

Turkish Teachers' and Students' Preferences of Error Correction in Different Levels of Proficiency

Öğretmenlerin ve Öğrencilerin Farklı Dil Seviyelerinde Yanlış Düzeltilimine İlişkin Tercihleri

Pınar UYANIKER¹

¹Milli Savunma Üniversitesi, Türkiye, pınaruyaniker@gmail.com

Geliş tarihi:05.07.2017

Kabul Tarihi:08.06.2018

ABSTRACT

Errors are an inevitable part of learning. Students make errors during learning process and these errors show that students are actually testing their hypothesis about language. Therefore, how errors are corrected and teachers' awareness about the issue is important. Students' preferences, their level of language proficiency, object of the course are some factors that affect treatment of errors. This study aims to shed light on teachers' and learners' preferences on error correction in different levels of proficiency. The participants were 242 learners and five English teachers. Five sessions in beginner and low-intermediate classes were voice-recorded. American Language Course Placement test was used to measure proficiency level of the students (see Table 1). A questionnaire was adopted to learn about students' preferences on error correction and to learn about the preferences of instructors, semi-structured interviews were conducted. The results of the study show controversy regarding what teachers believe and do in practice. In the records, it was seen that teachers make use of similar correction techniques but the interview results indicated teachers believe different techniques should be used for learners with different proficiency levels. Regarding proficiency level, it was observed that students with different proficiency levels preferred different correction techniques.

Key words: Error correction; preferences; different levels of proficiency.

ÖZ

Yanlışlar öğrenmenin vazgeçilmez bir parçasıdır. Öğrenciler öğrenirken yanlış yaparlar ve bu yanlışlar öğrencilerin dil ile ilgili hipotezlerini test ettiklerini gösterir. Bu bağlamda, yanlışların öğretmenlere sağladığı bilginin öğrenme ve öğrenmenin düzenlenmesi açısından önemli olduğu değerlendirilmektedir. Yanlışların nasıl düzeltildiği ve bu konudaki öğretmen bilinci de dolayısıyla önem kazanmaktadır. Öğrencilerin yanlış düzeltimi ile ilgili tercihleri, dil seviyesi, dersin amacı yanlış düzeltiminde göz önünde bulundurulması gereken bazı faktörlerdir. Bu çalışmanın amacı öğretmenlerin ve farklı dil seviyelerindeki öğrencilerin yanlış düzeltim tercihlerini anlamaktır. Katılımcılar 242 öğrenci ve 5 İngilizce öğretmenidir. Çalışma için başlangıç ve alt-orta seviyede 5 saatlik ses kaydı yapılmıştır. Öğrencilerin dil seviyeleri American Language Course Placement Test ile ölçülmüştür (bkz. Tablo 1). Öğrencilerin tercihlerini öğrenmek için bir anket, öğretmenlerin tercihlerini öğrenmek için yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları öğretmenlerin tercihleri ve yaptıkları arasında çelişki olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Yapılan kayıtlar sonucunda öğretmenlerin farklı dil seviyelerinde aynı düzeltme yöntemleri kullandıkları görülmüş, ancak öğretmenler görüşmede farklı dil

seviyelerine ilişkin farklı düzeltme yöntemleri kullandıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Farklı dil seviyelerine ilişkin olarak, öğrencilerin yanlış düzeltim tercihleri değişmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yanlış düzeltimi; tercih; farklı dil seviyesi.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher: Give me a sentence beginning ‘I...’

Student: I is ...

Teacher: No, NO!! I AM!!!

Student: Okay. I AM!!! the ninth letter of the alphabet. (Murray, 1999, p. 43).

‘Error correction’ or as Chaudron (1983) puts it “error treatment”, is teachers’ attempt to inform the learner of the fact of error. This attempt could be evident to the learner or the teacher could elicit the learner’s utterance in a more indirect way. Although Gass and Selinker (2001) brought about a question against clear-cut categorization of errors and asked whether it is reasonable to say that there must always be a single etiology for errors, error is defined as incompetence or lack of knowledge in learner’s interlanguage whereas a mistake is defined as slip of tongue or unsuccessful prediction (Brown, 2001). Error correction is of practical importance for teachers; while correcting language errors, teachers need to make fast decisions in order not to interrupt the flow of the lesson. In the meantime, they should decide the most effective way of providing feedback in accordance with the subject matter, students’ preferences and their proficiency levels. In classroom- based research, the subjects of the studies have been as follows: at what point in classroom interaction teachers provide correction (immediate or delayed), what type of correction teachers use (implicit or explicit), what types of errors teachers provide feedback on, what relationship there is between types of errors and teacher’s correction (Sheen, 2004). All above, error correction is a controversial issue in the second language acquisition (Dekeyser, 1993; Freeman, 2003). The literature on the correction of second language errors has still been quite speculative. Many studies have been conducted in order to see the efficacy of corrective feedback. However, there is lack of consistent findings in the limited literature of error correction due to different designs of the studies (Demirci, 2010). To illustrate, some studies made use of questionnaires leaving the classroom observation aside. This design may fail to understand the complicated nature of classrooms and teachers’ immediate decisions. Furthermore, studies carried out so far focused on the issue of correction either from teachers’ or learners’ perspectives. This study aims to find if teachers’ beliefs match to what they do in the classroom as well as presenting the issue from both teachers’ and students’ sides and tries to understand how teachers’ and learners’ preferences are affected by level of proficiency.

“Learners and teachers often have different preferences concerning error correction.” (Richards, & Lockhart, 1996, p. 189). Schulz’s study (1996 as cited in Lennane, 2007) established discrepancy between teachers’ and learners’ preferences; 90% of learners had a preference for correction whereas only 34% of their teachers agreed with this preference. Reasons for the differences in perceptions between students’ and teachers’ could be evaluation style, personal experiences and a myth that students are made to believe that grammar instruction is essential (Schulz, 2001).

Freeman (2003) stated that errors are important as they provide us windows on learner’s minds. Teachers, hence, will learn what learners are thinking, their stage of development and their strategies through errors. In other words, a learner’s error is significant because it provides the researcher evidence of how language is learned or acquired, what strategies or procedures the

learner is employing in the discovery of the language (Corder, 1967). Edge (1997) similarly asserted that errors are important in that they show us learners are taking steps for learning. Errors also show the teacher that learner is testing his hypothesis about language use (Corder, 1974). It is also important that teachers make use of their learners' errors (Corder, 1974; Freeman, 2003; James, 1998) because errors show the problematic areas to the teacher and teachers' feedback to these errors can accelerate the learning process and shed light to course designers and teachers to develop materials based on learner's problems (Dirim, 1999). To sum up, errors are important because they:

- show the parallelism or differences between first and second language.
- show how much the students have taken in. (not what teachers think they have put in)
- are indicators of learner's interlanguage or as Corder (1967) calls it "transitional competence"

1.1. Learners' and Teachers' Beliefs on Error Correction

According to learners, errors in pronunciation and grammar are important and should be corrected (Chenoweth, Day, Chun, & Luppescu 1983; Lennane, 2007) but they also think that being able to communicate is more important than correctness (Tumposky 1991).

Learners' preferences could show differences but it should be highlighted that learners favor correction as long as it is carried out in a non-threatening environment and help learners to communicate more effectively. Learners suggested that an ideal class is a place where teachers help learners when they make errors (Bailey, & Nunan, 1996).

Ellis (1990) suggested that teachers do not correct every error. "Many educators proposed that some errors have higher priorities for correction than other errors such as errors that have stigmatizing effects to the listener or the reader, and errors that students produce frequently" (Hendrickson, 1978, p.396). It was also stated that teachers tend to correct content errors, vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation errors respectively (Chaudron, 1988). Another data came from Hughes and Lascaratou (1982); some teachers felt that it was important to correct every linguistic error that occurred, while others felt that linguistic errors had to be ignored and only content errors had to be corrected. Chaudron (1986) found that the teachers corrected more morphological errors and fewer discourse errors. But today, it can be seen that discourse, content and lexical errors receive more attention (Ellis, 1994). According to Seidlhofer (2004), the criteria for correcting errors is intelligibility; she argued that most English teachers spend time correcting errors that appear to be generally unproblematic and no obstacle to communicative success. Another criterion for correcting errors is the tasks; teachers stated they corrected grammatical errors 'most of the time' in drills and 'not so often' in conversations (Olsen, & Catchart 1976).

Earlier studies highlighted the fact that teachers are inconsistent, ambiguous, and ineffective in correcting errors (Allwright, 1975; Ellis, 1990; Long, 1977; Lyster 1998). It was conjectured that error correction should be systematic and consistent because it would be difficult for learners to distinguish major errors from minor ones if the correction is inconsistent (Tatlıoğlu, 1994). Lee (2009) similarly found some mismatches between teachers' beliefs and feedback practice; teachers were inclined to correct errors for students but they thought that students had to learn to correct their errors. In addition, teachers continued to focus on errors although they knew that errors were inevitable.

1.2. Correction in Different Levels of Proficiency

Previous studies have given valuable information regarding correction and proficiency level; it was stated that advanced learners are more aware of their ignorance of content words and they resort to compensatory strategies to express their idea (James, 1998). It was reported that in advanced classes, teachers made use of recast less (39%) whereas this percentage went up to 60% in lower proficiency levels. The reason could be explained with respect to the fact that teachers could challenge learners by a variety of options (Lightbown, & Spada, 2001). Differently, Mackey and Philip (1998) indicated that advanced learners benefited more from intensive recasts. Advanced learners compared to less proficient learners tend to make errors in usage, style, appropriacy and global discourse errors. Their discourse was also limited in terms of speech act realization (Lennon, 1991).

Hendrickson (1978) noted that as the proficiency level of learners' increases, they are more likely to correct their own errors. Studies showed that less proficient learners produce more slips and correct fewer of these slips compared to more proficient learners. Less proficient learners tend to lose control and commit more slips in order to develop fluency (James, 1998).

The relationship between errors and level of proficiency is a focus of research by Klim (1994). In a conversational class, he observed a higher number of errors compared to other classes. It was stated that the reason for this higher number of errors to two facts; proficiency level and free exchange of discussion (Kul, 1992; Tathoğlu, 1994).

Conflicting findings regarding error correction could lead to a conclusion that proficiency level could be considered as one of the most important factors in determining the efficiency of error correction.

Although there is an on-going debate on whether teachers should provide feedback, the research showed that error correction can improve learners' language development (Lyster, & Saito, 2010). Teachers' and learners' preferences of error correction may differ in different contexts, scope of the lesson, and error type. This study aims to find teachers' and learners' preferences on error correction and see if language proficiency has an impact on teachers' and students' preferences. Furthermore, by comparing teachers' responses to students' errors to their answers in the questionnaire, it will be possible to see whether there is a consistency between what teachers do and what they believe. Another aim of this study is to find out the most frequently used error correction techniques in beginner and low-intermediate proficiency levels.

METHOD

2.1. Participants

2.1.1. Students

The participants of the study are 242 (126 beginners, 116 low-intermediate) Turkish male adult L2 English learners. Following the exam results, learners are placed as beginner and low-intermediate.

Table 1. Proficiency Level Determined by American Language Course Placement Test

	LEVEL	ALCPT* RANGE
Volume 1	Beginner	0-25
Volume 2	Elementary	25-35
Volume 3	High Elementary	35-50
Volume 4	Low Intermediate	50-60

Source: American Language Course Volume 1 Instructor Guide, p. 5., *ALCPT: American Language Course Placement Test

2.1.2. Instructors

Table 2. Teacher Profile

Information Teacher	Degree	University	Teaching Experience	Age	Gender
Teacher A	B.A	Ege University English Language and Literature	7	34	Male
Teacher B	B.A	Anadolu University ELT Department	3	25	Male
Teacher C	B.A	Kocaeli University ELT Department	3	25	Female
Teacher D	B.A	Ege University English Language and Literature	4	26	Female
Teacher E	B.A	Hacettepe University English Language and Literature	14	36	Female

2.2. Data Collection Tools

The observation is an important part of the study because as Kumar indicated observation is an appropriate way of collecting data “when you are more interested in the behavior than in the perceptions of individuals, or when subjects are so involved in the interaction that they are unable to provide objective information about it, observation is the best approach to collect the required information.” (Kumar, 1996, p. 105) Long (1977) also noted that error correction would be measurable only when teachers’ practices in the classroom were identified. Therefore, teachers were observed both in beginner and low intermediate levels. Ten lessons were voice recorded which amounts to 500 minutes of recording. Adopting both interviews and observation for data collection enabled the researcher to see whether there were any inconsistencies between what teachers did and believed.

Students were given questionnaires to find about their preferences on error correction. In the second part of the questionnaire, students were given scenarios including teachers’ different correction types. These correction types were chosen to correspond to explicit and implicit correction types (negation, repetition, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and ignore).

2.3. Data Analysis

In order to understand teachers’ practices of error correction, the classroom records were transcribed by the researcher and the data was analyzed regarding what and how the errors were

corrected, the reaction of the learner and the error type (see appendix). Following the classroom observation, teachers were interviewed.

Teachers' interview questions were based on Hendrickson's article (1978). The interview asked fundamental questions to teachers regarding error correction; who, when, what, and how to correct.

Students were given a questionnaire to learn about their correction preferences. The questionnaire was adapted from Cathcart and Olsen (1976). Questionnaire results were analyzed using SPSS.

2.4. Research Questions

1. What are teachers' preferences of error correction in beginner and low- intermediate proficiency levels?

2. What are students' preferences of error correction in beginner and low- intermediate proficiency levels?

3. Is there a consistency between what teachers do and what they think in terms of error correction?

4. What is the most frequently used error correction techniques in beginner and low-intermediate proficiency levels?

FINDINGS

3.1. Teachers' Preferences and Beliefs about Error Correction in beginner and Low-intermediate Proficiency Levels

Teachers were interviewed in order to have an understanding of their beliefs on error correction. Teachers' were asked on the type of errors that they correct (grammar, vocabulary, ideas expressed), time of correction (immediate vs. delayed), correction type (based on Chaudron's corrective list).

Some discrepancies between practices and beliefs were observed; teachers stated that they correct vocabulary errors and errors that affect coherence and communication regardless of the proficiency level except for teacher C who said she corrected grammar errors. On the contrary, it was observed in the recordings that grammar errors were the most frequently corrected errors. During the interviews, teachers reported that they correct pronunciation errors in beginner classes but it was observed in the classroom recordings that this preference is at best arbitrary. Teachers seem to correct only some pronunciation errors. In low-intermediate classes 65 pronunciation errors, in beginner classes, 37 pronunciation errors were corrected. However, the decision behind whether to correct or not to correct does not seem to depend on a certain criteria (intelligibility etc.).

During the interviews, teachers pointed out that immediate correction is more effective and they frequently use immediate correction in all proficiency levels. Delayed correction was not preferred by teachers and it was similarly observed during the session recordings that delayed correction was not used by teachers. One reason for preferring immediate correction can be explained by practicality; teachers may need to take notes and give feedback to students in delayed correction which is not practical in crowded classes.

Correction types that the teachers use in different levels of proficiency seem to show difference; it was observed in the session recordings that teachers preferred repetition with change, provide, interrupt, implicit repetition with beginner learners whereas they use repetition with change, negation, expansion, intonation with low-intermediate learners. Regardless of proficiency level, repetition with change was the most popular correction technique with a total of 69 times.

Another point worth mentioning is the issue of peer correction; during the interviews teachers A,B,E stated that they do not feel “comfortable” with peer correction for the fear that students “pick up errors” from each other. In beginner classes, peer correction was not observed very frequently possibly due to proficiency level. However, in low-intermediate classes peer correction was observed.

3.2. Students’ Preferences of Error Correction in Beginner and Low- intermediate Proficiency Levels

According to the results of the questionnaire, beginner and low-intermediate students prefer being corrected. Beginner, low intermediate students and teachers believe error correction is helpful and learners stated that they benefit from correction. Both beginner and low-intermediate students think errors of vocabulary, coherence and errors that hinder communication should be corrected. Beginner students are found to be more responsive to pronunciation errors. Both groups of students are comfortable with peer correction. Beginner students think errors should be corrected immediately and explicitly.

Table 3. Result of Item on “Were is used with You” as Teacher’s Response Beginner Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	9	7.1	7.1	7.1
	Not Good	19	15.1	15.1	22.2
	Good	35	27.8	27.8	50.0
	Very Good	63	50	50	100.0
Total		126	100.0	100.0	

The table shows beginner classes’ responses to explicit corrective feedback. Most students favor this type of correction. This finding is supported by the first part of the questionnaire. Beginner class students stated that they preferred explicit correction.

Table 4. Result of Item on ““Were is used with You”” as Teacher’s Response in Low Intermediate Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	36	37.9	40.0	60.0
	Not Good	12	12.6	13.3	20.0
	Good	6	6.3	6.7	6.7
	Very Good	36	37.9	40.0	100.0
Total		90	94.7	100.0	
Missing System		5	5.3		
Total		95	100.0		

Although low-intermediate learners had stated that they preferred explicit correction, they did not prefer this correction technique.

Table 5. Result of Item on “What do we use with You?” as Teacher’s Response in Low-Intermediate Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	19	20.0	20.7	20.7
	Not Good	38	40.0	41.3	80.4
	Good	17	17.9	18.5	39.1
	Very Good	18	18.9	19.6	100.0
Total		92	96.8	100.0	
Missing System		3	3.2		
Total		95	100.0		

Table 6. Result of Item on “Repeat Please” as Teacher’s Response in Beginner Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	55	43.7	44.0	68.0
	Not Good	22	17.5	17.6	24.0
	Good	8	6.3	6.4	6.4
	Very Good	39	31.0	31.2	99.2
	5	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total		125	99.2	100.0	
Missing System		1	.8		
Total		126	100.0		

This item is an example of elicitation. According to the first part of the questionnaire, learners stated they prefer explicit correction. However, this correction technique was not preferred by low-intermediate classes.

Table 7. Result of Item on “No” as Teacher’s Response in Beginner Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	49	38.9	39.8	39.8
	Not Good	32	25.4	26.0	65.9
	Good	32	25.4	26.0	91.9
	Very Good	10	7.9	8.1	100.0
Total		123	97.6	100.0	
Missing System		3	2.4		
Total		126	100.0		

Table 8. Result of Item on “No” as Teacher’s Response in Low- Intermediate Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	43	45.3	46.7	46.7
	Not Good	33	34.7	35.9	82.6
	Good	11	11.6	12.0	94.6
	Very Good	5	5.3	5.4	100.0
Total		92	96.8	100.0	
Missing System		3	3.2		
Total		95	100.0		

This move could be classified as ‘negation’ (Chaudron, 1983). In the table about the analysis of the corrective moves, it could be seen that negation was used four times; especially in low-intermediate classes. This move was not preferred by either class. The reason behind this preference could be the fact that only providing negation will not help the learner to understand the erroneous part. What’s more, it might discourage the learner. Consequently, it is assumed that if negation is followed by another act, beginner learners would have benefited more.

Table 9. Result of Item on “Was you in Istanbul?” as Teacher’s Response in Beginner Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	38	30.2	30.4	30.4
	Not Good	17	13.5	13.6	44.0
	Good	35	27.8	28.0	72.0
	Very Good	33	26.2	26.4	98.4
	Missing System	2	1.6	1.6	100.0
Total		125	99.2	100.0	
Missing System		1	.8		
Total		126	100.0		

Table 10. Result of Item on “Was you in Istanbul?” as Teacher’s Response in Low-Intermediate Classes

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Bad	9	9.5	9.8	9.8
	Not Good	15	15.8	16.3	26.1
	Good	35	36.8	38.0	64.1
	Very Good	33	34.7	35.9	100.0
Total		92	96.8	100.0	
Missing System		3	3.2		
Total		95	100.0		

Teacher’s emphasis on the incorrect utterance was favored by both beginner and low-intermediate learners. Interestingly, the same number of learners in different levels of proficiency preferred this correction. This correction does not provide the correct answer nevertheless, it was still preferred by the learner and it ended up with learners’ uptake.

DISCUSSION

In answering the first research question, it can be concluded that teachers preferred correcting grammar errors immediately and explicitly both in beginner and low-intermediate classes. Pronunciation errors were the second most frequently corrected error. Correction of structural elements might give us information about the focus of the lesson; it can be suggested that teachers gave priority to structure in their classrooms regardless of the proficiency level.

In beginner classes no peer correction was observed, but as the level of proficiency increases, so did the number of peer correction. This can be explained by the fact that students have accumulated enough knowledge to correct their peers and their “dependence” on the teacher has lessened. Thus, encouraging peer correction might foster classroom interaction as well as helping students to gain confidence and raise awareness about language and its use.

As for the second research question, both beginner and low-intermediate students think error correction is necessary and helpful for their language development. This finding supports the view that

students preferred explicit correction of oral errors and they considered pronunciation and grammar errors important (Lennane, 2007; Stern, 1991). Furthermore, students reported that they do not feel embarrassed while being corrected either by the teacher or by their peers. Beginner students think errors should be corrected immediately and explicitly whereas this preference seems to change in low-intermediate classes; in low-intermediate classrooms, students also prefer implicit correction. At this point, it is worth mentioning that in classroom observations, teachers allot approximately three seconds to students for self-correction, however, in the literature it was reported that ten seconds is necessary for self-correction (Klim, 1994). In the light of this information, it can be suggested that waiting time for correction is an important issue and teachers' awareness should be raised in order to help fostering self-correction. This will not only give students self-confidence but also provide a less threatening atmosphere in the classroom.

The third research question aimed at finding the discrepancies between teachers' beliefs and practices. For that matter, during the interviews, it was observed that although teachers reported preferences for correcting vocabulary and coherence errors, in practice they tend to correct grammar and pronunciation errors. It was further seen that in correcting pronunciation errors they were inconsistent and ambiguous, that is, they did not have a certain criteria (such as intelligibility) in correction (Allwright, 1975; Ellis, 1990; Long, 1977; Lyster 1998). Teachers in the study after receiving feedback on their inconsistencies admitted not having thought about the issue earlier. Thus, one of the outcomes of this study can be said to help teachers reflect upon their beliefs and practices.

In beginner classes, the most frequently used error correction techniques were; repetition with change (teacher simply adds correction and continues to other topics), provide (teacher provides the correct answer when student has been unable or when no response is offered) and interrupt (teacher interrupts student's utterance following error, or before student has completed). Comparing students' preferences, it can be suggested that providing the correct form/utterance is preferred by beginner learners. In low-intermediate classes; repetition with change, negation (teacher shows rejection of part or all of student's utterance) and expansion (teacher adds more linguistic material to student's utterance possibly making more complete) were the most frequently used error correction techniques. This finding can also be said to be in line with students' preferences. The chance in the error correction can be explained by the fact that in beginner classes, students have limited knowledge of language and correction techniques such as self-correction which require reconstruction is difficult. So, techniques such as provide are preferred. But in low-intermediate classes, students are given chance to recognize their errors with negation or expansion.

CONCLUSION

It is important that teachers are aware of the preferences they make about error correction, practice a variety of feedback techniques, consider the context and focus on the learner (Gortari, 1998). If error correction is to be effective, teachers should not stick to rigid methods but they should be willing to modify their practices concerning their learners' needs (Lennane, 2007). It was noted that "in order to have pedagogical credibility and increase their student's commitment to and involvement in learning, teachers must make an effort to explore students' beliefs about language learning and establish a fit between their own and their students' expectations" (Lennane, 2007, p. 29). Analyzing the data, it could be asserted that beginner and low-intermediate learners have different preferences for error correction and teachers know that different language proficiencies require different methods but in practice they fail to substantiate this awareness in a systematic way. In this study, instructors were both observed and interviewed. This perspective is thought to be effective in finding the diversity in teachers believes and practices.

Furthermore, this study can be said to raise awareness of English instructions about error correction. Some teachers having read the study stated that they did not think much about error correction. They added that the preferences they made could be considered arbitrary rather than thought and planned. They concluded that learning about students' preferences about error correction may result in a more effective learning because errors may give teachers clues about students' learning process.

SUGGESTIONS

It is suggested here that preferences of advanced learners' can help teachers and researchers to gain a deeper understanding of error correction. Differences regarding gender and age can also be researched. Finally, interviewing more teachers can also provide more valid data on the issue.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allwright, R. L. (1975). *Problems in the study of the language teachers' treatment of learner error*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (1996). *Voices from the classroom: Qualitative research in second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles*. London: Longman.
- Burt, M. & Kiparsky, C. (1975). *Global and local mistake*. Rowley: Mass Newbury House.
- Cathcart, R. L., & Olsen, J. W. B. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. In Fanselow, J.F., & Crymes, R.H. (Eds), *On Tesol '76*. (pp.41-45). Washington: D.C TESOL.
- Chaudron, C. (1983). A descriptive model of discourse in the corrective treatment of learners' errors. In Robinett, B.W. & Schacter, J. (Eds), *Second language learning: Contrastive analysis, error analysis, and related aspects*. (pp. 428-445). Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C. (1986). Teachers' priorities in correcting learners' errors in french immersion classes. In Day, R. (Ed.), *Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition*. (pp.64-84). Rowley: M.A Newbury House.
- 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, 79-87 doi:10.1017/S0272263100000310.
- Corder, S. P. (1974). The significance of learner's errors. In Richards, J.C. (Ed), *Error analysis* (pp. 19-24). United Kingdom: Longman.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). *The visual element in language teaching*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Dekeyser, R. M. (1993). The effect of error correction on L2 grammar knowledge and oral proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(4), 501-514.

- Demirci, P. (2010). *The effect of explicit and implicit corrective feedback on intake of past tense marker*. Retrieved from <http://www.yok.gov.tr>
- Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as social interaction discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Dirim, N. (1999). *Student reflections following teacher correction of oral errors*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Edge, J. (1997). *Mistakes and correction*. New York: Longman.
- Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition*. London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fielder, C. (2011). Positive feedback in the English language classroom. *Modern English Teacher*, 20(4), 63-66.
- Freeman, D. L. (2003). *Teaching language: From grammar to grammaring*. Canada: Thomson Heinle.
- Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition*. London: Lawrence.
- Gortari, T. (1998). *Research on error correction and implications for teaching*. Retrived from The Bridge: From Research to Practice.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62, 387-398.
- Huges, A., & Lascaratou, C. (1982). Competing criteria for error gravity. *ELT Journal*, 36(3), 175-82.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use*. London: Longman.
- Klim, D. A. (1994). *A comparison of oral error treatment in university-level ESL classes*. (Unpublished master's thesis), University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Kul, Ş. (1992). *The relationship between teachers' and students' preferences for error correction strategies in classroom conversation*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Kumar, R. (1996). *Research methodology. A step-by-step guide for beginners*. Australia: Sage Publications.
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT Journal*, 63(1), 13-22. Doi:10.1093/elt/ccn010.
- Lee, A. H., & Lyster, R. (2016). Differential effects of different types of corrective feedback on L2 receptive skills: A speech perception training study. *Language Learning*, 66(4), 809-833.
- Lennane, B.M. (2007). *Cross cultural influences on corrective feedback preferences in english language instruction*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). McGill University, Canada.
- Lennon, P. (1991). Error: Some problems of definition, identification, and distinction. *Applied Linguistics*, 12(2), 180-196.
- Lightbown, N. H., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51, 719-758.

- Long, M. (1977). *Second language acquisition and task based language teaching*. USA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 20, 37-66.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral Feedback in Classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265– 302 .
- Mackey, A. & Philip, J. (1998). conversational interaction and second language development: recasts, responses and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 338-356.
- Murray, S. (1999). Correct me if I am wrong. *Modern English Teacher*, 8(3),43-47.
- Pomerantz, A., & Behr, B. J. (1997). Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices. In Teun van, D. (Ed.) *Discourse as social interaction* (pp.64-91). Norfolk: Sage Publication.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244-285.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua Franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209-239.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263-300.
- Stern, H. H. (1991). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tatlıođlu, M. (1994). *Native speaker teachers' and non-native speaker teachers' preferences for error correction strategies in efl discourse classes*.(Unpublished Master's thesis). Bilkent University, Ankara.
- Tumposky, N. R. (1991). Student beliefs about language learning: A cross-cultural study. *Applied Language Studies*, 8,50–65.
- Vásquez, C., & Harvey, J. (2010). Raising teachers' awareness about corrective feedback through research replication. *Language Teaching Research*. 14(4), 421-443. Doi:101177/1362168810375365.
- Walker, J. L. (1973). Opinions of university students about language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 7, 102-105.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Amaç

Bu araştırmanın amacı öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin farklı dil seviyelerindeki (başlangıç ve orta seviye) yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin tercihlerini, sınıf içinde en çok kullanılan yanlış düzeltim modellerini öğrenmek ve varsa öğretmenlerin yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin tercihleri ve inançları arasındaki farklılıkları belirlemektir.

Yöntem

Bu çalışmada, 242 yetişkin erkek İngilizce öğrencisi (126 başlangıç, 116 alt orta seviye) yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin hazırlanan anketi cevaplamışlardır. Anket Cathcart ve Olsen'dan (1976) adapte edilmiştir. Anket cevapları SPSS kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir.

Kumar'ın (1996) da belirttiği üzere objektif veri toplanması gerektiğinde ve/veya kişilerin davranışları ile ilgili bilgi edinmek istendiğinde kullanılacak en uygun method gözlemdir. Long (1977)'unda benzer olarak belirttiği üzere yanlış düzeltimi ancak sınıf içi gözlem sayesinde ölçülebilmektedir. Bu bağlamda, deneyimleri 3-14 yılları arasında değişen beş İngilizce öğretmeni iki farklı seviyede (başlangıç ve alt-orta seviye) gözlemlenmiştir. Toplamda on ders saati boyunca (yaklaşık 500 dakika) ses kaydı yapılmıştır. Ses kayıtları daha sonra araştırmacı tarafından yazı dizine dönüştürülmüş ve yanlış türleri, yanlış düzeltim teknikleri ve öğrenci tarafından verilen tepki sınıflandırılmıştır. Gözlemden sonra Hendrickson'ın (1978) makalesinden yola çıkarak yarı yapılandırılmış görüşme ile yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin inançları sorulmuştur. Mülakatta katılımcılara Hendrickson'ın (1978) makalesi temel alınarak kim, neyi, nasıl ve ne zaman düzeltmeli başlığı altında toplanan sorular sorulmuştur.

Bulgular

Öğretmenlerin farklı dil seviyelerinde yanlış düzeltimine ilişki tercihleri ve davranışları

Görüşme verileri ve sınıf içinde yapılan kayıtlar incelendiğinde, bazı tutarsızlıklar görülmüştür. İlk olarak, öğretmenler görüşmede kelime ve iletişimi etkileyen yanlışları düzelttiklerini belirmelerine rağmen sınıf içi gözlemede yapısal (dilbilgisi) yanlışlarının en çok düzeltilen hatalar olduğu görülmüştür. İkinci en sık düzeltilen hataların ise telaffuz hataları olduğu görülmüştür. Ancak bu hatalarda kimi zaman düzeltme yapılırken kimi zaman yapılmamıştır. Bu bağlamda öğretmenlerin telaffuz hatalarını düzeltmede belirli bir kriter izlemedikleri gözlemlenmiştir.

Farklı seviyelerde farklı yanlış düzeltim yöntemleri kullanıldığı gözlemlenmiştir. Her iki seviyede de en çok kullanılan yöntem "değiştirerek tekrar" (Chadron, 1983) olup başlangıç seviyesinde "doğru cevabı sağlama, sözünü kesme ve dolaylı düzeltim metodları kullanılmış, alt-orta seviyede ise olumsuzlama (negation), genişletme (öğretmen yanlış düzeltmek için ek bilgi verir) ve tonlama ile düzeltim metodları kullanılmıştır. Farklı dil seviyelerinde gözlemlenen bir diğer farklılık ise, "arkadaş düzeltimi" konusu ile ilgilidir. Başlangıç seviyesinde öğretmenlerin tercih etmedikleri bu yöntem, daha ileri dil sınıflarında gözlemlenmiştir.

Öğrencilerin farklı dil seviyelerinde yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin tercihleri

Ankete katılan tüm öğrenciler öğretmen tarafından yapılan yanlış düzeltiminin yararlı, gerekli ve dil gelişimi için faydalı olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Her iki grup da kelime, tutarlılık ve iletişimi etkileyen yanlışların düzeltilmesi gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Başlangıç seviyesindeki öğrenciler yanlışların hemen ve açık bir şekilde, alt orta seviyedeki öğrenciler ise yanlış düzeltiminin direk yada dolaylı olabileceğini belirtmişlerdir. Katılımcılar arkadaşları tarafından düzeltildiklerinde rahatsız olmadıklarını söylemişlerdir.

Tartışma

İlk araştırma sorusuna cevap olarak öğretmenler iki farklı dil seviyesinde de yanlışları direk olarak düzelttiği ve benzer düzeltme metodları kullandığı gözlemlenmiştir. Her iki dil seviyesinde de dilbilgisi yanlışlarının en çok düzeltilen yanlışlar olduğu görülmüştür. Telaffuz hataları ise ikinci en çok düzeltilen yanlış olmuştur. Dil seviyesi ilerledikçe sınıf içinde arkadaş düzeltimine daha çok rastlanmıştır.

Öğrencilerin yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin tercihleri için dikkate değer en önemli nokta kendi kendine düzeltme için bekleme süresinin az olduğudur. Çalışmalar 10 saniye kadar beklendiğinde öğrencilerin yanlışları kendi kendilerine düzeltebildiğini göstermiştir. Ancak sınıf içinde yapılan kayıtlar göz önünde bulunduğu bekleme süresinin ortalama üç saniye olduğu gözlemlenmiştir. Öğrenciler telaffuz ve dilbilgisine ilişkin yanlışların düzeltilmesi gerektiğini belirtmişlerdir. Bu bulgu, Lennane (2007) ve Stern'nin (1991) çalışmalarını desteklemektedir.

Üçüncü araştırma sorusu öğretmenlerin inançları ve sınıf içi uygulamaları arasında tutarsızlık olup olmadığını araştırmaktadır. Yapılan görüşmeler ve sınıf içi ses kayıtları karşılaştırıldığında öğretmenlerin hangi yanlışların düzeltilmesi ve düzeltiği ile ilgili tutarsız oldukları görülmüştür. Bu bulgu, Allwright (1975), Ellis (1990), Long (1977), Lyster'in (1998) çalışmalarını desteklemektedir.

Sonuç

Öğretmenlerin ise inanç ve sınıf içi uygulamalarında çelişkiler gözlenmiştir. Bu çelişkilerin yanısıra sınıf içindeki uygulamaların tutarlı olmadığı, sistematik bir şekilde yürütülmediği gözlemlenmiştir. Tutarlı davranış öğretmenlerin uygulamalarını değiştirmeye gönüllü olmaları ile sağlanabilir. Pedagojik güvenilirlik için öğrencilerin öğrenmeye ilişkin inançlarının anlaşılması ve göz önünde bulundurulması gerekmektedir ve kendi tercihleri ve öğrenci tercihleri arasında bir bağ kurabilmelidirler (Lennane, 2007). Sonuç olarak öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin yanlış düzeltimine ilişkin farklı tercihlerinin bulunduğu söylenebilir.

Tablo 11. Sample of Analysis and Description of the Data of TA in Low Intermediate Class

TA	Line	Error	Type of Error	Correction Technique	Learners' Reaction
2	2165- 2168	S: You must use a medicine. T: You must use ya da take. 'Medicine' biliyorsunuz 'use' ile değil de 'take' ile. You must take your medicine. 'Medicine' çoğulu yok. 'medicine' hep 'medicine'. You must take your medicine to recover.	Lexical error	Explicit Correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)	No reaction
3	2321- 2323	S: put put putter [pat, pat patter] T: pat, pat patter mı? Put [pət], Put [pət], Put [pət]	Phonological/Grammatical error	Repetition with change and emphasis (Chaudron, 1983) Explicit Correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)	No reaction.
4	2435- 2437	S: My father, my youngest brother, and my son [sun] T: [sun] değil o son [sən] S: my son [sən] were born in the month of May.	Phonological error	Explicit Correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)	Corrects the error.
5	2442- 2444	S: We can't afford to buy presents so [su] we each// T: So [səu] S: In (x) so [səu]	Phonological error	Explicit Correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)	Corrects the error.