table 4). As for the teacher correction, the ranking is as follows: the NS teacher, the 2LS teacher, and the FLS teacher (see Table 2). These findings go hand in hand with Bruton and Samuda (1980) and Park (2010) who reveal that self-correction is rare and is slightly overwhelmed by peer-correction, and with Kivela (2008) who states that it is the teachers who correct most of the errors. It is striking to find the NS teacher is first in line when both teacher-correction and self-correction are in question. It is appreciated that he allows most of the self-corrections. As for the teacher-correction, the NS teacher's tending to correct content and discursive errors overwhelmingly (60% and 56% respectively), which is also desirable, might be the reason (see Table 2). Additionally, the ranking of the teachers correcting linguistic (phonological, grammatical and lexical) errors most is as NS teacher (n=96/257, 37%), 2LS teacher (n=93/293, 32%) and FLS teacher (n= 59/333, 18%) (see Table 2). This finding is in conflict with Mntambo (1995), Kivela (2008) and Hampl (2011). The reason for this might be either that the NNS teachers really focus on meaning more than form, or that their linguistic competences were not enough to treat their students' errors. The latter is just an assumption which is parallel to that, as Allwright and Bailey (1994) maintain, NNS teachers do not provide a native-like model of the TL. This is also in line with Mntambo (1995), Mosbah (2007) and Yang (2010), who emphasize NNS teachers' linguistic competences, unawareness of corrective feedback moves, and teaching beliefs.

Related to when the errors are treated, another criterion of having native-like interactions in the classroom, the ranking is as follows: the NS, the FLS, and the 2LS teacher. The criterion for this item is having more delayed corrections than immediate ones, which means not interrupting the flow of the communication in the classroom (see Table 5).

To sum up, it is not easy to decide which teacher's classes had most native-like conversations. In general, the overall ranking might be as follows: the NS, the 2LS, and the FLS teacher.

REFERENCES

Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. M. (1994). **Focus on the language classroom**, CUP, Glasgow.

Bruton, A. &Samuda, V. (1980). "*Learner and Teacher Roles in the Treatment of Oral Error in Group Work*", **RECL Journal**, 2, 49 - 63.

Chastain, K. (1976). **Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice**, Rand McNally College Publishing Company, Chicago.

DePorter, B. &Hernacki, M. (2000). **Quantum Thinking: Creative Thinking, Planning and Problem Solving**, Learning Forum Publications, Oceanside, California, USA.

Freiermuth, M. R. (1998). *"L2 Error Correction: Criteria and Techniques"*,**The Language Teacher**. Available: (On-line http: //langue.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/97/sep/freiermuth.html)

Hampl, M. (2011). Error and Error Correction in Classroom Conversation: A Comparative Study of CLIL and Traditional Lessons in Austria, Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Vienna.

Jabbari, A. A. &Fazilatfar, A. M. (2012). *"The Role of Error Types and Feedback in Iranian EFL Classrooms"*, **International Journal of English Linguistics**, 2(1), 135-148.

Jimenez, J. (2006).*"Corrective Feedback in EFL university classrooms: A Case Study at an Italian university"*, **Linguistica e Filologia**, 23, 45 – 89.

Karaata, C. (1999). Developing the Speaking Skill of the Students at Samanyolu Private High School, Unpublished MA Thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara.

Kivela, S. (2008). Pupils' Oral Errors and Teachers' Practices on Error Correction, Unpublished MA Thesis, Maaliskuu.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). **Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching**. OUP.

Lee, J. (2002). *"Gender effect on error treatment in university ESL classrooms"*, **Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education** [online], *4* (2), 16 <Available: http://www.eastern.edu/publications/emme/2002fall/lee.html>

Mings, R. C. (1993). *"Changing Perspectives on the Utility of Error Correction in Second Language Acquisition"*,**Foreign Language Annals**, 26 (2), 171-77.

Mntambo, N. (1995). A Case Study of Oral Linguistic Error-Treatment in Second Language Classrooms Where English is The Medium of Instruction, Unpublished MA Thesis, Rhodes University.

Mosbah, G. A. (2007). Treatment of Classroom Oral Errors: A Comparative Study Between Native and Non-Native Speaking Teachers, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Leicester.

Park, H.-S. (2010). Teachers' and Learners' Preferences for Error Correction, Unpublished MA Thesis, California State University, Sacramento.

van Patten, B. (1992). "*Second Language Acquisition Research and Foreign Language Teaching"*, **ADFL Bulletin**,Part 2. 23 (3), 23-27 Available (On-line: http//www.adfl.org./adfl/bulletin/V23N3/233023.htm)

Richards, J. C. (1991). **The Context of Language Teaching**, CUP, Glasgow.

Selinker, L. (1972). *"Interlanguage"*. **IRAL**;10, 219-231.

Shehadeh. (1999). *"Repair work and language learning"*,**FORUM**. 37 (4), 2.

Taipale, P. (2012). Oral Errors, Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake in an EFL Setting, Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Jyväskylä.

Yang, C. (2010). Oral Errors, Corrective Feedback, and Learner Uptake in Elementary School Classrooms, Unpublished MA Thesis, National Pingtung University of Education.