

Learning a Language Through Making Mistakes: The Correction Issue

Laura Stöckli-Rains
2005

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION:	3
MY PROFESSIONAL CONTEXT AND SOME PERSONAL REFLECTIONS	4
SOME PERSONAL THOUGHTS	6
DEFINITIONS:	8
A BRIEF HISTORY OF ERROR CORRECTION	9
LOOKING AT DIFFERENT RESPONSES TO ERRORS	12
THE PROCESS OF LEARNING	15
PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS	15
WHAT DO OTHER TEACHERS AND COLLEAGUES THINK	18
CONCLUSIONS AND POSSIBLE EFFECTS ON MY FUTURE TEACHING	20
THE CORRECTION ISSUE	20
REFERENCES	22
APPENDIX 1 ETHICS PROTOCOL	25
APPENDIX 2 QUESTIONNAIRE	26

Introduction:

This paper develops the argument that learners of second languages or foreign languages are apt to make mistakes, and that this is a significant part of the learning process. It argues, too, that overemphasis on correction is ineffective at the least, and detrimental at the most, in this process.

The correction of language, whether it be oral or written, plays a major role in most language teaching, so it may seem surprising that this paper argues against too much correction, if correction at all. What we have become accustomed to do automatically as teachers, constant correction, is often so inherently part of us that we often do not even give it a second thought. But we should! Do we really know what effect correction has on learners and if it really produces the desired results? My approach to this research task is based partly on using my own years of experience in teaching foreign languages in Switzerland, but it also relies on the surveys and statements of recent researchers and literature in this field.

I have underpinned my findings with questionnaires with my current classes, and other teachers in my school. I wanted to see if the information that I accumulated with my own students and colleagues would correlate with recent research findings. I used methodological triangulation, looking at the issue from different standpoints to maximize the credibility of my findings. As Miles and Huber say, 'triangulation is supposed to support a finding by showing that independent measures of it agree with it or, at least, don't contradict it' (Miles and Huberman 1984:235) As stated above, I do have my opinion, but I try in a dialectic way to come to a well-reasoned outcome.

My Professional Context and some personal reflections

The question of error correction has long been a burning question in the context of my own lessons. I have taught foreign languages for almost 20 years and see certain recurring phenomena. I began teaching in the lower school for pupils aged 7-10, where the children learn more through imitation. The teacher uses a wide variety of authentic English songs and verses for children, often with movement for the children to copy. “Old Mc Donald had a farm”, “Did you pinch my thumb?” “This is the church” and “In January there is lots of snow...” (Jaffke 82) to give just a few examples of the rich treasure of diverse materials to work with. The children are able at this age without embarrassment to enter wholeheartedly into a foreign language, delighted by the different sound of the language and its rhythm. Error correction is not a major theme. The speech of the children corrects itself through the manifold input of stories, games, songs and the many mono-lingual activities one does with the children. The Waldorf schools have over 80 years of experience with early foreign language learning (for the lower school) (Jaffke 94) and have had very good success when the lessons are given in a consistent pattern with enthusiasm. Later in the middle school the problems usually begin with constant change of teachers, lack of a clear programme with actual goals to be reached for each year. The lessons tend to remain too “playful” too long, allowing for possible unattended errors, no real striving towards correction of errors that could at this time creep in as one begins with writing and basic grammar. The possibility of errors in the lower school is not even a question, but a few years later in the 4th and 5th classes it is a definite issue when the pupils begin writing and reading and doing individual work, no longer just oral English that was also often in a choir. At this point it would be important for teachers to be aware of this new phase and consciously think of how they will deal with errors when they do arise. Should certain basic things be practiced

longer until the children really “get it”, or are these things self-correcting with time? How the teacher carries out his/her work could build the whole foundation for their later learning and even the basis for their foreign language knowledge and possible problems they might have later. Even later, in the upper school, at the age of 17,18 and 19, certain errors find their way into the pupils language and are very resistive to annihilation.

As I teach primarily at the upper school level, my work will be limited mostly to this age group or at least to the intermediate to advanced level of learning. One of the crucial questions is how to deal with errors that seem to have become part of their language, or at least to make the pupils consciously aware of them as a learning problem to be overcome. Points that have been gone over again and again just do not seem to sink in. Pupils tend to keep making the same mistakes even after being corrected , so the key question arises regarding the effectiveness of error correction. I shall argue the theme by looking at the situation from different standpoints, different opinions, approaches and theories, besides the most common, the most used method of directly approaching errors.

Some Personal Thoughts

Looking back at my own school time and the foreign language classes, correction often seemed to be something used as an authoritarian power a teacher had over you. You, the unknowledgeable, struggling person that was at the mercy of the all-knowing teacher that had all the answers. Correction could often be associated with humiliation, feeling incapable, striving towards something possibly unreachable. This very likely has an effect on my present day teaching and why I especially support pupils in becoming conscious of their learning and becoming autonomous to a certain degree.

Especially in a foreign language where one feels very vulnerable, correction must be done with much insight into pupil's feelings, where they stand, how much they can handle. A foreign language teacher can do a lot of damage, even irreparable damage, by giving insensitive error correction. We might be surprised to know how many people are damaged in some way because of their foreign language classes.

To illustrate this I would like to give an example of an actual experience of a famous Swiss writer and how he experienced it.

“French is a horror for me, and I react to the barely understandable sounds of this language traumatically. I myself find this ridiculous. I think it is unjust and dangerous, even on the border of racism when I transfer my aversion for the French language to the French people. I am a victim of my French lessons the damage is irreparable they have prevented me from ever learning this language. I don't even dare try to speak in this language, I can't afford to make mistakes.....to even one time disgrace myself.” (Bichsel 1985: 47, translation LS)

My own experiences of learning a second language while living in Switzerland have also helped reinforce my understanding of learners and their process of trial and error, their need of encouragement and support. You can have phases where you feel no one understands your attempts at speaking their language, you have an inner struggle of either going on or giving up, and sometimes an encouraging word can be

just the stimulation you need. On the other hand you also have to become resistant to people's looks of pathetic sympathy, or even anger and impatience with your inadequate attempts at communication, knowing that you can only learn by making mistakes and through slow but sure progress of assimilation. Possibly all these things play a psychological role in the background of my own beliefs with error correction in language lessons.

Besides my own personal experiences, I have had years of experiences with classes and correction, whether it be in speaking or written exercises. As a teacher I invest at least one half of my time in correction work. When I see papers full of red markings, comments and suggestions of how to go on, how to improve, later seeing how little is really taken up, then a real desire to reflect on and remedy the situation arises.

Pupils seem more interested in the mark they get than looking at the comments and how they could really take them to heart and try to change something. Even if revision is a part of the normal programme, often the results do not seem to show enough progress. This can be seen very clearly on the exemplary pupil that one has now and again, who takes what you say seriously and makes great leaps and bounds in their work, and you think, "Yes, that's how it could be, if the pupils would just be more conscious and take up what you say." The above statements show the psychological position a teacher often takes, looking at mistakes as something to stamp out and put an end to, whereas in reality, these mistakes could be looked at as a field of learning potential. (Hull 1985), (Kordes 1993), (Ur 1996)

I very possibly have to consider my own attitude and how I deal with mistakes.

After a more personal note I will now look at the theme on a more theoretical basis.

Definitions:

Errors, mistakes, faults, slips of the tongue, wrongs, lapses, transgressions, the list could go on and on, even with the connotation of the word sin. Our first thought is usually of something negative. Is that really the case, and if so why?

In this part I will try to look at the whole theme from a more analytic standpoint, beginning with definitions so as to have clarity of what is meant when using certain words in this paper.

In most of the literature about errors there are two typical manifestations of errors, one being on the performance level, the other in the field of competences. This can then be broken down into three categories; slips, errors and attempts. Slips, whether oral or written are things the learner can correct themselves, when made aware of them. Errors are what the learner should not make (according to the teacher) because they have already covered this in class. Either the pupil did not understand, or has forgotten what had been covered. Recent research in the field (Günther 2004) shows that a person can not retain information or knowledge on hearing it the first time, or even the second time, it must be repeated several times, in different ways to become part of the learners "stored knowledge". The third in this group is attempts. The pupil has not covered this area, but might make an attempt at something that he or she is not adept at, logically leading to possible mistakes.

A Brief History of Error Correction

A brief look at how thinking has developed over the years may well help to support **my thesis of looking at mistakes as being an opportunity to learn and not only as something negative.**

One could begin at the beginning with Adam and Eve, looking at who made the first mistake, but for my work it would not be directly relevant, so I will begin in 1892 to show how about one hundred years ago thinking was very different. In the pedagogic field at that time (in Germany) Ludwig Strümpell published a book about pathology in pedagogics, listing alphabetically all the possible mistakes that children could make and suggestions of how to eliminate them. It was clear at this time that mistakes were something negative. It shows that our relationship to mistakes has changed extremely. Although even as early as 1922 Rudolf Steiner, an Austrian philosopher, author and lecturer, took an entirely different approach to mistakes. In one of his lectures to teachers, parents and children in the Waldorf school in Stuttgart he talked in detail about this theme. He was not convinced that giving a composition to write and then having a pupil correct it was of any value, indeed, much more, he expected that a teacher could learn to develop a feeling for the individual mistakes each child makes and through this a pedagogic touch or feeling of how to help or further support this child to make progress. He felt the mistakes a child made were very interesting as pedagogical 'signposts' and should help a teacher to better understand the human nature in this individual. (Steiner, 1922:130 paraphrased by L. Stöckli) There were few in number at this time who saw any educational or learning value in mistakes. This did not change overnight, but gradually, as one sees when looking at the role error analysis has played in the last fifty years. Prior to the 1970's error analysis consisted of little more than collecting errors and classifying them linguistically. (French, 1949) This

provided information for remedial lessons, but with no theoretical framework for explaining the role of errors on learning a second language. With time this type of error analysis lost in interest with the rise of Contrastive Analysis in accordance with the whole Behaviourist movement, where the prevention of errors is more important than the identification of errors (Fries 1952). This theory was based on the premise that children learn basically through imitation, especially of their parents, and especially when they are rewarded and the language or speech leads to success (stimulus, response, reinforcement). Grammatical rules and other strategies are unimportant, the child is looked at as a passive being whose behavioural patterns are more important because they can be shaped and formed by parents and teachers, called 'shaping' by Skinner. (Skinner 1957) In the behaviourist theory, one tries through 'simplistic habit formation' to keep errors at a minimum. This led to the development of the "Structural Approach" that was widely used in America in the army programmes with structured 'drill and pattern' practices. (Nettle and Romaine 2000)

Soon after this Chomsky (1965) fostered a whole new way of looking at language learning (nativism) and accordingly, of looking at errors. With his idea of a "language acquisition device" children should be able to learn a language successfully and efficiently in a short space of time with this 'latent language structure'. Pit Corder took this idea further with the crucial insight that errors, far from being evidence of failure, were in fact signs of success, showing that the learner had moved on to the next stage of acquisition of which s/he did not yet have under control. He asserted that learners unconsciously construct hypotheses as to how the language works when exposed to the language data, trying out these hypotheses and thus errors are the 'traces' of these failed hypotheses. (Corder 1967) In more recent studies the

focus has been on development of a positive culture around errors and mistakes in school. (Cohen 1990)(Edge 1989) Even taking it a little further and encouraging pupils to make mistakes, to try out new things, seeing the learning potential in a positive attitude towards taking chances and even making mistakes in doing so.

(Spychiger et al 1998) Although the more recent research does show a new trend towards looking at mistakes as a source of information for better understanding of the learner, there are still many, maybe even the majority of teachers who feel it their inherent responsibility to correct every last mistake, and finally to eradicate them from writing and speaking in general. But, is this method as efficient as we think it is for supporting learning, or are there other possibilities, other ways of reinforcing progress?

Looking at Different Responses to Errors

Beginning with Krashen, who twenty years ago, very vehemently argued for allowing students to produce when they are ready, not forcing them and not correcting, but just letting them develop in their learning.

“What theory implies, quite simply, is that language acquisition, first or second, occurs when comprehension of real messages occurs, and when the acquirer is not ‘on the defensive’.....real language acquisition develops slowly....the best methods are therefore those that supply ‘comprehensible input’ in low anxiety situations....and not from forcing and correcting production.” (Krashen 1981:6-7)

Krashen always insisted that the learner develops a “feel” for correctness and that error correction has little effect on language acquisition. When a learner has had much input s/he begins to ‘instinctively’ know or at least deem what is correct. He called this the “monitor” and said that monitor over-users become too concerned with correctness so that they can not speak fluently. I agree with this for I see how pupils who have had more input are able to often find the correct word, the correct answer just through a ‘feeling’ of what is right and sounds correct, not necessarily by having learnt the rule. Others who I correct, often more than once, still don’t seem to get it right.

On the other hand there are still many advocates of correction of all deviation from the norm. Richards on one hand argues that if grammatically deviant speech serves the speakers’ purpose of communication, why should we pay further attention to it, and answers his own question by saying that deviancy from the norms will elicit reactions that may classify a person unfavorably. (Richards 1974: 49)

There are other ways of looking at this, for if it is clear that a person is learning a language, then a certain amount of tolerance is expected from the surroundings. This is though, a rather more complex question than at first appears. For if a person is not corrected and goes on making the same mistakes, it is possible that s/he feels a

certain complacency about the error, not realising even that it is a mistake, or that it is actually disdained to speak thusly among the native speakers. Long term, this can lead to fossilization, being very difficult to correct. At the same time correcting a learner's speech is a very delicate affair and must be done with much tact and respect for the person's feelings. Normally the best solution would be reformulation without directly confronting the person's speech. If a learner has enough correct input, then like Krashen says, these things should correct of themselves. As much as a teacher would like to look at errors as a potential area for learning and not so pedantically correct every last one of them, just as much pupils expect a teacher to correct them. This may not apply in all cases, but in most. I have hardly ever seen a pupil that doesn't get irritated if his work does not come back corrected, and to the full extent. Correction is something deeply embedded in our psych that we associate with a teacher's job, his or her responsibility, and if you don't do it, they don't think you are professional. It will take some doing to get away from this idea of correction. Normally when my classes write a dictation, I let them, for good reason, correct each others papers, and there is invariably at least some comment about having to do 'the teacher's job'. By not just writing their own dictation, but having to consciously correct someone else's dictation, looking very exactly at it a second time, helps to reinforce the spelling, sentence structure and grammatical devices.

Kleppin and Königs and later Kordes have done empirical research showing that a conscious dealing with mistakes or errors supports further learning and is at the same time expected and desired by the learners. (Kleppin/Königs 1992, Kordes 1993). I would support this evidence if teachers would really take the time to look at certain, but maybe not all, mistakes that pupils make. The pupils should be able to understand and consciously take up some of the more basic errors. More often than not, teachers and pupils are too busy to really invest enough time into this area of

work. We tend to go on, often too quickly, not dwelling long enough on the subject of learning through the mistakes we make. Often the only time pupils are normally really interested in correcting their work and consciously looking at the mistakes is when they have exams coming up and it is imperative to do the work correctly. Otherwise, pupils tend to be a little lazy about revising work, and doing it consciously!

Of course empirical research is always to be carefully used, language is something very individual, very specific for the specific situation, so research about language learning is hardly ever applicable in all situations. Findings can also be contradictory as seen on the following examples. Larsen says that attention to errors provides the negative evidence pupils need to reject or modify their language. (Larsen-Freeman 1991:293) However Robb et al say that it is not worth the instructor's time to provide detailed corrections since improvement comes only through further writing. (Robb, Ross and Shortreed 1986) Sengupta differentiates a bit and says That L2 learners may be overwhelmed by too detailed correction, whereas minimal correction may lead to only surface modifications of work. Also that learners may be uncertain as to how to incorporate the various suggestions and corrections into their revision process. (Sengupta 2000)

After looking at both sides of the discussion, one becomes aware that...

the main objective in error correction should always be kept in mind, and that is the learning processes and attitude of the pupil.

The Process of learning

At this point it may be necessary to look at the learning process to shed some light on the situation. Learning develops in stages as the learner interacts with the environment. At first the learner relies very strongly on L1 structures and even words, to get along, until he develops his or her own interim language which has some features of both the L1 and L2 languages, which is called interlanguage (Selinker 1972) This interlanguage actually describes the progression that a language learner makes, which is not at all linear, and errors are made along the way, as part of the learning and growing process. Normally this process is forward, but it can move backward and then again forward, it is a natural process which normally continues on as long as a person keeps learning and developing and doesn't stagnate or fossilize. If a learner comes to a point where their development reaches a plateau, a stage where s/he is unable to move on, then it is difficult to get out of this phase and the learning may stay at this point. Each phase of this learning a language is wrought with error possibilities, which should be looked at as a natural process, and we as teachers should with a conscious understanding of this be aware of how we correct errors.

Psychological Aspects

Although teachers are inclined to feel it is their duty to point out mistakes and diagnose errors, the relationship a teacher has with his pupils is by far more important. If the relationship exists first and foremost in pointing out errors, then the relationship will most likely not be a pleasant one. We must put adequate concentration on what is correct, on celebrating what pupils have done well, and in so doing motivate them on to more success. This must be a sincere valuing on the teacher's side, recognising the pupil's effort, but also possible capabilities, working

towards facilitating development. In learning a language this also means a certain amount of encouragement and even ignoring, or overlooking mistakes at times. In modern methodologies the use of selective correction is recommended so that the pupil's communication will not be stifled and mistakes should be accepted as natural concomitants of learning. (Dörnyei 2001: 93) A pupil must realise that making mistakes or errors is part of the process of learning a language and not something to be ashamed of or to be afraid of. Being overly afraid can greatly restrict the development of the learning and fluency. In some pupils this fear can be so strong that they are determined to stay silent rather than risk committing a mistake. 'When teachers believe in students, students believe in themselves. When those you respect think you can, *you* think you can.'(Raffini 1993: 147)

Modern language teaching theory and research suggests that too much correcting doesn't necessarily help and can even be counter-productive. If you constantly correct you can discourage the pupils. A much better technique of correction is called "reformulation". When a pupil says something incorrect, the teacher reformulates what he said, but in a natural and relaxed way, giving the correct form so that the pupil hears how it would be and s/he is reinforced in his/her learning. We have been conditioned through our schooling to think that mistakes are "bad", and most of us feel we are falling short of our goal when we make errors. We have a desire for striving towards perfectionism, which means no errors! I think we must make a radical revision of our understanding of errors. **Errors should not be looked at as exhibiting failure, but showing partial success!** We as teachers must realise that we are contributing to each pupil's positive or negative intellectual, social and emotional development according to our attitude and in everything we do. The assumption tends to linger that what has been taught must be retained, and error free, or there has been failure along the line somewhere, either on the teacher's

side or on the part of the pupil. **This must not be mistaken with laziness or carelessness, as these might also be factors for errors**, but more often failure in foreign language has to do with the stage at which the pupil is at and if they are ready to assimilate certain information into their repertoire at that stage.

In Waldorf schools the pupils are taught in a way that they develop a sense for the whole, to use their inner creativity and not just their intellectual faculties, to stand firmly in life with practical understanding of processes, which also applies to language learning. Especially in the beginning phases the lessons are very creative, open and built around relaxed, enjoyable assimilation of the language, which means little or no emphasis is put on correction. (Jaffke 1994) In general, also in the native German lessons, correction is not given as much emphasis as in the public schools, rather being able to write freely and creatively, giving more attention to style and use of a rich language. This can have advantages and disadvantages. Sometimes Waldorf pupils have problems with spelling even later in life. Would more attention on correction have alleviated this? Does this show that some or enough correction is necessary to really lead to improvement and learning?

On the other hand, Waldorf pupils seem to be very creative, full of self confidence and generally have a positive attitude towards life. One could again ask if this comes from growing up and learning in an anxiety-free atmosphere where error correction is not the most important criteria for judging pupils? These are questions that I can not answer in this piece of work, but would be well worth the research effort.

What do Other Teachers and Colleagues Think

In speaking with colleagues in Switzerland, more often than not they tended to say that they did do a lot of correcting, yet at the same time were not so sure as to how much it really accomplished. There was a slight discrepancy between what they actually practice and what they said in their discussions about the theme. Also on the questionnaires there was a clear trend towards correction and believing that it was absolutely necessary for progress. I didn't put my emphasis on data collection and data analysis, but did include the information from the questionnaire to show the underlying tendency in the school where I teach.

There was an even stronger vote from the side of the pupils for correction. Although they associate correction and making mistakes with something negative, they still thought it was a "necessary evil". They looked at correction as an absolute necessity for learning and expect teachers to correct at all costs. They even categorise a teacher as unprofessional if they don't correct efficiently and thoroughly. (see appendix 3)

Studies dealing with L2 learning are not supportive of comprehensive error correction techniques and conclude that marking students' errors does not help them improve nor eliminate their errors. (Leki 1991: 204)

So why do teachers go on marking errors comprehensively, and students demanding that teachers uncompromisingly correct their work?

When looking at surveys from other countries there seems to be a slight difference in the opinions of teachers from other countries. In reports from Latin America, Africa, Central Asia and the Caucasus, as experienced by (Ancker 2000) teachers are modifying their classroom practice to accommodate a more tolerant approach to errors and mistakes. They are no longer automatically correcting their students, but encouraging self-correction and peer correction. They are less concerned with

preventing mistakes and more focused on helping learners develop skills. On-line surveys ([www.teachingenglish](http://www.teachingenglish.com) 2005) about error correction seem to also support the argument that pupils learn a language through making mistakes. It is very interesting to follow the arguments and teachers all over the world. J. Gibson feels “the ideal pattern for correction is an individual matter for mutual agreement between an eager pupil and a competent and willing teacher”. Y. Pandey from Nepal tries to get his pupils to first try to find out what is wrong themselves and only then helps them. F. Aristedes from Angola also feels mistakes can not be regarded as failure, but as part of the learning process. There are voices for correction as well. J. Stronge in Spain feels it is essential to correct and explain all errors in written work, but more and more teachers are coming to the conclusion that errors do not impede progress, but are part of it! By looking at it in this light, pupils and teachers together are able to support the learning process and improve performance realising that errors are something to be conscious of but not overly emphasized. Although teachers are becoming more open, on the issue, many pupils remain steadfast in their belief that they need teachers to correct them if they want to make progress. Of course this difference has to be consciously looked at and worked on in order to find a common understanding on the metacognitive level.

Conclusions and Possible Effects on Future Teaching

I can draw at least one general conclusion from this study and that is that pupils are processing a language on the basis of their own knowledge, creating their own construction of learning which necessarily involves a certain amount of mistakes which are unavoidable, and we as teachers must learn to support and value their efforts at learning, looking at mistakes as opportunities for progress.

The matter of error correction is a many-sided theme, exceedingly complex and there is no conclusive way of looking at it.

I think it can also be safely said that we should look differently at error correction, **keeping the balance between too much and too little, differentiating when and what should be corrected.**

In general we can also say that error analysis is a limited tool for investigating SLA because it can only show a partial picture. It focuses normally on one point of error-making, one point in time and does not take into consideration the process of learning as a whole. Even defining different types of errors is not necessarily practicable and too restricting to what actually goes on in the learner's minds.

The Correction Issue

Dealing with this issue in new and innovative ways so that one doesn't always have to directly confront mistakes is the best way to help the progress of the learner, avoiding all the psychological pitfalls of normal straightforward correction.

One way is by **modelling**. The teacher or a pupil show an example on the board or overhead projector, explaining an area of learning such as grammar, or sentence structure, giving a positive input into the learner's work.

A second variation is **conferencing**. Either as a group with the class together, or in

smaller groups, exchanging ideas, looking at how the work is developing where there are difficulties etc.

A third example would be **evaluation/feedback**. Either the teacher reviewing the work and how it went over a period of time or pupils themselves evaluating their work in a diary or another form, looking at and reflecting on the learning process and their experiences and problems that have arisen.

A fourth method is **peer-coaching/peer-cooperation**. Pupils have learning partners where they support and help each other instead of standing totally alone in the learning process. This can also happen spontaneously if the teacher has fostered an appropriate climate of supporting each with polite and helpful feedback.

Of course the best way of error correction is the pupil himself coming to **self-correction**, one always learns best when one is able to find the mistakes oneself, and especially when one is motivated to find the mistakes and improve on them.

In order to do this a person must have **self-knowledge, experience and be able to self-reflect or observe**. Admittedly, many pupils are not at this stage and only reach it later in life, but still the ideal to strive for would be to incorporate this problem-solving approach into our teaching. An approach that engages the pupil to develop strategies of learning and of correcting their own mistakes. This theme goes hand in hand with another of my themes about autonomous learning (Stöckli-Rains: 2004). Pupils must learn to become more active in their own learning, consciously understanding why and what they are aiming for. This would then also include the whole area of errors and making mistakes. A self-reliant pupil would find ways of dealing with errors, realising they are natural and part of the learning process but at the same time learning through them to move on to a next and higher level.

References

- Althof, W (1999) *Fehlerwelten* Opladen, Leske + Budrich
- Ancker, W **Errors and Corrective FeedBack: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice** URL: <http://exchanges.state.gov/forum/vols/vol38/no4/p20.htm>[25 October 2005]
- Beeler, A (1999) *Wir Helfen zu Viel* Zürich, Klett und Balmer & Co. Verlag
- Bichsel, P. (1998) *Schulmeistereien* Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp
- Bowen, T/ Marks, J (1994) *Inside Teaching* Oxford, Heinemann English Language Teaching
- British Council teaching English. **Error Correction in Written Work** URL: http://www.teaching.org.uk/talk/vote/vote/vote_5_error.shtml [23 October, 2005]
- Brown, H (1994) *Teaching By Principles* New Jersey, Prentice Hall Regents
- Brown, J /Rogers, T (2002) *Doing Second Language Research* Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press
- Cohen, A.C. (1990) „*Writing as Process and Product.*“ *Language Learning Insights for Learners, Teachers and Researchers.* New York, Newbury House Publishers
- Corder, S. P. (1967) ‘*The Significance of learners’ errors*’ IRAL V/4: 161-70
- Dinkmeyer, D/ Dreikurs, R (2000) *Encouraging Children to Learn* Philadelphia, Taylor & Francis
- Dörnyei, Z (2001) *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Edge, J (1989) *Mistakes and Correction* London, Longman
- Ellis, R (1985) *Understanding Second Language Acquisition* Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Fries, C (1952) *The Structure of English, An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press
- Günther, B/Günther, H (2004) *Erstsprache und Zweitsprache* Weinheim und Basel, Beltz Verlag
- Howatt, A / Widdowson, H.G (2004) *A History of English Language Teaching*, Oxford, Oxford University Press

- Hull, G (1985) **Research on Error and Correction** New York, The Modern Language Association of America
- Jaffke, C. (1982) **Rhythms, Rhymes, Games and Songs for the Lower School** Stuttgart, Pädagogische Forschungsstelle beim Bund der Freien Waldorfschulen
- Jaffke, C. (1994) **Fremdsprachenunterricht auf der Primarstufe** Weinheim, Deutscher Studien Verlag
- Kern, R (2000) **Literacy and Language Teaching** Hong Kong, Oxford University Press
- Kleppin, K /König, F (1989) **Der Umgang mit Fehlern im Fremdsprachenunterricht** Bochum, F.G./Szulc, A. (Hrsg.)
- Krashen, S (1983) **Language Acquisition in the Classroom, The Natural Approach** Oxford, Pergamon Press
- Larsen-Freeman, D (1991), **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign language** Boston, Heinle & Heinle Publishers
- Leki, I (1991) **The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes** Foreign Language Annals, 24, 203-217
- Lewis, M (1993) **The Lexical Approach The state of ELT and a way Forward** Hove, Language Teaching Publications
- Miles, M.B. and A. M. Huberman (1984) **Qualitative data Analysis: A Sourcebook of new Methods** Beverly Hills, California, Sage
- Nettle, D. and Romaine, S. (2000) **Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages** Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Richard-Amato, P (1996) **Making it Happen Interaction in the Second Language Classroom** New York, Longman
- Richards, J (1978) **Understanding Second and Foreign Language Learning** Rowley, Newbury House
- Robb, T /Ross, TS /Shortreed, I (1986) **Salience of Feedback on Error and its Effect on EFL Writing Quality** TESOL Quarterly, 20, 83-93
- Sengupta, S (2000) **An Investigation into the Effects of Revision Strategy Instruction on L2 Secondary School Learners** System, 28, 97-113
- Selinker, L (1972) **Interlanguage** IRAL, 10, pp. 201-31

Steiner, R (1980) ***Rudolf Steiner in der Waldorfschule*** Dornach Switzerland, Rudolf Steiner Verlag

Stöckli-Rains, L. (2004) ***A Classroom Initiative to Explore the Role of Autonomous Learning on Pupil Motivation Towards the Acquisition of a Second Language*** Solothurn Switzerland, University of Plymouth Integrated Masters Programme

Ur, P. (1996) ***A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and theory*** Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Appendix 1 : Ethics Protocol

The information taken from observation, interviews or questionnaires was all with permission of the participants, with consent of participation and guarantee that all information would be used anonymously revealing no names of pupils or teachers or locations.

Participants were informed that they did not have to do the questionnaire, nor give their opinion if they did not want to, and were informed why the questionnaire was being done and for what the data was being collected and the research being done.

Appendix 2 Questionnaire

Questionnaire: Error Correction in the L2 Classroom

Gender:

Age:

Write in a number 1-4, according to how you feel.

4= *strongly agree*

3= *agree*

2= *disagree*

1= *strongly disagree*

	4	3	2	1
1. errors are to be avoided at all times				
2. teachers should ignore errors				
3. teachers should correct all errors				
4. errors are not negative, we learn through errors				
5. if a teacher doesn't correct errors you won't learn				
6. written errors are different than oral errors				
7. errors are discouraging				
8. errors are embarrassing				
9. teachers put too much emphasis on errors				
10. teachers are always looking for errors				
11. always being corrected isn't motivating				
12. a teacher who doesn't correct isn't professional				
13. Usually a person makes the same errors again				
14. It's a waste of time to correct errors				
15. Teachers correct errors arbitrarily				
16. Errors should be explained				
17. A person should find their own errors				
18. Encouragement is better than correction				
19. Pupils are more interested in a mark than in correction				
20. Error correction has little effect on learning				